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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Orators, those men of fiery tongue and eloquent language are a dying breed. Cicero says "that man will be an orator who can speak on whatever falls to him for presentation judiciously, in set form, elegantly, from memory, and with certain dignity of action." Among the great orators of this century is Fulton J. Sheen, a Roman Catholic Archbishop, who gained a national reputation mainly through the new electronic medium of broadcasting. Many said that it would be impossible for one man to hold a television audience for a half hour to speak of religion and morality, but they failed to reckon with Sheen, the spellbinder. Not only did he succeed in speaking to a televised audience, but for a number of years, he competed with the great comedian, Milton Berle.

Many factors contributed to Sheen's success as a speaker. He was a thinker, he had a magnetic personality, and he was intensely sincere. He states: "I do not talk on anything I do not believe in. I am not like an announcer on television who gets vehement about Sal Hapatica and doesn't take it. If I talk Sal Hapatica, I take it."1 Sheen himself feels that his universality of audience appeal stems from the fact that "people are reaching out for something, but they are confused."2 He viewed his role on television as teacher: "I am talking
as a university lecturer on those programs. I was a university professor for twenty-five years, and on television I am discussing subjects in a university sort of way. But I'm bringing them down to the level of the people." He spoke to his public about their problems as human beings. He spoke of the existence of God, the meaning of love, the training of children, the reason for a college education, and of such mundane things as fashions in clothing. He spoke of war and peace, and of the great threat to society in his time and ours—Communism.

Concerning Communism, Sheen felt himself a crusader. He saw Communism as imitating Christianity for

it has its Bible which is Das Kapital of Karl Marx;
it has its original sin which is class exploitation;
it has its chosen people which is its classless class;
it has its Messianic hope which is the World Proletariat;
it has its Sermon on the Mount which is its false appeal to the poor and the oppressed...it lays claim to the very depths of the soul, possessing the conscience and the spirit of man. Only a religion can do this;...it is the religion of the kingdom of earth, the religion which renders to Caesar even the things that are God's;...4

Man is constantly searching and oftentimes clings to ideas presented as solutions.

Just as soon as a man becomes disgusted with his personal life, he becomes a candidate for one of the forms of totalitarianism. Because the theistic philosophy is essentially personalist and free, it follows that as God is abandoned, there is a decrease in personal responsibility and human dignity. Totalitarianism grows in direct ratio to, and in proportion with, the dehumanization of man, and it does offer some temporary satisfaction for it gives the depersonalized man an object of devotion in place of God.5
Purpose and Scope of the Study

The purpose of this study is to analyze selected television addresses of Fulton J. Sheen on Communism and thereby to examine the rhetorical implications of those speeches in his crusade against it. The work merits investigation for a number of reasons.

First, since the Russian Revolution in 1917, Communism has been perceived as a threat to the world. The United States reacted violently against it after both World Wars and has continued a policy of "containment" and "coexistence" up to the present time. A study of Sheen's work as a rhetorical campaign would indicate that by presenting the tenets and philosophy of Communism, fear could be dispelled, and a more rational approach could be made to the subject.

Secondly, during the crucial decade from 1945 to 1955, when Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin was denouncing Communism by impugning persons in high places, Sheen was denouncing Communism at another level. Sheen was unique in his position on the national scene. He was a popular figure in the world of television, at that time a new electronic medium; he was a Roman Catholic cleric, an office which, when he began, was not an especially prestigious position; and he was recognized nationally as an orator, a fact which gave a different hue to everything he said.

Thirdly, Sheen's own statement of his work as a university lecturer identifies him as an epideictic speaker who addresses a composite audience, and therefore, his lines of argumentation should be
studied and analyzed. A study of Sheen's work on Communism is, therefore, justified.

Sheen began his television series in 1952 and continued it for the next five years. During that time, he spoke about some facet of Communism in twenty-nine of approximately one hundred thirty speeches. The speeches are one-half hour in length (restricted by television time). This study will deal with five of these speeches, one from each of the series. They are 1) "The Philosophy of Communism," 1952, 2) "Why Some Become Communists," 1953, 3) "The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence," 1954, 4) "Has Russia Really Changed?" 1955, and 5) "The Life and Character of Lenin," 1956. The analysis will be made from the transcriptions of the telecasts, which have been published.

Fulton J. Sheen, in the preface of the first series states:

Our telecasts were given without notes of any kind, nor were they written out prior to appearing before the camera. But inasmuch as the telecasts were recorded on film, all that was necessary was to transcribe them into a book. Though the ideas and words are the same as the telecasts, there has been one substantial change. The author, while willing to have his words recorded in print, was reluctant to perpetuate his abominable drawings on the blackboard.6

So he hired a professional artist to do the drawings for the publications.
Methodology

Persuasion is a difficult concept to deal with because it touches on so many variables: the speaker, his message, his desired goals, his receivers, and the process he uses. Because of this complexity, it is essential that a system which includes all of these variables be used to determine the persuasive effectiveness of a speaker. Chaim Perelman's theory of argumentation is that kind of theory and, therefore, will be used to make that judgment. And since Sheen's television series took place over a period of five years, an attempt will be made to ascertain the campaign aspects of this type of speaking, using Wallace C. Fotheringham's theory of campaign rhetoric.

According to Wallace C. Fotheringham, Professor of Communication at The Ohio State University, the criteria of a persuasive event are that the effect must be "1) relevant, 2) instrumental, 3) largely generated by message impact, 4) involve the perception of choice for the receiver, and 5) be interpersonal." In his book Perspectives on Persuasion, Fotheringham extends the idea of persuasion and presents a theory of campaign rhetoric which deals with the elements of persuasion over a long period of time rather than with only one speech. He speaks of "instrumental behavior" as a means to a goal not yet achieved:

The concept of instrumentality encourages seeing persuasion as a campaign—a structured sequence of efforts to achieve adoption, continuance, deterrance or discontinuance—rather than a one-shot effect. Effects established in an earlier
phase for a campaign are instrumental to the development of subsequent effects. The first effort to persuade commonly accomplishes only part of the job; that part, however, is necessary for the success of the next phase and for the ultimate goal.  

Fotheringham sees the effort as one of "unfreezing," "changing," and "refreezing." In other words, the speaker in his campaign first presents material to unsettle ideas held; he follows this with argumentation that persuades his listeners to change their views; and finally, he confirms these ideas in the minds of his audience. The campaign-rhetoric concept will be evident throughout the subsequent chapters and will be highlighted in the general conclusions at the end of the study.

The major portion of the study will be dealing with the theory of argumentation as set forth by Chaim Perelman, a native of Belgium, who has long been known as an expert in two areas of study: law and philosophy. Perelman has written extensively in both areas, for he finds a clear connection between law and the study of argument. In the work, The New Rhetoric, which he co-authored with Mme. L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, he presents a complete statement of his theory of argument. In it, he attempts to redirect philosophical attention to rhetorical problems as first presented by the ancients.

Because Perelman's methodology is to be used as the primary basis for this study, a more detailed consideration of his concepts seems necessary. He divides his treatise on argumentation into three parts: "The Framework of Argumentation," "The Starting Point of Argumentation," and "The Techniques of Argumentation."
The Framework of Argumentation

Chaim Perelman's approach to the study of persuasion is a study of argumentation—"the aim of oratory, the adherence of the minds addressed, is that of all argumentation." He goes on to say that this fact assumes the existence of intellectual contact, and sees the power of deliberation as a distinctive sign of a reasonable being. Perelman says:

The very nature of deliberation and argumentation is opposed to necessity and self-evidence, since no one deliberates where the solution is necessary or argues against what is self-evident. The domain of argumentation is that of the credible, the plausible, the probable, to the degree that the latter eludes the certainty of calculations.

In any given persuasive situation in which a speaker "aims at gaining the adherence of minds," a consideration must be made of the audience, for the audience determines to a great extent the type of argument to be used. The speaker must have some knowledge of the nature and composition of his audience in order to know how to best influence choice.

In his consideration of audiences, Perelman indicates three kinds:

The first such audience consists of the whole of mankind, or at least, of all normal adult persons, we shall refer to it as the universal audience. The second consists of the single interlocutor whom a person addresses in a dialogue. The third is the subject himself when he deliberates or gives himself reasons for his actions.

The universal audience transcends the other two in scope. Perelman views this audience as being composed of individuals who meet two essential requirements: first, they must be rational, and second,
they must be competent in the particular matter at hand.\textsuperscript{12} This view was made known to Richard Crable, an expert on Perelman, in an interview he had with the philosopher. The second type of audience, or the interlocutor is Perelman's "particular audience." This specialized audience includes persons in a certain culture, a certain social strata, certain common interests and persons believing the same dogmas, holding to the same set of theories or understanding the same principles. This particular audience and the self as audience may also be regarded as an incarnation of the universal audience. These two types of audiences are by nature more homogeneous\textsuperscript{13} and arguments which are most effective are from the preferable and the subjective. The universal audience is more diverse, appealed to by argument from objective reality and calls for a multiplicity of arguments.

In the area of persuasion of audiences, Perelman allows for "conditioning agents to increase one's influence on an audience." These take the form of "music, lighting, crowd effects, scenery, and various devices of stage management."\textsuperscript{14} All of these may be used to enhance the speaker in his attempts to further his case.

\textbf{Epideictic Genre}

Perelman's consideration of the practical effects of argumentation as "oriented toward the future"\textsuperscript{15} and as intended to bring about some action lies at the base of his belief that epideictic oratory forms a central part of the art of persuasion. He states:

The intensity of the adherence sought is not limited to obtaining purely intellectual results,
to a declaration that a certain thesis seems more probable than another, but will very often be reinforced until the desired action is actually performed.16

Epedeictic speaking among the ancients was reserved for the "occasion," which then decided the type of speech. The political or deliberative speech was used by the politician to predict the future; the forensic or legal speech dealt with the past; and the epideictic speech dealt with the ceremonial occasion in the present.

For Perelman, however, epideictic speaking took on a deeper meaning, for he saw it as intensifying the values already possessed by the receiver. Actually, for him, it becomes a matter of degree, and he proposes four results of intensification: 1) it enhances the communion of values, 2) it puts values above criticism, 3) it reinforces the hierarchy of values, and 4) it reinforces action. Perelman goes so far as to say that juridical and deliberative discourses are also forms of the epideictic. The epideictic introduces the importance of justifying or giving reasons and of audience adaption, whether it be self, particular, or universal. Perelman, then, sees the epideictic speaker as an educator, since what he is going to say does not arouse controversy, since no immediate practical interest is ever involved, and there is no question of attacking or defending, but simply of promoting values that are shared in the community, the speaker, though he is assured in advance of the good will of his audience, must nevertheless have a high reputation. In the epideictic, more than in any other kind of oratory, the speaker must have qualifications for speaking on his subject and must also be skillful in its presentation, if he is not to appear ridiculous. For it is not his own cause
or viewpoint that he is defending but that of his entire audience. He is, so to speak, the educator of his audience, and if it is necessary that he should enjoy a certain prestige before he speaks, it is to enable him, through his own authority, to promote the values he is upholding.17

As educator, the epideictic speaker becomes the formulator of common values for whom ethos or image is all-important.

The Starting Point of Argumentation

In analyzing argumentation, Perelman deals first with the starting point of argumentation and proceeds to associative and disassociative processes. The entire development presupposes the agreement of the audience:

When a speaker selects and puts forward the premises that are to serve as foundation for his argument, he relies on his hearers' adherence to the propositions from which he will start.18

The audience may refuse adherence because they do not find the speaker's ideas acceptable, or they may find his ideas biased, or they may feel that they are taken advantage of by the presentation of the speaker. Objects of agreement must be determined in advance by the speaker. Perelman divides these objects of agreement into two classes: "the first concerning the real, comprising facts, truths, and presumptions; the other concerning the preferable, comprising values, hierarchies and lines of argument relating to the preferable.19 As previously stated, objects of agreement based on the preferable are used to appeal to a particular audience, while objects of agreement relating to the real are used to appeal to a universal audience. This study deals primarily
with Sheen's approach to a universal audience. This, however, does not imply that Perelman's notion of the particular audience is irrelevant. What is meant, instead, is that Sheen believed his particular audience to be a personification of the universal audience.

**Facts:** Perelman does not find it possible, for his purposes, to define fact in any way that would enable one, at any given time or place, "to classify this or that concrete datum as a fact." He states:

> On the contrary, we must stress that, in argumentation, the notion of "fact" is uniquely characterized by the idea that is held of agreements of a certain type relating to certain data, those which refer to an objective reality... what is common to several thinking beings, and could be common to all.\(^{20}\)

The presentation of facts to a universal audience requires no justification; adherence is a subjective reaction to something that is binding on everybody. A fact may lose its status as a starting point if it is challenged or if it is used as a conclusion to an argument.

**Truths:** Perelman couples facts and truths as objects of agreement so that what has been said about facts is also applicable to truths. The two are differentiated by Perelman in this way: "the term 'facts' is generally used to designate objects of precise, limited agreement, whereas the term 'truths' is preferably applied to more complex systems relating to connections between facts."\(^{21}\) These connections enable a transfer of agreement to be made; thus, facts build a truth.

**Presumptions:** Allied with facts and truths, presumptions too appeal to the universal audience; however, presumptions once presented must be
reinforced in order to be effective. Perelman says, "In most cases, presumptions are admitted straight away as a starting point for argumentation. We shall even see that certain presumptions can be imposed upon audiences governed by conventions."\textsuperscript{22} Presumptions are accepted as "the normal, the likely." Perelman points out that "until there is proof to the contrary, it is presumed that the normal will occur, or has occurred, or rather that the normal can safely be taken as a foundation in reasoning."\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Presentation of Data:}—Perelman maintains that form and content are closely related to each other. In his presentation of data the speaker must consider both. The form of the discourse must deal with a time limitation, thereby forcing the speaker to make choices about which arguments would be more effective than others, which arguments need amplification and/or repetition, and which arguments need to be more concrete to create a sense of actuality. These arguments become, of course, the content of the speech. In this study, the content of two of Sheen's speeches will be analyzed for readability and human interest.

\textbf{The Techniques of Argumentation}

Perelman's techniques of argumentation are concerned with the structure of the argument and by a constant interaction of all its elements. He describes these techniques as "processes of association and dissociation." Perelman considers these processes "loci of argumentation because only agreement on their validity can justify their application to particular cases."\textsuperscript{24}
**Associative Schemes:** Perelman points out that "by processes of association we understand schemes which bring separate elements together and allow them to establish a unity among them, which aims at organizing them or at evaluating them, positively or negatively, by means of one another." Perelman sees associative schemes as quasi-logical arguments based on the structure of reality, in agreement with the nature of things, and as arguments "which aim at establishing the structure of the real: arguments taking the particular case into account." These are usually arguments by example, illustration, and analogy.

**Quasi-Logical Arguments:** For Perelman, quasi-logical arguments have a right to a certain conviction because of their similarity to the formal reasoning of logic and mathematics. He states:

... we believe that formal reasoning results from a process of simplification which is possible only under special conditions, within isolated and limited systems. But since there are formal proofs of recognized validity, quasi-logical arguments derive their persuasive strength from their similarity with these well-established modes of reasoning.

The standards for evaluating effective quasi-logical arguments include 1) compatible or incompatible but not contradictory arguments; 2) the ridiculous in showing conflict with accepted opinion through the use of irony; 3) identity and definition according to the normative, which indicates the manner in which a word is to be used; descriptive, which indicates the meaning given to a word in a certain environment at a particular time; condensed, which indicates the important elements of a descriptive definition; and complex, which combines elements of the three others; 4) arguments by transitivity—which makes it possible to
to infer that because a relation holds between certain propositions, it
will hold between others, thus making them transitive; 5) argument by
including the part in the whole and the whole into its parts; 6) argu-
ments by comparison with the idea of measure underlying the argument;
7) arguments by sacrifice, which is based on the idea of exchange—
discovering what kind of sacrifice one is willing to make in order to
achieve a certain result; and 8) argument as to probability, based on
possible occurrence.

Arguments based on the structure of reality:—In his presentation of
arguments on the structure of reality, Perelman analyzes arguments that
deal with relations of succession—those which he says "unite a phenom-
enon to its consequences or causes"—and arguments that apply to the
relations of co-existence, "which unite a person to his actions, a
group to the individuals who form it." 23

The techniques of argumentation dealing with sequential rela-
tions include establishing a causal link, and Perelman lists three
types:

1) argumentation tending to attach two given
successive events to each other by means of a
causal link; 2) argumentation tending to re-
veal the existence of a cause which could have
determined a given event; 3) argumentation
tending to show the effect which must result
from a given event. 24

Other arguments are by consequence, the ends-and-means argument, and
argument from waste, which says that since a task has been started and
much energy expended, it should not be given up or it will all have been
wasted. Techniques of argumentation dealing with relations of co-existence include argumentation from the nature of things; argument from authority which uses the acts or opinions of an individual or group to support a thesis; act and essence argument; and establishment through the particular case by example, illustration, and analogy.

Dissociative schemes:—According to Perelman, dissociative schemes are "techniques of separation,"

which have the purpose of dissociating, separating, disuniting elements which are regarded as forming a whole within some system of thought: dissociation modifies such a system by modifying certain concepts which make up its essential parts. By modifying concepts, dissociation is characteristic of all original philosophical thought. Logically and psychologically, association implies dissociation. The two must work together at the same time. By associating certain ideas, one necessarily dissociates or eliminates others. In order to clarify the concept of dissociation, Perelman uses what he calls the "appearance-reality" pair. He points out that "while appearances can be opposed to each other, reality is coherent: the effect of determining reality is to dissociate those appearances that are deceptive from those that correspond to reality." Perelman illustrates as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{appearance} & \text{Term I} \\
\text{reality} & \text{Term II}
\end{array}
\]

Term I corresponds to the apparent, to what occurs in the first instance, to what is actual, immediate, and known directly. Term II, to the extent that it is distinguishable from it, can be understood only by comparison with Term I: it results from a dissociation effected within Term I with the purpose
of getting rid of the incompatibilities that may appear between different aspects of Term I. Term II provides a criterion, a norm which allows us to distinguish those aspects of Term I which are of value from those which are not.\textsuperscript{32}

**Interaction of arguments:** Perelman finds that arguments "are in constant interaction at more than one level: interaction between various arguments put forward, interaction between the arguments and the overall argumentative situation, between the arguments and their conclusion, and finally, between arguments occurring in the discourse and those that are about the discourse."\textsuperscript{33} Further, he shows that arguments are strengthened or weakened by this process of interaction.

Assessment of the strength of argument is a factor in argumentation, as is convergence when several distinct arguments lead to a single conclusion and reinforce each other, and amplitude which allows the speaker an unlimited accumulation of arguments. In addition to these, Perelman concludes that choosing the order of arguments is essential to persuasion:

> If argumentation is essentially adaption to the audience in choosing the order in which arguments are to be presented in persuasive discourse, account should be taken of all the factors capable of furthering acceptance of the arguments by the hearers.\textsuperscript{34}

The analysis of the effectiveness of Fulton J. Sheen as a speaker will be made, then, in the light of these concepts of Perelman. The study will be made to judge his approach to his audience and message, and to his handling of the starting points and the techniques of argumentation.
Previous Research

Surprisingly, little research has been done on the work of Fulton J. Sheen. A few Masters theses, and two doctoral dissertations have been done thus far. In 1949, Reverend Henry Malone studied Sheen's radio preaching as an art. Five years later at the University of Wisconsin, a study was done about Sheen's career as a speaker on radio and television. The following year, Robert Stager at Bowling Green University analyzed Sheen's use of "Ethical, Emotional and Logical Proofs in Selected Radio and Television Addresses Regarding Communism from 1936 to 1952." In the brief work, Stager touches on all of these aspects; however, he makes some rather strange observations. In the section dealing with ethical proof, under "intelligence," he says, "This writer questions such word choices as "belly," "bludgeoned into living their lives without God," "when bones are strewn across the fields," "the rotted body of Lenin," and "Communism considers every man a stomach," coming into one's home from the lips of a Roman Catholic Bishop." Stager also criticizes Sheen's description of the Crucifixion "... but it is Divine to be impractical; it is Divine to hang there." This writer questions Stager's interpretation. These descriptive phrases seem instead to be "opening the doors of the mind." Stager concludes that a great portion of Sheen's popularity comes from the way in which he presents his material rather than from the material itself.

Also, in 1955, David W. O'Brien analyzed some of Sheen's published writings and radio talks to discover Sheen's attitude toward a contemporary religious outlook and the roots of modern religious thought.
In 1956, a Henry Adams studied selected sermons of Fulton J. Sheen and Harry Emerson Fosdick. The last masters thesis about Sheen was done in 1962 at the University of Arizona by Charles Romero. He analyzed the organizational elements of selected television addresses of Sheen.

Two doctoral studies were done. The first in 1961 touched on Sheen only partially. It was done by Henry Fincher Eason at the University of Denver. Eason studied five contemporary preachers of different religious denominations in order to discover the frequency with which they employed analogies to support sermon themes. In 1965, another doctoral study was done, devoted to Sheen entirely, probing the "rhetorical roots" of the churchman who was so successful in the new electronic medium of television, and to this end, William James Hanford proposed "A Rhetorical Study of the Radio and Television Speaking of Bishop Fulton J. Sheen." The purpose of the study was to probe "the persistent phenomenon of Bishop Sheen's reputation as a radio and television speaker during those years in which he enjoyed the apogee of his fame as an orator." The work is divided into five chapters. The first deals with "Methods and Background"; the second, "The Priest"; the third, "The Scholar"; the fourth, "The Orator"; and the fifth, "Analysis and Evaluation." Although the study was both historical and critical, the writer dwelt more heavily on the historical and biographical aspects of Sheen than on the critical. His presentation of Sheen the man, priest, scholar, and orator was extensive, well done, and based mainly on personal interviews. His critical analysis dealt mainly with the traditional rhetorical elements of invention, disposition, style, and
delivery in order to measure the effectiveness of Sheen's persuasiveness. Since that time no one has studied Sheen's work in depth, especially in regard to what seems to be his most intense interest, that is Communism.

**Plan of the Study**

The responsibility of a rhetorical critic, as defined in this study, is to make fair and accurate judgments concerning the effectiveness of Fulton J. Sheen's epideictic speaking in his television addresses on Communism from 1952 to 1956. Essential to the appraisal are the following: 1) a look at the communicator who became orator and crusader; 2) an examination of the rhetorical situation, the context in which the crusade began; 3) an examination of the effectiveness of the campaign aspect of the rhetoric; 4) an evaluation of the speaker's effectiveness in achieving his rhetorical goals; and 5) a summary and conclusion drawn from the study.

Chapter II will deal with Sheen, providing the reader with a background and preparation for the analysis of Sheen's work; Chapter III will identify the rhetorical situation; Chapters IV, V, VI, will analyze the speeches in the light of Perelman's concepts of argumentation; and Chapter VII will summarize and draw conclusions.

Let us now take a look at Fulton J. Sheen.
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CHAPTER II

FULTON J. SHEEN: EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND AND TRAINING

Because the speaker is so intimately connected with his speech, it is important to know something of him as a person. Perelman states:

In treating the relationship between act and person, the speech considered as an act of the speaker, deserves special attention, both because, for many people, speech is the most characteristic manifestation of the person and because the interaction between speaker and speech plays a very important part in argumentation.¹

In that context, let us look at Fulton J. Sheen, priest, scholar, orator, writer, editor, TV celebrity, and public relations man, who has been a part of the American scene for a very long time. When Sheen was installed as Bishop of Rochester in 1966, two Roman Catholic prelates put his fame into words. Francis Cardinal Spellman told Sheen, "You belong not only to the ages but to the world." And in the same vein, the retiring Bishop Kearney stated:

It is preposterous for anyone to attempt to introduce Bishop Fulton Sheen to an audience. There are only three kinds of people in all the world who don't know who he is. They include those who cannot read, those who have never listened to radio, and those who have never looked at a TV set.²

In his own time, Fulton J. Sheen has indeed become a legend.
Early Years and Education

Fulton J. Sheen was born in El Paso, Illinois, May 8, 1895, to Newton Morris and Delia (Fulton) Sheen. He was the oldest of four sons born to the pair. Baptized Peter, he took the name John at confirmation, and thereafter was called P.J. until he chose his mother's maiden name, Fulton, as his official first name. The family moved to Peoria, Illinois, when Fulton was seven, where his father alternated between shopkeeping and farming.

The Sheen family had a good Catholic home where the rosary was recited each evening, and Fulton grew up in this atmosphere of faith and devotion. As any child from such a good Catholic home, young Fulton attended a Catholic parochial school where he served as an altar boy. Sheen, even at this time, cultivated a desire for the priesthood. His high school days were spent at the Spalding Institute, in Peoria, conducted by the Christian Brothers.

Fulton J. Sheen went on to St. Viator College in Bourbonnois, Illinois, where he proved himself an excellent student, interested more in dramatics and journalism than in sports. As a freshman, he joined the debate team, an activity which might have been the beginning of his speaking career. An incident which took place at this time was related by Sheen in an interview with William Hanford:

The night before the big debate with Notre Dame University, Father William J. Bergin called me over to his room and said: "Stand up there. I want to tell you that you are the worst speaker I have ever heard in my life!" I said, "If I'm so terrible, why did you ever put me on the debating team?" He answered, "Because you can
think, not because you can talk!' 'You're going to learn,' [his coach told him.] 'Take a para-
graph out of your speech, any paragraph you want.' The subject we were debating was the Merchant
Marine, and I took a paragraph out of my Speech.
I repeated it over and over again and he said,
'Do you see your mistake?' 'No.' He underlined
certain words and told me to stand on my toes
and shout them. The effect was ridiculous.
[They kept at it for more than two hours.] 'I
was exhausted and so was he, 'I don't know what's
wrong with me.' [Father Bergin promised him he
wouldn't leave the room until he found out. In
the end, the strategy worked, and realization
came.] 'I think I know what it is, maybe I'm
not natural.' Father Bergin exclaimed, 'That's
all!' and dismissed him.

Notre Dame was defeated and Sheen has remembered well the lesson he
learned that day.

Sheen received his B.A. degree from St. Viator College in 1917
and went on to the major seminary in St. Paul, Minnesota, where he
completed two years of theology. The ceremony of ordination took place
on September 20, 1919 at St. Mary's Cathedral, where he had served as
altar boy. Instead of being assigned to parish work, as is customary
for the newly ordained, Sheen was sent to the Catholic University in
Washington, D.C. for two years of further study.

During those two years, Sheen had his first encounter with
parish work by helping out in numerous churches around the city:
preaching, hearing confessions, and offering Holy Mass. His first
sermon was given at one of these churches. Sheen was asked to substi-
tute for a priest who had to leave the city because of a serious ill-
ness in his family. An interviewer for Time magazine relates this
first experience:

Fearing that the church's pastor would think he
was too young, Sheen did not present himself at
the rectory till five minutes before Mass was
supposed to start. The pastor said gruffly:
"Get over to the church. The other altar boys
are dressed already." But Sheen made a hit;
"They asked me back the next week," he says.4

By the end of his Washington stay Sheen received two degrees
from Catholic University: the S.T.B. (Bachelor of Sacred Theology)
and the J.C.B. (Bachelor of Canon Law). On instructions from Bishop
Dunne, his ecclesiastical superior, Sheen left for Europe for gradu-
ate study.

Study Abroad

For five years, Sheen studied abroad. Three years were spent
at the University of Louvain, where he received his Ph.D. degree. He
also attended the Sorbonne in Paris and the Collegio Angelico in Rome,
where he received his D.D. (Doctor of Divinity). In 1925 he was
granted an agrege en philosophie (a kind of super Ph.D.) by the Univer-
sity of Louvain and his dissertation, God and Intelligence, gained for
him the Cardinal Mercier International Prize for Philosophy, with the
added distinction of being the first American ever to receive the award.
His brilliant educational career had prepared him well for the years
ahead.

While abroad Sheen had a number of other firsts: his first
convert, his first teaching, and his first full-time parish work.

On first arriving in Europe, Sheen and his brother Tom, who
traveled with him, went to a small village in France to learn the
language. They stayed in a Paris boarding house, where Sheen met a
Frenchwoman who lived on the floor above. The *Time* relates,

In deep distress over the breakup of her home, she told Sheen she was about to commit suicide. Sheen begged her to wait just nine days. She agreed, and for eight evenings Sheen sat with her, talking religion. His French was still so halting that he kept a dictionary open before him. On the ninth day, the woman entered the church.5

She was his first convert.

Sheen's teaching experience took place at St. Edmund's College in Ware, England. There he taught dogmatic theology. It was while he was at St. Edmund's that Sheen met Ronald Knox, the great translator of the Latin Vulgate. They became good friends.

Fulton Sheen's first experience in parish work was at a small church in Soho, England. It was recounted in *Time*:

He went to Britain for a year to be assistant to the pastor of St. Patrick's, Soho, a poor drab parish, half-Italian, half-London Irish, with a sprinkling of Chinese. He is still a loved and legendary figure at St. Patrick's. Whenever he goes to London, he preaches there and the parishioners eagerly look forward to his visit.6

On his return from Europe, although he had been invited by Nicholas Murray Butler to teach at Columbia and by Cardinal Bourne of London to go to Oxford with Knox to open the first Catholic College since the Reformation, Sheen was sent by his Bishop to another St. Patrick's parish. This one was in the Diocese of Peoria, Illinois. It too was a poor parish, and for nine months Sheen "made his sick calls and administered the last rites, begged for contributions and celebrated Mass."7 These nine months, it seems, were a test of his obedience. He had won so much acclaim, both at home and abroad, when
he was young, that his Bishop had to see whether he could obey.

**Teacher and Preacher**

By the end of 1926, Sheen had joined the faculty of The Catholic University of America, where he was to teach for twenty-five years. Sheen was an excellent teacher, and his classes were well attended, many auditing the courses. Father Daniel Noonan, his biographer, comments: "He was an exciting professor with a beautiful delivery and crystal-clear explanation. He was not, however, friendly with the students. He believed in monologue, not dialogue."  

Sheen's career as a preacher began in small parish churches, but before long he was in demand both at home and abroad. *Current Biography* enumerates his engagements:

Described by the London Universe as "the most popular of American preachers who have come to England." Father Sheen preached at the summer conferences held at Westminster Cathedral in London in 1925 and again from 1928 to 1931; lectured at the Catholic Summer School at Cambridge in 1930 and 1931; and during the summer of 1933 was visiting preacher at Santa Suzanna in Rome. Meanwhile, his fame as a speaker continued to spread in the United States. For five Lenten seasons he was the Sunday evening preacher at the Church of the Paulist Fathers in New York City, and from 1931 he has been annual Lenten orator at St. Patrick's Cathedral in the same city.

**Training as Speaker and Method of Preparation**

His own training as a speaker was minimal. He received his original training at St. Viator College while on the debate team. There was no speech training at the seminary. While he was in Washington in 1921, Sheen had two elocution lessons that he did not find
profitable. However, while he was abroad, he studied with a voice
teacher. Sheen recalls:

And then I went to Rome and I went to a voice
teacher; he gave me this example which I never,
ever forgot—all he did was to give me a deep-
breathing lesson and told me to practice it.
... He told me to fill up the diaphragm—not
to throw out the chest but to fill the dia-
phragm, and then talk from the diaphragm full of
air. ... That was the best training I have
ever received, and I'm glad I never had any other.
Because that, after all is the key—the key to
resonance. This was the only training I ever had.10

Sheen has what might be termed a unique approach to the art of
speaking: he never uses notes. This practice, however, can prove a
disadvantage as well as a great advantage. Obviously, in not using a
prepared script, one takes a chance of being misquoted and of not
being able to make a defense, since there is no text to go to.

In his second Life is Worth Living series, Sheen has a speech on
"How to Talk," in which he offers his personal approach to a discourse.
He begins by stating that the preparation for a talk is both remote and
proximate. Sheen states: "How long does it take to prepare a speech?
How much time is put into a telecast? About thirty or forty years, but
this is remote preparation. ... A good speech, too, has a tremendous
remote preparation and this implies three things: study, study, study."11

In his proximate preparation, Sheen decides on a topic, researches
it, then writes out a plan and the following day tears up the paper. The
next day he must begin thinking the process through again. He develops
a new plan and tears it up, so that nothing is kept from day to day.
Sheen comments,

The great advantage of this system is that one is forced to rethink the ideas; the subject is learned from the inside out, instead of from the outside in. Why should the living mind be subject to an inert sheet of paper?  

Sheen objects strongly to speakers who read their material. "Much wisdom," he says, is hidden in the remark of the old Irishwoman who heard a Bishop reading his discourse. She said, 'Glory be to God, if he can't remember it, how does he expect us to."  

Finally, Sheen presents sincerity, clarity, and flexibility as conditions of a good talk. In regard to sincerity, he cautions against imitation, for insincerity is often "derived from a want of conviction or truthfulness."  

Clarity comes only with a thorough understanding of the subject. He accuses professors of being dull because they do not really understand the subject. Flexibility he equates with adjusting to one's audience for whatever reason; boredom, heckling, or any other interruption.

Churchman

Sheen was honored by the Church, first in 1934, when he was appointed Papal Chamberlain with the title of Very Reverend Monsignor. In October of the following year, Pope Pius XI elevated him to the rank of Domestic Prelate, with the title of Right Reverend Monsignor. In 1951, Sheen was consecrated Titular Bishop of Cesariana and Auxiliary to the Archbishop of New York.

In September of 1950, Sheen was appointed National Director for the Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Before taking the new
position, he resigned his teaching post at The Catholic University of America. He intended to continue with his radio broadcasts but canceled all other speaking engagements except those which dealt with the aims of the Society, concern for the poor. The purpose of the society is to further evangelization of the world by prayer and aims. Sheen became the great champion of the poor of the world. He often said that "some were born with silver spoons in their mouths, but he was born with a collection plate in his hands for the Missions."  

Sheen goes on to say that: "This really is the greatest philanthropic charitable organization in the world. Not one of our 135,000 missionaries, doctors, nurses, teachers, or social workers receive a cent of charity. They all labor for the glory of God."  

Sheen not only begged for money from others, but contributed large sums himself. All of the money that Sheen received from his broadcasts was given to the Missions. He traveled far and wide, both to collect money for the missions and to visit the places in the mission lands where there was a great need. In September, 1966, an editorial in the Christian Century accused the Society of being the greatest charity fraud of all time, because very little of the collected money reached the poor. This accusation was immediately answered by priests and bishops in the field who had been recipients of the monies.

Converts

Another area which took much time and energy was Sheen's work with converts. Sheen felt strongly that one of the most important works that a priest must do was to bring people to Christ and Christ
to people. Much publicity was given to his converting famous people; among these were: Heywood Broun, Louis Budenz, Clare Boothe Luce, Fritz Kreisler, Jo Mielziner, Henry Ford II. But there are thousands of unknown persons who have received instruction to the Catholic faith from Bishop Sheen.

Countless stories are told about how bluntly Sheen introduced the subject of religion to those he was to convert. Two of the stories are these:

Once Sheen was leaving the apartment of a friend when someone casually mentioned, "That's Fritz Kreisler's apartment." Sheen rang the doorbell and introduced himself. They exchanged pleasantries. Suddenly, Sheen popped the question, "Would you like to take instructions?" A few months later Fritz Kreisler was in the Catholic Church.17

The conversion of Heywood Broun made headlines in 1939. Some of his friends were shocked, because he had attacked Sheen on his position on Communism in his column. . . . The Bishop got his adversary on the phone. "I want to see you," said Sheen, "About what?" asked Broun. "Your soul." They met at a Manhattan hotel and talked. Later, Sheen called Broun up again. "Heywood," he said, "you've run a thousand miles. You'd better come in and let me service you." Nine years later, seven years before his death, Broun entered the church.18

Sheen was highly thought of by his converts. In a letter to this writer, Clare Boothe Luce says:

Archbishop Fulton Sheen is a very great and a very holy man. He may even be a Saint. I think he is. He has one great mark of the Saint—he is full of the joy of God. I think everyone who has ever known him finds his happiness contagious.19
During his lifetime, Sheen has worn many hats. One of these is the hat of journalism. Ever since his days in high school, he had been interested in writing. He was a prolific writer, an author of many books. His interviewer from *Time Magazine* describes Sheen, the author, in this way:

> He lived in a light airy house (designed to order for him) startlingly modernistic, but comfortable and efficient. From his study, Sheen faced gently rolling hills through a large picture window; there he did most of his popular writing. For heavier tasks he would move to his "workshop" in the furnace room, piled high with books and papers, where he wrote with his back to the furnace.

Since 1925, Sheen has written more than sixty books. Most of his work is of the popular upstairs variety appealing to the general reader. Some of these include his *Life is Worth Living* Series (transcriptions of his television addresses); *Peace of Soul, Lift Up Your Hearts*, and *Three to Get Married*. Some appeal strictly to the Catholic reader, such as *The World's First Love, The Life of Christ*, and *The Seven Last Words*. Finally, there are many which are intended for those who feel at home with lengthy philosophic discussions. His first, *God and Intelligence*, was of this variety, and in it he defended the philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas.

At least two of Sheen's books deal specifically with Communism, the subject about which he is most vehement. In 1938, he wrote *The Cross and the Crisis*; and ten years later, *Communism and the Conscience of the West* was published. In this second book, he spells out clearly the tenets of the philosophy of Communism. He shows the basic defects
of Communism and hastens to point out that although Communism is to be seen as an evil, the Communist is to be loved. The work is an indictment of the shortcomings and the evils of the Western World, which had contributed so greatly to the beginnings of Communism. Much of the material that was in the book was used in the television addresses.

Of his books Sheen himself says, "I don't remember my books. My relationship to books is like Jean Jacques Rousseau to his children. He abandoned them all at birth. And I start on new ones." 21

Radio and Television

Sheen's broadcasting career began with radio. In 1930, the National Council of Catholic Men decided to sponsor the Catholic Hour, a Sunday evening program, and Sheen, who had already distinguished himself as a pulpit orator was chosen to speak. He was very successful, and "the program which began as a seventeen-station network was carried in 1950 by 118 NBC affiliates and by shortwave around the world, with an average listening audience estimated at 4,000,000." 22

Sheen's TV debut was probably even more amazing because when he began he was given as Time states, the "obituary spot," i.e., conflicting with two very popular shows on the other networks, Milton Berle and Frank Sinatra (Tues. 8 p.m., E.S.T.). Against this formidable competition, Sheen has made a spectacular showing. 23 To be able to hold an audience for a half hour without music or any other activity is, indeed, a feat. As Sheen's popularity increased, Berle's dropped, and Sinatra went off the air. The interviewer in Time continues, "Muses
Berle: If I'm going to be eased off the air by anyone, it's better I lose to the One for whom Bishop Sheen is speaking. 24

Sheen never felt that his television show was a "religious" program; rather he regarded himself as a teacher, with the world as his classroom. The subjects of the talks were varied. He spoke of war and peace, pleasure and pain, joy and sorrow, marriage, bringing up children, fashions, and many other topics.

The Television Series and Communism

Throughout his years of television broadcasting, Sheen spent considerable time on the subject of Communism. In his first series, six of twenty-six talks dealt with Communism. He began by speaking of the Philosophy of Communism; then he turned to Communism and Russia; his third talk on Communism that season was a eulogy on the "Death of Stalin," which was truly a masterpiece. Using Shakespeare's play, *Julius Caesar*, Sheen drew an incredible analogy between the death of Caesar and the death of Stalin. The words of the deified Caesar were put into the mouth of Stalin: "But I am constant as the Northern Star." He pointed out that the triumvirate after Caesar's death was Cassius, Mark Antony, and Brutus, and compared them to the triumvirate after Stalin's death to Beria, Malenkov, and Vishinsky. First Sheen points out resemblances in character between the respective pairs—Cassius and Beria, Mark Antony and Malenkov, Brutus and Vishinsky. Sheen, then, proceeds to read the play:

We shall not change any lines of Shakespeare, but only a few words. For Caesar, we shall read
"Stalin," for Rome we shall read "Soviet."
Remember, no lines of Shakespeare's tragedy of
Julius Caesar will be altered. Suppose Stalin
Stalin is dead. The plans for the funeral are
being made. All three want to talk at the
funeral of Stalin. 25

This telecast was given on February 24, 1953. Nine days later Stalin's
death was announced. There is no evidence to show that Sheen had any
kind of gift of prophecy nor that he had any knowledge of Stalin's im-
pending death. It seemed to be only an eerie coincidence.

The fourth talk that first season compared the Soviet and Ameri-
can Constitutions; the fifth concerned itself with the peace tactics
of the Soviets; and the final one that season (the last of the series
as well) was on "The Role of Communism and the Role of America."

The second series had eight of twenty-six talks on Communism.
These included "Pax Sovietica," "Liberal or Reactionary," "Why Some
Become Communists," "The Philosophy of Communism," "How Traitors Are
Nation's History."

In the third series Sheen concentrated on Communism in seven of
his talks. These were: "Lesson One in Economics," "Has Christianity
Failed?" "Freedom," "The Russian People," "Religion in Russia," "The
Russian Lullaby of Coexistence," and "The World in Which We Live."

The fourth series had eight talks on Communism: "Russia Is Not
Communism," "Has Russia Really Changed?" "What the Communists Mean by
Truth," "The Life of Karl Marx," "How a Democracy Differs from a
Totalitarian State," "Is Capital or Labor Always Right?" "The East and
the West," and "Russia's Unknown Power."
The fifth and final series found only three talks devoted to Communism: "The Life and Character of Lenin," "The Man Who Knew Communism Best---Dostoevsky," and "The Dry Martyr of Hungary---Cardinal Mindszenty." This last came during the Hungarian revolt and intensified interest in the audience.

**Initial Interest in Communism**

Sheen's interest in Communism dates well back in his career. In an interview with him and in answer to a query about his initial involvement, he states:

> It was a study of the Russian Revolution and its development. I was ordained in 1919, the Russian Revolution was in 1917. I was in Europe then for five years and during that time at the University, I met students, for example, from Russia, who were exiled from Russia, who told about Russia. Then when I came back to this country, I saw the danger of it.\(^{26}\)

Earlier in the interview, as Sheen was speaking of the preparation of his speeches, he emphasized the fact that he did not write speeches. "I study, and study, and study."\(^{27}\) In preparing for his work with Communism, this principle was in strong evidence. Sheen says,

> I studied it. I have read everything that Lenin has written in English and almost everything he wrote is in English. I have read every line of Stalin's that is in English and in French and everything of Marx. I studied the Soviet Constitution at great length, still know some of it by heart, particularly chapter twelve. So I gave myself over to a profound study of it and I taught it at the University.\(^{28}\)

Besides being well grounded in the tenets and philosophy of Communism, Sheen was able to get first-hand information to use as
supportive material. He states:

One, I had an informer inside the Communist Party who was a card-carrying member who was close to the Central Organization. And I was close to him for two years. Secondly, I had a secretary who was Russian and who would read Pravda and the other Communist publications every day and would give me the information. Then thirdly, there was a tremendous amount of material that was circulating as Communist documentation done by scholars which I used. I did not rely on hearsay newspaper accounts unless they would be speeches, for example, found in the New York Times.29

Sheen's crusade against Communism took him beyond the television cameras to lecture halls across the country. He speaks of being under pressure from the Communists because of the talks and for two years he had a body guard who would go with him whenever he would lecture.

There were many interesting incidents that took place along the way. Sheen recalls one of these that took place in a "certain city" where he was lecturing:

I would have the bodyguard sit on the stage, I would say he was a friend of mine and he knew Communists very well. He would hand me a pro—gram with marked spots where there were dangerous characters seated—expect trouble. And one night he just marked one X on the whole program—the whole hall was Communist. So I changed the lecture and I said—"Tonight is going to be very heavy. I'm only going to give you Communist documentation. (I did a lot of that, I carried the Soviet Constitution with me all the time.) And I'm only going to give you Communist sources. Now, if I read these myself I might be accused of misreading, so I'm going to call on the audience and I will point out certain people in the audience and ask them to come to the stage to read the documentation." No one came... so there was no trouble that night.30
Summary

Here, then, is a picture of the priest, scholar, orator, writer, editor, TV celebrity, and public relations man, who waged an almost lifetime campaign against Communism. Fulton Sheen spent a great deal of time in what he called "remote preparation" for this task. His brilliant educational career, his study of human nature through his priestly work, his long and effective teaching experience, his popularity as a speaker—all contributed to Sheen's success in his television series.

Sheen's interest in the study of Communism began while he was studying abroad, almost from the very beginning of the development of the philosophy in Russia. He was thoroughly versed in every phase of Communistic doctrine, possibly better versed than even the advocates of Communism in the Soviet Union itself.

Although Sheen continues to lecture nationally, he no longer speaks out on Communism. In a recent interview Sheen stated that "Communism today, as a philosophy has lost its appeal. That is why it isn't so necessary to talk about it."31

Let us now consider the rhetorical situation—the status of Communism in the United States.
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CHAPTER III

THE RHETORICAL SITUATION

Chapter Two gives the reader a picture of Sheen, his background and preparation, so that insights about him as a person may be gained. Important for the reader also is a view of the historical situation of the country, especially in regard to Communism. The purpose of this chapter is to give the reader further insights into the context in which Sheen began his television crusade against Communism in 1952.

Communism

Definitions

Communism is a term that has many meanings. Basically it is a term used to denote systems of social organization based upon common property or upon an equal distribution of income and wealth. Communities based on this thesis were organized in the early Christian Church. Throughout the ages, many communities have followed this plan (generally religion centered). Religious orders today still practice "communism" in its essence.

In 1848, the word communism acquired a new meaning when it became identified with socialism as presented by Karl Marx and Friedric Engels in their famous Communist Manifesto. For Marx, Communism did not
have a religious or ethical base. He regarded the changing economic structure as the foundation of social life. He looked to the working class as the bearer of a new order that would emerge on a worldwide scale as the result of a historical process, using the class war as the way to achieve the new order. Because Marx's doctrine was ambiguous on many points, especially regarding its application and the future course of its realization, it gave rise to various interpretations, the most noted being those developed by the Russian Revolutionaries. Daniels states:

Marxism—or Marxism brought up to date by Lenin, and "creatively applied" by Stalin and Mao, and then polished down by Khrushchev—is regarded by every Communist as the scientific foundation of his belief and the sufficient justification for every violent step a Communist regime takes. This is the dogma—but dogma governed by totalitarian politics, not by intellectual conviction—and the dogma has been shaped to suit the movement.  

Communism has become one of the most powerful forces in the world. Its rise has shaped much of history since the early 1900's. Some persons consider Communism the greatest threat to world peace; others look on it as the world's greatest hope.

**Communism in the United States**

Almost from its beginnings Communism has had its effect on life in the United States. As early as 1919, Americans having seen the spread of Bolshevism through Europe and fearing its implications, struck out at it or what they thought was it, and there followed
"The Big Red Scare." Griffith states:

The intolerant atmosphere of World War I politics, the triumph of the Bolsheviks in Russia, the organization of the American Communist Party, and widespread labor unrest all served as proximate causes. The Red Scare itself was created, however, by the vigorous activities of conservative businessmen, organized veterans, patriotic societies and by ambitious politicians in Congress and especially in the federal government.  

The decade after World War I found Americans tired of foreign entanglements and very much afraid that the radical revolution which had just taken place in Russia was on its way to tear down the government and institutions of the United States. Rumors were strong, and they found a ready audience in a people who, still thinking of peace as a dream, went on thinking with the mind of a people at war. Fredrick Allen observes, "A week after the Armistice, Mayor Hylan of New York forbade the display of the Red flag in the streets and ordered the police to 'disperse all unlawful assemblages.'"  

The country went into a national panic. Robert Murray in his work, Red Scare—A Study in National Hysteria, 1919-1920, recounts an observation made by an English journalist describing the scene:

No one who was in the United States as I chanced to be, in the autumn of 1919, will forget the feverish condition of the public mind at that time. It was hag-ridden by the spectre of Bolshevism. It was like a sleeper in a nightmare, enveloped by a thousand phantoms of destruction.  

Riots, lynchings, and a kind of mob rule followed. The era was one of discontent, with an unmistakable trend toward socialistic ideas, both in the ranks of labor and among liberal intellectuals, thus,
adding the necessary fuel to the fire. Very few stopped to consider the fact that the Communists numbered one-tenth of one per cent of the adult population of the country. Murray discovered that

The Communist party, nine-tenths alien in its composition, had a total membership of approximately 60,000. On a ratio basis, the combined membership figures for both Communist parties represented less than one-tenth of 1 per cent of the adult population of the country in 1919.5

However, emotional pitch was high and the reaction to all things Communist was immediate. Anyone who protested was suddenly labeled "Red."

In this way management often capitalized on a strike situation by shouting "Red" to the striking labormen.

A. Mitchell Palmer, then Attorney-General of the United States (a prototype of Senator Joseph McCarthy) acted in behalf of the Government and made a mass arrest of Communists who were meeting on New Year's Day of 1920. Allen describes the situation this way:

On this and other succeeding nights other Communists and suspected Communists were seized in their homes. Over six thousand men were arrested in all... Mr. Palmer was in full cry. In public statements he was reminding twenty million owners of Liberty bonds and the nine million farm owners and the eleven million owners of savings accounts, that the Reds proposed to take away all they had... Politicians were proclaiming, 'My motto for the Reds is S.O.S. --ship or shoot'... Hysteria had reached its height.6

Hostile feelings spread from Anti-Red to the Negro, Jew, and Roman Catholic. The white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant American reigned supreme.

The summer of 1920, with its promise of a presidential campaign, turned the attention of the American public elsewhere, and by the end
of the summer the Big Red Scare was almost completely out of sight.

There were a number of reasons for the ebbing of the panic. Among these was a realization that there had never been a real cause for the panic, plus the fact that the attitudes of the people were changing from wartime to peacetime. By 1921, the nation was ready for peace.

America in the 1920's is remembered as a land of prosperity.

But prosperity was spread unevenly. For the people with money in the bank, America was a wonderland, and the businessman was the hero.

Ernest R. May makes this observation:

On the surface, the 1920's were joyous years—the year of the Sunday drive and the big football weekend, the raccoon coat, the speakeasy, Rudolph Valentino and Clara Bow, Dempsey and Tunney, Babe Ruth and Lindbergh when, as Fitzgerald wrote, 'The parties were bigger, the pace was faster, the shows were broader, the buildings were higher, the morals were looser and the liquor was cheaper.'

The life of most Americans changed drastically during the 1920's.

First of all came the radio, enabling a much wider and faster dissemination of news, sports, and entertainment. Revolutionary new methods were introduced by the utility companies, allowing for the widespread use of electricity. Henry Ford gave America the Model T, the economy car which permitted the middleclass man to own a car. Alistair Cooke points out:

Ford made his radical break-through by thinking first of the needs of hundreds of thousands of consumers. His original labor policies make him the American god to employees, and his volcanic flow of productivity made him a terrible titan to his competitors.
The film industry got off to a booming start and soon film houses were overcrowded. Cooke continues:

Hollywood grew to be the most flourishing factory of popular mythology since the Greeks. It is the main reason why the America of the 1920s that passed into the file of the world's memory is not an America of throbbing steel production, not the sudden flowering of a brilliant native literature, but a kind of mass idiocy and frivolity.9

The Twenties were lived in superlatives.

Seven months after President Hoover was inaugurated the stock market collapsed. Reckless speculation, bidding up stock prices far beyond their value, buying stock on credit, a general public feeling that prosperity was endless, "what President Hoover called the final triumph over poverty"10—all of these contributed to the disaster of October 29, 1929.

After the crash, problems multiplied, tumbling over each other in their demand for attention. Unemployment became the nation's greatest problem. With the economic collapse came persecution of minorities, class and labor conflicts, the rise of fascism, and the spread of war. Leuchtenburg notes:

In the three years of Herbert Hoover's presidency the bottom had dropped out of the stock market and industrial production had been cut more than half. . . . By 1932, the unemployed numbered upward of thirteen million.11

That summer political conventions were held by the Republicans and Democrats. Herbert Hoover was nominated to run for a second term, but his chances of re-election in the middle of a depression were unlikely. The Democrats placed in nomination the then Governor of New
York, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who was elected even though he did not present a strong platform.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was inaugurated in the midst of a crisis. The banking system had failed, factories were closing, millions were out of work. The general feeling was one of hopelessness and of pending disaster. The new president's inaugural address showed a sense of leadership and put heart into a discouraged people. "'First of all,' declared the new President, 'let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself—nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror.'"12 This speech was followed by decisive action. "On March 4, 1933, Cooke relates, "the day of his inauguration, Roosevelt hurled a thunderbolt at the headlines by closing—without any sure legal sanction—every bank in the country."13 This action was followed by calling Congress into special session to pass an emergency banking act to save the country's financial structure.

For the first time many Americans questioned the capitalistic system and took a second look at Soviet Russia. The left-wing advocates saw the problems of the Soviets as "growing pains" and those of the Americans as dissolution. In the 1932 election many prominent writers and other intellectuals supported the Communist ticket. The Depression created doubts about the American system of free enterprise, making many people receptive to criticism of the old order. On November 16, 1933, the United States and Russia formally resumed diplomatic relations. The Soviets promised to respect the religious liberty of
Americans in the U.S.S.R. and to slow down Communist propaganda in the United States. Leuchtenburg says:

For nine days the Soviet envoy conferred with the President and State Department officers. Late in the night of November 16, Roosevelt and Litvinov formally exchanged eleven letters and one memorandum which signified the restoration of diplomatic relations between the two powers. The Russians agreed to guarantee religious liberty to Americans in the U.S.S.R. and to curb Communist propaganda in this country.  

With Roosevelt came the New Deal. The New Deal with its creation of new programs and many jobs was looked on by Roosevelt's political opponents as socialistic. Griffith points out that

During the thirties it simply became sound conservative doctrine to attack the New Deal as the forerunner of an American Bolshevism. "If Roosevelt is not a Communist today," charged Robert A. Taft of Ohio, "he is bound to become one." "Roosevelt," echoed the Republican National Committee in 1936, was "the Kerensky of the American Revolutionary Movement."  

Roosevelt's supporters—at least the great majority of them—saw it as progressive and humanitarian. The administration's main aim was to get the nation's economy going again and to save capitalism. Mistakes were plentiful, money was wasted, but a sense of confidence and purpose was restored to the American people.

In the 1930s, some Americans had supported Communist causes in the belief that Soviet Russia was a determined foe of Fascism and Imperialism. In 1939 that illusion was shattered for most of them. A Nazi-Soviet pact of non-aggression in August, 1939, had freed Hitler to launch World War II. Leuchtenburg states "When on August 24, the
Nazi signed a pact with the Soviet Union which separated Russia from the West; war could no longer be far off, yet people still could not believe that the nightmare of World War I would be repeated."16

Isolation was always a subject of much controversy. As late as 1937 a Neutrality Act was put into effect, or rather an attempted effect. Morris and Woodress point out that "Neutrality acts in the second-third of the twentieth century turned out to be as ineffectual as 'keep off the grass' signs outside a burning building during a three-alarm fire."17

Nineteen thirty-nine found Hitler goose-stepping into Poland, with England and France rising to her defense by declaring war on Germany. Thus began another bloody, devastating war. Within a month after the declaration of war, Roosevelt asked for a repeal of the Neutrality Act of 1937. The act was repealed and the United States began supplying France and England with war materials.

The following year brought the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the United States was at war in both the Atlantic and Pacific areas. The war was long and tedious, producing many dead and countless wounded. The American people responded enthusiastically with their support of the government. National defense was uppermost in the minds and hearts of the people. "Disused factories lit up like firecrackers. America became a continental workshop, and quite safe . . . from aerial bomb- ing."18 For the United States, World War II began and ended in the Pacific. After the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and
Nagasaki, the Japanese government surrendered. Alistair Cooke recounts the incident.

So the Second World War ended in a flash "brighter than a thousand suns." When the Japanese were led aboard the battleship Missouri in Tokyo Bay to surrender, the American commander in the Pacific, George Douglas MacArthur, said in four resonant words: "These proceedings are closed." 19

It is interesting to note that during the war, there was little evidence of Communist spy hysteria. It is as though the public had more important things to turn to.

The Great War, "the war for survival," was over in 1945. There followed what Eric Goldman called "The Crucial Decade," the decade in which the people of the United States would have to decide whether they would continue the economic and social revolution which had been a part of the previous decades. They also had to decide whether they would become a part of the international scene. Goldman concluded that although there was much contention about both problems, the answers to both questions was a "decisive affirmative."

One of the most positive outcomes of the post-war period was the beginning of a change of attitude toward the Negro, Jew, and Catholic. All through the New Deal period and the war years, the powerful thrusts of minorities had been battering holes in the walls of discrimination. However, "despite the rumblings of change during the Great Depression and in World War II," says Leuchtenburg, "the United States in 1945 remained a country dominated by WASPs." 20

Fear began to grow in the minds of the people about the post-war
situation. The conversion from war to peacetime production is always frightening. Unemployment began, battles over prices raged, food shortages created a black market, and strikes became more and more frequent until Truman threatened "to draft into the Armed Forces of the United States all workers who are on strike against the government." Those words settled at least one strike.

Internal problems worried the country, but for the first time people began to realize that they were a part of the international scene. Of critical issue, especially since the discovery of atomic energy, was international control of it. It seemed apparent that the Soviets were not to be trusted. Shortly after the end of the war, American Communists began to leave the Party stating that belonging to the party meant complete loyalty to Soviet Russia. At this time also, the Communists were taking over Europe little by little, beginning with Czechoslovakia and moving on. Goldman in The Crucial Decade says:

Americans looked homeward, was it going on here too? A Gallup Poll indicated wide support for the proposal to bar all Communists from federal offices of the United States. The House Un-American Activities Committee went to work with increased zeal and members of the Senate Foreign Relations and Appropriations Committees sounded alarms.

The fear that Communism would creep from country to country, island to island, led Truman to decide, according to Richard Morris, "the United States must shoulder the burden of containing Communism." Hence the reason for the involvement of United States troops in Korea and Vietnam, and for the great deal of aid sent to under-developed countries. The United States and Russia had become embroiled in a
Cold War. Griffith points out:

The cold war transformed the climate of American politics, overlaying traditional political issues with a new and emotionally charged set of concerns. The growing power of the Soviet Union and its challenge to American supremacy served to focus previously diffuse fears and anxieties over Communism.23

Again, disposed to shake off the horrible pressures of the post-war era and tired of rationing and other shortages, Americans of late 1945 and early 1946 turned to fun and games. Eric Goldman describes the scene:

The big football weekend roared back; television sets sold like red meat; women snapped up lame skirts, sequin-trimmed aprons, cartwheel hats with pastel blooms waving in billowing nets. Any night was likely to burst into New Year's Eve... and all through the spreeing there did run an unmistakable sense of displacement, a feverish running away that reveled in the harsh, the mocking, the blatant.24

With 1948, came the election, with Harry S. Truman and Thomas E. Dewey battling for the presidency. Politicians, news commentators and "bookies" were convinced that Dewey would be the new president. The Chicago Tribune printed an extra stating that "Dewey Defeats Truman."

However, Truman came through with the greatest political victory in American History. He had twenty-four million votes to Dewey's twenty-two million, and controlled 303 to 189 votes in the Electoral College. The victory was a tribute to Truman's "spunk," but it also made a clear statement that the people were still aware of and interested in, the New Deal. Soon afterward, Truman made a statement that "every segment of our population and every individual has a right to expect from his
government a fair deal," and since then Truman's era was designated the Fair Deal. There were only minor differences in the two deals; they were both economically oriented. One dealt with abundance and the other with the depression. Truman saw the Fair Deal as the extension of the New Deal.

The decade 1945-1955 was called "crucial" by Goldman. Herbert Agar, writing in The Price of Power says:

What a decade it has been: 1945, the bomb; 1946-47, total disillusionment with Russia, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan; 1948-49, the Berlin airlift, the rape of Czechoslovakia, Communist victory in China; 1950-53, the Korean War (including General MacArthur, the war-within-a-war); 1951, desperate rearmament throughout the West; 1952-53, the American H-bomb followed by the Russian H-bomb; and, finally, in 1954-55, a little relaxation of tension.

The New Red Scare

The House Un-American Activities Committee had been hard at work during these post-war years hunting up Red spies. Griffith states:

Congressional conservatives now charged that the Roosevelt and Truman administrations were 'soft' on Communism abroad and tolerant of subversion and disloyalty at home; and beginning in 1945 they launched a series of investigations into Communist activities designed in part to embarrass the government.

Headlines announced a probe of countless numbers of Hollywood people who were as surprised as anyone at their "Red affiliation." Griffith continues:

Before December, 1948, most of HUAC's investigations seemed to be linked to domestic concerns—the committee's primary targets were left-wing New Deal personnel, New Deal Agencies, such as the Federal Theatre
Loyalty oaths were required up to mid-1948, when Truman stretched his order to cover employees filing military contracts. Many people would resign rather than sign; some were fired, but great numbers barely survived the ordeal and remained under the shadow of fear. A *Yale Law Journal* writer (March, 1952) told of an "elderly lady" who, having "belonged to organizations for helping the Negro was completely panicked and became violently ill" at the misinterpretation of her strictly Christian ideals. The "Grand Inquisition" was on. These incidents, without doubt, sent tremors of fear of Communism through the country. For most Americans, Communism as a world force, far from being contained, seemed a greater, a more insidious force.

**Senator Joseph McCarthy**

It was into this melee that Senator Joseph McCarthy began his attack and the people were ready to believe anything. Morris states that "Senator McCarthy was in part a product of the Cold War. As the military strength of the Soviet Union grew in the 1950's, tensions in the United States over the danger of internal subversion grew." During a speech given in Wheeling, West Virginia, on Lincoln's birthday, McCarthy lit the spark of hysteria that started the conflagration that was to continue to burn for four years. In the speech he stated that he had a list of 205 names of persons who were Communists, who were working for The State Department. He had no copy of the speech,
and even his staff did not remember what he had said precisely. On receiving word of his announcement, The State Department wired a request for the names and promised a complete and immediate investigation of the 205. Richard Rovere says:

He [McCarthy] panicked in an uncharacteristic way—possibly because he feared that some part of what he said was actionable—and in Denver, enroute to Salt Lake City, he claimed to have been misquoted. . . . Going on to Salt Lake City he told his audience: 'Last night I discussed the Communists in the State Department. I stated that I had the names of 57 card-carrying members of the Communist Party.'

Those numbers were to change every time he spoke of the incident. And thus began the four years during which Senator McCarthy was to dominate the American political scene.

Few major leaders escaped his accusations. Once he realized he had the attention and interest of many Americans, he feared no one. He held two presidents captive, hurling accusations of treason at the Democratic Truman and accusing the Republican Eisenhower of fraud.

Both administrations moved warily, fearing to prompt him to yet wilder accusations. McCarthy was greatly feared by the Senate also, since he terrorized and falsely accused his opponents, used hostile free-wheeling methods of investigation, and widened his scope of attack year by year. The whole thing seemed to be a game for him. Rovere, his biographer, saw the situation in this way:

Yet the antic features of McCarthyism were essential ones. For McCarthyism was, among other things, but perhaps foremost among them a headlong flight from reality. It elevated the ridiculous and ridiculed the important. It outraged common sense and held common sense to be outrageous. It confused the
categories of form and value. It made sages of screwballs and accused wise men of being fools. It diverted attention from the moment and fixed it on the past, which it distorted almost beyond recognition. 30

Rovere further claims that McCarthy seemed to pride himself on being vulgar. He drank a good deal and would have himself photographed asleep on the floor with a bottle beside him. And above all, he could not tell the truth, says his biographer:

"McCarthy," Joseph and Stewart Alsop wrote on December 3, 1953, "is the only major politician in the country who can be labeled 'liar' without fear of libel." . . . But McCarthy was surely the champion liar. He lied with wild abandon; he lied without evident fear; he lied vividly and with a bold imagination; he lied often, with very little pretense to be telling the truth. . . . but I know of nothing to suggest that he ever lied except with calculation. 31

Sociologists, looking back on the McCarthy era, have found many interesting points. Among these are that McCarthy was a demagogue, yet his targets were strange. Daniel Bell points out that while "Huey Long, the last major demagogue had vaguely attacked the rich and sought to share the wealth! McCarthy's targets were intellectuals, Harvard, Anglophiles, internationalists, the army." 32 His followers seemed to come from "soured patricians," the new rich who were much interested in the free-enterprise system, and the rising middle-class, who wanted to prove their Americanism.

This "proving of Americanism" is the second point of interest brought out by the study of the sociologists. Lipset points out that "Americanism is a creed in a way that 'Britishism' is not. People become Americans, they were not born to it, consequently, they always
felt the need to prove their loyalty. To be against Communism was at this time to be a loyal American."33

Finally, McCarthy overstepped himself by taking on the Army with accusations of being soft on Communism. These accusations, however, boomeranged, and McCarthy was himself accused of using a carbon copy of a letter, presumably from J. Edgar Hoover, the original of which did not exist. With this last hearing, the career of Joe McCarthy was ended.

The final blow came with censure by the Senate. Rovere says that "Sixty-seven members, or two-thirds-plus, on that day had voted for censure at the close of a year that had opened with only William Fulbright willing to cast a vote of record against him."34 And Leuchtenburg claims that "For a period of nearly five years, McCarthyism besmirched American politics, and the issue of subversion left its mark on the pulpit and the Hollywood movie lot, the campus and the union hall."35

It was during this last period of "witchhunting," that Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen's voice too, was raised against Communism. His approach was entirely different. His approach was that he hated Communism but loved the Communist. It was interesting to note that Sheen in all his talks on Communism during those hectic years never mentioned McCarthy and his antics. In an interview on February 13, 1974, Sheen was asked about this omission and he replied:

Well, one, [sic] because he was a politician and I have no interest in politics, none whatever. I would never mention Nixon today in a talk. I am
totally disinterested in politics, I never discuss it. He was a politician. There was no reason I should have, and he was not an authority on it in any case, so I never even thought of the omission. 36

Sheen's answer may cause one to speculate. He claims not to have an interest in politics, yet he concerned himself with Communism, which by the time he began his series had become a major political issue. Did he feel that he could do more good by presenting the evils of Communism in a campaign effort over a period of time and thus, by educating the people, help them to arrive at more rational conclusions about Communism? To know is to reduce fear; perhaps he was right!

This chapter gives the reader an overview of the historical situation into which Sheen arrived. Let us now consider five of Sheen's speeches according to Perelman's theory of argumentation.
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CHAPTER IV

THE FRAMEWORK OF ARGUMENTATION

Keeping in mind the historical setting of Communism in the United States and the circumstances that brought Fulton J. Sheen to the position he held as television speaker in 1952, when he began his "Life is Worth Living" series, let us turn now to an application of the concepts of Chaim Perelman to the selected speeches of that period. This chapter will study the framework of argumentation, that superstructure which encompasses the audience, the speaker, and the message. Discussion of the audience will include the type of audience and the conditioning agents used to influence that audience; discussion of the message will include the measure of influence in increasing "adherence to values already possessed"; discussion of the speaker will include ethos or image and what Perelman calls "skillful presentation." From this point on, references to the speeches will be made by giving the number of the paragraph from which the quotation is taken; these numbers correspond to the paragraphs in the speeches as given in the Appendices.

Universal Audience

Perelman stresses the idea that "all argumentation aims at gaining the adherence of minds and by this very fact assumes the existence of intellectual contact." For Perelman, all argumentation is audience-oriented. He defines an audience as an ensemble of those the
orator seeks to influence, and he speaks of three specific audiences:

The first of such audiences consists of the whole of mankind, or at least, of all normal, adult persons; we shall refer to it as the universal audience. The second consists of the single interlocutor whom a speaker addresses in dialogue. The third is the subject himself when he deliberates or gives himself reasons for his actions (my italics).1

Of the three types of audiences mentioned, the one most relevant to this study is Perelman's universal audience. In his definition of universal audience, Perelman refers to the "whole of mankind" or "all normal adult persons." This is his way of saying that when the speaker considers a universal audience, he is considering a group of rational, thinking men. The size of the group does not matter. The universal audience may number a million, or it may consist of one person. In preparing to address a universal audience, the speaker must construct for himself this audience from what he knows of his fellow man, and his task must be to convince them through the use of arguments appealing to the true, the real, and the objectively valid.

More often than not, this universal audience is a composite audience, that is, a group of persons who differ in every way—character, loyalties, and functions. When the speaker addresses a composite audience, he must use a multiplicity of arguments, arguing on many levels in order to reach all concerned. Another type of universal audience often referred to by Perelman is the particular audience. The particular audience is made up of persons belonging to a certain social circle or milieu, holding to a certain set of beliefs. The
members of a particular audience are usually to be persuaded rather than convinced and are appealed to through values, hierarchies, and loci of the preferable. Those who belong to a particular audience may be, in certain circumstances, a part of the large universal audience. Catholics, for example, belong to a particular audience, yet in some instances they are considered a part of the larger universal audience of rational men. Although Sheen addresses himself to the universal audience, of necessity, certain things that he says will affect the particular audience differently. Let us look at Sheen's approach to his audience.

Although Sheen had never been exposed to these concepts of Perelman, he too recognized the necessity of intellectual contact. He felt that the minds of the speaker and the audience must be engaged in an interplay of active reasoning. In an interview in 1953, Sheen told Gretta Palmer of the Catholic Digest:

Movement there must be . . . if the minds of the watchers are not to stagnate through boredom. But there are many kinds of movement possible on television. Besides the so-called dramatic shows, there are panel discussions, in which several persons debate a controversial subject. This is movement, all right; but it is sterile movement. It has the same impact on the mind of the watcher as a collision of two or three automobiles. Its excitement comes out of clash and disorder.

But our program takes advantage of the fact that reason itself is a form of movement. You might say that the listener makes a tour of some area of human thought, riding in the same automobile all the way, moving from point to point with the speaker. This journey of the watcher's mind gives him a sense of action, because his own mind is acting. He does not need the kind of external drama he would get in a cowboy program.
The speaker must be prepared to take his listeners on a "tour of some area of human thought." In almost every speech, Sheen makes a point of reminding the audience that they are about to enter a reasoning process in which he and they would, together, come to logical conclusions.

Sheen addressed himself also to Perelman's composite universal audience. He had been given an "obituary" time-slot on television—a prime-time slot competing with popular performers like Milton Berle and Frank Sinatra. Almost immediately, Sheen had a high popularity rating, while Berle's rating dropped and Sinatra left the air completely. The fact that Sheen survived and kept increasing his rating is evidence that he was viewed by millions. Sheen must also have been aware that within that universal audience were persons from particular audiences—Catholics, including fellow priests and the hierarchy, as well as Communists. Nelson Hart writes:

Having decided to go on television, he Sheen constantly kept reminding himself that he would be talking to all Americans; to Protestants, Jews, agnostics; in fact, to anyone who cared to listen out of curiosity or hostility. At that time he resolved to start with a common denominator and to work up the ladder toward a spiritual goal. 3

Sheen realized the diversity of his audience and prepared to meet the situation by presenting a multiplicity of arguments. (These will be treated in the chapter on the techniques of argumentation.) Sheen, in addressing himself to this universal audience of normal adult persons, had to have a knowledge of that audience. His years as a priest must
have proved invaluable in this regard. Sheen had been a priest for thirty-three years before he took on the television task, and had spent that time meeting with individuals and helping them to solve every kind of problem imaginable—a student of human nature, so to speak. His daily contacts in and out of the confessional were probably the primary sources of this knowledge of human nature and consequently, of a composite, universal audience.

**Conditioning Agents**

Perelman speaks of conditioning agents—"music, lighting, crowd effects, scenery, and various devices of stage management to be used to increase one's influence." Because of the medium involved, these "conditioning agents" were used by Sheen to their fullest. An interviewer in *Time* recounts:

Manhattan's Adelphi Theatre, Off Broadway, was filled with a waiting audience. "Thirty seconds!" a tense voice called. The theatre hushed. Spotlights flooded the stage with an almost supernatural brightness. "Five seconds, five!" Gentle music filled the air and a technician waved his hand. Calmly striding from the wings came a stately man. He wore a black cassock with purple piping; from his shoulders billowed a purple cape and on his chest gleamed a gold cross. He looked taller than his 5 feet, 8 inches.

According to Father Daniel Noonan, Sheen was "fastidious about the lighting and camera work. His eyes are magnetic; he insisted they be underlit, so they would look like dark, glowing coals." The set was designed according to Sheen's specifications by one of his converts, Jo Mielziner, a famous Broadway designer, and thus the whole effect was very dramatic, partly because Sheen himself had a sense of the
theatrical. Loretta Young called him "the greatest actor of all time." An article in Theatre Arts Magazine claims that show business folk seeing Sheen in action for the first time applauded his unfailing sense of theatrics. 

... Like an actor who has trod the boards for years, Sheen knows when to modulate his voice, when to "throw away" a line, when to ease tension with one of his studiously corny jokes.\(^7\)

**Adherence to Values**

Perelman states that "the purpose of the edideictic speech is to increase the intensity of adherence to values held in common by the audience and the speaker."\(^8\) He quotes Simone Weil, who says "if one hears this thought expressed publicly by some other person, and especially by someone whose words are listened to with respect, its force is increased a hundred-fold and can sometimes bring about an inner transformation."\(^9\)

In 1957, two researchers, studying independently of each other, discovered an American value system for the period 1940 to 1952. Edward D. Steele arrived at his conclusions from investigating social-scientific sources and applied them to campaign speeches. W. Charles Redding began with a content analysis of campaign speeches and compared them to social-scientific accounts of the American value system. In an article in the *Western Speech Journal*, Redding and Steele state:

1) it is possible to locate a body of relatively unchanging values shared by most contemporary Americans; 2) it is possible to formulate these values—at least approximately—in "clusters" of assertions; and 3) it is possible to observe the explicit or implicit functioning of such values as underpinning for persuasive, appealing argument in speeches addressed to a mass audience.\(^10\)
The definition of values will be limited here to standards of desirability, or as stated by Redding and Steele, to "values, as they exist psychologically in the mind of the audience, which have been generalized from the total experience of the culture and 'internalized' into the individual personalities of the listeners as guides to the 'right' way to believe or act."\(^{11}\)

The American value system: Redding and Steele list seventeen values as common to American audiences from 1940 to 1952. They are the following:\(^{12}\)

1) Puritan and pioneer morality
2) The value of the individual
3) Achievement and success
4) Change and progress
5) Ethical equality
6) Equality of opportunity
7) Effort and optimism
8) Efficiency, practicality, and pragmatism
9) Rejection of authority
10) Science and secular rationality
11) Sociality
12) Material comfort
13) Quantification
14) External conformity
15) Humor
16) Generosity and "Considerateness"

17) Patriotism.

In his talks on Communism, Sheen makes no mention of five of these values: Achievement and Success, Equality of opportunity, Efficiency, Practicality, Pragmatism, External conformity, and Humor. He makes a few references to seven of them: Change and progress, Ethical equality, Effort and optimism, Science and secular rationality, Quantification, Patriotism, and Sociality.

The values most often used and most strongly appealed to by Sheen—to be illustrated and documented later—are these five, as defined by Redding and Steele:

**Puritan and Pioneer Morality**

Americans like to see the world in moral terms. Acts are said to be good or bad, ethical or unethical. Good works promise salvation and economic success is commonly interpreted as evidence of a benevolent God's grace. Like our Puritan ancestors, we still—at least verbally—venerate such virtues as continence, honesty, simplicity, cooperation, self-discipline, courage, orderliness, personal responsibility, and humility.

**Value of the Individual**

In both colonial and contemporary America every person is valued as an autonomous, unique, decision-making personality, worthy of concern and possessing intrinsic dignity. The individual's happiness and welfare (including his comfort, privacy, labor, physical integrity, property, health, etc.) are the ultimate criteria for private or governmental policy. 'Using others' for personal gain is a denial of their integrity and thus of moral purpose.
Rejection of authority\textsuperscript{15}

The essence of 'individualism' is freedom of choice, freedom to make decisions subject only to the reciprocal obligation to respect the rights of others. . . . The emphasis on rejection of authority creates a tendency to think in terms of rights rather than duties. . . . Rejection of authority in economic affairs has become institutionalized in the attitude that the Government should not interfere with the 'free enterprise' system.

Material comfort\textsuperscript{16}

The American standard of living is one of the highest in the history of the world and is broadly equated with 'happiness.' As new wants are satisfied, they become regarded as essentials in nutrition, medical care, housing, transportation, and communication.

Generosity and 'considerateness'\textsuperscript{17}

Universal concern for the individual contributes to a genuine humanitarianism in America, especially in material ways . . . this American humanitarianism is perhaps linked with a 'missionary spirit,' the 'Mission of America,' the determination to bring to the rest of the world the benefits of God's benevolence as manifested in American, political, and social institutions.

Puritan and pioneer morality: Of the five mentioned values most strongly appealed to in Sheen's speeches, the one used most often was the appeal to "Puritan and pioneer morality"—seeing the world in moral terms. Although Sheen had stated that his program was not a religious program, his speeches are heavily laden with moral overtones.

In his speech on "The Philosophy of Communism," he speaks of Communism as "intrinsically wrong" (par. 11), a judgment that sees acts as good or bad and as consonant with the "Puritan and pioneer morality." Or he presents the Communists as stating that "we deny all morality
taken from neo-economic class conceptions. Take the seventh and tenth commandments—'Thou shalt not steal' and 'Thou shalt not covet they neighbor's goods.' The Communists say, 'Can't you see these two commandments are based on private property? ... When the state owns everything, there is no need of that morality" (par. 15). By presenting the negative approach of the Communist, Sheen confirms and strengthens the moral issue in the mind of the individual viewer. In the same vein he states, "Communist morals will see but one wrong, namely injuring or hurting state property or in any way betraying the revolutionary class" (par. 18, my italics). Other examples of his appeal to moral values are as follows:

Notice that whenever the Communists try to convince us of their superiority, they make moral judgments about us. They say we are 'immoral,' 'unjust,' 'unethical,' and 'bad' while they are right and good. ... Those who believe in an ethical order independent of economics can condemn exploitation, but the materialism of Communism cannot do it without repudiating the whole system (par. 23).

Communism is strong only when it borrows some of the moral indignation that has been inherited from the Hebraic-Christian tradition; ... moral indignation is needed against injustice, but the Communists have no basis for using it ... we, who have moral ideals are speaking to the rest of the world in terms of economics (par. 24).

... "the truth that every man has an immortal soul" (par. 34).

We need the kind of revolution that will purge out of a man's heart pride and covetousness and lust and anger (par. 35).

Sheen's appeal to moral values is as strong in his second speech, "Why Some Become Communists." He cries out for a need for
personal responsibility by condemning the Communists' refusal to accept it. He says, "The reason they do not want Truth or Goodness or an Absolute is because the discovery of truth would commit them to responsibility" (par. 5). He states further, "When persons reject the normal pattern, given by God, they revolt... after a while people tire of their freedom, because freedom rightfully implies responsibility... Religious conversion deepens personal responsibility, Communist perversion destroys it" (pars. 6, 7, 8).

Sheen spends a good deal of time in this speech on the idea of guilt and conscience and on the vices that cause "uneasiness." He refers to fellow Americans as "defenders of morality, decency, and religion" (par. 10), who deepen that sense of guilt when we err. Sheen points out that "Communism makes progress in relation to the breakdown of morals" (par. 11), thereby strengthening the need for a moral attitude in the viewer. He hails educators as the perpetuators of this moral fiber: "those who instruct shall shine as stars for all Eternity. Few joys are greater than to mold young minds and young wills in the way of truth and goodness" (par. 13, my italics).

In the three other speeches, Sheen makes reference to morality, virtue, God's favor, and good works approximately twenty times.

**Value of the individual:** The second value of the system that Sheen makes frequent reference to is the "value of the individual." This emphasis is quite understandable, since he is dealing with Communism, which according to Sheen, recognizes the class and not the individual.
These are especially pertinent. The first is from a negative statement, "The second basic principle of Communism is that man has value only inasmuch as he is a member of a class" (par. 26). Sheen is, in essence, saying that since the Communists value man only as a member of a class, our way is to value him as a member of a class, our way is to value him as an individual. The second reference, still in the negative, expands the idea: "Marx and Communism have turned the supremacy of the species into the supremacy of the class. Once admitted, it follows that what happens to an individual is of no concern" (par. 31). Sheen follows this with an example of what Russia does to her satellite people in war. He speaks of tanks running over wounded bodies: "Communist tanks ran over the bodies of their wounded. No one would even kick them out of the path of the great machines, because they are no longer of worth" (par. 32). Although Sheen does not document this passage, a news item in June, 1974 confirms the Communist disregard for human life. The newscaster making the announcement about the recent death of a Russian general related the following incident. The general had been asked by Eisenhower what their strategy was in attacking when they knew they were in a mine field. The general answered, "As if there were no mines." Human life was not worth the concern.

The third reference emphasizes strongly the worth of the individual before God. Sheen says, "We must recognize the evil of this Communist philosophy and begin affirming, in the United States, the worth of a person as a creature of God. . . . A person has more worth than the whole universe" (pars. 33, 34).
In the speech, "Has Russia Really Changed?", Sheen makes two strong statements, again in the negative sense. He shows how the Communists feel and thus reaffirms the value of the individual in the Christian World. Sheen points out:

Nature is rather heedless and careless as to what happens to individuals, as long as it preserves the species. Communism has taken over the biological law and made it apply to the human order. . . . Marx said that the individual as such had no value; it was Christianity, he said which put a worth upon the individual. A person has value only when he contributes to the revolutionary class (par. 6).

In the second instance, Sheen uses a list of Soviet leaders who had been killed since 1917, indicating that expediency is all-important. No individual matters in the least.

9 out of 11 cabinet members holding office in 1936
5 out of 7 of the last Central Executive Committee
43 out of 53 secretaries of the Central Community Party organization
15 out of 27 of the top Communists who drafted the 1936 Constitution
70 out of 80 members of the Soviet War Council
3 out of every 5 marshals of the Soviet Army
All members of Lenin's first post-Bolshevik Politburo, except Stalin (par. 14).

Rejection of authority: Closely related to the "value of the individual" is the "rejection of authority" value, since it deals with freedom, rights, individualism, and the idea that government should not interfere with free enterprise. The two speeches that best lend themselves to an appeal to the rejection of authority value are: "Has Russia Really Changed?" and "The Life and Character of Lenin." Let us
look at instances in each of the speeches respectively. In the "Changed" speech, Sheen point out that

a man is free on the inside because he can call his soul his own; he is free on the outside when he can call his property his own. Communism, knowing that it cannot possess man as long as he has this freedom—namely, private property—affirms, as its basic principle, socialism, or the putting of all property in the hands of the state (par. 8).

Along with the right to private property goes political freedom, freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech, all of which Americans held sacred. Sheen solidifies this value by pointing out the loss of this freedom, "Hence the Soviet Constitution recognized freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech, only on condition that they are used to support the Communist system. Any person who affirms that he can decide for himself is automatically considered an enemy of Communism." The horror of totalitarianism is thus brought home again and again.

Sheen had begun this address by speaking of metanoia and now bluntly states that "a true metanoia could exist if the Soviets would grant freedom to enslaved nations behind the Iron and Bamboo curtains. ... Self-determination of peoples is one of the basic rights of human nature; when the Soviets grant it, they will become part of the free world" (par. 22). Sheen concludes the speech with a plea for the Russian people and their desire for freedom, indicating that their desire for freedom is like ours: "The people cannot freely express themselves. ... They will be found to have prayed to the same God and hoped for the same freedom" (par. 25).
In the "Life and Character of Lenin" speech, Sheen appeals to the rejection of authority value three times. He speaks of political freedom, private property, and the governing by the Czar. All three examples are presented from the negative point of view; thus, by showing the denial, Sheen affirms the positive position. He quotes Lenin as saying, "In Russia, political freedom will be gained by the working-class or it will not exist at all" (par. 9). Another instance of the appeal to the rejection of authority value is, "if man is ever to be restored to himself, private property must be destroyed and religion must be persecuted" (par. 17). The third example combines the rejection of authority value with the value of the individual. Sheen quotes Lenin as saying:

The Czar rules over Russia with 300 noblemen, they enforce their will on the masses so why should I not build up my own nobility and succeed in enforcing my will on the masses, especially as it is for the benefit of future humanity? The result will be 50 to 60 million people if they are sacrificed for the benefit of future humanity? The price for such a future world would be much higher than those millions of worthless wretches. These generations are worth nothing. They are only cannon fodder for the experiment (par. 29).

Material comfort: An appeal to the values of "material comfort" and "generosity and considerateness" are made in each speech. In the reference to material comfort, Sheen does not glorify wealth as a value. Rather he reminds his audience of the Christian ideal: "What doth it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul?" (Philosophy, par. 34). When Sheen speaks of "guilty consciences,"
he mentions the rich, "Others have an uneasy conscience because they are rich. Perhaps their wealth was not acquired honestly; maybe it was, but they now see a tremendous disproportion between what they have and what others have and they begin to feel uncomfortable" ("Why," par. 12). Sheen is again rather disparaging of the wealthy when he mentions "economic slumming," where the rich went down to the dives and cafes of the poor, "not to relieve their needs by a surrender of their wealth, but in order to enjoy the shock and the thrill of riches contrasted with poverty" ("Why," par. 15).

In the same vein, in the "Life and Character of Lenin" speech, Sheen presents what he considers admirable qualities of Lenin in an attempt to show that Lenin was not a typical revolutionary. One of these characteristics of Lenin was "his complete and total detachment from sordid gain (my italics) Though he came from a comparatively well-to-do family, his life was lived in voluntary poverty" (par. 6). At the end of the "Lenin" speech, Sheen tells the story of St. Francis of Asissi, who gave up wealth to serve the poor.

Generosity and "considerateness":--The fifth value "generosity and considerateness" ties in with Sheen's idea of the use of wealth: giving it away, or at least sharing it. Possibly his work with the Propagation of the Faith, where he was always asking for money for the poor made him doubly conscious of this value. Besides, most priests are champions of the poor.

"The Philosophy of Communism" speech gives a few examples of
generosity and considerateness. The first deals with Sheen himself. In narrating a story about himself and a cab driver in the introduction of the speech, Sheen tells of giving the man five dollars so that the man could take time from his job as cab driver in order to watch Sheen on television (pars. 1-9). In the second instance, Sheen aligns himself with the American idea of generosity when he states: "We believe in food for the hungry, regardless of who they are" (par. 28). He then presents the Russian view: "Molotov in good Marxist fashion argues that bread be given only to certain people, namely, those who follow Communist revolutionary ideas" (par. 28). That same speech reveals the story of Heywood Broun, who asked the Communists to help a cartoonist who had cancer. Sheen says "Broun went to the Communists and asked if they would not give him (the cartoonist) some pension to help pay his hospital bills. They refused. "He is of no use to us" (par. 29). Sheen's reminder of the Russians' lack of generosity and their strong sense of materialism made his point more emphatic than any positive statement Sheen might have made about generosity.

Sheen in these five speeches, has appealed to "values already possessed by his audience," and through his use of both positive and negative statements, he has induced his audience to increase their adherence to those values. Let us turn now to a discussion of the ethos or image of the epideictic speaker.
Epideictic Speaker: Ethos, Image

Perelman insists that the epideictic speaker must have qualifications for speaking out on his subject and must also be skillful in presentation. . . . He is, so to speak, the educator of his audience, and if it is necessary that he should enjoy a certain prestige before he speaks, it is to enable him, through his own authority to promote the values he is upholding. 18

This concept is often expressed by other rhetoricians, ancient and modern, as "ethos" or "image," which contributes highly to the effectiveness of the communicator. Four constituent elements are presented for consideration: the first is character or trustworthiness, dealing with the speaker's sincerity, his intent, his reliability, his credibility. The second may be described as intelligence, knowledge, or expertise; the third factor is goodwill or identification with the listeners; and the fourth element is charisma, a somewhat intangible quality which takes into account a speaker's observable talent, his achievements, his position in life, his personality and appearance, his style, and his life experience. 19 The "image" or "ethos" of Fulton J. Sheen is to be discovered in his speeches. What impression does one receive from Sheen, through his words, in the light of these elements?

By the time Sheen appeared on the TV screen he had been a priest for a number of years. He had been promoted to Monsignor, then Bishop, and here he was—the Bishop Sheen, not just a priest, a holy man of God—but a Bishop. The title itself must have been very impressive to viewers—to Catholics who had a great respect for the hierarchy
of the Church, as well as those who were not Catholic.

The Philosophy of Communism: Ethos, Image

In the first of the five selected speeches, Sheen addressed himself to the philosophy of Communism. He opened the speech with a personal experience.

Last week, I met a very incredulous gentleman, a taxi driver. After a few blocks he said, "Say, you wouldn't happen to be ___ would you?" "Yes." "I wonder how I could convince anybody that you were in my cab." I said, "Come to the office and I will autograph a book for you, and then you can prove it by the autograph." He said, "They won't believe you autographed it. They will think somebody else did it—not even my wife will believe me! I want to tell somebody about it while you are on television, but I never get to see you on television. I have to earn my living and every Tuesday night when you are on, I am out hacking." Here is five dollars. Next Tuesday night at eight o'clock, you go into a bar, give a dollar of the five to the bartender, and ask him to tune me in on his television set. The four dollars is to pay for not driving your cab that half hour. Then, when we come on the screen, you can tell everyone at the bar.

"Suppose they don't believe me?" "To overcome that incredulity," I said, "I'll tell you what I'll do, next Tuesday night I'll tell this story, then they'll have to believe you." Now I have paid my debt.

Presented in a conversational tone, this personal experience, human-interest story was a move toward elevating or solidifying Sheen's image with his viewers. This eminent figure, this Bishop, speaks at length with a cab driver, whom he calls a gentleman, gives him money, and helps the man to grow in the esteem of his fellows. Sheen describes the incident as if he were talking about a friend. Sheen chooses a bar for the viewing. Score one with much of the male population.
The viewer, knowing that here was an individual who would do so much for a total stranger, must assume that here is a man of character, who is sincere and kind. Many in his audience could identify with the story, either as one of the men who might be in a bar watching television or as someone who, on identifying a celebrity, would want some proof of the meeting, or as just a person on the street, flattered by the notion that Bishop Sheen would speak to him. One would assume that Sheen would do that and more. If he would go to such lengths in a trivial matter, what would he do if a serious problem arose. An audience is won over.

It is not difficult to imagine the impressive sight of that first television image. An empty study, an open door, and dramatically, through the door sweeps a figure in a flowing cape, a Catholic bishop. He looks out at his audience, smiling faintly, and his eyes light up. The interviewer for Time found those eyes captivating. He states:

They are one of the most remarkable pairs of eyes in America, looking out from deep sockets, pupil and iris almost merged in one luminous disk which creates the optical illusion that he not only looks at people, but through them and at everything about them. 20

Charismatic qualities are apparent in his personality and appearance, his style, his observable talent, his achievements, and his life experience as a man of God.

Sheen gets down to the serious business of speaking with the statement

There is considerable confusion in our American life about Communism; too much emotional hatred of Communism and not sufficient thinking and reasoning about it (par. 10).
This statement makes rather obvious the fact that Sheen is very much aware of what is going on in the political arena, where Senator McCarthy and his cohorts are spreading the terror of Communist infiltration. How reassuring that this speaker knows about the high pitch of the emotional tide. His awareness would put the audience at ease and ready to listen to his "thinking and reasoning about it." Sheen goes on to condemn Communism, distinguishing between the philosophy of Communism and the tactics of Communism.

By using a method in which he quotes "Communists," thus giving their views, and speaks of "we" as Americans, thus defending our view, he presents a consolidation of credibility, knowledge, and expertise, as well as identification. In addition to quoting Communists in general, he often becomes specific by using the words of Lenin. When speaking of the role Marx played, Sheen says almost offhandedly, "Karl Marx, who studied philosophy and should have known better, confused what is known as a condition with a cause" (par. 20). The familiarity with which he uses these names and the ease with which he quotes the lines give a strong impression of expertise.

Sheen displays a broad knowledge of religion and culture in pre-Christian and Christian times as he brings in facts to verify his statements. He strongly identifies himself with his audience, especially in regard to morality. "Notice," he says, "that whenever the Communists try to convince us of their superiority, they make moral judgments about us. They say we are 'immoral,' 'unjust,' 'unethical,' and 'bad,' while they are right and good" (par. 23, my italics).
Later in the speech, Sheen relates a personal experience about his connection with Heywood Breun, an ex-Communist. Having known people who had actually been card-carrying Communists, Sheen gains added credibility. In nearing the close of his talk, Sheen backs up his statement that the individual is of great moral worth by quoting from the Declaration of Independence and The New Testament, and finally places himself and his audience on the side of ultimate authority in total communion: "If God is with us then who can be against us" (par. 35).

Why Some Become Communists, 1953: Ethos, Image

The second speech confronting us begins with the question "Why do some American people become Communists?" By opening in this manner, Sheen creates goodwill with his audience by saying to them in effect, "I'm sure you know the answer, but let's think this through together." He answers the question with what is the most common reason given for why Americans become Communists—bad economic conditions—and proceeds immediately to refute the alleged cause by naming countries where bad economic conditions are not the cause of Communism, thus giving evidence of his knowledge of the situation. Further, he uses Marx himself as an example of economic conditions not being the cause of his turning to Communism, again revealing his expertise on the subject.

Sheen's first reason for why some American become Communists is that they are reacting against liberalism. This is a very interesting point, almost a paradox, since most Americans think of liberals as
pro-Communist. Sheen indicates clearly that liberalism can mean three things. He speaks of liberalism as understood by the Manchester school; liberalism as professed by Americans who believe in fundamental rights and liberties within the law; and liberalism as professed by those who expect liberty without law. These insights point up Sheen's depth of understanding of the problem and confirm his credibility still further.

In his arguments, Sheen brings in the revolutionary tendency of youth, does not condemn them for it, but rather states that the "revolutionary character of modern youth throughout the world is due to a rightful protest against parents and educators who have not bequeathed to them the meaning of existence" (par. 6). With these words, Sheen helps both parents and youth to identify with the problem. Parents of teenagers, especially of those who are "revolting"—and these are legion—are grateful that they now have a reason why Johnny does the things he does and consequently can better understand him. Certainly good will has been furthered between speaker and audience. Further, Sheen identifies with his audience in the realization that true freedom implies responsibility. Many Americans, especially those in the middle-class segment of society, are responsibility-ridden creatures. Sheen quotes two men, Klaus Fuchs and Louis Budenz, who knew Communism well, to further his credibility about the concept of freedom.

Sheen states that "another reason why some become Communists is to escape a sense of guilt" (par. 9). Here again identification is strong. Who has not felt the "uneasiness that can come from bad behavior, such as dishonesty, pride, egotism, selfishness, lust, and
alcoholism. But it can also come from having too much money" (par. 9). As Sheen goes on to show how "some" join Communism as a "way out," his viewers can relax, because although they have felt a sense of guilt, they did not turn to the evil of Communism.

Once again, Sheen makes an appeal to the young for morality. He says, "Educators in a democracy must be sure that the youth are taught to lead moral lives, for Communism makes progress in relation to the breakdown of morals. It even seeks to destroy morality in youth through the spread of false opinions and evil literature" (par. 11). Goodwill and identification spread as parents relate to the call for morality.

Sheen's third reason for why some become Communists is "found in the betrayal of the intelligentsia" (par. 13). In his multiplicity of arguments, Sheen makes a definite distinction between "intelligentsia" and "intellectuals" thus allowing for further identification. He traces the etymology of the word and uses the authority of Arnold Toynbee to further his case. Sheen's knowledge and expertise on the subject comes through, suggesting that this man has a firm command of history.

Sheen turns to Christianity in his last statement, showing that "the grace of God can undo Communism and make them free men again," using Douglas Hyde, the editor of the London Communist daily, and his wife as examples. His final appeal is again to the ultimate authority: "God can do His work when we put ourselves on his side."
The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence," 1954; Ethos, Image

This third speech gives evidence first of Sheen's knowledge and expertise in regard to his subject and second, of his effort to foster goodwill and to inculcate in his audience a firm sense of identification.

In presenting his case, Sheen lists, year by year, Russia's promises of "coexistence" and then, year by year, the "breaking of the treaties" (par. 4):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promise of Coexistence</th>
<th>Breaking of Treaties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1933 Litvinoff Agreement. Litvinoff promises Pres. Roosevelt that Russia would not organize Communist parties or groups, or use American citizens to foster overthrow of the American Government.</td>
<td>1934 Soviet Russia organized the Communist cell in America to infiltrate the government up to the second level of its authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 Lithuanian Non-Aggression Pact with the Soviets.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Lithuania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 Soviets renounced war in protocol with Poland.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets attacked Eastern Poland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Soviets signed non-aggression pact with Finland.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets invaded Finland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Soviets signed Estonian non-aggression pact.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets invaded Estonia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Soviets signed Latvian nonaggression pact.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Latvia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Soviets signed Polish nonaggression pact.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets seized Poland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 Czech-Soviet Alliance</td>
<td>1939 Soviets refused to aid Czechoslovakia against Hitler.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence of this kind favorably impresses the audience with the speaker's knowledge and expertise. Sheen goes on to quote Stalin as he spoke on coexistence before the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party. On December 2, 1927, Stalin said:

We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal depends on whether we succeed in delaying the war with the capitalist countries which is inevitable. . . . therefore, the maintenance of peaceful relations with capitalist countries is obligatory for us. The basis of our relations with capitalist countries consists in admitting the co-existence of two opposed systems (par. 5).

To give further evidence in regard to peaceful coexistence, Sheen quotes from an article that appeared in "the party organ of the Academy of Science of the Soviet Republic," March, 1954. The article explains why the Soviet Union had to accept peaceful coexistence, "in contrast to Marx whose philosophy does not admit of coexistence" (par. 12). Sheen uses a second article taken from The Communist, entitled "Peaceful Coexistence of the Two Systems." The author was A. Leontyev, spokesman of Soviet foreign policy. Sheen continues his argument, using Marx and
Churchill as authorities for their own points of view. Sheen's ability to quote various sources is certainly impressive.

Then Sheen moved to a discussion of the decline of sensitivity in England about bombing from 1935, when "England was very sensitive about the use of bombing planes on the frontiers of the Middle East and India," to 1942, when "the British Bomber Command received this directive from the War Cabinet: 'To focus its operations on destroying the morale of the enemy civil population and, in particular, of the industrial workers'" (pars. 22, 23). Sheen's information about this area is extensive.

Sheen uses analogies and examples to further identify with his audience. He says "America is apt to think in terms of slogans, such as peaceful coexistence and thus make itself as naive as the woman who thinks she looks as young as they say she does" (par. 7). The analogy of the wolf and the lamb: "The wolf promised coexistence to the lamb, but when the wolf ate the lamb, there was only uni-existence" (par. 7). Sheen extends his definition of coexistence by likening it to the marital order, with which the majority of his viewers could identify. Co-existence he says,

may be likened to a husband and wife who live in a state of mutual antagonism. The wife has a precious Ming vase poised in hand, ready to throw at her husband, in his turn, he has his favorite golf club lifted high in the air, ready to bring it down on her offending head. Both, however, momentarily shrink from the armed conflict because neither of them wishes to risk their prize possessions (par. 8).

The analogy is easily understood and easily identified with. Another
example of coexistence involving "Nephew Khrushchev" and "Uncle Sam" follows this one.

Nephew Khrushchev and his Uncle Sam decide to coexist in the same room. They both stay up late at night because each is afraid to go to bed while the other is still up. Finally, both having retired at identically the same moment, Uncle Sam says, "Good night Nephew Khrushchev." Nephew Khrushchev answers "Good night, Uncle Sam." Then both turn over, reach under respective pillows and pull out guns to see if they are cocked (par. 9).

Sheen fosters goodwill by presenting a picture of peace which has its basis in the "God of Justice." His final appeal is still another instance of identification:

If, instead of fearing germs and Communists, we began fearing a breakdown of our moral order; if we restored the sanctity of home and marriage, raised children in discipline and love of God and became less tepid about defending moral law; then we would have less fear of the enemy, for if God is with us, who can prevail against us (par. 31).

Has Russia Really Changed? 1955: Ethos, Image

The fourth of the selected speeches strengthens Sheen's image as a man of knowledge and expertise. The speech is interwoven with those devices of identification and credibility that enhance his charisma.

The variety and depth of information that Sheen presents in this talk are remarkable. After a brief introduction, in which he calls upon his audience to identify with him as a part of "the Western world" desiring peace, Sheen moves on to define change, going back to the Greek origin of the work, then amplifying the idea, and finally concluding the section with a story. He proceeds to apply the notion of
metanoia (change) to Russia, careful to distinguish between the philosophy of Communism and its tactics. Sheen says "the first is internal and affects the mind and the spirit; the second is external and refers to actions, methods, and strategy" (par. 2). Sheen draws on his literary background to illustrate the difference between the two. He relates the story of the siege of Troy. The intent of the Greeks had not changed, but their tactics had.

Sheen applies the distinction between philosophy and tactics to the Russian scene to prove that the philosophy of the Russians had not changed but that their tactics had indeed changed. Going through the basic principles of Communism, Sheen reiterates many of the ideas previously stated: 1) the primacy of class over the individual, 2) the persecution of religion, 3) the abolition of private property, and 4) the lack of political freedom. Throughout, Sheen uses Russian authorities—Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev—with expert fluency.

The second part of the speech deals with the change in tactics used by Russia. Sheen states that Russia now desires coexistence and that the reason for this desire is fear. Sheen presents a list of Russian leaders who had been killed since the revolution began in 1917, to point up strongly the fact that the Russians fear each other as much, if not more than, as they fear the rest of the world. The list is as follows:

- 9 out of 11 cabinet members holding office in 1936
- 5 out of 7 of the last Central Executive Committee
- 43 out of 53 secretaries of the Central Committee Party Organization
- 15 out of 27 of the top Communists who drafted the 1936 Constitution
70 out of 80 members of the Soviet War Council
3 out of every 5 marshalls of the Soviet Army
All members of Lenin's first post-Bolshevik
Politburo, except Stalin (par. 14).

Other tactical changes are the result of the cooling off of the revolution in general, and the discovery of the atomic bomb. Fear stands as the deterrent. Sheen points out some of the factors in the "cooling off of the revolution." He says:

Economic revolutionists transfer booty and loot from one man's pocket to another. Now that the Communist leaders are in possession of loot, they are settling down to a sophistication and to a love of pleasure. Stalin, whose name means "steel," is dead; Molotov, whose name means "hammer," has been found wrong. The hard things are perishing; the soft things are arising. No revolution ever achieves what it sets out to achieve (par. 18).

The discovery of the atomic bomb was a second deterrent that brought about tactical changes. Sheen states:

But when the atomic bomb was discovered, it was possible now for the so-called "enemy" of the Soviets to have power equal to or greater than the Soviets with their revolutionists and Fifth Columnists. The Soviets now see it as possible for the "enemy" to destroy them. For a while they said that because of the vastness of their empire they would not suffer as much from atomic bombing as other nations. Then they readily admitted that, because their government is more centralized it is more capable of being dislocated and destroyed. Not because the Soviets had begun to recognize justice as the foundation of peace have they changed their tactics, but because of a fear about survival in case of war (par. 21).

Sheen concludes by warning that the philosophy of Communism has not changed, although the tactics have; therefore, diplomats should beware.

Reaching into his literary storehouse once more, Sheen reinforces
this idea of deception on the part of the Russians by quoting Shakespeare's *Henry VI*:

I can smile and murder while I smile,  
And cry "content" to that which grieves my heart  
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears  
And frame my face to all occasions (par. 23).

In advising his viewers on the type of attitude to choose in relating to Russia, Sheen recommends the Christian ideal, telling the story of Jesus and his relationship to Judas, who betrayed him. The Gospel said that Our Lord knew that Judas would betray Him, and Sheen goes on to say, "But this did not prevent the Saviour from walking with Judas; from sharing secrets, and even from inviting him to the supreme banquet of Love" (par. 24).

Sheen's final plea in this speech is made to his television audience, asking them to identify with the Russian people as human beings:

The Russian people are good people, perhaps more like us than any other people in the world. . . . The people of Russia are no more Communists than the people of Germany were Nazis. . . . the Russian people will be discovered not to have been Communists at all. They will be found to have prayed to the same God and hoped for the same freedom (par. 25).

*The Life and Character of Lenin, 1956; Ethos, Image*

During his fifth series, Sheen gave only three speeches about Communism, one of which was "The Life and Character of Lenin." The entire speech reads like a story, a human-interest story, which fascinates most people and establishes a credibility difficult to refute. He begins by painting a picture via the cartoonist of the way in which the revolutionist is imagined: "as uneducated, boorish, and sinister,
with long hair hanging to his shoulders and the bomb in his hand" (par. 1), a picture with which most of his viewers could readily identify as indeed their conception of a revolutionary. Against this background, he names Lenin as "one who introduced one of the greatest revolutions in the world" but who does not fit the picture. He brings in a quotation from St. Paul, who said of himself, "Woe to me, if I preach not revolution" (par. 1), to substantiate his statement that the picture does not fit all revolutionaries (although St. Paul did have a beard), reinforcing the idea that all revolution is not bad and inducing the audience to accept the idea that change might be good. Channeling the energy of the potentially great is all important.

First, Sheen presents four qualities that Lenin possessed that are complementary: he was normal, he was kind and likable, he was intellectually brilliant, and he was not greedy for personal gain, all of which are traits with which an audience would like to identify. Then Sheen says, "given these traits, it now remains to inquire how this intelligent and remarkable man ever became a revolutionist advocating the grossest kind of cruelty and tyranny" (par. 7).

Sheen next narrates the events that made Lenin develop deep resentments and develop the ideology by which he lived. Throughout, Sheen gives historical facts concerning the contributions made by various individuals and groups to the great revolution. Sheen points out that "at that particular time, there was raging in Russia a dispute between two ways of organizing Russia's future. One was that of the Narodniki, and the other, that of the Marxists" (par. 9).
Sheen takes his listeners back to the remote beginnings of Communism: "If there is any one man to whom Bolshevism owes its remote origins, outside of Karl Marx, it is Plekhanov. Plekhanov's idea was that the new form of Socialism in Russia must not be made by peasants but by the working class. In 1889, Plekhanov wrote: 'In Russia, political freedom will be gained by the working class, or it will not exist at all!'" (par. 9)

Sheen points out the greatness of Lenin and the evolution of his ideas: "Lenin's greatness lay not in his creative originality of thought but in his ability to transmute an existing system of Karl Marx into a program of militant action" (par. 15), and "Marx alone explains the disparity between Lenin's character and his political actions... the answer is the ideology of Marx" (par. 16).

Sheen reviewed the principles from which Communism rose, all of which are the basis for an understanding of Lenin, the revolutionary.

The cruelty of Lenin was, therefore, ideological, dogmatic, doctrinal, metaphysical, it was not personal. It was not in his character; it was a principle to which he subscribed, not a part of his psychological makeup. It was never a question of whether or not he liked a person; it was a question as a social sadist, but in the name of Bolshevism (par. 21).

All of these details indicate the intense research which must have gone into the preparation of the speech—further confirmation of Sheen's knowledge, intelligence, and expertise.

The remainder of the speech is a series of quotations from Lenin himself. In letting him speak, Sheen points up again his own knowledge
and understanding of the man. Sheen concludes the speech by relating an incident in the life of another revolutionary who had also given up his heritage, whose father had taken him to court to return money he had taken in selling some goods and giving the money to the poor. The youth returned the money and, in addition, laid his clothes at his father's feet. Sheen says:

From that day on, he would be a revolutionist of the world. If Lenin had loved the poor in charity as he detested classes in hate, he might have been the St. Francis of the twentieth century (par. 42).

This appeal by Sheen to the Christian standard, which is the American "ideal," solidifies good will and identification with his audience.

As an epideictic speaker, Sheen has given clear evidence in his speeches that his ethos or image is strong. He establishes goodwill; gives indication time after time of his intelligence, his expertise, and his knowledge of the subject matter he covers; promotes communion with his audience by identifying with them. All of these combine to reinforce the charisma of the speaker.

Skillful Presentation

Although Perelman does not emphasize delivery as such, he does maintain that the epideictic speaker, "more than in any other kind of oratory," must have "qualifications for speaking on his subject and must also be skillful in its presentation, if he is not to appear ridiculous."

Sheen's first television appearance can attest to the fact that here was a man skillful in the presentation of his subject matter. An interviewer for Time writes, "Du Mont was overwhelmed by the mail
response (8,500 letters a week). The program now carried by 17 stations, has a Trendex popularity rating of 13.7, unequaled by any other 'inspirational' or intellectual show.\textsuperscript{22} Gretta Palmer writing in the \textit{Catholic Digest} comments: "In one year on television he had had more letters from would-be converts than from all his years on radio."\textsuperscript{23}

One of the techniques used most effectively by Sheen in his presentation was humor. Nelson Hart observes, "Most comedians lick their chops in envy at Sheen's sense of timing and his flair for getting laughs when he wants them. Possessing the rare ability of knowing when to turn off the jokes and turn on the philosophy, he can carefully balance serious passages with anecdotes or jocular footnotes."\textsuperscript{24} Sheen himself feels that humor is one of his stronger points. In an interview with this writer, Sheen said almost wistfully:

\begin{quote}
The humor, for example, is never in anything that is written. I begin with humor. I put humor in talks, even in sermons. There's always humor. Now \textit{that} nobody would write about. I don't know, but sometimes there might be a little planned humor. But anyone who just takes it from what I've written would say, "Well, he never used a story."\textsuperscript{25}
\end{quote}

Sheen's comments about those reading his work and missing both humor and story are hardly accurate. The five speeches used in this study, for instance, are filled with illustrative examples, which he culled from history and literature as well as from the work-a-day world—from the home, the golf course, the shoe store, etc. Sheen seems never at a loss for these examples, which generally are appropriate for the subject matter he is presenting.
In "The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence" speech, for example, Sheen points up the fact that Americans are inclined to make a term such as "peaceful coexistence" into a slogan. Thus, he says, making "itself as naive as the woman who thinks her friends think she looks as young as they say she does" (par. 7). In the same speech, Sheen speaks of coexistence as an "ice peace" and tells the story of the married couple at odds with one another. Another story, making the same point about coexistence, follows immediately. This one deals with "Nephew Khrushchev" and "Uncle Sam" (see pages 87 and 88).

The "Has Russia Really Changed?" speech has two compelling humorous stories. In showing that in a true metanoia both a new motivation and atonement go together, Sheen says, "otherwise there is the absurdity revealed in this story:

A priest was stopped by a total stranger, who said, "Father, I have just stolen an automobile; what must I do?" The priest said, "You must return it to the owner." The thief said, "I will give it to you." The priest said, "No, I cannot take it; return it to the owner." The thief said, "The owner will not take it." "In that case, you may keep it." A few hours later, the priest discovered that his own automobile had been stolen (par. 2).

The second humorous story is used to emphasize the fact that "very few of the Communist leaders die a natural death." Liquidation came swiftly and often. Sheen says:

The New Yorker once carried a cartoon which characterized this mutual dread of Soviet leaders. About twelve pallbearers were carrying out a coffin to a Russian grave. One of the pallbearers turned to the other and said, "Who is in here? I was away last week." (par. 16)
These are just a few of the examples of the stories used by Sheen. Stories, many of them humorous, abound in all of Sheen's presentations.

Another important aspect of a skillful presentation is delivery, and Sheen's is masterful. The fact that he uses neither notes nor cue cards enables him to face his audience directly. His look never falters, and one feels that he is speaking only to the individual viewer. His freedom from a script allows him freedom of movement, which makes the entire presentation less rigid and cold. His style of delivery is admired by many in the theatrical world, especially his sense of timing -- knowing exactly when to pause for effect or when to use an overly rapid style or when to tell a story. His voice comes out in deep resonant tones, sometimes very low, sometimes strong and vibrant, but always commanding attention. The interviewer from *Time* described his voice as "soft, yet suggesting the possibility of thunder."26

His graceful gestures are meaningful and natural. He embraces his audience with his outstretched arms, or he challenges them with a pointed-finger gesture. Father Nelson Hart describes these gestures: "His hands finger the chain of his pectoral cross, or spread outward in supplication or hammer down a point in the air, or thrust skyward."27

Sheen has won many distinctions for his television presentations. Among these are The Radio-Television Daily citation of Television's Man of the Year for 1952, the Academy of Television Arts and Sciences award as Most Outstanding Personality on Television in 1952, and the Freedoms Foundation Award in 1953 and 1954. He also won the Best Religious Program on Television Award given by *Look* magazine in 1954. Sheen had made his mark on the television world.
Summary and Conclusions

The framework of argumentation in Perelman's view, covers the audience, speaker, and message. All argumentation centers on the audience because all argumentation needs the contact of rational, reasoning minds. For Perelman, then, all argumentation is audience-centered. This audience is considered a diverse composite of "normal adult human beings." Perelman also demands that the speaker have knowledge of his audience so that he might better influence choice.

As a speaker using the television medium, Sheen addresses himself to this diverse composite of millions of viewers who voluntarily choose to tune him into their homes. He has a great understanding of human nature, which he gained through his work as priest-counsellor and which he uses to great advantage in his work with his audiences.

Perelman allows for conditioning agents—those elements which enhance and support the speaker in the presentation of his material. Sheen makes full use of them all. He laid out the plans for the set; he supervised lighting and camera work; and he had the music arranged for the show.

One of the purposes of the epideictic speech is to promote and intensify values held in common by the audience and speaker. A set of values, discovered by two researchers as being at the core of the American value system, were used to discover which of these were most often used by Sheen. In his speeches, Sheen appeals strongly to five of these: 1) Puritan and Pioneer Morality, 2) The Value of the Individual,
3) Rejection of Authority, 4) Material Comfort, and 5) Generosity and Consideration. The values are illustrated and documented by excerpts from the speeches. Morality and the value of the individual are most relevant in dealing with Communism. Communism becomes a moral issue, especially since Sheen sees it as atheistic and finds that Communism progresses in proportion to a decline of morality. The value of the individual is used often because Communism negates this value and stresses the value of the class.

Another of Perelman's recommendations for the epideictic speaker is a strong ethos or image. Sheen's ethos, in the light of the speeches studied, is very strong. He has proved himself trustworthy and sincere, intelligent and knowledgable—an expert on the subject of Communism. He makes constant efforts to identify with his audience; consequently, he comes across as a charismatic figure.

Sheen presents his material skillfully. He is a real master of humor, delivery, gestures, and voice. He seems able to convince himself and his audience that he is a great speaker. One has the distinct impression that he can do no wrong. Indeed, he has an air of authority, a touch of arrogance, about him. Countless times, he has explained his method of preparation and has indicated the hours of study that make it possible for him to speak without using cue cards or notes. He prides himself on this ability to speak without a script or notes and points out that although many have tried, they could not imitate him.

While teaching at Catholic University, Sheen was reproached by Father Ignatius Smith, the chairman of the Philosophy Department there,
who "remonstrated with him for allowing no questions during his outside lectures. Sheen replied that his explanations were so clear there could not possibly be any questions." After relating the incident, Father Noonan remarks cryptically, "This was an arrogant remark from an incipient prima donna." The attitude that his "explanations" are sufficiently clear seems to be the attitude that he brings to his television speeches. Sheen always seems to be aware of the impact he is having on his audiences and on the people he meets on the street. Father Noonan observes, "Like Lyndon Johnson, he seems to savor the aroma of success, doting on his ratings and disparaging them when they drop. He is thrilled when a fan recognizes him on the street. He loves to be surrounded by people of wealth and distinction." But perhaps, this is the penalty of success.
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CHAPTER V

THE STARTING POINT OF ARGUMENTATION

The preceding chapter dealt with "The Framework of Argumentation," studying the audience, the conditioning agents that heighten and enhance the situation, the message as increasing adherence of the audience to values already possessed, the ethos of the speaker, and the skillful presentation of his subject matter.

The purpose of this chapter is to discover whether Sheen and his audience are, indeed, at the same "starting point of argumentation." The content of his speeches will be analyzed to discover whether his audience could accept the facts he presents as facts, the truths as truths, and the presumptions as presumptions. The definitions of facts, truths, and presumptions are those developed by Perelman. The style of his speeches will also be studied to discover the "readability" and the "human interest" aspects of the work.

One of the purposes of this chapter is to discover whether the audience accepts Sheen's facts, truths, and presumptions as starting points. This writer realizes the difficulty of trying to make this analysis without official records and ratings. The American Broadcasting Company in New York was contacted, but they have no records from that period. However, interviews with Sheen from 1953 and 1954 brought to light the following information. The Time interviewer reported that
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almost immediately mail began to pour in (8,500 letters a week). In
the same interview, the Trendex rating of 13.7 is given as the beginning
rating for the Sheen broadcast and it rose steadily. Gretta Palmer of
the Catholic Digest reports that by the end of the first year, the Ameri-
can Research Bureau rating of the program was 23.7, and the Bureau indi-
cated that Sheen was seen and heard in 2,380,000 homes by 5,700,000
people. Palmer also alludes to that fact that Sheen had received more
letters from would-be converts in one year on television than during all
his years on radio—a response that would indicate a large non-Catholic
following. Sheen told Gretta Palmer that his talks were aimed at the
small family groups in their own livingroom.1 Thus, Sheen enjoyed a
long and successful television career with consistently high ratings.
These consistently high ratings would strongly point up the fact that
his audience stayed with him, voluntarily choosing to tune in to his
"prime time" spot. This is the audience with whom Sheen sought agree-
ment. Let us, then, turn to the facts, truths, and presumptions Sheen
uses as starting points of argumentation.

Facts, Truths, Presumptions

In the area of argumentation, Perelman speaks of facts, truths,
and presumptions as objects of agreement concerned with the "real," and
that the speaker uses in his appeal to a universal audience. Facts are
those data "which refer to objective reality." This statement implies,
according to Perelman, that type of claim which will gain "the agreement
of the universal audience."2 It is instructive to note, however, that
when a fact is challenged in argumentation it will lose "its privileged
status," thereby forfeiting its position as "a starting point."³

The term truths, on the other hand, connotes "complex systems relating to connections between facts."⁴ A scientific theory or a religious conception, for example, is comprised of a series of related facts which when taken together form a truth.

In making this distinction between facts and truths, Perelman acknowledges certain difficulties involved in his interpretation. As he puts it:

We have no desire to settle, once and for all, the philosophic problem of the relationship between facts and truths; this relationship characterizes the conceptions of various audiences. For some people, fact is opposed to theoretical truth as the contingent is to the necessary, for others, as the real is to the schematic. It is also possible to so conceive their relationship that the statement of a fact is a truth and that any truth enunciates fact.⁴

Despite this reservation, he observes: "nonetheless, the distinction between facts and truths seem to be helpful and legitimate for our purpose, since it corresponds to the usual practice in argumentation of relying at one point on facts and at another on systems of wider import."⁵

A presumption is a statement of belief that describes what is "normal or likely."⁶ Although presumptions, in Perelman's view, are remarkably similar to facts and truths but they have one important distinguishing characteristic. Since a presumption derives its meaning from what is normal and likely, it is at best a statement grounded in probability, consequently, it must be constantly reinforced. Only in this way can a presumption function as a starting point. In developing
his theory of presumption, Perelman makes the following important claim:

Agreement based on the presumption of the normal is supposed to have the same order of validity for the universal audience as agreement upon established facts and upon truths so that agreement on presumptions is often not easily distinguishable from agreement on facts. At a given moment, presumed facts are treated as equivalent to observed facts and can serve, with equal authority, as a premise for argument. This only true, of course, until the presumption is subjected to discussion.7

Thus, facts, truths, and presumptions are used by the epideictic speaker in the presentation of his argument to a universal audience. Let us look at Sheen's use of these in the five selected speeches. References to paragraphs in the speeches are numbered as they are in the Appendix at the end of this work. The reader is reminded that the terms, facts, truths, and presumptions, are used in the light of Perelman's conception of them.

The Philosophy of Communism, 1952

After a brief introduction, in which Sheen relates a personal experience, he opens his talk "The Philosophy of Communism" with a statement based on the feelings of the people at the time. He states: "There is considerable confusion in our American life about Communism; too much emotional hatred of Communism, and not sufficient thinking and reasoning about it" (par. 10). This speech was delivered in 1952, two years into McCarthy's polemics, and the country was in a great emotional upheaval. Suspicion and fear of Communism were heavy in the air. Although many in Sheen's TV audience may have favored McCarthy's actions,
few if any would deny that confusion abounded, that there was "too much emotional hatred of Communism and not enough thinking and reasoning about it." On these two points at least, Sheen and his audience were at the same starting point.

Sheen sets forth the major presumption on which he builds the argument of the entire speech by saying: "But Communism is intrinsically wrong, independently of Russia's foreign policy. The foreign policy of Russia is a tactic; it is by the philosophy of Communism that Russia is to be judged" (par. 11). Sheen presents economic determinism and the Communist notion of man as the two basic principles of the philosophy of Communism and reinforces his premise by showing the evils of each, thus showing that Communism is intrinsically wrong.

Within the scope of this reinforcement are facts, truths, and presumptions that add to the argument that builds agreement between audience and speaker. In proving the evils of economic determinism, Sheen uses a number of facts. First, he speaks of methods of production in a democracy as based on private ownership of property; and he relates these methods to the Seventh and Tenth Commandments. Presumably, the commandments were accepted by the majority of his listeners, especially in the 1950's, as the basis of morality. Still arguing against the determination of culture, civilization, religion, philosophy, art, morals, and literature by economics, Sheen points to a second fact. He reminds his viewers that "during the days when we were foolishly having a honeymoon with Russia, there was a considerable amount of art developed that was Communist-inspired" (par. 19). How
well many in his audience would remember the disenchantment with capitalism in the 1930's. They would remember the days when the United States and Russia were allies. They would remember the honeymoon. Sheen would have agreement from his audience.

In the same argument on economic determinism, Sheen states a presumption. He states that "the first fallacy of economic determinism is that Karl Marx, who studied philosophy and should have known better, confused what is known as a condition with a cause" (par. 20). Sheen begins his reinforcing of the statement by speaking of a window being the condition, not the cause of light. He goes on to show that economics is not the cause of determining the culture or the religious beliefs. He defends his statements with historical facts. First:

There was no difference between the economic methods of production among the Jews and those among the Hindus or the Chaldeans; but their civilizations were different; their religious and moral concepts were different, the Hebrew having the highest concept that was known to man in the pre-Christian era (par. 21).

And the second fact was that "There was no change of economic methods in the Roman Empire from when it became Christian from when it was pagan. But the civilization and the art and the religion and the morality were totally different in the two periods" (par. 22). Firmly based on historical evidence, these facts would be accepted by his listeners.

Using an analogy to establish another presumption, Sheen states that "economics has gone to the heads of the Communists like wine to an empty stomach" (par. 25). He reinforces the statement by showing that
their thinking centers on economics and challenges their right to use moral terms such as "unjust," "unethical," "bad," and "immoral." The Communists seem preoccupied with economics, according to Sheen, yet in making judgments they resort to the language of the Christian traditions that they condemn.

Sheen turns to the second major part of his argument, to "the Communist notion of man" and begins with the presumption: "The second basic principle of Communism is that man has value only inasmuch as he is a member of a class" (par. 26). Sheen uses the authority of Marx, Molotov, and ex-Communist Heywood Broun to build his case, showing that the only importance man has for the Communists is as a member of the Revolutionary class. Sheen further reinforces his notion that man is of extremely high value and refutes the Communist idea that the individual man is of secondary importance to the class by pointing out what little regard the Soviets have for human life: "Communist tanks run over the bodies of their wounded. No one would even kick them out of the paths of the great machines, because they are no longer of worth" (par. 33). Sheen cites as a further argument the historical fact that "as Hitler put the emphasis upon race, as Mussolini put it on the nation, so the Communists put it on a revolutionary mass" (par. 34). He goes on to build a truth concerning the worth of the individual. Sheen begins by stating that "personality has a religious basis," adding that "a person is a subject, not an object." He reiterates a truth often used: "A person has more worth than the universe: What doth it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul?"
(par. 34). Another truth is presented, this time regarding the rights of the individual. First, he states that "a person realizes himself and comes to relative perfection in society, but only because he has within himself a principle independent of a society, namely, a soul; then he states, "This soul has rights anterior to any state or dictator, parliament or king." Together, these build to the truth: "As our Declaration of Independence puts it, 'The Creator has endowed man with certain inalienable rights'" (par. 34).

Sheen makes a final presumption in this speech by stating, "Communists are right in saying this world needs a revolution, but not their cheap kind, which merely transfers booty and loot out of one man's pocket into another's" (par. 35). The presumption lies in the words "this world needs a revolution" and is defended and reinforced by statements that indicate the kind of revolution that will unite society, the kind that begins in the heart of every American, the kind that purges a man's heart of "pride and covetousness and lust and anger." Thus, Sheen completes his argument on the philosophy of Communism.

**Why Some Become Communists, 1953**

Sheen, in this presentation of "Why Some Become Communists," uses a negation to state his major presumption. He states that one of the reasons most often given (for why some Americans become Communists) is that Communists are made by bad economic conditions. The presumption stated positively would read "there are many causes of Communism." His speech, then, centers on the three reasons that he puts forward as the
causes of Communism: 1) a reaction against liberalism, 2) an escape from a sense of guilt, and 3) a betrayal of the intelligentsia. Before he begins explicating his reasons, however, Sheen takes time to refute the one reason "most often given" as to how Communists are made. He uses facts historically based that would be accepted by his audience. He states:

Bad economic conditions are not the cause of people becoming Communistic; if they were, countries with low economic standards would be most Communistic. The economic level of Burma is very low, but the people are definitely anti-Communist. Economic standards of Portugal and Ireland are not nearly so high as in the United States; yet both countries are definitely anti-Communist (par. 1).

He further points out the fact that Marx was not poor and yet turned to Communism.

The following presumption takes the form of a statement that gives substance to one-third of Sheen's speech. He says, "One reason why some become Communists is a reaction against liberalism" (par. 3). In the reinforcement of his presumption, Sheen defines liberalism and shows how it prepares its adherents for Communism. He states that liberalism can have three meanings. The first meaning that he gives is that liberalism can mean "that particular philosophy of the last century which believed that economic production should be uncontrolled by state, morality, or religion. Such was the liberalism of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, and the Manchester school" (par. 3). The other two definitions of liberalism are presented as presumptions and each is properly reinforced. The first of these is:

Liberalism can also mean a belief in fundamental
rights and liberties within the law. Every American is that kind of liberal. Such liberalism believes that everybody should be free to draw a triangle on condition that he give it three sides. It believes that everyone should be free to draw a giraffe on condition that he give it a long neck, for such is the nature of a giraffe. It believes that everyone should be free to drive his car in traffic, but on condition that he obey the traffic laws. This is the right kind of liberalism -- freedom under the law (par. 4).

The third definition follows immediately in the text:

Finally, liberalism can mean liberty within the law. This is the kind of liberalism that makes Communists. Liberals of this variety are interested only in freedom from something, but not in freedom for something. They say they have an open mind, but it never closes on anything. They say they are looking for truth; yet if they ever met truth, they would drop dead. The reason they do not want Truth or Goodness or an Absolute is because the discovery of truth would commit them to responsibility. They are always unprepared for truth, like the golfer, who in his first trip to the course makes a hole in one (par. 5).

The second definition is reinforced by illustrative argument the third, mainly through the use of a quasi-logical argument. Other presumptions on the same general topic are presented and expounded in detail, making his audience's agreement with him possible and probable.

Sheen's second major argument begins with the presumption:

"Another reason why some become Communists is to escape a sense of guilt" (par. 9). Sheen's presumption that some become Communists because of a sense of guilt is followed up by the claim that very few would deny:

"Every man who does wrong has an uneasy conscience. This sense of guilt and uneasiness can come from bad behavior, such as dishonesty, pride, egotism, selfishness, lust, and alcoholism. But it can also come from
having too much money" (par. 9). Sheen continues his argument that a sense of guilt is a reason for people becoming Communists by making a point of showing the relationship between the breakdown of morals and the progress made by Communists. As morality declines, Communism rises. He also makes a strong point by showing the guilt felt by the rich when they "see a tremendous disproportion between what they have and what others have" (par. 12). They will either support Communism to "salve" their consciences or else support it so that if there is a Communist takeover, their riches will be safe. Sheen hastens to tell the rich that "Lenin said that they would be the first to be liquidated" (par. 12).

Another presumption introduces the third major area of argumentation: the betrayal of the intelligentsia as a reason for Communism. The defense is built first on the definition of intelligentsia and the distinction between them and the intellectuals. Second, he makes a comparison between "intellectual slumming" and "economic slumming" by presenting the historical fact of the one as the basis for the other. Many of his listeners would know that "fifty years ago there was such a thing as 'economic slumming,' in which the rich went to the dives and the cafes of the poor, not to relieve their needs by a surrender of their wealth, but in order to enjoy the shock and the thrill of riches contrasted with poverty" (par. 15). "Intellectual slumming," says Sheen, finds the intelligentsia going down to the Communist masses, "not to give them the truth of which they are custodians, but in order to enjoy the shock and thrill of mass revolutionary movements" (par. 16).
Another presumption on this same topic is the claim that the intelligentsia are not at home in a culture. Sheen states:

The intelligentsia are uprooted. They are not at home in a culture; uprooted spiritually and morally disoriented, they fit into Western Christian civilization like a woman trying to get a 7 foot into a 3-A shoe. That is why many of the intelligentsia no longer write books in their own native countries; some Americans expatriate themselves to write in England, others in France, others in Spain, others in Africa; some Irishmen go to England to expound their ideas, and some of the German intelligentsia to America. These men are not at home at home; they feel the need of an alien class to act as a transformer of their ideas, that is to change them from low to high voltage. Because they have lost their roots and their culture, they gravitate to Bolshevism or what is alien to the great tradition that had made Western civilization and democracy. The so-called "wise" men are not so wise as they think they are (par. 17).

In the presentation of this claim, Sheen makes no attempt to document his statements, and he names no names. Perhaps he had the names of some authors who expatriated themselves from their own countries and gravitated "to Bolshevism or what is alien to the great tradition that had made Western civilization and democracy." However, many writers have felt the need "of an alien class to act as a transformer of their ideas, that is, to change them from low to high voltage." These have continued to be "intellectuals" and have sought the refuge of other countries so that they might have a better perspective on their native situation, but they did not "gravitate to Bolshevism." Sheen does not appear to be convincing here, for there are many examples of writers who have left the United States and have not become Communists. Among these are: James Baldwin, Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald,
Gertrude Stein, Tennessee Williams, James Jones, and Gore Vidal. Sheen generalizes without substantiating his claims.

The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence, 1954

This speech on "The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence" opens with what seems to be a long introduction, including statements of a truth, a presumption, and a factual verification of the presumption, before Sheen states the major premise on which his whole argument is based.

The truth he presents is built up fact on fact: "Coexistence is proper to the inanimate kingdom; stones exist; living is proper to the plant kingdom; cabbages co-live. Feeling is common to the animal kingdom; cats co-feel." Sheen then states the truth "Loving is proper to the human order; love one another as I have loved you" (par. 1).

Sheen begins another truth:

Coexistence is for those who are incompatible such as a quarrelsome husband and wife. Tigers and lions coexist in a zoo, but they have separate runways. Because coexistence is infrahuman, and below the norm by which nations ought to live together, it is fitting that there be a test of the sincerity of coexistence proposals. The test Our Lord gave was that of judging a tree by its fruits. Grapes cannot be gathered from thorns, nor figs from thistles" (par. 2)

This series starts with the idea of coexistence, and one would expect a carry-through from this idea to a truth. The claim that "grapes cannot be gathered from thorns, nor figs from thistles" does not quite complete the series of analogous facts which precede it. Instead, Sheen shifts gears mid-stream and prepares his audience for his next statement by speaking of a "test of sincerity of coexistence proposals" (par. 2).
His next statement is the presumption: The Soviets make promises of peaceful coexistence. Sheen states:

When the Soviets testify to their peace aims and bring testimonials of their peaceful character from their satellite nations, it is reasonable to look back into their past and study whether they kept their promise of "peaceful coexistence," or used it to pillage nations, prostitute people, tyrannize minority groups, and confiscate the productive machinery of various countries (par. 3).

Sheen gives his viewers a very long "look into their past" by presenting promises made by the Russians, beginning in 1926, and by showing how each one was broken until 1950. He enumerates fifteen instances, one by one, i.e., "1932, Soviets signed Polish nonaggression pact; 1939, Soviets seized Poland." In addition to this evidence, Sheen also quotes Stalin, who in speaking to the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party in December, 1927, told his audience that peaceful coexistence would have to be maintained.

Following this lengthy introduction, Sheen makes his major presumption: "In the light of these and other facts which might be added, it is obvious that what the Soviets mean by 'peaceful coexistence' is a temporary arrangement, a tactical maneuver, an accommodation to the historical problems of an hour in order to achieve world revolution" (par. 6). In support of this presumption, he examines the idea of peaceful coexistence as a temporary arrangement, a tactical maneuver, studies the reasons for it, and finally asks if coexistence can be a basis for peace.

Sheen presents another presumption based on coexistence when he says that "the basis of coexistence is fear, mutual antagonism in which
each tolerates the other because it dare not risk perishing" (par. 8). To reinforce this statement, Sheen uses the story of a quarrel between a married couple and a story of "Nephew Khrushchev and Uncle Sam." Both stories illustrate coexistence born of fear. Sheen brings the idea of fear as a basis of coexistence into better focus by a discussion of the fear generated by the knowledge that the atomic bomb was in the possession of both the United States and Russia. At the time this speech was given, the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki was still a shocking, almost an embarrassing event. Knowledge of the devastation that could be wrought by this weapon struck in both parties a mutual fear that only a weapon like that could bring. Sheen further brings out the fact that the Communist leaders had to overthrow the Marxist idea that "capitalism would disintegrate" by itself and move to the idea that coexistence was the only way.

Sheen then asks, "Can such a fear be a basis for peace?" His presumption is that "it is very foolish to believe that the terrific instruments of destruction will induce men to forego war" (par. 22). Recalling the invention of the gun and recalling the decline of morality in regard to the use of bombs on non-military targets make Sheen and, through him, his viewers feel that the knowledge that the two powers have such terrible destructive weapons will "induce" them to forego war. Sheen also points out that the Soviet Union "does not work within the same moral limitations as the rest of the world" (par. 23).

The final presumption of his speech is stated in the form of a question, but it maintains, in effect, that "there is hope for peace."
Sheen strengthens it by stating: "Peace is more like a tree than a pyramid. The roots of the tree are the people who must first have justice in their hearts; the branches of the tree, pointing to heaven, represent the acknowledgment and dependence of nations on the God of Justice, the Source of Law and Equity" (par. 26). The pyramid concept would mean that peace came from above, but Sheen stresses the idea that peace must begin in each individual and spread to society. The only fear in this concept is the fear of doing harm to someone we love.

Has Russia Really Changed? 1955

Before stating the major presumption on which the entire speech "Has Russia Really Changed?" is built, Sheen prepares his audience, first of all, by establishing a need for change, especially in regard to Russia; secondly, by presenting the Greek word for change, metanoia, which goes beyond simple change and implies both an internal and an external change; and thirdly, by applying the notion of metanoia to Russia to show that there must be an internal change of tactics. Making the distinction between tactics as external and philosophy as internal leads Sheen directly to the presumption that is given in the form of two questions: "Has the philosophy of the Soviets changed? Have their tactics changed?" Restated the presumption would read: although the philosophy of Communism has not changed, their tactics have changed. Sheen develops his explanation of the philosophy of Communism by discussing four of the basic principles that have remained "as unaltered now as in 1917": 1) The primacy of class over the individual, 2) Persecution, 3) No private property, 4) No political freedom.
To prove that there has been a change in tactics, Sheen presents 1) The desire for coexistence, 2) Revolution loses its fervor, and 3) Atomic bomb.

The first of these restates a part of the major presumption: "The philosophy of Communism, which is the establishment of a totalitarian state throughout the world by revolutionary means, has not changed" (par. 6). Beginning with the first basic principle, "the primacy of class over the individual," Sheen presents his case for no change in philosophy. He states what he perceived to be a fact: "Nature is rather heedless and careless as to what happens to individuals as long as it preserves the species" (par. 6). He backs up his statement by using Marx's words and by pointing out the general disregard of human life in Communist-held territories. Briefly, Sheen touches on facts concerning religion, private property, and political freedom, emphasizing their absence in the Communist world.

Having established the fact that the philosophy of Communism has not changed, Sheen presents a presumption in the second area of discussion, namely, the tactics of Communism. He states, "There has been, however, an unquestioned change in the tactics of the Soviets." He takes up the challenge immediately with a series of facts:

Such changes are growth in contacts with foreign countries, difference in the tone of official propaganda, a lessening of bitterness in Soviet speeches at the United Nations, visits of Russian secret agents to our farms and our housing developments, soft-pedaling of Communist activities in Western nations, the ungodding of Stalin, and finally, the confession on the part of Molotov that he had erred in saying that only the foundations of socialism had been built in the Soviet Union (par.11).
The next presumption states that "the three principal reasons for the change in tactics are to be found chiefly within Russia itself" (par. 13). The first reason is the desire for coexistence, especially among the Russians themselves. Sheen gives statistics about the Soviet leaders who had been killed since 1917:

9 out of 11 cabinet members holding office in 1936
5 out of 7 of the last Central Executive Committee
43 out of 53 secretaries of the Central Community Party Organization
15 out of 27 of the top Communists who drafted the 1936 Constitution
70 out of 80 members of the Soviet War Council
3 out of 5 marshals of the Soviet Army
All members of Lenin's first Post-Boishevik Politburo, except Stalin (par. 14)

Fear of liquidation is uppermost in the minds of the Soviet leaders, since very few die a natural death. A second reason for a change in tactics is that the revolution loses its fervor. Sheen point out, "Now that the Communist leaders are in possession of loot, they are settling down to a sophistication and to a love of pleasure" (par. 18). A third reason for change in tactics among the Russians was the discovery of the atomic bomb. "But when the atomic bomb was discovered, it was possible now for the so-called 'enemy' of the Soviets to have power equal to or greater than the Soviets with their revolutionists and Fifth Columnists" (par. 21). Fear and love of pleasure are the means of breaking down the resistance of the Soviets, and they are ready to change their tactics and work toward coexistence.

Having presented reasons for the change of tactics of the Communists, Sheen offers a suggestion as to the attitude Americans should
assume toward the Russians: "It should be exactly the attitude of our Blessed Lord toward Judas, who changed his tactics but not his philosophy" (par. 24). Through this analogy, Sheen points out that "we must carry on with the exchanges of friendship, we must sit down at conference with them in the hope that, by calling them friends, they may avert their suicide and the suicide of the world" (par. 25). His final statements are facts about the Russians as other human beings with whom the viewers can identify, thus making for complete agreement between speaker and audience. Sheen states:

The Russian people are good people, perhaps more like us in their good nature than any other people in the world. . . . Once the Soviet terror is destroyed, whether through the self-annihilation of their leaders or by the slow fermentation of God's grace, the Russian people will be discovered not to have been Communists at all (par. 25).

The Life and Character of Lenin, 1956

In this speech "The Life and Character of Lenin," Sheen delineates the life and character of Lenin. He uses two major presumptions: 1) Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov was a remarkable man; and 2) This intelligent and remarkable man became a revolutionist advocating the grossest kind of cruelty and tyranny.

Four other presumptions are presented to support the fact that Lenin was a remarkable man. "First, he was normal" (par. 2); "second, Lenin in his nonrevolutionary activities was a kind, likable person" (par. 4); "third, another outstanding quality of Lenin was an intellectual brilliance combined with extraordinary industry" (par. 5); the
"fourth characteristic of Lenin was his complete and total detachment from sordid gain" (par. 6). Supporting the statement that he was normal are facts about his relationship with his family, emphasizing his ordinary environment, "no maladjusted childhood, no juvenile delinquency, no rebellion against parental authority, no poverty" (par. 2). Among the facts that substantiate the presumption that he was kind and likable are references to an experience he had while fox-hunting; Lenin could not bear to shoot the animal. Other facts were that he was devoted to his Mother, that he was not given to debauchery, that he was a faithful husband, and that he was a man who gave picture-books to little children. To show Lenin's intellectual brilliance and extraordinary industry, Sheen points out that he won a gold medal for excellence, that he attended the University of Kazan and upon expulsion continued to study law and finished first in an examination on that material, and that he studied languages and philosophy. Lenin's complete and total detachment from sordid gain is confirmed by the fact that he lived in voluntary poverty. Sheen says, "He [Lenin] was satisfied with the poorest of quarters. . . . In London he selected the poorest area of the Whitechapel district . . . he chose the poorest rooms from the Smolny Palace . . . Lenin gained no material advantages from a revolution which made him master of all Russia" (par. 6).

Having established Lenin as a remarkable individual, Sheen turns to a study of how this man could become "a revolutionist advocating the grossest kind of cruelty and tyranny." Sheen finds the answer in Lenin's resentment and ideology and holds that the second is far more
important than the first. In regard to the first, Sheen very briefly presents facts about the life of Lenin that reveal his resentment toward the Czarists, who had had his brother executed for an attempted assassination. Sheen makes this presentation in two paragraphs. The presentation of facts underlying Lenin's ideology is another matter: it is extremely lengthy (approximately 33 paragraphs). His first presumption is this: "That which changed Lenin was the ideology of Karl Marx" (par. 9). In building the case to support this statement, Sheen gets very involved; he begins his explanation with the very origins of Communism—the dispute between the "Narodniki" and the "Marxists." He includes details about George Flekhanov, who contributed to the origins of Bolshevism in a remote way. Sheen explains Lenin's exile, his writings, his activities, and becomes very detailed and rambling—more so in this speech than in any other. Besides this tendency to ramble, Sheen adds little flourishes that may be called "clever." For example, in speaking of Lenin's ability to transmute an existing system of Karl Marx into a program of militant action, Sheen very cleverly states, "The idea of Marx came first, then the Revolution of Lenin. As in Christianity, 'In the beginning was the Word and the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us,' so in Communism: In the beginning was Marx and Marx became Lenin and the revolution dwelt amongst us" (par. 15).

Sheen ends his delineation of Lenin's life with an account of his "last battle," which was against his final enemy "God." Sheen, by this time, just seems to be giving informal details that would sustain interest. In speaking of the death of Lenin, Sheen becomes very
dramatic by having Lenin's death coincide with the deaths of two prelates whom Lenin had ordered to be executed. Sheen states:

On Palm Sunday, Monsignor Butkevitch was condemned to a martyr's death; on Tuesday of that week, Lenin was struck with his final and wholly incapacitating stroke. Lenin was a corpse before Monsignor Butkevitch was murdered on Good Friday night in the cellar of notorious No. 11 Bolshaya Lubyanka. The time was a few minutes past six in the evening of January 21, in the year 1924. Several men were in a room in the Kremlin as a message was tapped on the telegraph: "Lenin is dying." A few minutes later, an auto sled sped out across the city; in it were Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Kalinin, Bukharin, and Tomsky. Trotsky was then in the Caucasus. All night long this group was in conference over the body; there was only one who did not weep when Lenin died: that was Stalin (pars. 36, 37).

It is interesting to note Sheen's dates here. If Lenin died on January 21st, and this was before the Monsignor died on Good Friday (Lenin had the incapacitating stroke on Tuesday of Holy Week), there seems to be an error in dates—"Good Friday never comes in January.

The remainder of the speech deals with the death of Lenin, and the takeover of Stalin. Finally, Death speaks to Lenin in his tomb, after which imaginary scene, Sheen regretfully compares Lenin to Saint Francis of Assisi, who also chose poverty. "If Lenin had loved the poor in charity as he detested classes in hate," says Sheen, "he might have been the St. Francis of the twentieth century" (par. 42).

Thus Sheen presents facts, truths, and presumptions to his audience and in most cases can expect agreement. However, in a few instances he generalizes, assumes too much, and does not document his statements.
Readability and Human Interest

Sheen attracted large television audiences and kept them for as long as he stayed on the air—a period of five years. As has been stated previously, the topics he discussed were quite varied in subject matter. Among the many topics he addressed himself to were the following: love and marriage, fear and anxiety, bringing up children and coping with teenagers, education, clothes fashions, war, peace, and Communism. Some questions come to mind as one considers these facts—what was it that drew audiences? Did they find these topics interesting? Were his arguments so compelling? In order to ascertain what it was that drew and held audiences, I made a study of the "readability" and "human interest" aspects of two of Sheen's speeches. The criteria for the analysis was taken from Rudolf Flesch's book, How to Test Readability.

Flesch uses the dictionary definition of readability in his explanation of the term, stating that "readable... means 'easy or interesting to read'". He divides the readability test into two parts: 1) reading ease, and 2) human interest. The reading ease of a piece estimates the level of "understanding" of the material the reader or listener may expect. In order to determine reading ease one must first discover the average sentence length. This is done by counting the number of words, and the number of sentences in the work. Then the number of words divided by the number of sentences give us the average sentence-length. The second step in testing for "reading ease" is to
discover the average word-length. This is done by counting the number of syllables in the entire piece and dividing that number by the number of words. In Flesch's formula the number of syllables is used per one hundred words, therefore, the result must be multiplied by 100.

The human interest test estimates the appeal the presentation will have for the reader or listener. The human-interest factor is determined by counting the number of "personal words" in the speech. Flesch identifies "personal words" as:

1) all first-, second-, and third-person pronouns except the neuter pronouns it, its, itself, and the pronouns they, them, their, theirs, themselves, if referring to things rather than people . . .
2) All words that have masculine or feminine natural gender . . .
3) group words, people (with plural verb) and folks.¹⁰

The total number of "personal words" are then divided by the total number of words and multiplied by 100. The second step of the human interest test determines the percentage of "personal sentences." According to Flesch these include:

1) Spoken sentences, marked by quotation marks or otherwise, often including speech tags like "he said," set off by colons or commas . . .
2) Questions, commands, requests, and other sentences directly addressed to the reader . . .
3) Exclamations . . .
4) Grammatically incomplete sentences, or sentence fragments, whose full meaning has to be inferred from the context.¹¹

The total number of "personal sentences" is divided by the total number of sentences and multiplied by 100 to determine the percentage of the human interest factor.

The two speeches chosen for the analysis are "Has Russia Really Changed?" delivered in 1955, and "The Life and Character of Lenin"
delivered in 1956. The first of these speeches is rather conceptual in nature, dealing with the philosophy and the tactics of Communism, whereas the second speech deals with a person, a subject which makes somewhat of a contrast. One interesting feature of the differences in the two speeches is the length. Although they were both delivered in twenty-eight minutes of television time, the "Changed" speech has twenty-five paragraphs, or eight single-spaced pages of material, and the "Lenin" speech has forty-two paragraphs, or thirteen pages of writing. Perhaps the difference in subject matter is the reason for the difference in length. Let us study the two speeches to discover reading ease and the human interest aspects of each.

In the speech "Has Russia Really Changed?" Sheen uses 108 sentences. These range in length from five words to one in which there are seventy-seven. The average sentence length, however, is twenty words. In the entire piece, there are 2,218 words which comes to 160 syllables per one hundred words. Twenty words per sentence and 160 syllables per hundred words means that the "Reading Ease Score" is fifty. Flesch presents a table to help the reader to translate this score by describing the style appropriate to the score. The numbers of the reading-ease score indicate that a score of thirty-to-fifty is "Difficult" and that fifty-to-sixty is "Fairly Difficult." Sheen's score of fifty makes the material he presents difficult and puts his speech in the range of such academic and scholarly magazines as Harper's or Atlantic.

In this speech, there are 124 "personal words" and fourteen
"personal sentences," which means that six percent of the words used by Sheen are "personal" and that ten percent of his sentences are "personal." This brings the human-interest score to twenty-six, putting it at the lower end of a twenty-to-forty-point rating of the "interesting" style. The magazine category typical of this style of presentation is the Readers Digest and Time.

The second speech "The Life and Character of Lenin" is a discourse with 224 sentences, 4,274 words, and 6,773 syllables. This brings the average sentence length to nineteen words and 160 syllables per hundred words. This raises the reading-ease score to fifty-two, still on the lower end of the fifty-to-sixty scale of the "Fairly Difficult." The magazine category comparable in style is Harper's or Atlantic. As might be expected, the human-interest level is higher in this speech on Lenin than in the other speech. The "personal words" number ten percent of the total, and the "personal sentences" number twenty percent of the total. The human-interest score reaches forty-five, which Flesch describes as a "Highly Interesting" style. The following charts will show how the readability of Sheen's prose ranks with Flesch's rating of the readability of some other prose.

The reading ease of the two speeches falls between the "difficult" and the "fairly difficult" categories, while the human-interest factor ranges from the "interesting" in the "Changed" speech to the "very interesting" in the "Lenin" speech. Though the speeches are "interesting" and "very interesting," respectively, they are both "fairly difficult" to comprehend. How then does Sheen manage to keep
### Readability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading Ease Score</th>
<th>Description of Style</th>
<th>Typical Magazine</th>
<th>Syll. 100 words</th>
<th>Avg. Sentence Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90 to 100</td>
<td>Very Easy</td>
<td>Comics</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 90</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Pulp fiction</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 80</td>
<td>Fairly Easy</td>
<td>Slick &quot;</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 70</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Digests, Time</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 60</td>
<td>Fairly Difficult</td>
<td>Harper's, Atlantic</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 50</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Academic, Scholarly</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 30</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>Scientific, Professional</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Human Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Interest Score</th>
<th>Description of Style</th>
<th>Typical Magazine</th>
<th>Percent Pers. Words</th>
<th>Percent Pers. Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60 to 100</td>
<td>Dramatic</td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 60</td>
<td>Highly Interesting</td>
<td>New Yorker</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 40</td>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>Digests, Time</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 20</td>
<td>Mildly Interesting</td>
<td>Trade Journals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 to 10</td>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>Scientific, Professional</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
his audience? The answer seems to lie 1) in his delivery and 2) in his use of illustrative material.

Effective delivery is one of the ways Sheen manages to keep his audience. His conversational tone, his ability to speak directly to each individual in his audience, his ability to use his eyes, his body and his voice, are the factors that make the difference in making this difficult material interesting and fascinating. Sheen speaks with a deep resonant, compelling voice that draws attention to itself. The rhythm and cadence of his words become melodic and sometimes hypnotic. Sincerity and conviction are also strongly evident in his presentation. Sheen has stated that he will not speak on anything unless he personally believes in it. And this sincerity and conviction come through in the presentation he makes. The final point that may be made in this regard is that often people are intrigued by the use of an erudite vocabulary and will listen to it because of the fascination it has for them.

The second consideration that would explain his ability to keep his audiences interested, even though the material is difficult, is the fact that Sheen uses illustrative material extensively. The examples he uses are always easy to understand, somewhat like the "parable" idea in the Scripture. In the speech, "Has Russia Really Changed" for example, Sheen is explaining the Greek word for change. He calls it metanoia and states that it implies internal as well as external change. He says that "in a true metanoia, both a new motivation and
atonement go together; otherwise there is the absurdity revealed in this story:

A priest was stopped by a total stranger, who said, "Father, I have just stolen an automobile; what must I do?" The priest said, "You must return it to the owner." The thief said, "I will give it to you." The priest said, "No, I cannot take it; return it to the owner." The thief said, "The owner will not take it?" "In that case you may keep it." A few hours later, the priest discovered that his own automobile had been stolen (par. 2).

Sheen made his point about change in internal and external practice and his audience enjoyed a story. Following the story, Sheen goes on to "apply the notion of metanoia to Russia" to show that a distinction must be made between the philosophy of Communism which is internal and the tactics of Communism which are external. He uses another illustration. This time he relates the ancient story of the siege of Troy by the Greeks:

Ulysses conceived the idea of offering a wooden horse as a gift to the Trojans; Cassandra, the daughter of the Trojan king, protested, saying, "I fear the Greeks bearing gifts." It was her contention that only the tactic had changed but that the intent of the Greeks to destroy Troy had not changed. The gift horse was admitted; at night the soldiers emerged from the horse, opened the gates, admitted the Greeks, and the city was destroyed (par. 3).

The distinction that Sheen makes between philosophy and tactics is likely to satisfy his audience.

Within almost every argument, Sheen interjects an idea or statement easily understood. For example, in his explanation about "no political freedom" under Communism he quotes Molotov as saying,
"Under Communism, one party is in power; all the others are in jail" (par. 9). Or when he speaks of the fear that the Soviet leaders have of one another he lists Soviet leaders who had been killed since 1917 and caps the argument with a humorous story which has been quoted in the previous chapter (see paragraph 16). Throughout the speech Sheen, then, moves from difficult concepts to illustrative material.

The "Life and Character of Lenin" speech is different in the sense that it flows like one long narrative. It is as if Sheen said, "I'm going to tell you the story of Lenin's life." He relates numerous incidents from Lenin's life, using specific details, which make for a deeper sense of actuality and thus increases presence. One of the techniques that Sheen uses to reach all types of persons in his audience is a statement such as "The cruelty of Lenin was, therefore, ideological, dogmatic, doctrinal, metaphysical—it was not personal" (par. 21). Although most of the words in the statement are beyond the comprehension of many in his audience, reaching the "very difficult" level of readability, the sense of the statement comes through very simply as "The cruelty of Lenin was not personal." Sheen communicated thus with his entire audience, using a combination of factors to accomplish it. But accomplish it he did.

Summary and Conclusions

Perelman states that a speaker must present objects of agreement to his audience as the starting point of argumentation, and with a universal audience where the appeal is to arguments from objective
reality, these take the form of facts, truths, and presumptions. According to Perelman, all three of these are fundamentally facts, the difference being that truths are the result of a series of connected facts and that presumptions must be reinforced by other facts in order to gain agreement from an audience.

Sheen uses facts, truth, and presumptions throughout his speeches, and with these, he induces the agreement of his audience. However, in some instances, facts, or what are stated as facts, are presented without documentation. Sheen is himself intellectually brilliant and seems to assume complete authority for all of his statements. What he says must be so. He seems to take agreement for granted. Sheen makes generalizations with that same sense of authority. For example, in his argument that the "intelligentsia are uprooted" he makes the claim that writers expatriate themselves to other countries because "they feel the need of an alien class to act as a transformer of their ideas." This may be true, but he continues with the statement, "Because they have lost their roots and their culture, they gravitate to Bolshevism." Sheen makes no attempt to document these "facts." In one instance, an error in a time sequence is made. In speaking of Lenin's death, Sheen states that Lenin had an "incapacitating stroke" on Tuesday of Holy Week and was dead before Good Friday. He then gives the date of death as January 21, 1924. This is not possible, since Holy Week could never come that early in the year. However, an error of this kind seems to be the result of speaking without notes. Thus although Sheen's facts are sometimes in question, they are generally
accepted and agreed to by his audiences.

Another aspect of the starting point of argumentation is the verbal form of the discourse. The material Sheen presents in his speeches on Communism is, according to Rudolph Flesch's readability test, "difficult" to comprehend. The second portion of the Flesch test of readability deals with the human-interest factor. In this chapter, I analyzed two speeches, using the Flesch test. Both speeches rated difficult on the reading-ease scale, but the human-interest score was appreciably different. The speech "Has Russia Really Changed?" deals with terms and concepts of the philosophy and tactics of Communism and rates "interesting" on the human-interest scale. The second speech, on the other hand, dealing with "The Life and Character of Lenin," rates "very interesting." Since both fall into the difficult "academic and scholarly" part on the scale, one wonders what makes Sheen's audience continue to listen to him. The conclusions are that 1) his delivery is exceptional, and 2) his use of illustrative material is extensive and "down to earth."

Let us turn now to the techniques or argumentation as presented by Perelman and utilized by Sheen.
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CHAPTER VI

THE TECHNIQUES OF ARGUMENTATION

Consideration of the starting point of argumentation in the preceding chapter included 1) a study of facts, truths, and presumptions as they appeared in Sheen's arguments; and 2) a study of style, including readability and human interest, using the formula prescribed by Rudolf Flesch in his work, How to Test Readability. These areas were analyzed to discover the extent to which they were used to promote choice, presence, and communion.

In the present chapter, Sheen's speeches will be examined in the light of Perelman's concepts of the techniques of argumentation. The discussion will be divided into two major areas: 1) Associative and Dissociative Schemes, and 2) Interaction of Arguments.

Associative and Dissociative Schemes

Perelman differentiates between the associative and dissociative processes in this way:

By processes of association we understand schemes which bring separate elements together and allow us to establish a unity among them, which aims either at organizing them or at evaluating them, positively or negatively, by means of one another. 1

By processes of dissociation we mean techniques of separation which have the purpose of dissociating,
separating, disuniting elements which are regarded as forming a whole or at least a unified group within some system of modifying certain concepts which make up its essential parts.  

Among the associative schemes are 1) quasi-logical arguments; 2) arguments based on the structure-of-reality; and 3) arguments which aim at establishing the structure of the real.  

The quasi-logical arguments are non-formal arguments based on probability. They deal with 1) compatible or incompatible but not contradictory arguments; 2) the ridiculous, in showing conflict with accepted opinion through the use of irony; 3) identity and definition according to the normative, the descriptive, the condensed, and the complex; 4) arguments by transitivity; 5) argument by including the part in the whole and the whole into its parts; 6) argument from comparison; 7) argument from sacrifice; and 8) argument from probability.  

In speaking of the arguments based on the structure-of-reality, Perelman states that they "make use of this structure to establish a solidarity between accepted judgments and others which one wishes to promote." In his presentation of arguments based on the structure of reality, Perelman analyzes arguments which deal with relations of succession and arguments which apply to the relations of coexistence.  

The techniques of argumentation dealing with sequential relations include establishing a causal link, argumentation by consequences, and ends and means. Techniques of argumentation dealing with relations of coexistence include argumentation from the nature of things, argument from authority, act and essence, waste, direction and establishment through the particular case by example, illustration, and analogy.
Interaction of Argumentation

Perelman stresses the fact that arguments are in "constant interaction at more than one level." There is interaction between the different arguments used, between the arguments and the overall situation, and between the arguments and their conclusion. Further, he shows that arguments are strengthened or weakened by this process of interaction. Also important to the persuasive situation is the order of arguments.

Let us apply these concepts of Perelman about the techniques of argumentation to the speeches of Sheen. References will be made to the speeches by paragraph number as previously done.

The Philosophy of Communism, 1952: associative/dissociative schemes:—

In this speech advancing the philosophy of Communism, Sheen uses both associative and dissociative schemes to present the Communist position, and then using the same schemes, he proceeds to refute this position. Beginning with a quasi-logical argument from definition (descriptive), Sheen identifies economic determinism: "Economic determinism sounds very learned, but it means, very simply, that culture, civilization, religion, philosophy, art, morals, and literature are all determined by economic methods of production" (par. 13).

Using the rhetorical figure of the imaginary direct speech, Sheen sets forth the position of the Communists and argues for the compatibility (quasi-logical argument) of the Communist contention as presented in the definition, with conditions in the non-Communist world and outside the Communist philosophy.
Sheen states:

"Morals, in like manner," the Communists say, "in private enterprise would be so constructed as to defend ownership" (par. 15). . . . "Religion is based upon the economics of private enterprise, too," contend the Communists. "It is an opiate given to the workers to make them content with being exploited" (par. 16).

Sheen adopts a series of quasi-logical arguments to refute the Communist position. First, he ridicules the naivete of the Communists who ascribe all good things to themselves: "Communist literature will attack capitalism, make fun of America, and prove that Russia invented everything from flying machines to radar" (par. 17). Secondly, he points out their logical error by substituting the part for the whole, by stating: "Communist morals will see but one wrong, namely, injuring or hurting state property or in any way betraying the revolutionary class" (par. 18). Thirdly, returning to ridicule, Sheen describes Communist-inspired art "muscular men with little heads (no brains), man was made for production" (par. 19).

Moving to a more serious argument, Sheen points out the incom¬patibility (quasi-logical argument) between the Communist claim and historical evidence. He begins by belittling the authority of Marx by questioning his understanding of the nature of things: "Karl Marx, who studied philosophy and should have known better, confused what is known as a condition with a cause" (par. 20).

While the Communists contend that economics is the cause of cultural and religious values, Sheen contends that the evidence of history shows that even though no differences in economic methods of
production exist, cultures and religions do differ. Thus he disqualifies the all-inclusive economics by dissociating a particular culture or religion and economics.

\[ \text{1 economics} \]
\[ \text{2 cultural values} \]

\[ \text{1 economics} \]
\[ \text{2 religious values} \]

\[ \text{1 opinion} \]
\[ \text{2 truth} \]

Having thus established a new emphasis through dissociation, Sheen takes the offensive in the argument.

First he shows that Communism is strong only when it invokes moral indignation. Then he establishes that moral indignation is based upon the authority of the Hebraic-Christian tradition. Since the one who invokes the authority is committed to the principles subscribed to by that authority, it is clear, according to Sheen, that Communism is an untenable position.

Using the act/essence argument (based on the structure of reality), Sheen states that the act of accepting Communism implies rejection of democracy, since the essence of democracy is what Marx refers to as "an illusion of Christianity, namely, that every man has an immortal soul" (par. 27). By dissociation then, the essence of Communism implies in Marx's words, "Persons of and by themselves have no value" (par. 27).

Using illustrations (establishing structure of reality), Sheen reinforces the reality of the Marxist position that man has no value in himself. First, he states Molotov's argument that bread be given only to those who follow Communist revolutionary ideas. Then he recounts
a story told to him by Heywood Broun:

Some years ago, Heywood Broun told me of a cartoonist employed by one of the Communist newspapers in New York. The cartoonist developed cancer and was obliged to give up work. Broun went to the Communists and asked if they would not give him some pension to help pay his hospital bills. The answer that he received from the Communists was "He is of no use to us. He is no longer a member of the revolutionary class, and therefore, for us he does not exist" (par. 29).

In order to establish the rule "that the individual is of no consequence," Sheen presents the example: "Man is then likened to lower forms of life in which an individual fly, an individual gnat, an individual ant is of no consequence; what is of importance is the species" (par. 30). Thus, having established the supremacy of the species as all important to the philosophy of the Communists, Sheen uses another illustration to reinforce it. He illustrates the Communist idea of the worthlessness of the individual by pointing out that Communist tanks run over the bodies of their wounded.

After presenting the Communist position in the above arguments, Sheen refutes it by presenting the reverse position using the same techniques of argumentation--argument based on the structure of reality, using the act/consequence argument. The act takes the form of subscribing to the tenets of Christianity and reinforcing its roots. The consequence is, in Sheen's words, "The hour has struck to affirm the power and worth and vocation of the individual" (par. 34).

Sheen concludes the speech by agreeing with the Communists who say that the world needs a revolution, but he won't accept a "cheap kind."
Instead, he outlines a course of action, promoting two successive events joined by a causal link. The events were the revolution in the heart of every individual and the extension of that revolt to society. The revolution in the heart of man causes the revolution in society.

The Philosophy of Communism, 1952: interaction of arguments: Sheen strengthens his arguments through the process of interaction that takes place between the different arguments used and between the arguments and their conclusion.

In paragraph 15, Sheen presents the Communist position and concludes that there is no need for morality. In paragraph 16, he concludes that religion is an opiate. In paragraph 23, dependent on the arguments that came before, Sheen shows that the Communists use morality and judgments based on morality to condemn the capitalist world. Thus he creates a dilemma for the Communists. Sheen takes up the argument about religion as an opiate and adds to the dilemma of the Communist position. In paragraph 25 he reinforces the entire argument in a conclusive statement.

In paragraph 27, Sheen uses the act/essence argument and concludes that Communism implies that persons of and by themselves have no value. This followed by paragraphs 28 and 29, both of which are illustrative of this point. Paragraph 30 restates the original premise. Thus, Sheen's arguments are strengthened by the interweaving of points, by the building of the case to a definite conclusion, and by keeping all the arguments contained in one logical presentation.
Why Some Become Communists, 1953: associative/dissociative schemes:

Sheen opens this speech with a question, "Why do some Americans become Communists?" The common response, he says, is "bad economic conditions." Sheen refutes the common response first by showing a deficiency in the understanding of the nature of things. This deficiency is mistaking cause for condition, i.e., "bad economic conditions are not the cause of people becoming Communist" (par. 1). Secondly, he illustrates this contention by presenting cases from the contemporary world: "The economic level of Burma is very low, but the people are definitely anti-Communist. Economic standards of Portugal and Ireland are not nearly so high as in the United States; yet both countries are definitely anti-Communist" (par. 1). He further reinforces the argument by a contrasting illustration, showing that favorable economic conditions also provide fertile soil for Communism.

Furthermore, many who become Communists in the United States are those who belong to the middle class or even the rich. Marx himself did not become a Communist because of his poverty; actually his father belonged to the middle class and sent him through the university. A touch of ridicule (quasi-logical argument) caps the argument: "Economic conditions in the Garden of Paradise were excellent, but the first Red got in"(par. 2). There is no missing the implication inherent in the argument.

Sheen dissociates low economic standards from the cause of Communism by showing 1) that there are countries at a low-economic level which are anti-Communist, and 2) that there are people of middle-income
and high-income levels who are Communists (including Marx himself).

Using a quasi-logical argument from definition (descriptive), Sheen differentiates among three types of liberalism. He clarifies with illustrations: "Such was the liberalism of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, and the Manchester school" (par. 3) and

Such liberalism believes that everybody should be free to draw a triangle on condition that he give it three sides. It believes that everyone should be free to draw a giraffe on condition that he give it a long neck, for such is the nature of the giraffe. It believes that everyone should be free to drive his car in traffic, but on condition that he obey the traffic laws (par. 4).

In regard to the third type of liberalism, "liberty without law," Sheen uses a quasi-logical argument by pointing out the ridiculous:

Liberals of this variety are interested only in freedom from something, but not in freedom for something. They say they have an open mind but it never closes on anything. They say they are looking for truth; yet if they ever met truth, they would drop dead. . . . They are always unprepared for truth like the golfer who in his first trip to the course makes a hole in one (par. 5).

Turning to the question of how one type of liberalism (liberty without law) prepares for Communism, Sheen draws a loose analogy, establishing the rule that a rejection of the normal pattern of life leads to revolt. He associates revolt and the normal pattern of life, and thus dissociates Communism and the normal pattern of life. Sheen says:

The present revolutionary tendency in youth in the world is not due to the fact that youth itself is perverse. The revolutionary character of modern youth throughout the world is due to a rightful protest against parents and educators who have not bequeathed to them the meaning of existence. In
reaction against an irrational, unpurposeful existence, they seek compensation in the intensity of an experience such as sex license, revolution, or Communism" (par. 6).

Basing his argument on the structure-of-reality concept and using the argument from consequence, Sheen shows that a false theory of liberty produces chaos, which in turn leads to Communism "which is a compulsory organization of the class created by false liberalism" (par. 7). Following the gratuitous assumption, Sheen says "If there be no truth, there is nothing left but the forcible massing of individuals into social 'happiness.' Thus does boundless liberty lead to tyranny" (par. 7). Sheen uses an analogy to illustrate the compulsory organization of chaos. "If the sheep will not go into the sheepfold, dogs are sent after them to drive them in" (par. 7). He concludes gratuitously that "'Goodness' of a new kind is achieved by necessity" (par. 7).

Through illustrations, Sheen elucidates the new kind of goodness and the consequences that follow from it by using quotations from Klaus Fuchs and Louis Budenz who experienced it:

Klaus Fuchs, who passed atomic secrets to Russia, explained his Communism: "I had the sense of becoming a 'free man' because I succeeded in establishing myself completely independent of surrounding forces of society. Looking back on it, the best way of expressing it is to call it a controlled schizophrenia." Louis Budenz, the former editor of the Communist daily in the United States, calls Communists "men without faces" (par. 8).

Referring to his argument of the "normal pattern of life" and using the imaginary direct-speech technique, Sheen develops the rationalization process of the individual who has performed the act of
rejecting the normal pattern. Consequently he turns to Communism to salve his conscience and says "By joining the Communists I can solace my conscience by being interested in social justice. Then I will be righting everyone else's life, and Communism will let me lead my life as I please" (par. 10). Thus, he completes the argument from consequence (structure of reality).

In response to this rationalization, Sheen uses the cause/effect argument by claiming that the effect of turning to Communism will be obviated by causing youth to lead moral lives:

Educators in a democracy must be sure that the youth are taught to lead moral lives, for Communism makes progress in relation to the breakdown of morals. It even seeks to destroy morality in youth through the spread of false opinions and evil literature. Once a sense of justice is destroyed in the individual, Communists seek to get youth interested in what they call "social justice," that its evil may seem to be righteous (par. 11).

Again using the cause/effect argument, Sheen rationalizes "the uneasy conscience of the rich," this time in the third person. The cause is seeing a "tremendous disproportion" between what they have and what others have," causing a feeling of discomfort. They turn to Communism, which is the effect, either "to salve their guilty conscience" or to secure a favored position so that they may keep their wealth "when the Revolution comes" (par. 12). Sheen counters this rationalism by appealing to the authority of Lenin who says, "Poor fools! they are the first to be liquidated when Communism comes into power" (par. 12).

Advancing to the third reason for Communism, Sheen begins with
a quasi-logical argument from definition (descriptive). He describes intelligentsia differentiating between them and true intellectuals. Using argument from authority (establish structure of reality)—his own as an etymologist and that of the historian Toynbee—Sheen reinforces the definition of intelligentsia. He furthers the argument by presenting an analogy between economic and intellectual slumming.

Argument from consequence (structure of reality) establishes the third reason for Communism. The act is the severing of their roots in Western Christian civilization by gravitating to Bolshevism as a consequence. Sheen illustrates his point by noting persons who have sought expatriation.

In the peroration, Sheen uses the cause/effect argument and its reversal. First he shows that with moral failing as a cause, people turn to Communism, and reverses that by showing that with the grace of God as cause, people turn away from Communism. His final argument illustrates the above. Sheen cites the instance of Douglas Hyde and his wife, who accepted God’s grace and turned away from Communism.

**Why Some Become Communists**, 1953; interaction of arguments:—Sheen’s arguments are strengthened by the process of interaction, each adding to the other. Perelman points out that "order ensures that particular premises are given sufficient presence for them to serve as starting points of reflection." He goes on to say that "some arguments can only be understood and accepted if other arguments have already been stated."
Sheen seems to take particular pains to see that each argument used is prepared for. After presenting the argument, he either builds on the argument or refutes it. Sheen opens the speech "Why Some Become Communists" with an oratorical question, answers it, shows that it is a wrong notion, illustrates his point. In the second paragraph he gives a reversal of the argument. Sheen concludes the argument with a touch of irony.

Sheen begins building again by giving a descriptive definition of liberalism. He interweaves the quasi-logical argument by definition with illustrations to establish the structure-of-reality concept. Each definition is thus reinforced.

Having presented the kind of liberalism that prepares for Communism, Sheen uses a loose analogy to establish the rule that a "rejection of the normal pattern of life leads to revolt." He associates revolt and the normal pattern of life and dissociates Communism and the normal pattern of life. This dissociation is reinforced in the following sections by enumerating facets of the "normal pattern of life."

Paragraphs 9 and 13 introduce reasons for Communism, reasons which could not stand without the preparation given in paragraph 6. Sheen refers to his "normal pattern of life" over and over again. He ends the speech by giving a cause/effect argument and, based on that, a reversal of it. Thus, Sheen exemplifies Perelman's theory that some arguments can only be understood if others have already been stated.
The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence, 1954: associative/dissociative schemes:—In the opening argument of the speech, "The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence," Sheen presents a theme and elaborates upon it throughout the entire discourse. The theme takes the form of a test of the sincerity of coexistence proposals made by the Soviets. He argues first from the authority of Christ: "The test our Blessed Lord gave was that of judging a tree by its fruits. Grapes cannot be gathered from thorns, nor figs from thistles" (par. 2).

Using the dissociative technique, Sheen indicates that many of the actions of the Russians cannot be the "fruit" of genuine desire for peaceful coexistence. He dissociates aggressive action, breaking of treaties, and disregard of the individual through cruelty and tyranny from the genuine fruit of sincerity.

Sheen then presents the "rule" by which the Communists operate: expediency in extending the Communist influence, which gives rise to using a promise of peaceful coexistence "to pillage nations, prostitute people, tyrannize minority groups, and confiscate the productive machinery of various countries" (par. 3). Sheen establishes the rule (argument based on the structure-of-reality example) through the citing of numerous instances in which promises of coexistence were made and of pacts broken through the application of the rule of expediency (see par. 4, Appendix C). Following this citation of facts, Sheen uses argument from authority by quoting Stalin, who established that the Communism take-over would be delayed: "Therefore the maintenance of peaceful relations with capitalist countries is an obligatory task for
us. The basis of our relations with capitalist countries consists of admitting the *coexistence* of two opposed systems" (par. 5).

Using the quasi-logical argument from definition (descriptive), Sheen defines what the Soviets mean by peaceful coexistence: "a temporary arrangement, a tactical maneuver, an accommodation to the historical problems of an hour in order to achieve world revolution" (par. 6). Sheen then goes back to argument by authority (structure of reality) to reinforce his contention. He uses Stalin and Lenin:

> Hence Lenin said that every form of lying, knavery, and deceit was permissible to bring about the Communist Revolution. Stalin said that coexistence as a permanent phenomenon was not recognized by Communist philosophy, because the two systems of Communism and what he called "capitalism" could not exist (par. 6).

Both Stalin and Lenin use the end/means argument based on the structure-of-reality concept. Sheen points out that Americans are apt to take a naive approach to the situation by taking the Russians at their word, and uses two analogies to illustrate his point.

He turns again to the quasi-logical argument from definition. This time he uses the normative type, setting fear of non-survival and mutual antagonism as the basis of existence. Illustrative stories of coexistence based on these norms of fear and mutual antagonism and elaboration of the application of these norms are advanced. The first story is of a husband and wife who "live in a state of mutual antagonism" (par. 8), and the second story is about Nephew Khrushchev and Uncle Sam, who also coexist (par. 9).

In paragraphs 12 to 18, Sheen discusses two articles, both
written by Russians, who argue for the revision of the Communist theory regarding coexistence, thus promoting argument from authority (structure of reality). These revisions are necessary because the predictions of Marx regarding the collapse of capitalism failed to materialize. In the first article, I.A. Seleznyev explains "why the Soviet Union found it necessary to accept coexistence as an element in foreign policy, in contrast to Marx, whose philosophy does not admit coexistence" (par. 12). In the second article says Sheen, "the author (A. Leontyev) then corrects Marx further by saying that the Soviet Union must not expect the early collapse of capitalism; that Communism in the Western World is not going to have an easy birth; that the Marxist law has not worked out as it should; therefore, there must be "coexistence for more or less lengthy historical periods" (par. 16).

A quasi-logical argument by comparison is used to establish the need for "coexistence for long periods of time" (par. 19); comparison is between the reality of the destructive violence of the Soviets and the United States as an atomic power. He advances the argument by illustrating the policy that "it hopes to continue to nibble away without war, until it has finally conquered the world as it has taken China, part of Korea, and Vietnam" (par. 19). The illustration also emphasizes that there was no change in ultimate aim but rather a change in tactic: "There will be revolution by attrition rather than by armed conflict" (par. 19).
Using the argument of consequence based on the structure-of-reality concept, Sheen claims, "An atomic war would be the end!" (par. 20). The act of war brings about the consequence of total destruction.

The quasi-logical argument from transitivity is presented by Sheen only in order that he might refute it. The transitive propositions are these: Non-Soviets are capable of killing everyone, Soviets are capable of killing everyone, therefore, nobody will kill anyone. In paragraphs 22 and 23, Sheen claims this argument to be purely illusory and cites illustrations of the decline of morality and the consequent imperviousness to wide-scale non-military slaughter. Sheen implies argument by probability.

In showing that the hope for peace lies in the hearts of men rather than in governments, Sheen rejects the analogy of oil poured on a pyramid (peace from above) in favor of the analogy of a tree: "The roots of the tree are the people who must first have justice in their own hearts; the branches of the tree, pointing to heaven, represent the acknowledgment and dependence of nations on the God of Justice, the Source of Law and Equity" (par. 26).

The quasi-logical argument by definition (descriptive) is the basis of his final contention. Sheen defines servile fear as "the fear of a slave for a tyrant, or fear the United States has for the Soviets, and the Soviets for the United States" (par. 28). He defines filial fear as "the fear a devoted child has for a kind father, or a friend
for a friend; it is, therefore, a kind of reverence or a shrinking of
doing harm to anyone we love" (par. 29).

Concluding that a type of fear (filial) is indeed salutary for
promoting peace, Sheen states:

If instead of fearing germs and Communists, we began
fearing a breakdown of our moral order; if we restored
the sanctity of home and marriage, raised children in
discipline and love of God and became less tepid about
defending moral law, then we would have less fear of
the enemy, for if God is with us, who can prevail
against us.

The Russian Lullaby of Coexistence, 1954: interaction of arguments:

As has been noted, interaction of arguments is in itself a powerfully
persuasive technique. In the speech "The Russian Lullaby of Coexis-
tence," Sheen presents what might be called variations on a theme.
First he explains coexistence and gives the yardstick by which it can
be measured as sincerity, using Christ as the authority. These orig-
inal arguments are the basis of points made later.

Against the yardstick of sincerity, Sheen lists promises of co-
existence and broken promises of coexistence. Thus, having reinforced
the idea that they are not sincere, he proceeds to give their defini-
tion of coexistence, and then illustrates and refutes their view of
coeistence. This seems to be the pattern throughout the speech. He
builds constantly and consistently. One established fact is the basis
of the next.
Has Russia Really Changed? 1955: associative/dissociative schemes:--

Sheen introduces his argument in the speech, "Has Russia Really Changed?" by advancing the possibility that Russia can change but favoring the probability (quasi-logical) that a system which has "enslaved 37 out of every 100 people in the world" would perpetuate this course of subjugation.

Sheen lays the foundation for further argumentation by the quasi-logical argument from definition (descriptive) and by illustration. He defines the Greek concept of change, metanoia, which implies a dual transformation, internal and external. The illustration points up external change with no internal change. Sheen further applies the notion of metanoia to the Russians to distinguish between their philosophy (internal) and tactics (external). Sheen illustrates this with the example of the Trojan horse. Cassandra's fear of Greeks bearing gifts is shared by Sheen, who fears Russians bearing promises of peace.

Paragraph six contains a quasi-logical argument by comparison, an argument from authority (structure of reality, and illustrations, which establish the structure of reality). A comparison is set up between the biological species and the revolutionary class. As Communism takes over the biological law, says Sheen, "Nature is rather heedless and careless as to what happens to individuals, as long as it preserves the species" (par. 6) which translates to what Marx said, "a person has value only when he contributes to the revolutionary class" (par.6). Argument from authority calls upon collective Christianity, which holds
to the worth of the individual. The illustration bears out Marx by pointing to the "disregard of human life in China, in Northern Vietnam, Northern Korea, the salt mines of Siberia, and the concentration camps of Eastern Europe" (par. 6).

In the next three paragraphs, 7, 8, and 9, the ends/means argument (structure of reality) is used to show that the means of extinction of the belief in God makes possible the total possession of man by the state. Sheen continues the ends/means argument in the following two paragraphs. Although the end (total possession of man by the state) is the same, the means vary. These means include denial of private property and denial of political freedom.

Argument based on the structure of reality is used to state the conclusion in a cause/effect relationship. Sheen demonstrates that the cause, adherence to the theories of Marx, Lenin, and Engels still produces the effect of maintaining a totalitarian state.

Having examined the philosophy of Communism in the light of metanoia, Sheen determines that that philosophy remains unchanged. He then turns to the tactics or the external manifestation of Communism. His opening argument in this regard is illustration of changes that have taken place in the Communist tactics, both within their own country and with other nations.

Such changes are growth in contacts with foreign countries, difference in the tone of official propaganda, a lessening of bitterness in Soviet speeches at the United Nations, visits of Russian secret agents to our farms and our housing developments, soft-pedaling of Communist activities in Western nations, the ungodding
of Stalin, and finally, the confession on the part of Molotov that he erred in saying that only the foundations of socialism have been built in the Soviet Union (par. 11).

Sheen's arguments for advancing the reasons for external change are based mainly on cause/effect argument and illustration. The systematic liquidation of Soviet leaders has caused a desire for coexistence among themselves (par. 14). This argument is further borne out by a humorous illustration. "The New Yorker once carried a cartoon which characterized this mutual dread of Soviet leaders. About twelve pallbearers were carrying out a coffin to a Russian grave. One of the pallbearers turned to another and said, "Who is in here? I was away last week"" (par. 16).

The next four paragraphs advance the second reason for a change in tactics. This change is argued from cause to effect that the revolution has lost its fervor. Besides the simple loss of momentum, three other factors have contributed to producing a cooling effect on the fervor of the revolutionists. They are 1) the transfer of booty, 2) the love of pleasure, and 3) the loss of the love of equality.

The third reason for a change in tactics is the discovery of the atomic bomb. Sheen again uses the cause/effect argument attributing the development of the atomic bomb as the cause of the fear of non-survival.

The act/essence argument from the structure-of-reality concept is used as a conclusion to show that the Soviets have changed tactics but have not changed philosophy. The act corresponds to the tactics
and the philosophy to the essence. Ordinarily the act demonstrates the essence, but in this instance the act belies the essence and is used as a negative argument. Sheen points out "A true metanoia would exist if the Soviets would grant freedom to enslaved nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. . . . Self-determination of peoples is one of the basic rights of human nature; when the Soviets grant it, they will become part of the free world" (par. 22).

Sheen's final argument is one of analogy, recommending a course of action in our treatment of Russia. He recommends that Russia be treated by us as Judas was treated by Christ: "But this did not prevent the Saviour from walking with Judas, from sharing secrets, and even from inviting him to the supreme banquet of love" (par. 24).

Dissociation is the overriding argument in showing that the philosophy of Russia has not changed, since the philosophy precludes assigning value to the individual, permitting free exercise of religion, and granting of private property and political freedom. The philosophical pairs involved in the dissociation are:

1. apparent change 1. change in tactics
2. true change 2. metanoia

Has Russia Really Changed?: interaction of arguments:—This is another strong example of Sheen's demonstration of how arguments interact with one another and with the conclusions. The first argument is necessary for subsequent ones. He defines terms and develops philosophies in order to counter them with other definitions and other arguments.
Early in the speech Sheen lays the foundation for the speech by presenting the Greek-based word *metanoia*, an all-inclusive term meaning change (internal and external). The internal change is equated with the philosophy of Communism, and the external change is equated with the tactics of Communism. The rest of the speech deals with arguments and illustrations to prove that the philosophy of Communism has not changed, while the tactics have changed, and with the reasons for the change.

The Life and Character of Lenin, 1956: associative/dissociative schemes: --This speech "The Life and Character of Lenin," taken in its entirety, may be considered as a single argument. The overall effect is to demonstrate a kind of sympathy and understanding of the man (Lenin as individual), while reinforcing the condemnation of the ideology which "perverted" the man. This is an eminently consistent example of the course Sheen advocates in the previous speech where he advances his theory of what our attitude should be toward Russia (and toward the Russian).

Sheen initially dissociates Lenin from the stereotype of the revolutionary. The *caricature* pair introduces the speech, followed by a quasi-logical argument from definition (descriptive). He defines revolutionary. This context sets up a contrast: Lenin is like St. Paul, a revolutionary; Lenin is unlike St. Paul, a destroyer of men.

Sheen next establishes himself as an authority in analyzing character in general and in analyzing Lenin's character in particular.
Paragraphs 3, 4, 5, and 6 are the factual reinforcement for this characterization and may be considered as the development, through the quasi-logical argument by definition (normative). These normative terms identify the man's "natural" characteristics, and show his overriding or all-pervading obsession with revolution. By nature Lenin is normal, kind, intellectual, but because of the obsession with the ideology of Communism, Lenin dissociates himself from these natural characteristics.

Sheen assumes causes for the desire to seize power (effect) and traces the roots of his resentment (lesser cause) and the growth of his espousal of Marxist Ideology (greater cause).

Given these and other traits, it now remains to inquire how this intelligent and remarkable man ever became a revolutionist advocating the grossest kind of cruelty. The answer is twofold:

1. Resentment; 2. An ideology. The second is far more important than the first (par. 7).

Sheen spends a good deal of time narrating the circumstances favoring the furthering of Lenin's revolutionary intent and in setting the stage for his revolution (par. 10-14).

Beginning with paragraph 15 and continuing through 18, Sheen uses the ends/means argument (structure of reality). He proceeds to show that the theoretical ends of Marx must become practical ends (private property destroyed and religion persecuted) and justifies any means (gangsterism) to achieve them.

In paragraph 19, Sheen turns to another of Lenin's guiding maxims, that "persons or individuals of and by themselves are worthless." He presents a rationale by illustrations from the nature of things, and
counters the maxim with his own argument based on the authority of Christ. Sheen points out that,

Nature is heedless of the lives of individuals as long as the species survive. But in the human order, it is not so. Each person has a sovereign individual value. "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" (par. 19)

Again Sheen presents Lenin's position and the argument that from the act of subscribing to the principles of Marxism there follows the consequence of acting cruelly. Sheen also portrays Lenin as continually mindful of the requirements of the revolutionary. One such requirement was dissociation from anything which could temper his cruelty. Sheen says:

Lenin kept himself even from those influences which might have tempered his inherent cruelty. Speaking to Gorky of Beethoven, he said: "I know nothing more beautiful than the 'Appassionata'; I could hear it every day, it is marvelous, unearthly music. Every time I hear these notes, I think with pride and perhaps childlike naivete that it is wonderful what man can accomplish, but I cannot listen to music often, it affects my nerves. I want to say amiable stupidities and stroke the heads of people who can create such beauty in filthy hell; but today is not the time to stroke people's heads. Today, hands descend to split skulls open, split them open ruthlessly (par. 22).

Lenin's singleness of purpose and the rationalization of the justifi-
cation for his cruelty are a conglomerate of arguments from sacrifice and waste and ultimately from Lenin's own program for presenting convincing "arguments" to Europe. The argument from sacrifice is as follows: "When Gorky came to him with petitions for the lives and liberties of intellectuals who had fallen into the hands of the Cheka,
Lenin asked him: "With what foot-rule do you measure the number of necessary and superfluous blows in a battle?" (par. 26) and the argument from waste is as follows:

... so why should I not build up my own "nobility" and succeed in enforcing my will on the masses, especially as it is for the benefits of future humanity? The result will be 50 to 60 million people killed. What are 50 or 60 million people if they are sacrificed for the benefit of future humanity? The price for such a future would be much higher than those millions of worthless wretches. These generations are worth nothing, they are only cannon fodder for the experiment—a practical experiment—which will bring humanity nearer to happiness (par. 39).

Lenin's program for presenting convincing arguments to Europe is:

We will take good care not to shock those European masses, we will play up to them and in the preliminary stages give them slogans that will make their mouths wet. Our slogans and promises will hold them spellbound, so that their leaders will not dare speak against us, lest they be stoned by the indignant masses. No doubt we will bring in respite—and what attractive respite, but only in order to reculer pour mieux sauter (par. 31).

Sheen attributes the devastating ideology to the Western World (Germany in particular) and illustrates the responsibility by enumerating the influences and the help which came from those sources:

The philosophy of Communism, which was the inspiration of Lenin, is wholly German. It originated in the brain of Karl Marx, who extracted it principally from the dialectics of Hegel and the materialism of Feuerbach; its economics came from England, where Marx lived a third of his life; its social theory came from France, principally from Proudon" (par. 33).

The final paragraphs are a description of Lenin's end and legacy—a legacy of contradictions and contrasts, completing the ultimate argument that here was a man unable to come to terms with himself.
The conclusions present another philosophical pair

saint
revolutionary to illustrate the effect that Lenin might have had
if he had not chosen to carry out the teachings of Marx. Sheen says,
"If Lenin had loved the poor in charity as he detested classes in hate,
he might have been the St. Francis of the twentieth century" (par. 42).
Sheen implies that it takes a certain kind of almost fanatic zeal to
be either a true saint or a true revolutionary.

The Life and Character of Lenin, 1956: interaction of arguments: As
tioned in the opening statement of the analysis of the speech "The
Life and Character of Lenin," this speech taken in its entirety may be
considered as a single argument. Sheen first establishes Lenin as
"a remarkable man," and then shows that a fanatic obsession "the ide-
ology of Marx" twisted this normal, kind, and likable person into a
revolutionary monster.

The tone of the speech is conversational and the entire speech
is a narration using predominantly illustrative arguments. Sheen
closes the speech with a philosophical pair:

Beginning: \[ \frac{1 \text{ caricature}}{2 \text{ revolutionary}} \]; Ending: \[ \frac{1 \text{ saint}}{2 \text{ revolutionary}} \]

Conclusions

The techniques of argumentation as presented by Perelman deal
with associative schemes—schemes which bring separate elements to-
gether, and dissociative schemes—schemes which imply separation, dis-
uniting elements from each other. The two are complementary to each
other for by bringing certain elements together, one necessarily dis-
sociates others. The schemes which bring separate elements together
are quasi-logical arguments and arguments based on the structure of
reality. These are used by Sheen through the five speeches.

Sheen, ever the epideictic speaker and educator, assumes that
his audience is not familiar with the true picture of Communism but
rather had only an elementary conception of it. Therefore, he is con-
cerned with teaching its philosophy, its principles and its practices.
Once he has presented these, he proceeds to show the error in the phil-
osophy, its principles and its practices. He does this mainly by set-
ting up the Communist position and refuting it with a counter argument.

In the five speeches, one sees and almost consistent pattern
of argumentation. Sheen leans heavily to arguments based on the struc-
ture of reality and the relations establishing the structure of reality.
This preoccupation with the real as the basis of his arguments is better
understood when one realizes that Sheen was thoroughly grounded in the
Thomistic tradition. The Thomistic draws heavily on Aristotelian philos-
ophy. The pattern of argumentation Sheen seems to use is this:

Definition

Illustration or example or analogy

Argument from Reality

    Cause/Effect
    Ends/Means
    Act/Consequence
    Authority

Illustration or example or analogy
(Dissociations interjected periodically)
The speech "Has Russia Really Changed?" demonstrates the consistency of this pattern. After a brief introduction dealing with the possibility of change in Russia, Sheen defines change and follows it with an illustration of external change. In order to emphasize the difference between internal and external change, Sheen illustrates again (Greeks bearing gifts). He then turns to argument from reality presenting an argument by comparison (biological species and the revolutionary class), argument from authority (collective Christianity), and follows this with an illustration (disregard of human life). The ends/means argument is used next, followed by a cause/effect argument, followed by an illustration. Sheen advances reasons for external change with a cause/effect argument followed once again by an illustration; this time a humorous one. Other reasons for change are put across by using the cause/effect argument, followed by an act/essence argument, followed by an analogy. Dissociation is the overriding argument, as was previously stated.

Thus, Sheen is consistently logical in his argumentation, presenting a unified, closely interwoven series of arguments. This feat becomes truly amazing when one stops to consider the fact that these twenty-eight minutes of argumentation are presented without a single note, outline, or cue card.
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CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY AND RHETORICAL IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to analyze selected television addresses of Fulton J. Sheen on Communism and thereby to evaluate his rhetorical effectiveness against it. The criteria for judging the particular aspects of his speeches are based on: 1) Chaim Perelman's theory of argumentation, and 2) Wallace C. Fotheringham's theory of campaign rhetoric. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to summarize and to point out the rhetorical implications of Sheen's effectiveness as an epideictic speaker in a campaign situation.

Summary

The study indicates that Sheen's career played a significant part in his speaking. His brilliant educational background, his work as teacher and preacher, his work as counsellor and convert-maker, his work as author, and his years in radio broadcasting, all contributed to his success as a television speaker. Although his debut on television was viewed with apprehension—no one had ever succeeded with a program such as this, speaking for one-half hour—the show turned out to be most successful. Sheen's telecast was scheduled opposite Milton Berle's and Frank Sinatra's shows. The television world was shocked by the overwhelming response to Sheen's show. Soon Berle's rating slacked off, and Sinatra went off the air, but Sheen's ratings climbed and continued to climb. Sheen never felt that his broadcast was a religious program.
even though he was a preacher. My research points up the fact that Sheen's approach to his television role was an active rather than a static one. In 1953, Sheen told an interviewer that his program "takes advantage of the fact that reason itself is a form of movement. You might say that the listener makes a tour of some area of human thought . . . moving from point to point with the speaker. This journey of the watcher's mind gives him a sense of action because his own mind is acting."

This concept of "intellectual contact" coincides with Perelman's idea that the speaker and the audience have a meeting of minds. This meeting of minds is the basis of Perelman's theory of argumentation.

This study deals specifically with five of Sheen's speeches on Communism. I discovered that although Sheen dealt with a variety of topics in his speeches, the subject of Communism was used more consistently and more often than any other, thus making a campaign of it. Sheen thought of himself as a crusader and had become interested in what he called the "evils of Communism" while he was studying abroad. Sheen arrived in Europe soon after the Russian Revolution and had the opportunity to speak with many exiles from Russia. His interest grew, and he began an intensive study of Communism—all the works of Marx, Lenin, and Stalin, and he almost memorized the Russian Constitution. Thus began his Crusade. The rhetorical situation here, it seems, called for such action.

The United States had been affected by Communism almost from its beginnings in 1917, and by the 1950's, fear and suspicion of Communism had reached a fever pitch. By this time, Senator Joseph McCarthy had begun his campaign against Communism. McCarthy began in 1950 and for four
years dominated the American political scene. And while McCarthy was fighting Communism in his way in the political arena, Fulton Sheen waged his intellectual war against Communism by speaking out against the evils of its philosophy.

Sheen's addresses were studied in the light of Perelman's theory of argumentation, which falls into three major categories: 1) the framework of argumentation, which allows for the examination of the speaker, the audience, and the message; 2) the starting point of argumentation, which allows for examination of objects of agreement and description of style; and 3) the techniques of argumentation, which allow for the examination of the chains of argument and the interaction of these. Perelman's entire theory of argumentation is based on the objective of gaining the adherence of minds.

The Framework of Argumentation

Examination of Sheen's speeches shows that his approach to his task was that of a teacher—in Perelman's terms, that of an epideictic speaker seeking to educate his audience. In the presentation of his arguments, Sheen addressed himself to the American public, the personification of the universal audience, and brought to this audience a knowledge of human nature that only a priest—counsellor could have. Sheen knew people—people from every walk of life—and he capitalized on that knowledge, approaching his audience with a multiplicity of arguments. With this knowledge of human nature and of his subject matter and with his prestige as a prelate, Sheen brought to his audience a strong ethos.
Enhancing that ethos and the speaking situation were conditioning agents—music, lights, a set, and makeup.

As an epideictic speaker, Sheen sought to "increase adherence to values already possessed," and his strongest appeal was to a sense of morality. Communism, according to Sheen, is atheistic and basically immoral. Americans could best combat Communism through a strong sense of morality, since the decline of morality meant the rise of Communism. All of this was skillfully presented by Sheen, for he was a master of delivery, the envy of fellow priests and of many in the theatrical world. Sheen had a dramatic flair, and his use of the pause was superb. Because he spoke without notes, he made direct contact with each individual viewer with his "magnetic" eyes. The exchange became personal. His voice was clear, commanding, and deeply resonant, and his gestures were natural, graceful, and meaningful. His sense of humor and his ability to tell stories were strongly in evidence in every speech. All of these factors contributed to what Perelman refers to as a "skillful presentation." Thus knowledge of the audience, awareness of the message, and the image of the speaker are joined to build the framework of argumentation.

The Starting Point of Argumentation

The search for objects of agreement used as starting points of argumentation reveals that Sheen, in his appeal to the universal audience, based his arguments on objective reality. He made presumptions and reinforced them with facts. In his presentation, Sheen relied heavily on
historical facts but delved into other areas as well. He presented facts and truths, sometimes simplistically, and expected compliance from his audience. In some instances, he set himself up as an authority and, therefore, felt no need for documenting material he presented as factual. The material Sheen did present was, according to the Flesch reading-ease scale, difficult to comprehend. He seemed to be addressing himself to an academic, scholarly audience. Yet through skilful delivery and the use of much illustrative material, he was able to reach his other viewers as well.

The Techniques of Argumentation

In a personal interview with Sheen, this writer was told that he (Sheen) did not believe in a profusion of arguments because they tend to be confusing, and "they bore." He said that "what you do is state your principle and then give examples." Analysis of the speeches brings out the fact that Sheen did just that. He uses Perelman's "multiplicity of arguments," and these are always clarified by illustration, example, or analogy. Sheen saw Communism as "a living reality and, therefore, being more close to our cultural civilization," and as a consequence most of his arguments are based on the structure-of-reality concept. Generally, Sheen presented a consistently logical, unified argument.

That same interview brought out another point which coincides with Perelman's concept of interaction of arguments. Sheen noted that the order and sequence of arguments is the important thing. He developed arguments sequentially—"one will come out of the other," says Sheen.
As mentioned earlier, Sheen's arguments were unified within the individual speech, flowing one from the other, and this united coherence persists throughout the series. This five-year effort to effect a change in the attitude of the American people toward Communism is, further, an example of campaign rhetoric as proposed by Fotheringham. The first speech on Communism given in the first series in 1952 was "The Philosophy of Communism." Setting the stage for the "development of subsequent effects," Sheen presented two basic principles of Communism: 1) economic determinism, and 2) the Communist notion of man. In that speech, he elaborated on both of these concepts, examining them from all angles. Sheen's presentation of the philosophy of Communism was basic to the audience's understanding of the rest of the speeches.

The second speech, delivered in 1953 and the third in the series, presupposed some knowledge of the basic philosophy of Communism. Sheen did not define Communism in this speech, but he gave reasons for people turning to Communism. In "The Russian of Coexistence" speech of 1954, Sheen, referring again to the philosophy of Communism, built on the idea of the worth of the individual, an idea directly opposed to the Communist notion of man as being subordinate to the group. In the fourth speech, Sheen discussed "Has Russia Really Changed" and used the Greek word metanoia for change. This type of change implied internal change as well as external change. The internal change, according to Sheen, had to do with the philosophy of Communism, and he reinforced the concept. The external change was an extension of economic determinism. Both of these ideas had been presented in 1952. The fifth series, "The Life and
Character of Lenin," seemed to be a summary statement of the philosophy of Communism and its ramifications as understood by and translated by Lenin into a terrifying way of life. Economics, the worth and the worthlessness of the individual, religious persecution—all of these were touched on and reinforced, but all presupposed a previous acquaintance with the concepts. This repetition of ideas showed a strong carry-through of ideas introduced in the first series and built on through the fifth. It is interesting to note that by 1956 there were only three speeches in the series devoted to Communism. The fire had died down considerably. Surely Sheen brought some semblance of rationality to the scene he identified in his first speech by stating: "There is considerable confusion in our American life about Communism; too much emotional hatred of Communism, and not sufficient thinking and reasoning about it."

**Historical Implications**

This doctoral study introduces some noteworthy implications for rhetorical communication. The first of these is the need for a method in the preparation of a speech. Perelman does not discuss this need in his work; however, Sheen stresses adequate preparation as absolutely essential to the speaker, and it proved to be one of the greatest sources of his strength as a communicator. Sheen, as noted in Chapter Two, speaks of two kinds of preparation: 1) remote preparation, and 2) proximate preparation. Remote preparation, he argued, includes years of study and experience that are gained through living. The proximate preparation, on the other hand, includes an in-depth study of
the particular topic chosen, thinking it through thoroughly, writing an
outline, and destroying that outline. The following day, the idea is
thought through again and outlined, and then the outline is again de-
stroyed. This process is repeated until the idea becomes a part of the
individual. Sheen feels that once ideas are written on paper, the
speaker becomes a slave to that paper. The words should flow out of
the speaker, and each time the speech should be a fresh new experience.
The advantages of this type of speaking are many. It allows the speaker
freedom—freedom to move away from the podium, freedom to confront di-
rectly his audience, thus initiating a warm, friendly rapport, and free-
dom to use meaningful gestures. It also adds a great deal to his credi-
bility—the speaker knows his subject so well, he has no need for notes.

There are a few disadvantages in the use of this method; the speaker
leaves himself open to the possibility of being misquoted, since there
is not a prepared script for easy reference and there is a greater pos-
sibility for making errors in informational data. The third disadvan-
tage is that it takes much more time. It must be pointed out, however,
that the advantages of the method seem to outweigh the disadvantages of
it. Sheen's mastery of the technique served him long and well and is
probably one of the most significant factors in his success as a speaker.

A second implication derived from the study is that although a
speech is delivered in language difficult to comprehend, the speaker can
still reach a "popular" audience. On the Flesch reading-ease scale, as
has been pointed out, Sheen's speeches scored "difficult," a rating that
put them into the "academic, scholarly" style of material. Yet Sheen
kept his audience and his ratings stayed consistently high. The answer seems to lie in his delivery and in the use of examples to clarify points made. His delivery is of the intimate, conversational variety that rhetoricians propose as a desirable standard for one kind of effective persuasive discourse, and his examples are a natural outgrowth of the material being presented. The natural relaxed atmosphere that he creates tends to put his audience at ease and ready to listen.

The third implication for rhetorical communication lies in the area of ethos. James C. McCroskey (An Introduction to Rhetorical Communication, 1972) advances the notions of "initial" and "derived" ethos. The first is based on the background and personal characteristics of the speaker, and the second is based on the message and delivery of the particular speech. Strongly evident here is Sheen's "initial" ethos. His authoritativeness was based on a background of educational brilliance; he was in the news as a great preacher, as a churchman who converted such famous persons as Heywood Broun, Fritz Kreisler, Clare Boothe Luce, and others; he was known as a "beggar" for the poor through the Society for the Propagation of the Faith; and he was well-known as an author and radio personality. The personal characteristics that came through were a burning sincerity, a great compassion for humanity, a twinkling eye that marked a great sense of humor, and an attractive appearance. Sheen's initial ethos was so strong that he could speak with authority; he did not need to "derive" it from his message. He was Quintilian's orator "the good man speaking well."
Not only does this study offer the foregoing implications regarding rhetorical theory but suggests several possible areas for further study. This study dealing with the specific area of Communism leads one to speculate whether the same conclusions would be drawn from the analysis of speeches on less dogmatic topics. What would a comparative analysis of Sheen's speeches on Communism and of speeches on other topics show? Since Sheen's delivery is so effective, perhaps a study of his methods would be profitable to communicators. Another possible area of study is Sheen's humor and/or the use of illustration, example, and analogy in his speeches. All of these would reveal aspects of Sheen's effectiveness as a speaker and would prove a valuable contribution to the study of rhetorical communication.
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Last week, I met a very incredulous gentleman, a taxi driver. After a few blocks he said, "Say, you wouldn't happen to be_. would you?" (1)

"Yes." (2)

"I wonder how I could ever convince anybody that you were in my cab." (3)

I said, "Come to the office and I will autograph a book for you, and then you can prove it by the autograph." (4)

He said, "They won't believe you autographed it. They will think somebody else did it. Not even my wife will believe me! I want to tell somebody about it while you are on television, but I never get to see you on television. I have to earn my living and every Tuesday night when you are on, I am out hacking." (5)

"Here is five dollars. Next Tuesday night at eight o'clock, you go into a bar, give a dollar of the five to the bartender, and ask him to tune me in on his television set. The four dollars is to pay for not driving your cab that half hour. Then, when we come on the screen, you can tell everyone at the bar." (6)

"Suppose they don't believe me?" (7)

"To overcome that incredulity," I said, "I'll tell you what I will do. Next Tuesday night, I'll tell this story. Then they'll have to believe you." (8)

Now, I have paid my debt. (9)

There is considerable confusion in our American life about Communism; too much emotional hatred of Communism, and not sufficient thinking and reasoning about it. (10)

But Communism is intrinsically wrong, independently of Russia's foreign policy. The foreign policy of Russia is a tactic; it is by the philosophy of Communism that Russia is to be judged.

The two basic principles of Communism which we select for presentation are:

1. Economic determinism.
2. Communist notion of man. (12)
Economic determinism sounds very learned, but it means very simply, that culture, civilization, religion, philosophy, art, morals, and literature are all determined by economic methods of production. The latter is the base on which all else rests.

For example, if the method of production at a given period of history is based on private ownership of property, such as we have here in our democracy, the Communist argues that literature, art, and philosophy are nothing but a superstructure or a defense of private enterprise. "Your literature would be so written," the Communists say, "as to justify slavery, colonialism, capitalism, and the right of property owners to submerge the workers."

"Morals, in like manner," the Communists say, "in private enterprise would be so constructed as to defend ownership." As Lenin wrote, "We deny all morality taken from non-economic class conceptions." Take the seventh and tenth commandments—"Thou shalt not steal" and "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's goods." The Communists say, "Can't you see these two commandments are based upon private property? Why should anyone prohibit stealing except in a society where there is personal ownership of the methods of production? When the state owns everything, there is no need of that morality, for everyone will be so prosperous there will be no need of stealing."

"Religion is based upon the economics of private enterprise, too," contend the Communists. "It is an opiate given to the workers to make them content with being exploited. It leads them to believe that there is another world to make up for all the injustices of this one." The Communists add, "If you change your method of production and, instead of having private enterprise, put all property in the hands of the state, then the superstructure changes. There will then be Communist literature, Communist morals, Communist art, and Communist philosophy.

Communist literature will attack capitalism, make fun of America, and prove that Russia invented everything from flying machines to radar.

Communist morals will see but one wrong, namely, injuring or hurting state property or in any way betraying the revolutionary class.

Art, too, becomes Communistic. During the days when we Americans were foolishly having a honeymoon with Russia, there was a considerable amount of art developed that was Communist-inspired. Remnants of it can be seen in some hotels and public buildings. The art is unmistakable, for it shows great, tremendous, muscular men with little heads (no brains), pushing wheels, pulling at ropes, tugging at plows; i.e., man was made for production; his origin is economic, so is his destiny.
What is the fallacy of economic determinism, which means that economics determines everything? The first fallacy of economic determinism is that Karl Marx, who studied philosophy and should have known better, confused what is known as a condition with a cause. For example, the window is a condition of light, but the window is not the cause of light. We are willing to admit that economics, to some extent, does condition literature and art. But it certainly does not cause literature and art.

If economics is the cause of culture and religion, why, in the pre-Christian era, were different cultures and religions produced by the same economic methods of production? There was no difference between the economic methods of production among the Jews and those among the Hindus or the Chaldeans, but their civilizations were different; their religious and moral concepts were different, the Hebrew having the highest moral concept that was known to man in the pre-Christian era. Since their economic methods of production were identical, it cannot be said that economics was the cause of the differences in cultures.

There was no change of economic methods in the Roman Empire when it became Christian from when it was pagan. But the civilization and the art and the religion and the morality were totally different in the two periods. Therefore, it is not the economics that determines civilization. The way a violin is made does not determine the music that will be played on it.

Economics has gone to the head of the Communists like wine to an empty stomach. Notice that whenever the Communists try to convince us of their superiority, they make moral judgments about us. They say we are "immoral," "unjust," "unethical," and "bad," while they are right and good. These moral judgments do not belong in the economic category. Whence comes their moral worth, if reality be not moral? If economics is at the base of reality, how can it be said that any system is "right" and another "wrong"? If religion be a product of economic method of production, how could it be an opiate? Finally, if changes in morality, art, and culture are due to changes in methods of production, what causes changes in the methods of production? They are often due to invention, and invention is an intellectual or a spiritual cause. Those who believe in an ethical order independent of economics can condemn exploitation, but the materialism of Communism cannot do it without repudiating the whole system. They have no right to use the words "right" and "wrong," but only "private" and "social." If everything is economically determined, right and wrong, truth and error have no existence, for they do not fit in an economic category.
Communism is strong only when it borrows some of the moral indignation that has been inherited from the Hebraic-Christian traditions; Communism is weak when it departs from that tradition. Communism has bootlegged and smuggled into its system the decency and morality that have come from the great Hebraic-Christian tradition of the Western World and then uses it to pass judgment on the world. Moral indignation is needed against injustice, but Communists have no basis for using it.

This is a reminder of how we ought to meet Communism on the Voice of America and elsewhere, namely, not to talk about the supremacy of economics, we pay tribute to the Communists' error of the primary value of economics. Communists are speaking to the rest of the world in terms of economics. They are using the language that we ought to be using.

The second basic principle of Communism is that man has value only inasmuch as he is a member of a class. In one of his earlier writings, Karl Marx, who is the father of Communism, said, "We have already destroyed the outer religion; now we must destroy the inner religion," that is, man's spiritual nature.

Then follows this very remarkable statement in which Marx very correctly tells us the essence of democracy. Marx knew the basis of democracy far better than many who live under its blessings. Marx said that democracy is founded on the principle of the "sovereign worth of a person." "This, in its turn," he continued, "is based upon a postulate, a dream and an illusion of Christianity, namely, that every man has an immortal soul." In the first edition of his work on capital, Marx says, "Persons of and by themselves have no value. An individual has a value only inasmuch as he is the representative of an economic category, 'the revolutionary class'; outside of that, man has no value."

Molotov developed this idea by saying that "bread is a political weapon." We believe in food for the hungry, regardless of who they are. Molotov in good Marxist fashion argues that bread be given only to certain people, namely, those who follow Communist revolutionary ideas.

Some years ago, Heywood Broun told me of a cartoonist employed by one of the Communist papers in New York. The cartoonist developed cancer and was obliged to give up work. Broun went to the Communists and asked if they would not give him some pension to help pay his hospital bills. The answer that he received from the Communists was "He is of no use to us. He is no longer a member of the revolutionary class, and therefore for us he does not exist." That was good Communism, but it is not good humanitarianism. Once you start with the principle that the person has no value, but only the revolutionary class has, then liquidation becomes inevitable.
Man is then likened to lower forms of life in which an individual fly, an individual gnat, an individual ant is of no consequence; what is of importance is the species.

Marx and Communism have turned the supremacy of the species into the supremacy of the class. Once admitted, it follows that what happens to an individual person is of no concern. The revolutionary class of Communism alone has value. Communism is an aggressive religion of the species.

This explains how Russia uses her satellite people in war. Communist tanks run over the bodies of their wounded. No one would even kick them out of the path of the great machines, because they are no longer of worth. It also explains their war tactics in Korea. The first line of attack rushed into battle to be cut down. The second line, which was unarmed, carried mattresses and threw themselves on barbed wire to be shot. The third group had guns and gave battle.

This liquidation of man in the modern world will not be arrested simply by protests of horror. We must recognize the evil of this Communist philosophy and begin affirming, in the United States, the worth of a person as a creature of God.

As Hitler put the emphasis upon race, as Mussolini put it on the nation, so the Communists put it on a revolutionary mass. The hour has struck to affirm the power and worth and vocation of the individual. That means returning to what Marx rightly saw as the basis of democracy, namely, the truth that every man has an immortal soul. What we are attempting to do now in our Western world is foolishly to preserve the fruits of Christianity without the roots. Personality has a religious basis. A person is a subject, not an object. A person has more worth than the universe: "What doth it profit a man if he gains the whole world and loses his soul?" A person realizes himself and comes to relative perfection in society, but only because he has within himself a principle independent of a society, namely, a soul. This soul has rights anterior to any state or dictator, parliament or king. As our Declaration of Independence puts it, "The Creator has endowed man with certain inalienable rights." The world must move away from mass civilization by restoring value to the person. The Lord of the Universe saw value in the lowest kind of criminal and addressed in the second person singular: "This day Thou shalt be with Me in Paradise." This promise was the foundation stone of democracy.
Communists are right in saying this world needs a revolution, but not their cheap kind, which merely transfers booty and loot out of one man's pocket into another's. We need the kind of revolution that will purge out of a man's heart pride and covetousness and lust and anger. The true battle against Communism begins in the heart of every single American. The revolution must begin in man before it begins in society. The Communist revolution has been a basic failure; it is not revolutionary enough; it leaves hate in the soul of man. We need not fear Communism as much as we need fear being Godless. If God is with us, then who can be against us? (35)
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Why do some American people become Communists? One of the reasons most often given is that Communists are made by bad economic conditions. That is not true. Low economic standards are merely a condition of Communism, but they are not a cause. The cause of light in a room is the sun. The window is the condition of the light coming in. Bad economic conditions are not the cause of people becoming Communist; if they were, countries with low economic standards would be most Communist. The economic level of Burma is very low, but the people are definitely anti-Communist. Economic standards of Portugal and Ireland are not nearly so high as in the United States; yet both countries are definitely anti-Communist. (1)

Furthermore, many who become Communists in the United States are those who belong to the middle class or even the rich. Juvenile delinquency also predominates in those same classes. Marx himself did not become a Communist because of his poverty; actually his father belonged to the middle class and sent him through the university. Marx was first an atheist, then a Communist. Economic conditions in the Garden of Paradise were excellent, but the first Red got in. (2)

One reason why some become Communists is a reaction against liberalism. Liberalism can mean one of three things. First, it can mean that particular philosophy of the last century which believed that economic production should be uncontrolled by state, morality, or religion. Such was the liberalism of Adam Smith, John Stuart Mill, and the Manchester school. (3)

But liberalism can also mean a belief in fundamental rights and liberties within the law. Every American is that kind of liberal. Such liberalism believes that everybody should be free to draw a triangle on condition that he give it three sides. It believes that everyone should be free to draw a giraffe on condition that he give it a long neck, for such is the nature of a giraffe. It believes that everyone should be free to drive his car in traffic, but on condition that he obey the traffic laws. This is the right kind of liberalism—freedom under the law. (4)
Finally, liberalism can mean liberty without law. This is the kind of liberalism that makes Communists. Liberals of this variety are interested only in freedom from something, but not in freedom for something. They say they have an open mind, but it never closes on anything. They say they are looking for truth; yet if they ever met truth, they would drop dead. The reason they do not want Truth or Goodness or an Absolute is because the discovery of truth would commit them to responsibility. They are always unprepared for truth, like the golfer who in his first trip to the course makes a hole in one. (5)

How does this kind of liberalism prepare for Communism? According to this kind of liberalism, life has no purpose or final goal. Therefore, life is meaningless. But as soon as life becomes meaningless, the mind becomes revolutionary. A boiler has a purpose, imposed by the mind of an engineer, to contain steam at a given temperature. When it loses its purpose, it explodes. When persons reject the normal pattern of human life, given by God, they revolt. The present revolutionary tendency in youth in the world is not due to the fact that youth itself is perverse. The revolutionary character of modern youth throughout the world is due to a rightful protest against parents and educators who have not bequeathed to them the meaning of existence. In reaction against an irrational, unpurposeful existence, they seek compensation in the intensity of an experience such as sex license, revolution, or Communism. (6)

Under this false theory of liberty, which is more correctly license, everyone seeks to satisfy his own will. Continuous self-affirmation not only produces antagonisms between individuals, but conflict between classes. The logic of license is frightening. If all things are allowable, then man becomes a slave to his own freedom. After a while people tire of their freedom, because freedom rightfully implies responsibility. Then comes the reaction. Chaos becomes so general that fatigued minds look for someone to whom they can surrender their freedom and therefore their responsibility. This is Communism, which is the compulsory organization of the chaos created by a false liberalism. If there be no truth, there is nothing left but the forcible massing of individuals into social "happiness." Thus does boundless liberty lead to tyranny. If the sheep will not go into the sheepfold, dogs are sent to drive them in. "Goodness" of a new kind is achieved by necessity. (7)
Klaus Fuchs, who passed atomic secrets to Russia, explained his Communism: "I had the sense of becoming a 'free man' because I succeeded in establishing myself completely independent of surrounding forces of society. Looking back on it, the best way of expressing it is to call it a controlled schizophrenia." Louis Budenz, the former editor of the Communist daily in the United States, calls Communists "men without faces." No longer self-determined, the party imposes its reason on them, rules their existence, and even tells them how to interpret history. Religious conversion deepens personal responsibility; Communist perversion destroys it.

Another reason why some become Communists is to escape a sense of guilt. Every man who does wrong has an uneasy conscience. This sense of guilt and uneasiness can come from bad behavior, such as dishonesty, pride, egotism, selfishness, lust, and alcoholism. But it can also come from having too much money.

A man whose conscience bothers him because he is not living right may eventually reach a point where he will say, "I want to escape this remorse and gnawing guilt. I find that all the defenders of morality, decency, and religion are deepening my guilty feeling. I hate them for doing so, but what can I do alone? The great advantage of Communism is that it will give me hate a collective status. Communism does away with distinctions of right or wrong; it even makes the wrong right and the right wrong. By joining the Communists I can solace my conscience by being interested in social justice. Then I will be righting everyone else's life, and Communism will let me lead my life as I please."

Educators in a democracy must be sure that the youth are taught to lead moral lives, for Communism makes progress in relation to the breakdown of morals. It even seeks to destroy morality in youth through the spread of false opinions and evil literature. Once a sense of justice is destroyed in the individual, Communists seek to get youth interested in what they call "social justice," that its evil may seem to be righteous.

Others have an uneasy conscience because they are rich. Perhaps their wealth was not acquired honestly; maybe it was, but they now see a tremendous disproportion between what they have and what others have, and they begin to feel uncomfortable. Their reaction may be twofold: either, to support Communism to salve their guilty conscience, or else to support it in the hope that "when the Revolution comes," they may keep their wealth. Communism has the great "advantage" of reforming everybody else, while leaving the self "free" for its own sin. Poor fools! Lenin said they are the first to be liquidated when Communism comes into power.
A third reason for Communism is to be found in the betrayal of the intelligentsia. A distinction is made between the intelligentsia and the intellectuals. The intelligentsia are those who have been educated beyond their intelligence. We are not speaking of people who are truly intellectual, who are necessary for culture and civilization. To be an intellectual is one of the noblest vocations God has given to man; teachers are the bearers of the Word, and "those who instruct shall shine as stars for all eternity." Few joys are greater than to mold young minds and young wills in the way of truth and goodness. (13)

The word "intelligentsia" has a Latin root *intellectus* with a Russian ending - *sia*. In modern terms, it is Bolshevism tacked on to Western ideas, or vice versa. Generally, it is the Western that is absorbed into the Soviet. Arnold Toynbee says the intelligentsia are born to be unhappy, because there is something alien or hybrid in their make-up. (14)

Fifty years ago there was such a thing as "economic slumming," in which the rich went down to the dives and cafes of the poor, not to relieve their needs by a surrender of their wealth, but in order to enjoy the shock and the thrill of riches contrasted with poverty. (15)

Economic slumming today has become intellectual slumming, under which the intelligentsia go down to the Communist masses, not to give them the truth of which they are the custodians, but in order to enjoy the shock and the thrill of mass revolutionary movements without intelligent direction. (16)

The intelligentsia are uprooted. They are not at home in a culture; uprooted spiritually and morally disoriented, they fit into Western Christian civilization like a woman trying to get a 7 foot into a 3A shoe. That is why many of the intelligentsia no longer write books in their own native countries; some Americans expatriate themselves to write in England, others in France, others in Spain, others in Africa; some Irishmen go to England to expound their ideas, and some of the German intelligentsia to America. These men are not at home at home; they feel the need of an alien class to act as a transformer of their ideas, that is, to change them from low to high voltage. Because they have lost their roots and their culture, they gravitate to Bolshevism or what is alien to the great tradition that has made Western civilization and democracy. The so-called "wise" men are not so wise as they think they are. (17)

There is no danger whatever to academic freedom when a professor is asked by his government if he is a member of the Communist party. But there is danger to academic freedom when a professor
uses American liberty by invoking the Constitution in order to destroy it and deliver us over to Moscow. Despite moral failings, which helps make Communists, it must never be forgotten that the grace of God can undo Communism and make them free men again. Such was the case of Douglas Hyde, the editor of the London Communist daily, and his wife. Both were listening one night to the radio as Vishinsky was speaking. Mrs. Hyde, after listening to him for ten minutes, became exasperated. Dashing to the radio, she shut off Vishinsky, saying, "I am getting sick and tired of Vishinsky. He is talking about peace, but he is doing everything possible to obstruct and destroy it. I do not believe he wants peace." And with that, her husband said, "You are not talking as a Communist." She said, "I don't care whether I am talking as a Communist or not." He retorted, "If you do not stop that kind of talk, I will report you to the party and you will be disciplined." She said, "All right. Report me." "Why," he said, "you are beginning to talk as if you might go into the Church." She said, "I am." He said, "Shake, so am I." God can do His work when we put ourselves on His side.
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Coexistence is proper to the inanimate kingdom; stones exist, living is proper to the plant kingdom; cabbages co-live. Feeling is common to the animal kingdom; cats co-feel. Loving is proper to the human order: "Love one another as I have loved you." (1)

Coexistence is for those who are incompatible, such as a quarrelsome husband and wife. Tigers and lions coexist in a zoo, but they have separate runways. Because coexistence is infrahuman, and below the norm by which nations ought to live together, it is fitting that there be a test of the sincerity of coexistence proposals. The test Our Blessed Lord gave was that of judging a tree by its fruits. Grapes cannot be gathered from thorns, nor figs from thistles. (2)

When the Soviets testify to their peace aims and bring testimonials of their peaceful character from their satellite nations, it is reasonable to look back into their past and study whether they kept their promise of "peaceful coexistence," or used it to pillage nations, prostitute people, tyrannize minority groups, and confiscate the productive machinery of various countries. (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coexistence</th>
<th>Breaking of Treaties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promise of Coexistence</td>
<td>Breaking of Treaties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933 Litvinoff Agreement. Litvinoff promises Pres. Roosevelt that Russia would not organize Communist parties or groups, or use American citizens to foster overthrow of the American government.</td>
<td>1934 Soviet Russia organized the Communist cell in America to infiltrate the government up to the second level of its authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 Lithuanian nonaggression pact with the Soviets.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Lithuania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929 Soviets renounced war in protocol with Poland.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets attacked Eastern Poland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promise of Coexistence</td>
<td>Breaking of Treaties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Soviets signed non-aggression pact with Finland.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets invaded Finland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Soviets signed Estonian nonaggression pact.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Estonia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Soviets signed Latvian nonaggression pact.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Latvia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932 Soviets signed Polish nonaggression pact.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets seized Poland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935 Czech-Soviet Alliance.</td>
<td>1939 Soviets refused to aid Czechoslovakia against Hitler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937 Chinese-Soviet non-aggression pact.</td>
<td>1949 Soviets plundered the industries of Manchuria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Estonia-Soviet Alliance</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Estonia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Latvian-Soviet Alliance.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Latvia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939 Alliance of Soviets with Lithuania.</td>
<td>1940 Soviets annexed Lithuania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 Polish-Soviet Alliance.</td>
<td>1947 Soviets seized Poland.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his speech on coexistence given before the Fifteenth Congress of the Communist Party on December 2, 1927, Stalin said:

We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal depends on whether we succeed in delaying the war with the capitalist countries which is inevitable, but which may be delayed either:

1. Until proletarian revolution ripens in Europe or . . .

2. Until colonial revolutions come fully to a head, or finally . . .
3. Until the capitalists fight among themselves over the division of the colonies.

Therefore the maintenance of peaceful relations with capitalist countries is an obligatory task for us. The basis of our relations with capitalist countries consists in admitting the coexistence of two opposed systems.

In the light of these and other facts which might be added, it is obvious that what the Soviets mean by "peaceful coexistence" is a temporary arrangement, a tactical maneuver, an accommodation to the historical problems of an hour in order to achieve world revolution. Hence Lenin said that every form of lying, knavery, and deceit was permissible to bring about the Communist Revolution. Stalin said that coexistence as a permanent phenomenon was not recognized by Communist philosophy, because the two systems of Communism and what he called capitalism could not coexist.

America is apt to think in terms of slogans, such as "peaceful coexistence" and thus make itself as naive as the woman who thinks her friends think she looks as young as they say she does. Historical facts prove that coexistence in the minds of the Soviets always end in uni-existence. The wolf promised coexistence to the lamb, but when the wolf ate the lamb, there was only uni-existence. When one sounds this warning to beware of Soviet intention because they have never kept their word in the past, fellow travelers plead, "Let bygones be bygones; there is no use crying over spilt milk." The subjugation of 37 out of every 100 people in the world to Communist tyranny is not as trivial as "spilt milk," but even if it were, let us at least find out who is breaking the jug.

The basis of coexistence. What does coexistence imply? Not love, honesty, justice, or cooperation; therefore, not peace. Peace is the tranquillity of order, and order implies justice. As a marriage without love is coexistence, so among nations is coexistence an agreement without peace. The basis of coexistence is fear, mutual antagonism in which each tolerates the other because it dare not risk perishing. Coexistence is what might be called "ice peace." In the marital order, it may be likened to a husband and a wife who live in a state of mutual antagonism. The wife has a precious Ming vase poised in her hand, ready to throw at her husband; the husband, in his turn, has his favorite golf club lifted high in the air ready to bring it down on her offending head. Both, however, momentarily shrink from the armed conflict because neither of them wishes to risk their prize possessions.

Another example of this basis of coexistence can be imagined as happening at the United Nations. Nephew Krushchev and his Uncle Sam decide to coexist in the same room. They both stay up late at night because each is afraid to go to bed while the other is still up.
Finally, both having retired at identically the same moment, Uncle Sam says, "Good night, Nephew Khrushchev." Nephew Khrushchev answers, "Good night, Uncle Sam." Then both turn over, reach under respective pillows, and pull out guns to see if they are cocked.

Coexistence is inspired by fear and principally the fear of nonsurvival on the part of each. But there is a slight difference in the fear of each.

America, having developed the atomic bomb and having publicized its effects, knows that the indiscriminate use of it could eventually end in the destruction of all life in many parts of the planet.

The Soviets' fear of survival exists just as much with them as it does with us. It now remains to see whether this fear has anything to do with their plea for so-called "peaceful coexistence." In March, 1954, there appeared an article in the party organ of the Academy of Science of the Soviet Republic entitled "Problems in Philosophy." The author was I.A. Selezyev. This article explains why the Soviet Union found it necessary to accept coexistence as an element in foreign policy, in contrast to Marx, whose philosophy does not admit coexistence.

The Marxist position is that there is imminent in nature and in history the law of increasing tension between those who have property and those who have not, or in Communist jargon—between the capitalist and the proletariat. This tension increases to a point where there is a Communist revolution—"the expropriating of the expropriators and the transfer of all property into the hands of the Socialistic State."

Marx is now thrown overboard because the Communists are recognizing that the law has not worked out. In the double-talk of the article, Marx is rejected in these words: "The contradictions that have arisen between Capitalism approaching its doom and growing Communism need not necessarily be solved by an armed struggle between them."

The author then corrects Marx further by saying that the Soviet Union must not expect the early collapse of capitalism; that Communism in the Western world is not going to have an easy birth; that the Marxist law has not worked out as it should; therefore, there must be "coexistence for more or less lengthy historical periods."

The second article appeared in The Communist, October, 1954, and was entitled "Peaceful Coexistence of the Two Systems." The author was A. Leontyev, who was one of the spokesmen of the Soviet foreign policy.
Once again there is a repetition of the idea that Marx held — that capitalism would disintegrate of and by itself because of its intrinsic contradictions. (17)

What is new in this article, however, is a further correction of Marx. Marx took over from Hegel the idea that the greatest possible conflict and violence in society can make the greatest changes in human affairs. As Marx put it in his Poverty of Philosophy, "It is the bad side of history which produces progress by producing struggle." In other words, progress toward Communism is best attained through violence which the Communist revolution introduces. (18)

Now comes the new idea. The atomic age has changed Communist thinking, without stating it in so many words. The article points to this conclusion — the atomic age is capable of unleashing unlimited destructive violence, which makes Communist violence look trivial and puny. In other words, Communist violence was thought to be the greatest kind of violence in the world which was capable of producing a Communist state; but now it happens that the atomic age has produced a greater capacity for violence and destruction than the Communist violence. What is worse, "the enemy" possesses this atomic violence, as well as the Soviets. The Soviets, therefore cannot risk losing what they have already gained; hence, the author recommends three times in the course of his article "coexistence for long periods of time." During these periods of coexistence, it hopes to continue to nibble away without war, until it has finally conquered the world as it has already taken China, part of Korea and Vietnam. In other words, it is the fear of risking all that it has gained that makes Communism seek coexistence, during which there will be revolution by attrition rather than by armed conflict. (19)

Wars today are total. Probably the last war between gentlemen was the Civil War. War is now a struggle for survival. The planet can be disturbed, and even future generations made physically and mentally defective through atomic radiation. At the end of an atomic war, there will be no peace conference; we will just gather up the broken pieces. War, up to this point, was a means to an end. An atomic war would be the end! Hence the plea for coexistence. (20)

Can such a fear be a basis for peace? Winston Churchill gave us such a "pollyanna-ish" hope when he said, "When the advance of destructive weapons enables everyone to kill everybody else, nobody will want to kill anyone at all." (21)
It is very foolish to believe that the terrific instruments of destruction will induce men to forego war. It must be recalled that when dynamite was invented, it was then held that there would be no more wars. When Maxim invented his gun, it was said that war from that point on would be impossible. Very often the rapidity of the destruction consequent upon atomic explosion gives some nations the hope for the quick ending of a war; then, once warfare has broken out in a traditional, less lethal plane, as passion is whipped up, the atomic bomb might be used as the last desperate gamble. Furthermore, it must not be forgotten that there is only one force which will prevent the use of a destructive weapon such as an atomic bomb, and that is the moral and spiritual force. With the decline of morality among nations, we cannot look for this restriction. For example, in 1935, England was very sensitive about the use of bombing planes on the frontiers of the Middle East and India. Lord Londonberry said before the House of Lords on May 22, 1935, that "it was with the greatest difficulty that bombing airplanes were used on a limited front." In September, 1939, the British and French governments announced "that only strictly military objectives in the narrow sense of the word" would be bombed. In February, 1940, Mr. Chamberlain said in the House of Commons, "Whatever the lengths to which others might go, the Government will not resort to blackguardly attacks on women and other civilians for the purposes of mere terrorism." (22)

Two years after the speech of Mr. Chamberlain, in February, 1942, the British Bomber Command received this directive from the War Cabinet: "To focus its operations on destroying the morale of the enemy civil population and, in particular, of the industrial workers," Lubeck was chosen; then Rostock; then Cologne and other cities as the deterioration of moral standards increased. It must also be remembered that the Soviet Union does not work within the same moral limitations as the rest of the world. Marx has said that the individual himself amounts to nothing; it is the class alone that is important. The very aggressive philosophy of the Soviet Union operating outside of the Ten Commandments could very quickly produce reprisals by the Western World, which would have little in common with the moral law to which it is supposed to subscribe. Reducing the number of snowballs between boys who are having a snowball fight from 180 to 20 will not reduce the aggressiveness of the gangs. Not even the taking of brickbats outside of the snowballs will prevent their fighting unless some moral force intervenes. (23)

Wherein then lies hope for peace? It is generally assumed that peace is something made by governments and particularly by the UN. It is thought to be something like oil poured on a pyramid, the top of the pyramid being the UN and the base of the pyramid being the people. (24)
All we have to do is to enjoy the peace created for us by nations gathered in assembly and let the peace flow out to individuals. (25)

As a matter of fact, peace does not come from above in the sense that it is made by the UN. Peace is more like a tree than a pyramid. The roots of the tree are the people who must first have justice in their own hearts; the branches of the tree, pointing to heaven, represent the acknowledgment and dependence of nations on the God of Justice, the Source of Law and Equity. (26)

This kind of peace does have a relationship to fear. But it must be remembered that there are two kinds of fear: servile and filial. (27)

Servile fear is the fear of a slave for a tyrant, or the fear the United States has for the Soviets, and the Soviets for the United States. (28)

Filial fear is the fear a devoted child has for a kind father, or a friend for a friend; it is, therefore, a kind of reverence or a shrinking of doing harm to anyone we love. (29)

This kind of fear is salutary, but it reverences God as the guarantor and vindicator of the moral law. (30)

If, instead of fearing germs and Communists, we began fearing a breakdown of our moral order; if we restored the sanctity of home and marriage, raised children in discipline and love of God and became less tepid about defending moral law, then we would have less fear of the enemy, for if God is with us, who can prevail against us? (31)
APPENDIX D

HAS RUSSIA REALLY CHANGED?
HAS RUSSIA REALLY CHANGED? 4

The Western World, anxious for peace, is asking itself the question, "Has Russia really changed?" It is obvious that the world cannot exist half slave and half free. If there is to be peace, there must be a change in that system which today has enslaved 37 out of every 100 people in the world. The possibility of a change is not to be denied, for it exists in nations, as well as individuals. As the thief at the right-hand side of the Saviour became His escort into Paradise, so, too, Russia could, in a future day, fulfill the hope of its nineteenth-century prophets and become a mediator between the East and the West.

The Greeks had a word for change, metanoia, and, in the light of it, the question of a change in Russia must be understood. Metanoia implies something internal and something external. The internal is a change of motives, goals, purposes, values; the external change is repentance, making up for evil, and trying to repair the damage done. The outside change through repentance is a proof of the sincerity of the inner change. A thief no longer has evil in his heart when he returns the loot. In a true metanoia, both a new motivation and atonement go together; otherwise there is the absurdity revealed in this story: A priest was stopped by a total stranger, who said, "Father, I have just stolen an automobile; what must I do?" The priest said, "You must return it to the owner." The thief said, "I will give it to you." The priest said, "No, I cannot take it; return it to the owner." The thief said, "The owner will not take it." "In that case, you may keep it." A few hours later, the priest discovered that his own automobile had been stolen.

Applying the notion of metanoia to Russia, one must make a distinction between the philosophy of the Communists and their tactics. The first is internal and affects the mind and the spirit; the second is external and refers to actions, methods, and strategy. The difference between the two can be illustrated by the ancient story of the siege of Troy by the Greeks. Ulysses conceived the idea of offering a wooden horse as a gift to the Trojans; Cassandra, the daughter of the Trojan king, protested, saying, "I fear the Greeks, bearing gifts." It was her contention that only the tactic had changed, but that the intent of the Greeks to destroy Troy had not changed. The gift horse was admitted; at night the soldiers emerged from the horse, opened the gates, admitted the Greeks, and the city was destroyed.
Keeping the distinction between philosophy and tactics in mind, it remains now to ask two questions:

1. Has the philosophy of the Soviets changed?
2. Have their tactics changed? (4)

The answer to the first question is "no"; the answer to the second question is "yes."

(5)

The philosophy of Communism, which is the establishment of a totalitarian state throughout the world by revolutionary means has not changed. The basic principles remain as unaltered now as in 1917. Four of these basic principles are:

1. The primary of class over the individual. Nature is rather heedless and careless as to what happens to individuals, as long as it preserves the species. Communism has taken over that biological law and made it apply to the human order. The species in the biological order now becomes a revolutionary class under Communism, which cares not if individuals perish, as long as the revolutionary class remains. Marx said that the individual as such had no value; it was Christianity, he said, which put a worth upon the individual. A person has value only when he contributes to the revolutionary class. From this principle, there flows the disregard of human life in China, in Northern Vietnam, Northern Korea, the salt mines of Siberia, and the concentration camps of Eastern Europe. (6)

2. Persecution of religion. If a man believes in God, then he cannot be totally possessed by the State, for he is in relation to a reality which evades social controls. Communism knows it cannot possess man totally unless it persecutes religion, which holds that man does not exist for the State. (7)

3. No private property. As Communism denies the soul, which is the inner guarantee of freedom, so it denies private property, which is the external guarantee of freedom. A man is free on the inside because he can call his soul his own; he is free on the outside when he can call property his own. Communism, knowing that it cannot possess man as long as he has this external guarantee of freedom—namely, private property—affirms, as its basic principle, Socialism, or the putting of all private property in the hands of the State. (8)

4. No political freedom. As Communism denies the right to private property, because it is the badge of freedom, so, too, it denies the right to decide who shall govern. As Molotov once said, "Under Communism, one party is in power; all the others are in jail."
Hence the Soviet Constitution recognizes freedom of the press, freedom of assembly, and freedom of speech only on condition that these are used to support the Communist system. Any person who affirms that he can decide for himself is automatically considered an enemy of Communism.

These basic principles of Communism which make for a totalitarian state and a denial of freedom are unchanged. This is evident from a statement made by Nikita Khrushchev in Moscow on September 17, 1955: "If anyone believes that our smiles involve abandonment from the teachings of Marx, Lenin, and Engels, he deceives himself poorly. Those who wait for that must wait until a shrimp whistles."

**Tactics.** There has been, however, an unquestioned change in the tactics of the Soviets. Such changes are growth in contacts with foreign countries, difference in the tone of official propaganda, a lessening of bitterness in Soviet speeches at the United Nations, visits of Russian secret agents to our farms and our housing developments, soft-pedaling of Communist activities in Western nations, the un-godding of Stalin, and, finally, the confession on the part of Molotov that he had erred in saying that only the foundations of socialism had been built in the Soviet Union.

It cannot be denied that there has been a change in the strategy of the Soviets, and this strategy has manifested itself in an internal easement and an external appeasement. It remains now to inquire why the Soviets have changed their tactics, and now use the strategy of smiles.

The three principal reasons for the change in tactics are to be found chiefly within Russia itself.

1. **The desire for coexistence.** The real problem of coexistence is not between the Soviets and the Western World, but between the Soviets themselves. They will soon be celebrating the fortieth anniversary of the Revolution; looking back on what has happened to their Soviet leaders, they may well wonder if they will not, like monsters of the deep, devour one another.

The following is a list of those Soviet leaders who have been killed since 1917, not including Beria:

- 9 out of 11 cabinet members holding office in 1936
- 5 out of 7 of the last Central Executive Committee
- 43 out of 53 secretaries of the Central Communist Party organization
15 out of 27 of the top Communists who drafted the 1936 Constitution

70 out of 80 members of the Soviet War Council

3 out of every 5 marshals of the Soviet Army

All members of Lenin's first post-Bolshevik Politburo, except Stalin. (14)

Very few of the Communist leaders die a natural death. Because of this fear of liquidation which haunts Communist leaders, the change in tactics has produced what the Soviets call "collective authority." There is no longer a "Number One Man." (15)

No collective authority has endured before this. After Caesar died, collective authority did not last. The French revolutionists turned on one another; not even Marx and Bakunin could coexist, and, rather than see Bakunin build the First International, Marx killed it; collective authority did not exist when Lenin died, for Stalin, Trotsky, Zinoviev, Radek, Tomsky, Kamenev sparred and fought one another, until Stalin bombed himself to a proletariat throne. The New Yorker once carried a cartoon which characterized this mutual dread of Soviet leaders. About twelve pallbearers were carrying out a coffin to a Russian grave. One of the pallbearers turned to the other and said, "Who is in here? I was away last week." (16)

2. Revolution loses its fervor. All passions decrease with age except avarice and greed. In the mechanical order, machines wear out; in the order of human love, there is a weakening of the emotions; even in the spiritual order, saints have to be reminded to "stir up the first zeal"; and, in the political order, revolutionists slow down. (17)

Economic revolutionists transfer booty and loot from one man's pocket to another. Now that the Communist leaders are in possession of loot, they are settling down to a sophistication and to a love of pleasure. Stalin, whose name means "steel," is dead; Molotov, whose name means "hammer," has been found wrong. The hard things are perishing; the soft things are arising. No revolution ever achieves what it sets out to achieve. The Soviet Revolution began with the notion of "equality": there were to be no classes; there was a vicious condemnation of the bourgeois; there was to be a change in the great cleavage which existed before the Revolution between the upper and lower classes, the landed gentry and intelligentsia on the one hand, and the peasants on the other. Bolshevism destroyed this in theory, but it is now restoring it in practice by the cleavage between the Party members and the economically dispossessed. (18)
The revolutionists have also lost their love of equality. No longer does one hear of another revolutionist being called a "comrade." "Marshal" is the coveted title. The true but startling fact is that Communism, which started out to be a hatred of the bourgeois, is creating in Russia, for the first time, a bourgeois civilization. (19)

Montesquieu once said, "The republics end through luxury; the monarchies end through poverty," and we might add that dictatorships end through the luxury of its leaders and the poverty of the masses. (20)

3. Atomic bomb. Until the discovery of the atomic bomb, Russia had a weapon which none of the civilized nations of the world used, namely, a Fifth Column whose aim was to stir up revolution against law, order, tradition, and culture. Revolutionary forces in any nation, taking their orders from Moscow, created a potential danger to established law and order. But when the atomic bomb was discovered, it was possible now for, the so-called "enemy" of the Soviets, to have a power equal to or greater than the Soviets with their revolutionists and Fifth Columnists. The Soviets now see it is possible for the "enemy" to destroy them. For a while they said that because of the vastness of their empire they would not suffer as much from atomic bombing as other nations. Then they readily admitted that, because their government is more centralized, it is more capable of being dislocated and destroyed. Not because the Soviets had begun to recognize justice as the foundation of peace have they changed their tactics, but because of a fear about survival in case of war. (21)

In essence, the tactics of the Soviets have changed, but the philosophy has not. It would be very easy for the Soviets to convince the Western World that they have changed their philosophy. A true metanoia would exist if the Soviets would grant freedom to enslaved nations behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. As Heywood Broun once said, "Personally, I have no enthusiasm for organized jeering sections, but I hold that the spontaneous right of raspberry should be denied to no one." Self-determination of peoples is one of the basic rights of human nature; when the Soviets grant it, they will become part of a free world. (22)

Until then, let all the diplomats who sup with the Soviets use a long spoon. When the Soviets offer them the pipe of peace at the United Nations, let the diplomats watch, to be sure that they, too, are inhaling. Smiles must not always be accepted at their face value. As Shakespeare wrote in his Henry VI:

I can smile and murder while I smile,  
And cry "content" to that which grieves my heart  
And wet my cheeks with artificial tears  
And frame my face to all occasions. (23)
What then should be our attitude toward Russia? It should be exactly the attitude of Our Blessed Lord toward Judas, who changed his tactics but not his philosophy of life. At the very beginning of His public life, when the public would have made Our Lord a material king because He gave them bread, Judas was disappointed at the Saviour's emphasis on the spiritual. The Gospel said that Our Lord knew that Judas would betray Him, but this did not prevent the Saviour from walking with Judas, from sharing secrets, and even from inviting him to the supreme banquet of Love. Even when Judas reached the point where he used the tactic in the Garden, of a kiss, Our Blessed Lord said to him, "Friend, wilt thou betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" It was not just reproach; it was a plea not to use the sacred marks of friendship as a prostitution, but rather to be a true friend by change of mind and spirit. (24)

In like manner, though we know that the philosophy of Communism has no more changed than the intent of Judas, nevertheless we must carry on with the exchanges of friendship, we must sit down at conferences with them in the hope that, by calling them friends, they may avert their suicide and the suicide of the world. The peace of the world does not depend on the Soviet diplomats, who represent only 3 per cent of the population, who are members in the Communist Party, but on the 97 per cent who have no choice, no freedom, no party. The Russian people are good people, perhaps more like us in their good nature than any other people in the world. They do not want war with us, and we do not want war with them. It is wrong to think of them as Communists. In a police state, where secret police dominate, the people cannot freely express themselves. Not long ago we thought almost all of the people of Germany were Nazis, but when the terror of the Nazi leaders was destroyed, the people were found to be longing for a free voice in a free world. The people of Russia are no more Communists than the people of Germany were Nazis. Once the Soviet terror is destroyed, either through the self-annihilation of their leaders or by the slow fermentation of God's grace, the Russian people will be discovered not to have been Communists at all. They will be found to have prayed to the same God and hoped for the same freedom. (25)
APPENDIX E

THE LIFE AND CHARACTER OF LENIN
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Cartoonists often picture a revolutionist as uneducated, boorish, and sinister, with long hair hanging to his shoulders and the bomb in his hand. Such, however, is not the picture of the one who introduced one of the greatest revolutions in the world, Vladimir Ilyich Ulyanov (the name Lenin was one of many assumed to confuse the police) was a remarkable man. St. Paul said of himself: "Woe to me if I preach not the Gospel." Lenin said: "Woe to me, if I preach not revolution." With one single unremitting and un-deviating aim, amidst perils in the city and perils in the country, imprisonment, exile, and suffering, he succeeded in establishing a system which has brought 37 out of every 100 people in the world under the specter of the hammer and the sickle.  

First, he was normal. None of the three current ways of explaining character are applicable to him: the Freudian, the economic, or the revolutionary. It was not the Freudian, for there was no father complex, nor mother complex, nor any such fiction in his normal and healthy family life. Nor was it economic, for his family was of the bourgeois class and later of the titled nobility. His family was Orthodox in religion, though not conspicuously so. His father was an inspector of schools, his mother was the daughter of a doctor. Those who knew his parents say that never once was there any evidence of a quarrel in the family. There was no mal-adjusted childhood, no juvenile delinquency, no rebellion against parental authority, no poverty. The latter point is important, for the Marxist theory does not explain the Marxism of Lenin. He was not determined by economic circumstances of poverty to become a revolutionary.  

Vladimir was the third child, born on April 22, 1870, in the village of Simbirsk. When he was three years old, his father was given the title of "Excellency" and the privilege of hereditary nobility. Later on, Vladimir recorded himself as a member of the hereditary nobility. The principal of the school that he attended bore the name of Kerensky, and he had a son named Alexander. Both Lenin and Alexander went to the same school, breathed the same air, looked out on the horizons from the banks of the Volga, had exactly the same economic status and social standing; and yet the destiny of Russia was decided years later by Lenin seizing the Provisional Government, which was headed by his fellow townsman, Alexander Kerensky.
Second, Lenin in his nonrevolutionary activities was a kind, likable person. As a lad he once went hunting foxes; a fox appeared directly in front of him; he pointed his gun, but refused to shoot. Someone asked him why he did not shoot the fox, and his answer was: "It was so beautiful." He was devoted to his mother, corresponded regularly with her in terms of deep affection, and as a youth reported to her that he visited his sister's grave to see that the cross was still upright. Lenin was never given to debauchery; he was drunk only once in his life, and that was on beer. He was a husband of only one wife, faithful and devoted to the woman he loved, and though the union was never blessed with children, he and his wife had only one quarrel, and that was a short one, when Lenin forgot to post some letters he had in his pocket. While in exile, he wrote asking for some picture books which he wished to give the children of a family who befriended him.

Another outstanding quality of Lenin was an intellectual brilliance combined with extraordinary industry. He won the gold medal in his school for being the "best student." At the age of fifteen, he lost his faith, as did his older brother. As Lenin put it: "I threw the cross onto the dung heap." He later entered the University of Kazan, from which he was later expelled, but he continued to study law privately and again finished first in the examinations. He studied French and German until he mastered them, spent years in the libraries of Paris and London and Geneva; he specialized for two years in the philosophy of Kant, which interested the less revolutionary minds of Russia at the time. There are few men in public life who can look back on a record of study and industry comparable with that of Lenin.

The fourth characteristic of Lenin was his complete and total detachment from sordid gain. Though he came from a comparatively well-to-do family, his life was lived in voluntary poverty. He was satisfied with the poorest of quarters, with his wife acting as housekeeper, nurse, secretary. In London he selected the poorest area of the Whitechapel district, in which to dwell. He hated all pomp and display. Stalin could never understand, later on, why Lenin would never wait until all members of a group were present at a meeting before he would make his entrance. Lenin would be found first in the room, making conversation with anyone who happened to be near him. At the time of the Revolution, he chose the poorest rooms in the Smolny Palace, and gained nothing from the Revolution except a cap which his chauffeur stole from a passer-by when Lenin had lost his own. Outside of that, Lenin gained no material advantages from a revolution which made him master of all Russia. He protested against any deification of himself and warned against erecting monuments to him. His whole life was spent in acquiring knowledge, but for one definite purpose—revolutionary
action. He was interested in one thing only, the seizure of power, and how to organize that power when it was seized. (6)

Given these and other traits, it now remains to inquire how this intelligent and remarkable man ever became a revolutionist advocating the grossest kind of cruelty and tyranny. The answer is twofold:
1. Resentment
2. An ideology
The second is far more important than the first. (7)

Resentment. Lenin's older brother, by four years, Alexander, went to St. Petersburg to study chemistry. The atmosphere in the university was already charged with a crude kind of anarchism. A few years before, when Lenin was only eleven years of age, the Czar, Alexander II, was assassinated after six unsuccessful attempts by revolutionists. But the oppression of the people continued under Alexander III. Young Alexander united with a group of young revolutionists who attempted to take the life of Alexander III. He was later seized, forced to confess publicly, and finally was executed. Lenin afterward told his sister that it was no way to establish a revolution. "We shall get nowhere along this road; it is not the right one." Lenin was eighteen at the time of his brother's execution. This developed some resentment in Lenin, but what was equal to resentment against the Czar was his contempt of the Liberals of his home town, who refused to travel with his mother to witness the execution of her son. Liberals have always liked Lenin, but Lenin never liked Liberals. Later on, he said that Liberals could be used to prepare a revolution, but they also should be shot immediately after the Revolution. (8)

Ideology. Lenin was convinced after the death of his brother that individual terror in principle was "pedantic" and unrevolutionary. That which changed Lenin was the ideology of Karl Marx. At this particular time, there was raging in Russia a dispute between two ways of organizing Russia's future. One was that of the Narodniki, and the other, that of the Marxists; both were forms of Socialism. Narodnichestvo sometimes called Populism, was a kind of agrarian Socialism with great reference for the people, hence the word "Narod." Marx originally was a Narodnik. Later on, however, there fell into his hands the writings of an exiled Russian, George Plekhanov, who had been living in Switzerland since 1881. If there is any one man to whom Bolshevism owes its remote origins, outside of Karl Marx, it is Plekhanov. Plekhanov wrote: "In Russia, political freedom will be gained by the working class, or it will not exist at all." Plekhanov had already translated the Communist Manifesto of Marx into Russian in 1882, before it was published in England. (9)
In 1895, Lenin visited Plekhanov in Switzerland. Plekhanov convinced him that he should not turn his back upon the Liberals whom he hated, but rather use them to attain Marxist ends. Lenin said of Plekhanov: "I felt then that I had to do with the future chief of the Russian Revolution." After his return from several months' visit in France, Switzerland, and Germany, Lenin was put in prison for his revolutionary writings. What was extremely curious about the attitude of the Czarist government at that particular time was that, though they put him in prison for his subversive writings, nevertheless, they gave him every opportunity to do subversive writing. During imprisonment he wrote The Development of Capitalism in Russia. Later on, he was exiled to Siberia, but to its more pleasant lands, which he compared to Italy. He wrote to his mother, saying: "I have everything I need and even more than I need." His place of exile was actually not very far from what is today known as Tannu Tuva, which is the site of the Soviet's most secretly guarded "atomic city." (10)

Partly because he was a nobleman, he was given some courtesies; he engaged a furnished room at a peasant's cottage and had his laundry and mending done; had plenty of time for working on books; translated two volumes of The Theory and Practice of English Trade Unions by Sidney and Beatrice Webb. Later on, Krupskaya, a young woman whom he met before he went to visit Plekhanov, was sentenced to Siberia. Lenin asked if she might not be sent to the same place as himself. The authorities agreed, and Lenin and Krupskaya were married in Siberia. Before she came, in preparation for the wedding, he wrote to her to bring, not the things that most grooms would think about before marriage. She was to bring many revolutionary periodicals, a chess set, a pen wiper in order to save his coat lapel, grammars, dictionaries, and statistical reports. The first word that Krupskaya's mother said to Lenin when she arrived with her daughter was: "Gracious, how you've spread." Krupskaya and Lenin lived there for two years, but she had one more year to serve. Lenin never thought of remaining behind with her; the revolutionary movement was far more important. (11)

Once out of prison, Lenin was not only a revolutionist but a revolutionist against revolutionaries; he could tolerate no one who did not subscribe to his own views of Marx. He broke with Plekhanov, became involved in another dispute between the Mensheviks and the Bolsheviks. Both groups wished to establish Socialism in Russia. One believed in evolutionary democratic processes, the other in revolutionary processes of terror and violent seizure of property. Both claimed to be stems from the common parent of Marx. Lenin described the difference between the two as follows: "There is an apple hanging from a tree! The Mensheviks wait for it to fall; the Bolsheviks knock it down." Lenin always contended that the Marxist Revolution would be ushered in by bullets and not by ballots. (12)
In 1907, Lenin went to Switzerland and was in exile practically all of the time until after the outbreak of the Communist Revolution in Russia, in 1917. These ten years were spent studying, directing revolutionary activities in France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, and England.

At one time when Lenin and his wife were in London in the slums of Whitechapel, about five o'clock one morning there were three knocks at the door—the three knocks being the signal of a fellow revolutionist. Lenin opened the door and called to his wife: "Pero has arrived." Pero was Trotsky.

No one can understand Lenin without knowing the ideology that inspired him. As John Doyle O'Reilly put it: "The thinker lives forever, the toiler dies in a day." Carlyle also said: "God help the world when He lets loose a bad thinker." It is popularly believed that ideas do not matter; that everything depends on how we act. This forgets that we act on our ideas; ideas are dynamic; they are motors and springs of action. The idea is first; then the deed. Ideas do not long remain within the two covers of a textbook, nor within the four walls of a classroom; they are planted as seeds and later on grow as either cockle or wheat.

Lenin's greatness lay not in his creative originality of thought but in his ability to transmute an existing system of Karl Marx into a program of militant action. He had all the traits of a leader of a revolution: an absolute dogmatic faith in its doctrine, a bold sweep of tactical imagination, and a terrible relentlessness in executing his designs. The idea of Marx came first, then the Revolution of Lenin. As in Christianity, "In the beginning was the Word and the Word became flesh and dwelt amongst us," so in Communism: "In the beginning was Marx and Marx became Lenin and the revolution dwelt amongst us."

Marx alone explains the disparity between Lenin's individual character and his political actions. One wonders how a man as intelligent as Lenin and so kind to his wife and others, could be politically so cruel. The answer is the ideology of Marx. When a gangster is arrested for cutting a rival into bits and drowning him in a sack in the river, the gangster's wife is always quoted as saying: "But Bozo was always so good and gentle and kind." Yes, in his home relations, but outside his home his philosophy of life was "gangsterism."

Lenin took over from Marx the false principle that evil is social, not personal. All the injustices and wickedness in society are due to economic methods of production. Evil resides in classes, not in consciences. The two basic classes which cause evil are
property owners and religionists. Both alienate man from himself. Property alienates man from himself by making him the slave of an exploiter; religion alienates a man from himself by making him a slave of something non-existent; hence religion is an "opiate." It follows that, if man is ever to be restored to himself, private property must be destroyed and religion must be persecuted. (17)

Marx made evil reside in a class, particularly an economic and religious class. Obviously, then, the way to do away with evil is by expropriating the exploiters and persecuting the believers. (18)

The second principle which Lenin derived from Marx was that persons or individuals of and by themselves are worthless. In the animal kingdom, it is the species alone that matters. Nature is heedless of the lives of individuals so long as the species survive. But in the human order, it is not so. Each person has a sovereign individual value, "What doth it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" But for Marx, a person has no value unless he is a member of the revolutionary class. It is the herd, the class, which alone is important. Individuals or persons have no intrinsic value. Marx wrote that the belief in personal value was a silly postulate of Christianity, which teaches that every man has an immortal soul. (19)

Put these two principles together and you have terror, expropriation, violence, and persecution. What matters in the social order, then, is not the reformation of conscience, but the liquidation of classes. That is why Communism can survive only by what Brezinski has called "the Permanent Purge." (20)

The cruelty of Lenin was, therefore, ideological, dogmatic, doctrinal, metaphysical—it was not personal. It was not in his character; it was a principle to which he subscribed, not a part of his psychological make-up. It was never a question of whether or not he liked a person; it was a question as to whether that other person subscribed to his ideas. He was a social sadist, but in the name of Bolshevism. (21)

Lenin kept himself even from those influences which might have tempered his inherent cruelty. Speaking to Gorky of Beethoven, he said: "I know nothing more beautiful than the 'Appassionata'; I could hear it every day, it is marvelous, unearthly music. Every time I hear these notes, I think with pride and perhaps childlike naiveté that it is wonderful what man can accomplish, but I cannot listen to music often, it affects my nerves. I want to say amiable stupidities and stroke the heads of people who can create such beauty in filthy hell; but today is not the time to stroke people's heads. Today, hands descend to split skulls open, split them open ruthlessly." (22)
Lenin sent a message to the American workers, stating that "a half a million or a million victims" might be necessary to establish the Revolution. He then wrote to the Socialists, stating: "If there are wavering among the Socialists who came over to you, or among the petty bourgeoisie in regard to the dictatorship of the proletariat, suppress the wavering mercilessly; shooting is the proper fate of a coward in war." Gorky once asked him: "Is it only my imagination or do you feel pity for the people?" His answer was a frightful one. "For the intelligent ones, I am sorry," said Lenin.

In 1905, Lenin wrote: "A revolutionary army is needed because great historical questions can be solved only by violence and the organization of violence in a modern struggle is a military organization." He then told how a small minority could govern any majority. They need only possess three things: (1) Army. (2) Police. (3) A myth or an official legend which controls education, press, and the means of communication.

In regard to the masses, they are likened to beaters flushing out foxes in a fox hunt. From this principle came the idea of children spying on their parents. Lenin added that it is the hunter on horseback (secret police) who make the kill. The secret police, if not satisfied, may even turn and hunt down the flushers.

When Gorky came to him with petitions for the lives and liberties of intellectuals who had fallen into the hands of the Cheka, Lenin asked him: "With what foot-rule do you measure the number of necessary and superfluous blows in a battle?"

One of the most interesting conversations on this subject is recorded by Dr. Vladimir de Korstovetz, who was formerly a member of the Russian Imperial Foreign Office and who talked with Lenin in Geneva. Lenin said: "We will take Russia unawares and in a way unprecedented in history; we will turn it into a proving ground for Socialism, and ultimately for Communism. We will ultimately succeed, and we will put fear and terror into the hearts of our enemies." Korstovetz asked: "Fear and terror?"

Lenin answered: "Yes, they are our main weapons; besides under the influence of fear and terror applied on a grand scale, the human organism loses its balance and its bearings and becomes the best clay which can be molded into a monument of our future achievements. Fear, terror, jealousy, hunger, sex—all the primitive instincts of man—are our strong allies, and by using them in a systematic and organized manner the future will be ours. And when I say future, I mean it; a future in our lifetime."
Continuing, he said: "The Czar rules over Russia with 300
noblemen, they enforce their will on the masses—so why should I not
build up my own 'nobility' and succeed in enforcing my will on the
masses especially as it is for the benefit of future humanity. The
result will be 50 to 60 million killed. What are 50 or 60 million
people if they are sacrificed for the benefit of future humanity?
The price for such a future would be much higher than those millions
of worthless wreaths. These generations are worth nothing, they
are only cannon fodder for the experiment—a practical experiment
—which will bring humanity nearer to happiness.\footnote{29}

"I want new generations," he continued, "and I will mold
them in my own way. They will become 100 per cent Communist and
Communism will be for them a creed of fervent belief as well as
an immediate program of practical action."\footnote{30}

The, turning to the subject of Europe, he said: "We will
take good care not to shock those European masses, we will play up
to them and in the preliminary stages give them slogans that will
make their mouths water. Our slogans and promises will hold them
spellbound, so that their leaders will not dare speak against us,
lest they be stoned by the indignant masses. No doubt we will
bring in respites—and what attractive respites, but only in order
to \textit{reculer pour mieux sauter}.\footnote{31}

It is our aim here only to delineate the character of Lenin,
not to tell the story of Communism in Russia. But it should be
pointed out that Bolshevism owes its origin to the bad thinking of
the Western World. When Communism now persecutes the Western World
it is wholesaling the philosophy which we once retailed to them.\footnote{32}

The philosophy of Communism, which was the inspiration of
Lenin, is wholly German. It originated in the brain of Karl Marx,
who extracted it principally from the dialectics of Hegel and the
materialism of Feuerbach; its economics came from England, where
Marx lived a third of his life; its social theory came from France,
principally from Proudhon.\footnote{33}

Lenin himself was an exile in Europe from Russia from 1907
until 1917. The Revolution had already broken out against the
Kerensky government. One afternoon in March, 1917, Lenin was just
about to leave for the library after lunch. Krupskaya was washing
the dishes. The door opened, and someone shouted: "Have you heard
there is a revolution in Russia?" Lenin was then in Switzerland.\footnote{34}
The German generals, Ludendorff and Hoffman, in their anxiety to win Russia away from the Allies in the First World War, accepted a suggestion of the Marxist Martov that Lenin and others be shipped into Russia to further the Revolution. In a boxcar marked "extra-territorial," Lenin went to Russia, where there were in all only 40,000 Bolsheviks, and less than 15,000 in Petrograd. Later on, he left Russia briefly, returning again when Trotsky told him that he was master of Russia. Kerensky fled from Petrograd. Lenin called a meeting of the Central Committee. Few knew him. Looking over the crowd with his little Mongol eyes, he said: "We shall now proceed to construct the Socialist system."

Lenin's last battle was against his final enemy, God. He had ordered the public trials of Archbishop Cieplak and Monsignor Butkevitch. On Palm Sunday, Monsignor Butkevitch was condemned to a martyr's death; on Tuesday of that week, Lenin was struck with his final and wholly incapacitating stroke. Lenin was a corpse before Monsignor Butkevitch was murdered on Good Friday night in the cellar of notorious No. 11 Bolshaya Lubyanka.

The time was a few minutes past six in the evening of January 21, in the year 1924. Several men were in a room in the Kremlin as a message was tapped on the telegraph: "Lenin is dying." A few minutes later, an auto sled sped out across the city; in it were Stalin, Zinoviev, Kamenev, Kalinin, Bukharin, and Trotsky. Trotsky was then in the Caucasus. All night long this group was in conference over the body; there was only one who did not weep when Lenin died: that was Stalin.

Krupskaya read the last will and testament of Lenin: "Stalin is too rude, and this fault, entirely supportable in relations among us Communists, becomes insupportable in the Office of General Secretary. Therefore, I propose to the Comrades to remove Stalin from that position and appoint to it another man who in all respects differs from Stalin only in superiority—namely, more patient, more loyal, more polite and more attentive to Comrades, less capricious and so forth."

Stalin would have destroyed the testament had it not been for Lenin's wife. Though Stalin could not destroy the testament, he did destroy physically every man about whom Lenin wrote in his testament, and whom he regarded as the brains and conscience of the Party.

Karl Marx was buried in Highgate Cemetery in London, where a stone slab marks his grave; the ashes of Engels were sprinkled over the North Sea; the body of Trotsky, who was killed by an ice pick under orders from Stalin, now decays in Mexican soil; but a great monument, which Krupskaya hoped would never be erected, now holds the body of Lenin.
Death speaks to him in his tomb:

"Thou hast denied immortality, but thou dost give thyself immortality.

"It is not the immortality of the spirit, but the immortality of a cadaver stuffed with paraffin and wax.

"The soul which is the wick and oil have gone to God for judgment; what you exhibit is but the clay vessel without light or life.

"He boasted that he threw the cross onto the dung heap; but was not Job on the dung heap and restored?

"Was not the stone that was rejected made the everlasting cornerstone of the edifice of charity?"

One thinks of another revolutionist who loved the poor and was prepared to break off ties to expand charities. A youth who was accused by his father of stealing some bales of cotton, selling them and giving the proceeds to the poor. The youth was summoned by his father, Pietro Bernadone, before the court. Francis took the bag of money which he had destined for the poor, returned it, threw it at his father's feet, then took off his clothes piece by piece except one, and that was a hair shirt. He threw them all in a bundle at his father's feet and went out into the world absolutely poor. He saw himself just as silly as a fly on a windowpane. He could see the word "fool" or "revolutionist" written in fiery letters across the path as he walked the frozen ground between the frosty trees. From that day on he would be a revolutionist of the world. If Lenin had loved the poor in charity as he detested classes in hate, he might have been the St. Francis of the twentieth century.
END NOTES - APPENDICES


BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books


216


**Articles and Periodicals**

"Awaiting Confirmation," *Newsweek,* February 27, 1967, p. 64.


"Charity or Duplicity?" *Christian Century,* September 28, 1966, p. 1167.


"Sheen Converts Communist," *Life*, October 22, 1945, p. 44.


**Other Sources**

Interview with Archbishop Fulton J. Sheen, Columbus, Ohio; February 13, 1974.


Letter from The Honorable Clare Boothe Luce, July 2, 1974.
