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Introduction

To many voters, the words make the man. Many voters interpret the personality projected by a politician's speech as the candidate's real self. Since the age of Plato, speakers have manipulated this projected personality, called ethical image by rhetoricians, to favorably display good sense, good moral character, and good will towards the audience.

Since ethical image emerges from language rather than action, a crafty speaker can shape the words, the arguments—the rhetoric—of a speech to project a particular image, an image that may not correspond with the speaker's real self. Ethical image can create favorable impressions about a candidate's personality.

Conversely, the ethical image of a speech or body of speeches can elicit less than favorable impressions about a candidate's personality. Whether thoughtlessly neglected or cleverly orchestrated, ethical image emerges from speeches. Accurate or inaccurate, ethical image provides audiences a perception of personality.

Clearly, ethical image creates problems and possibilities for a speaker. What kind of image should I project? How do I achieve this image? And of course, is it moral to manipulate ethical image, to project less than an accurate
portrait of personality? Should I be myself?

For the voter, the problems are more profound. Which candidate should I choose? What is ethical image, and what is real self? How do I distinguish between the two? What is truth, and what is illusion?

In our age, the concept of ethical image wields tremendous power. Rhetorician Wayne C. Minnick claims that voters have increasingly selected candidates because of personality traits such as confidence and speaking prowess, reasons, he says, which "seem unrelated to... genuine fitness for office." Voters often base their political choices not on the issues or the qualifications of a candidate, but on the candidate's personality. In a time when politicians use advertising techniques and media saturation to sell themselves, the image of the candidate takes on added importance, for images bombard us. It is quite possible, perhaps likely, that voters base their selection of candidates not on actual personality, but on projected personality--on ethical image. Illusions can form the basis for choice.

But we need not fall prey to media saturation or to political image making. By scrutinizing its source, we can defuse the persuasive power of ethical image. By analyzing a politician's rhetoric, speakers and auditors alike can understand how words project personality: we can recognize why the projected image, the ethical image, attracts or repels
us. By explicating a candidate's words, we can begin to realize how those words help to shape perceptions of the person behind the speeches.

The speeches of Gary Hart afford us an appropriate subject for study. Since he is so new to the arena of national politics, time has not closed or widened the gap between his actions and his ethical image. Although politically active for over ten years, Hart burst upon the national political scene seemingly from nowhere during the 1984 Democratic campaign for President. People outside his home state of Colorado knew little about him. But his victory in the New Hampshire primary ended his obscurity. In a matter of days, the news media overwhelmed the American populace with pictures of Gary Hart, psychological profiles of the man behind the face, political analyses concerning his stand on issues, predictions about his future, interviews with the candidate—and of course, the words of Gary Hart. From all the media attention emerged an image of Hart the man, or rather a collage of images, some reflecting Hart's character, some the manipulative product of press kits—all connotative.

To determine Hart's composite ethical image, this paper will explicate ten speeches Hart has delivered during the years between 1975 and 1982. Five of the speeches concern topical issues such as big government, nuclear war, nuclear power, and our defense efforts. The remaining five Hart
delivered in praise of other people. These ten speeches, a representative cross section of Hart's rhetoric, reflect a consistent ethical image.

Before explicating the speeches, this paper will provide an overview of past scholarship on ethical image in order to establish a context for this work. Specifically, the overview will examine what scholars have said about the morality of rhetoric, the morality of rhetoricians, and ethical image.

In analyzing the speeches of Hart, this research uses a model of rhetorical analysis developed by James Kinneavy in *A Theory of Discourse*. While Kinneavy provides a comprehensive model for analyzing all facets of a speech, this paper will use his framework for explicating the three basic components of ethical image: good sense, good moral character, and good will towards the audience. Rather than discuss extrinsic factors influencing image, such as dress and smile, this research focuses on the rhetoric—the speeches themselves—to determine the source of Hart's ethical image.

In his speeches, Hart projects an ethical image centered on good sense and a rational approach to America's problems. In his deliberative addresses, speeches on topical issues, Hart often appears to his audience as a teacher, correcting misconceptions about the issues, or defining what he sees as the real issues beneath the surface problems. Hart
consistently suggests reforms in his speeches, reforms based on his ideas about the problems at hand. In addition to revealing the true nature of problems, Hart emphasizes his good sense by projecting knowledgeableness about the issues, confidence in his appraisal, and readiness to act. He also uses connotative language to stress his rationality.

His ceremonial speeches, in praise of others, project a similar ethical image, one centered on Hart's good sense. In these speeches, Hart admires qualities requiring the discipline and determination of a highly rational mind.

Overall, Hart projects the ethical image of a man of reason: knowledgeable, confident, objective, rational, and ready to act. He seems to value intellect and reasoning much more than compassion or warmth. The result is an unbalanced ethical image. His emphasis on rationality, coupled with his lack of emotion, his posturing as a teacher, and his failure to establish common ground, distance Hart from some of his audience. Rather than help him, Hart's ethical image works against him.
Survey of the Literature

In a sense, the rhetorical theories of the ancients and of Augustine can be seen as reactions to unethical rhetoric and unethical rhetoricians. These theorists all provide standards for the aspiring rhetorician to follow in order to develop as a speaker, though no two sets of standards are alike. But the theorists do share a common concern about the morality of rhetoric, the morality of rhetoricians, and ethical image.

Plato discusses image, although he doesn't isolate ethical image in his evaluation of rhetoric. Instead, he finds rhetoric to be entirely image and illusion. Since rhetoric and rhetoricians distort truth, both are condemned by Plato as immoral. Plato does define a "true" rhetoric, one containing a noble rhetoric and a noble rhetorician, but his definition is an ideal prized but rarely (if ever) attained.

More pragmatic than Plato, Aristotle approaches the rhetorical issues of morality and image objectively. Rhetoric itself is not good or evil, but an art that can be used to support either cause. Likewise, the rhetorician using the art can be either good or evil. More important than the morality of rhetoric and rhetorician is Aristotle's notion of ethical image. Aristotle describes ways an orator's
address can project an image of personality. Rather than condemn rhetoric, its practitioners, or the use of ethical image, Aristotle values the persuasive art and its users; he presents a comprehensive theory of rhetoric to help speakers find all the available means of persuasion, and to help audiences defend themselves against unethical rhetoricians. He views rhetoric and its practitioners more realistically than does the philosophical Plato.

The Roman concepts of ethical rhetoric, ethical rhetors, and ethical image evolve from the ideas of the Greek theorists. Quintilian believes that perfect rhetoric should support honor and justice. The perfect rhetorician is the "good man trained in speaking," good in the Roman sense of the word. Duty-bound to his family and state, Quintilian's good man places the welfare of the people above his own ambition and desires.

The Romans also expand the Aristotelian notion of ethical image. Quintilian fuses the image presented by oratory with the good man. Thus, rather than the words of a speech, the good man leading a virtuous life becomes the source of the ethical image.

The good man in Augustine's rhetorical theory is Christ, the extension of God. In fact, all eloquence, all virtue—everything good—emanates from God. Regarding the ethical
use of rhetoric, Augustine allows that the persuasive art can serve either good or evil purposes. While he condemns the evil pagan oratory, Augustine defends the Christian use of rhetoric to teach Christian values. The good rhetorician is in fact only an instrument of God, for according to Augustine, God is the source of all truth. Since the gospel is God's word, the gospel is truth; the Christian rhetorician merely dispenses truth.

Augustine's Christian speaker, functioning as a servant of truth, can employ rhetorical techniques to convince an audience of his morality, even though he lives a life of wickedness. He can use projected ethical image to deceive the audience. The image, more important than the man's life in creating ethical image, carries the work of God. The end, to Augustine, justifies the means.

Modern rhetoricians face the same issues that concerned the ancients. Many scholars, influenced by Plato and Quintilian, write in reaction to what they consider unethical rhetoric, or in reaction to the lamentable state of oratory. An ethical rhetoric, and ethical rhetoricians, much concern modern scholars, since they seek to provide ethical guidelines for aspiring rhetoricians. The notion of ethical image advanced by Aristotle interests them less than the ideal of training the ethical orator--the "good man trained in speaking." These scholars, notably Nilsen, Wallace, Weaver,
and Eubanks, demand a rhetoric founded firmly in value, in the good. Since the definition of good varies among these scholars, as does their conception of the "good man," no modern "good man" exactly resembles the good man Quintilian describes.

Image and illusion are central to Plato's conception of rhetoric. According to Plato, rhetoric uses images and illusions, flattery and manipulative appeals, to pander to the desires of the audience. Rhetoric, like the craft of cooking Plato compares it to, is "knavish, false, ignoble, / illiberal, working deceitfully by the help of lines and colors, ... making men affect a spurious beauty to the neglect of true beauty." Plato therefore condemns this "false rhetoric" in his Socratic dialogue Gorgias.

Plato's negative attitude towards rhetoric stems in part from his definition of truth. Since truth is a collection of standards existing in the minds of gods, concepts created by man are once removed from truth; paintings or words depicting man's creations are twice removed from truth. Because rhetoric deals with things at least twice removed from truth, Plato considers it "a pseudo-art of appearances rather than a vehicle for conveying truth" (Golden, p. 40).

According to Plato, rhetoricians, "mere enchanters of the soul, more interested in dazzling their audience than in instructing it," are equally as false as rhetoric,
concerned with images rather than reality. The means, the ends, and the practitioners of rhetoric are all unethical.

The Phaedrus, a later Platonic dialogue, outlines a "true" rhetoric, but one that can exist only if certain conditions are met. True rhetoric, defining key terms, dividing the subject with a specific audience in mind, is directed towards the soul. Whereas "false" rhetoric aims to please an audience, "true" rhetoric aims to promote what is good for them.

Unlike the deceitful "false" rhetorician, Plato's "true" rhetorician is a dialectician, a speaker who "uses language to teach and inspire, rather than conceal truth and value. . . . He is the conveyor and preserver of truth and morality" (Golden, p. 42). But as Everett Lee Hunt says:

> it is truth spelled with a capital T. It is not mere accuracy in the use of statistics, care in quoting history, fairness in the selection of examples. These things may be done by tradesmen. A knowledge of Truth is reserved for philosophers.

Hunt additionally evaluates Plato's "true" rhetoric:

> The theory as set forth in the Phaedrus may be accepted as a noble ideal, but no one up to that time had appeared who could approach its requirements. With the advancement of learning the theory recedes even farther into the realm of ideals.

The ethicality of rhetoric and of rhetoricians poses no
problem for Aristotle, the theorist who created the concept of ethical image. Indeed, he views rhetoric as neither good nor evil, but as an art that can be used in support of either cause. The immoral rhetorician can use the art for evil purposes; the good rhetorician can use rhetoric to uphold justice, to analyze all sides of a dispute, or to defend against the immoral rhetoric of others (Golden, p. 48).

Aristotle also defines the concept of ethical image:*

Persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible. We believe good men more fully and more readily than others: this is true generally whatever the question is, and absolutely true where exact certainty is impossible and opinions are divided. This kind of persuasion, like the others, should be achieved by what the speaker says, not by what people think of his character before he begins to speak.

Speakers can therefore project ethical image if by their arguments they seem intelligent, virtuous, and concerned about the needs and wants of their audience (Golden, p. 50). In other words, both moral and immoral rhetoricians

*Ethical image is called by various terms through the history of rhetoric, including ethos, ethical proof, ethical image, the ethical argument, and the argument from personality. In this paper I will use the term ethical image.
can project through their speech the image of an ethical person.

The Romans built upon the Aristotelian ideas about moral rhetoric, moral rhetoricians, and especially ethical image. To the Romans, oratory, concerning as it does justice and honor, exists solely to guide the audience towards what is right (Golden, p. 69). But the Romans, notably Quintilian, blurred the distinction between the ethical image projected by a speaker's words, and the real character of the speaker. Quintilian extends the concept of ethical image to include an orator's entire life. The ethical image projected by speech becomes only one portion of a speaker's entire ethical appeal. In Quintilian's terms, the rhetorician is "the good man trained in speaking."9

Intellectually astute, Quintilian's good man possesses a virtuous moral character, believes sincerely in the causes for which he argues, and sometimes uses unethical means (lies) if the purpose of the speech merits their use.10

Golden points out that the Roman meaning for "good" differs from the modern Western definition. To the Romans, "good" meant "dutiful service to family and state" (Golden, p. 70). Many later rhetoricians define the ideal speaker as "the good man trained in speaking," but their meaning of good deviates from Quintilian's original conception.

The Christian orator Augustine is the next major
rhetorician to discuss the morality of rhetoric and rhetoricians, as well as ethical image. His book, *On Christian Doctrine*, provides information to religious speakers on effective communication.

Augustine, like Aristotle, sees rhetoric as basically amoral. It can be used for good or for evil. He condemns "pagan" rhetoric, the showy entertainment emphasizing style and delivery, which flourished during and after the reign of the Caesars (Golden, pp. 81-82). But Augustine encourages Christian speakers to use rhetorical techniques to move their audiences to lead virtuous lives (Corbett, p. 604).

To Augustine, the Christian speaker, teacher of the "Divine Scripture," is the "defender of right faith and enemy of error," and "should both teach the good and extirpate the evil." Augustine doesn't approve of using unethical means in a speech. To him, there is no better argument than truth, because truth emanates from God, the source of all joy, eloquence, and goodness. Since he is an instrument of truth, the Christian speaker does not have to be the "good man" of Quintilian's phrase, nor does he have to believe sincerely what he preaches:

For he who speaks wisely and eloquently, but lives wickedly, may benefit many students, although, as it is written, he "is unprofitable to his own soul." Whence the Apostle also said, "Whether as a pretext, or in truth let Christ be preached."... the truth may be announced
not in truth, that is, evil and fallacious hearts may preach what is right and true.\footnote{13}

Augustine realized that immoral rhetoricians can use the persuasive art to preach moral virtues; skilled rhetoricians can manipulate rhetorical techniques, such as ethical appeal, to move audiences (Corbett, p. 604).

Augustine reverses the Roman fusion of man and image. He maintains the distinction between the two, emphasizing the persuasive power of the ethical image projected by speech.

It is the concept of image that initially provokes the writing of Thomas R. Nilsen, a modern rhetorical theorist. Nilsen reacts unfavorably to the unethical use of rhetoric and image in campaign oratory. To him, the use of advertising techniques to manufacture a candidate's image and ideas threatens democracy, because the distortions caused by these methods remove the sense of true dialogue from the democratic process.\footnote{14}

Rather than preserve modern rhetoric's emphasis on style and manipulation, Nilsen wants to restore rhetoric's ethical base. He seeks to train speakers to respect the means of persuasion, and to practice a rhetoric that encourages free speech. His conception of moral rhetoric—and moral rhetoricians—binds the persuasive art and its practitioners to the democratic process. The good rhetorician, using rhetoric to perpetuate the democratic process, should openly
encourage dialogue and debate, properly use legislative procedures and legal processes, and publicly define "rules of evidence" and "tests of reason." To promote free speech, the good rhetorician uses free speech ethically and responsibly. The responsible speaker bound to the democratic process fulfills Nilsen's concept of the "good man trained in speaking."

Karl Wallace also seeks to replace rhetoric's lost ethical base. In his early writing, he yokes his concept of good rhetoric and ethical rhetoricians to the wagon of democratic ideology. According to Wallace, the ideology of a political state determines the ethical ideas behind that state's rhetoric. To preserve free speech, we must preserve free culture. Therefore, Wallace advocates commitment to democratic ideals, to guarantee preservation of rhetoric and free speech. By supporting democratic ideals, rhetoricians can insure the survival of free speech, maintain the dialectical approach to negotiations, and nurture integrity and self-respect; rhetoric will "reflect the ultimate values of the political community."

Wallace's mature statement about ethical rhetoric, "The Substance of Rhetoric: Good Reasons," ties rhetoric less to democratic ideology than to ethics. In fact, the study of rhetoric and ethics overlap:
of most human talk and discussion, are assertions and statements that concern human behavior conduct. They are prompted by situations and contexts that present us with choices and that require us to respond with appropriate decisions and actions. Second, such statements are usually called judgments and appraisals. They reflect human interests and values, and the nature of value-judgments and the ways of justifying them are the special, technical, and the expert concern of ethics. Third, the appearance and use of value-judgments in practical discourse are the proper, although not the sole, concern of the theory and practice of rhetoric.

Rather than stress the form, the structure, the organization of speeches, Wallace believes rhetoricians should concentrate on the substance, the subject matter, the foundation of speeches. Since the subject and the style of speeches both require choices, rhetorical theory should evaluate those choices ("Good Reasons," p. 241).

To help the speaker ground rhetoric in substance, and to shift rhetoric towards his notion of ethical value, Wallace invents a modern set of topics based on ethical standards (the desirable, the obligatory, the praiseworthy/blameworthy, and their opposites). Each argument arising from these topics, guided by a speaker's ethical and moral judgments, is called a "good reason," a "statement offered in support of an ought proposition or value-judgment" (Good Reasons," p. 247).

Wallace's ethical rhetoric blends rhetoric and ethics to produce "good reasons." Orators should derive "good
reasons" from values such as justice, honor, and freedom, and from value-judgments arising from those values ("Good Reasons," p. 247). Moreover, the value-judgments should also have a rational base. Reasoning, whether by induction, deduction, generalization, causation, or correlation should validate the argument. Wallace further emphasizes that reasons which determine common practices are often based not on syllogisms, but on general principles, principles reflecting "the beliefs and conduct of the group" ("Good Reasons," p. 248). As Wallace says, "the concept of good reasons embraces both the substance and the processes of practical reason" ("Good Reasons," p. 248).

The rhetorician practicing Wallace's rhetoric of "good reasons" would have to be a good man, relying on ethical means and sound judgment to advance arguments. Wallace suggests that "good reasons" in fact should replace appeals such as ethical image, because the emphasis with "good reasons" is placed on the rationality and value of the arguments rather than the type of argument or method of appeal to be used ("Good Reasons," p. 249). With "good reasons," rhetoricians and rhetoric would not appeal to passion or pander to image, but would instead appeal to the reasoning ability of the audience. Rather than manipulative, Wallace's "good man" is direct, honest, and above all, rational.
Richard Weaver provides another perspective on ethical rhetoric and ethical rhetoricians. As Plato does, Weaver
detests unethical rhetoric; like his Greek predecessor,
Weaver juxtaposes false rhetoric and true rhetoric, calling
them "base" and "noble" respectively.

In Weaver's view, "base" rhetoric exploits people,
obfuscates truth, and ultimately seeks to limit under­
standing and prevent dialectic. "Noble" rhetoric, based
on dialectic, exposes truth. Indeed, rhetoric completes
dialectic by relating dialectical considerations to real
world situations. Rhetoric puts the results of contempla­
tion into action (Weaver, "Phaedrus," pp. 77-78).

Naturally, the rhetorician using Weaver's "noble"
rhetoric needs to be, in Quintilian's phrase, "a good
man," though Weaver doesn't define "good man" as duty­
bound to family and state. According to Weaver, the
good rhetorician is bound to a value system based on "truth"
and dialectic; he belongs to an elite group of people
who should know what is good for an audience. Weaver's
"good man" loves truth. His "dialectical perceptions
are consonant with a divine mind" (Weaver, "Phaedrus,"
p. 73).

In addition to being a philosopher, the good rhetorician
should envision both ethical and ideal actions resulting
from a speech. He should also consider any special circumstances faced by the audience, then select the best possible arguments for that audience.20

A speaker with "superior virtue, knowledge, or personal insight" can emerge as a leader if he or she blends those characteristics with rhetorical skill.21 But regardless of our degree of intelligence or amount of rhetorical skill, we are all rhetoricians, for each time we speak we try to influence others to accept our world view. We therefore all share the responsibility of speaking as "noble" orators, "good in . . . formed character and right in . . . ethical philosophy."22

A value system also forms the basis of Ralph T. Eubanks' conception of a moral rhetoric and moral rhetoricians. In fact, Eubanks thinks a rhetoric grounded in axiology can enable man to overcome the spiritual malaise of our age.23

Eubanks wants to restore humanism to rhetoric. He disapproves of rhetoric's current emphasis on stylistic concerns, favoring instead a rhetoric "in which knowledge is dominated by wisdom."24 Wisdom, the ability to make sound choices, requires reference to a value system.

Since value is the fundamental concept behind Eubanks' ethical theory of rhetoric, he takes great pains to define value completely. In Eubanks' theory, a true value is something desirable, as opposed to something desired. Values
are ideals, "not tied to any specific attitude, object, or situation, representing a person's beliefs about ideal modes of conduct and ideal terminal goals" (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues," p. 15). Ideal terminal goals include happiness, freedom, security, and the like, while ideal modes of conduct include the quest for beauty, compassion, and justice (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues," p. 16).

True values, never exhausted, act as standards to guide actions. They are commands, sanctions to measure individual actions and attitudes against. They imply obedience; they require commitment (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues," pp. 16-18).

Eubanks further distinguishes between two kinds of value—the "moral ought" and the "axiological ought." The "moral ought" concerns what is ethically right, while the "axiological ought" concerns what is good (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues, p. 19). Often the two kinds of value are in conflict. For example, it would be good to fall in love, but it wouldn't be right to fall in love with your neighbor's wife. According to Eubanks, rhetoric should attempt to satisfy the "dual demand" of the "moral ought" and the "axiological ought":

The ideal of prudentia, or "wise living," requires a synthetic view of moral conduct, a view that takes full account of the "demands" of both the good and the right. (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues," p. 20)

Eubanks grounds his humane rhetoric in the values that
have endured since the emergence of Western civilization: health, creativity, wisdom, love, freedom with justice, courage, and order (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues," p. 24). At the core of these values is belief in the "dignity and worth of the individual" (Eubanks, "Ax. Issues," p. 24).

Recent work by Eubanks focuses on the role of the rhetorician in his humane theory of rhetoric. More than a man of reason, Eubanks conceives of the "good man trained in speaking" as a "reasonable" man who uses wisdom morally and intellectually. The "reasonable" man weighs his "dual duty" to the "moral ought" and the "axiological ought"--the right and the good--then follows the moral imperative, even when doing so delays reaching the desired goal (Eubanks, "Reflections," p. 308). For example, it might be good for a person to sell a car, but it would be wrong to sell it without telling the buyer about the car's severe engine problems. To follow the moral imperative, the seller must either refrain from selling the car, or reveal the car's problems to the buyer.

To foster the growth of this renewed humane rhetoric, Eubanks provides practical guidelines for "reasonable" rhetoricians. They are responsible for nurturing through speech the civilizing values of a humane rhetoric (health, creativity, wisdom, love, freedom with justice, courage, and order). They should also speak directly and sincerely, avoiding deception and falseness (Eubanks, "Reflections," pp. 309-10).
Rhetoricians must be truthful, because untruthfulness "violates the very process by which wisdom is transmitted and knowledge generated" (Eubanks, "Reflections," p. 310).

In a sense, Eubanks attempts to define concretely what Weaver leaves abstract—a value system forming the basis for an ethical theory of rhetoric. Both men admonish orators to base persuasive acts on values, to use ethical means, and to be ethical speakers. Wallace and Nilsen do likewise. Although they call it different names—good reasons, dialectic, axiology—all of these rhetoricians sense a need in rhetoric for a foundation grounded in values. Though they use different labels, these scholars also argue for replicas of Quintilian's "good man trained in speaking," calling them speakers with good reasons, noble rhetoricians, or reasonable men.

As Plato did in his age, this group of modern rhetoricians writes in reaction to the unethical rhetoric of our age. By providing both experienced and inexperienced speakers a framework for developing rhetorical technique, a framework based on what is good and right, these scholars attempt to infuse the field of rhetoric and its practitioners with an ethical sense.

But is being a good man enough? The answer is yes and no. Certainly, using ethical means in persuasion, weighing the good and the right when making judgments and decisions, basing arguments on value and thought, trying to expose
truth--certainly all of these actions reflect the kind of leadership any community would cherish. But being ethically sound and using rational arguments won't help to persuade audiences of a speaker's leadership qualities unless the audience perceives the qualities. The good man, through words, must project the image of a good man. He must appear to be as qualified as he really is. An effective ethical image can help the good man attain a position from which he can work to better the lives of his countrymen. But an ineffective ethical image can deprive the same good man of the privilege of serving.

Many scholars study not the source of rhetoric, but rhetoric's end product--the speeches themselves. They read a speech much as critics "read" a painting or any other aesthetic object, to determine how its characteristics contribute to the overall meaning. Speeches themselves can serve as a Rosetta Stone, unlocking the source of an orator's ethical image. By examining an orator's addresses, scholars can determine if a speaker's speech "is so spoken as to make us think him credible," as Aristotle says.

Several recent studies focus on the ethical image of politicians, as revealed by analysis of their speeches. One study by Jerry E. Mandel examines the projected image of Charles Percy during the 1966 Senate campaign in Illinois, to determine if Percy's image was one of "high credibility,"
and to see if it contrasted that of his opponent. Though he had no legislative experience, Percy used his speeches to project the image of a problem-solver. Percy also stressed his trustworthiness and reliability by quoting the testimony of noteworthy officials supporting his proposals, and by making references in his oratory to his ability to act quickly and solve problems.

In a similar study, Richard E. Crable uncovers the source of Eisenhower's tremendous ethical image. Crable points out references in Eisenhower's speeches to his humility, notably to Ike's meagre farm-boy beginnings, to his identification with "ordinary soldiers," and to Eisenhower's humble portrayal of his role in World War Two. Crable also explicates references in Eisenhower's speeches to his being a "man of the nation," and a "healer of the nation's wounds."

Judith S. Trent and Jimmie D. Trent, in investigating George McGovern's actions and rhetoric during his 1972 Presidential campaign, find that in part McGovern failed as a candidate because he undermined his strong ethical image. McGovern initially emerged as a moral, intelligent man, resembling other Democratic Party leaders such as Truman, Stevenson, and Kennedy. But his constant revision of program proposals, his fickle alliances, and his about-face on the selection of Thomas Eagleton as his running mate all contributed to eroding his ethical image. McGovern's later harsh
attacks on Nixon (he compared him to Hitler, and called members of Nixon's administration "lackeys") further eroded an already damaged ethical image.32

Several recent articles address the rhetoric of Jimmy Carter. J. Louis Campbell identifies charismatic characteristics in Carter's rhetoric. According to Campbell, elements of charisma include divine inspiration, a sense of mission, and an image as an outsider.33 Campbell traces Carter's connection with divinity to the references to faith in his rhetoric, the personal testimony of noted political figures (Humphrey), and to over one hundred media articles attesting to Carter's spirituality.34 Carter's rhetoric also nurtured his image as an outsider on a mission. His speeches often included references to his being an "anti-politician" and "anti-Washington."35

Les Altenberg and Robert Cathcart examine the concept of human rights running through Carter's speeches. In his speeches, the authors find that Carter unites a series of themes under the symbolic and ambiguous term "human rights," to invest it with "the symbolic power of an ultimate term."36 Since "human rights" stands for so many things in Carter's rhetoric, accusations of evasiveness emerged; the authors contend that the ambiguous nature of the term caused the confusion of voters and resulted in Carter's loss of credibility.37
A study by John H. Patton reveals another of Carter's symbolic uses of language. According to Patton, Carter argues for a moral basis for politics, suggesting that Americans deserve moral leadership. Carter separates himself from the politicians in power by stressing his own moral qualities, emphasizing the moral qualities of the audience, and contrasting both with the ethical delusions caused by previous Republican administrations. By using his rhetoric to emphasize the moral bond they share, Carter offers the audience the chance to transcend the unethical government in power by electing their moral representative—Carter—to office. As Patton says, "we are urged symbolically to believe that a government of the people, in any essential sense, is not only possible but eminently desirable." One of the most comprehensive rhetorical analysts is James Kinneavy. He devotes over one hundred pages of his book A Theory of Discourse to analysis of the logical, organizational, and stylistic components of rhetoric. To demonstrate his analytical methods, Kinneavy performs a rhetorical analysis on Franklin Roosevelt's "First Inaugural Address."

Kinneavy explicates the logical, pathetic, and ethical arguments in Roosevelt's speech individually. He takes primarily an Aristotelian view of ethical image, finding it
an image projected by the speech itself. The ethical image "is not real personality, but personality projected as what Madison Avenue calls image."\(^2\)

According to Kinneavy, a discourse projects ethical image by displaying the speaker's good will, good sense, and good moral character. A speaker can establish good moral character, the most ethical part of the ethical image, if the speech itself shows the speaker to be sincere and trustworthy. The audience must believe the speaker will not deceive them (Kinneavy, p. 239). Corbett adds that good moral character is established by showing dislike for unscrupulous tactics (Corbett, p. 81).

To project good sense, the discourse must show the speaker to be knowledgeable, able to make practical decisions, and able to select the proper means to an end (Kinneavy, p. 239). The speaker must also seem confident and self-assured (Kinneavy, p. 239). Additionally, the logical arguments used in a speech reinforce the image of a speaker's good sense (Kinneavy, p. 239).

A speech projects good will towards an audience when through the words of a speech the speaker seems to share the same wants, cares, and feelings as the audience (Kinneavy, p. 239). The emotional arguments used in a speech complement the image of a speaker's good will (Kinneavy, p. 239).

Kinneavy examines Roosevelt's "First Inaugural Address"
to determine, among other things, the source of his ethical image as determined by the speech. Roosevelt emphasizes his moral character by referring several times in the speech to his candor, his honesty, the moral nature of his suggestions, and his disdain for the unethical practices of the previous administration (Kinneavy, p. 256).

To project his good sense, Roosevelt uses the speech to portray himself as a man of decision. Roosevelt aims to take immediate actions to put Americans back to work, control banking, encourage farmers, organize relief efforts, provide a sound money system, and live peacefully with our neighbors—he intends to lead the nation to economic and spiritual recovery (Kinneavy, p. 257). His references to urgency, his logical arguments, and the certainty in his statements also attest to Roosevelt's good sense (Kinneavy, p. 257).

Roosevelt emphasizes his good will towards his audience by displaying his sympathy for their wants and needs. He establishes a common ground between himself and his audience: their needs become Roosevelt's needs. His appeal to their sense of nationalism, his concern for their domestic problems, and his emphasis on the urgency for action to solve their problems all underscore his commitment to their future (Kinneavy, p. 258).

Kinneavy's study of ethical image provides a model for analysis, a model that can be applied to a body of speeches
to locate the source of a speaker's ethical image.

The following paper uses Kinneavy's approach to examine the ethical image of Gary Hart. His method is particularly well-suited to this research because it explicates the three Aristotelian components of ethical image projected by a speech. Kinneavy's method enables a researcher to isolate the linguistic source of good sense, good moral character, and good will in ethical image. Moreover, Kinneavy's method helps to evaluate the speech texts rather than the rhetorical situation. His method helps uncover the ethical image created by language.

The purpose of this study is two-fold. First, determining the source of image can help us understand how words can create impressions about speakers in the minds of an audience. Secondly, recognizing the source of ethical image can help speakers, or potential speakers, better understand why they project the image they do.
The ethical image projected by Hart in his deliberative speeches centers on his good sense—his knowledge of the issues, his pragmatic, rational approach, and his call to action. Knowledge of the issues forms the core of Hart's good sense. In each of these speeches, Hart presents carefully researched, well-reasoned positions on the issues he addresses. He orchestrates his ideas by dividing his analyses into component parts, by citing statistical evidence to back up his generalizations, and by alluding to his own rational, deliberate approach to the problems we face.

Hart further cultivates his good sense by creating contrasts in his speeches between his rational assessment of America's problems and the poorly reasoned or unreasoned ideas he opposes. To heighten the contrast between his positions and the positions he refutes, Hart uses connotative language to present opposing positions unfavorably. Like foils in a play, the contrast in these speeches between poorly reasoned positions and Hart's soundly reasoned ones makes Hart's ideas appear even more rational in relief.

Hart uses his good sense as a platform from which to instruct his audiences about the real issues he sees beneath the surface problems. These speeches—sermons of pragmatism—identify what Hart considers misguided or mistaken ways of seeing or solving our problems. Through his good sense,
Hart teaches us the real problem of big government, the best way to plan for our defense, the meaning of the accident at Three Mile Island, and the real issues we have to face to ease the threat of nuclear holocaust. The real issues exposed and defined, the speeches then propose reforms, better ways of seeing and handling the problems based on Hart's ideas. With these speeches, Hart attempts to reform attitudes about the subjects addressed.

The other two components of ethical image, good moral character and good will towards the audience, grow from Hart's good sense. By casting opposing positions in unfavorable terms, then contrasting those positions with his own objective appraisals, Hart simultaneously shows himself to be truthful and scrupulous. Since he addresses issues affecting the American public, the subject matter of the speeches provides some common ground between Hart and his audience. But he erodes the small common ground by posturing as a teacher/reformer, by constantly maligning attitudes and actions contrary to his own, and by failing to project humor, warmth, or emotion in his speeches. Although Hart bases his speeches on good sense and research--on rationality--his lack of emotion and his consistently superior stance cause him to project an unbalanced ethical image.
Big Government: Real or Imaginary--April 20, 1976

In this speech, delivered in Denver before the Western Electronic Manufacturer's Association, Hart projects an ethical image based on good sense. By dissecting the mammoth big government into component parts, then cutting the component parts into even smaller pieces, Hart shows his knowledge of government size, shape, function, and spending patterns.

Contrary to those who believe big government to be growing, Hart notes that the number of federal employees has remained close to five million for the past twenty-three years. He finds the federal payroll relatively unchanged too, actually declining from around sixteen percent of the federal budget in 1950 to thirteen percent in 1975.

Hart further displays his knowledge of federal bureaucracy by thoroughly analyzing government functions and government spending. He determines that most government employees work in the Department of Defense, with the Postal Service, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of the Treasury being the only other large government agencies. In fact, unlike the critics of expanding bureaucracy, Hart realizes that government has grown not at the federal level, but at the state and local level.

Hart also knows that government spending has remained relatively constant. After adjusting for inflation, economic
and population growth, he finds the percentage of government spending of the gross national product to have remained steady from 1952 until 1973. Although the percentages fluctuate from year to year, the proportion of "economic output consumed by the federal government" has remained the same. 43

Hart underscores his knowledge about government spending by dissecting it, to determine where the money goes. According to Hart, the defense has received a "progressively smaller slice" of the federal budget. Actually, "federal spending priorities have shifted, from defense to income security and medical assistance for the elderly," a shift that may account for inaccurate views on federal government growth (since spending on social programs is more visible to the public than defense spending).

Hart also knows the real reason why people assume taxes to be increasing. Although the tax rate has remained almost unchanged for the past twenty years, Hart discloses that the "tax burden" has moved from business to individuals, perhaps resulting in the mistaken perception of a higher tax rate.

To reinforce his knowledge of federal bureaucracy, Hart emphasizes his objective examination of big government, thereby underscoring his image of good sense. He seems to look beyond commonly held beliefs about bureaucracy, and
instead closely scrutinizes the nature of big government to render a valid judgment. According to Hart, by "slicing through the rhetoric about bureaucracy, we find some simple and down-to-earth facts that reflect a clear national consensus."

To begin his inquiry into federal bureaucracy, Hart "starts at ground zero" with "a close look at the size and shape of federal bureaucracy." Since the "vague" term federal bureaucracy lacks "any precise meaning," Hart decides to "look at what federal employees really do." Providing statistical evidence about the functions of government employees "cuts the bureaucracy down to size and gives us a little feel for what federal employees really do." Hart also decides to "take a quick look at what ... state and local employees are actually doing," to better define state and local bureaucracy. The statistics he quotes to verify the growth of state and local governments "should clearly illustrate the trend." Furthermore, the place of growth, state and local school systems, "makes sense," because education became an American priority during the 1960s.

Hart also draws attention to his rational assessment of government spending. He declares "it is only reasonable to take a hard look at government spending." This reasonable, hard look requires adjusting statistics for inflation and economic growth, in order to present "an honest examination."
Federal budgets, like federal size and spending, can also be brought "down to earth," since the large billion dollar figures "lack real meaning." Failure to distinguish between the different sources of tax revenue "blurs the fact that the burden of taxes has shifted from business to the individual."

Hart accents his thorough analysis of government size, shape, spending, and tax collection with references to his deliberate investigation of federal bureaucracy. He further enhances his image of good sense by contrasting his "valid" appraisal of big government with the misconceived ideas of most critics of bureaucracy. Hart's use of charged language makes his positions appear honest and accurate, while making opposing arguments appear specious and inaccurate. The first two paragraphs of the speech set up this opposition between Hart and the inaccurate critics:

It is time to come to grips with what is popularly called "Big Government." It is certainly no secret that public officials have detected rising public disillusionment with big government. Big government, the "mess" in Washington, and the "Washington establishment" have all become major themes of presidential candidates. I decided to start at ground zero and appraise just what has happened to big government over the last ten or so years.

The federal bureaucracy is the element of big government most frequently the topic of cocktail party abuse and campaign rhetoric. It is widely assumed to grow at an alarming rate and expand to control every aspect of our lives. I have seen figures, as you probably have, showing
agencies of government being constantly created, but virtually never being abolished. So I decided to begin my inquiry into big government with a close look at the size and shape of federal bureaucracy.

Hart describes opponents to his position unfavorably. "Public disillusionment" about what is "popularly called big government" has taken the form of "cocktail party abuse" and "campaign rhetoric"; "figures" document the limitless growth of bureaucracy, which is "widely assumed." Hart, the man of action, decides to "come to grips" with big government.

Throughout this address, Hart continually corrects inaccurate perceptions of big government. Critics of the ever-growing number of government agencies "omit the important fact that government agencies are also cut back." To Hart, the idea that federal employees are overpaid is "unfortunately no more valid than the myth of the constantly growing bureaucracy." "Figures," inaccurately interpreted statistics measuring government spending, "do not reflect reality" or "create a false impression." Hart refutes the "figures" with what he calls "statistically sound measurements" or "statistically verified facts." Popular criticisms of the growing size, spending, and taxation of federal bureaucracy Hart calls "popular villains."

Hart's speech, "statistically verified," shows that the "three popular villains of big government"—growing size,
increased spending, and increased taxation—are in fact "largely mythical." Hart's emphasis is on statistics, on bringing federal bureaucracy "down-to-earth," on cutting it "down to size," to "give you a more direct feel for the dimensions of that vague entity called the federal government." But he actually creates a speech debunking common conceptions of federal government, leaving only one accurate view of the bureaucracy—his. By exposing the error in common attitudes about bureaucracy, by revealing his researched conception of big government in contrast to "invalid" appraisals, and by noting that government is not growing out of control, Hart creates a vacuum, for he has explained away most criticisms of bureaucratic growth. But Hart has an ulterior motive. He intends to fill that vacuum with his idea of big government's real problem:

Once erroneous charges against big government are put in perspective, we can begin to zero in on what is left. We definitely have a problem with big government, but it is not simply a problem of size or spending or taxes.

The real problem is "inflated expectations," believing "the myth that it [government] can solve every problem and meet every challenge." The real problem with big government resides not in Washington, but in the attitudes of the people. Hart teaches us the true nature of bureaucracy in order to reform attitudes about the characteristics of
government, and about expectations from government.

The last five paragraphs of the speech posit Hart's final lesson for the audience, a lesson in austerity. Our nation must "learn to live within limits." Rather than expect government to solve all problems, we must "limit our expectations." Hart counters the ill-advised slogans such as "win the war on poverty" and "whip inflation" with his own slogan, "learning to live within limits," six times in the last seventeen statements of his speech, to emphasize his point. Hart also includes the maxim-like "Let us raise our spirits but limit our expectations." In addition to his slogan and maxim, Hart includes his detailed definition of what "learning to live within limits" requires.

Hart's image of good moral character, implied more than explicit, stems from his good sense. True, Hart mentions his "honest appraisal," his speaking "frankly," but it is his approach to the problem that validates his honesty. Hart appears to have gone to considerable length to present an honest examination, researching bureaucracy thoroughly, correcting commonly held beliefs, and moreover, ignoring those beliefs to dig deeper, to get at the real truth. By contrasting his rational approach with the invalid measures he sees, Hart seems to rebuke misguided appraisals in favor of his soundly-documented, "even-keeled" judgment. In a very real sense, his image of moral character comes from
his rational argument, and the way he orchestrates it.

Hart's image of good will towards the audience results from the subject of his address. By selecting the topic of big government, Hart shows a common concern with the audience about the problems of federal bureaucracy. This small common ground, however, is eroded by Hart's continuous rebuttal of all positions save his own. In this address, there is only one accurate estimation of big government, the one belonging to Hart.

Furthermore, Hart appears cold and aloof. Only in one short section of the speech, near the middle, does he appeal to heartfelt emotion, and this appeal requires reform as well. Hart asks the audience to restrain their expectations of government in order to restore humanity to our nation. When they rely on government programs, "people are stripped of their humanity to fit cold definitions of program categories." According to Hart, "what we need are citizens and human beings." Other than in this isolated instance, which asks people to be citizens as well as human beings, Hart appeals only to more deliberative, rational virtues requiring re-straint and sacrifice. He implicitly asks the audience to reform their perceptions of big government, then Hart explicit-ly requests that they change their attitudes about government. Hart implores the audience to become diligent citizens.
The Meaning of Three Mile Island—May 8, 1979

With this address to the National Press Club in Washington, Hart directly plays the role of teacher. He examines the "meaning" of the incident at Three Mile Island, a "meaning" which consists of five basic "lessons." The lessons are in fact reforms in attitudes on energy issues that Hart attributes to the nuclear accident at Three Mile Island. In Hart's speech, the incident is less a catastrophe than a revelation.

Hart establishes good sense, the core of his ethical image, by searching beneath the surface of the nuclear accident for lessons, then dissecting each lesson into its component parts. The "lessons" concern a wide range of effects generated by the incident at the ill-fated plant.

The first lesson, that nuclear accidents can happen, contradicts nuclear experts who failed to predict or prepare for an accident like the one at Three Mile Island. Hart says that no report, probability studies or computer codes predicted the possibility of an accident like the one at the ill-fated plant. Hart further demonstrates his knowledge of the nuclear accident by dividing the event into twelve stages easily understandable even to laymen. The "complex" series of events, perplexing and frightening to the nuclear operators, resulted in disagreements over both what was happening and what to do about it. According to Hart, this
was a "Class 9 accident--meaning that the reactor was not designed to prevent it or contain it."

From the accident itself, the second "lesson" emerges: the nuclear debate has expanded to include ordinary Americans. No longer a "dialogue of the deaf" between "zealous supporters and opponents of nuclear energy," the accident at Three Mile Island has involved everyone.

The third "lesson" resulting from the accident is that our "institutions" are now on trial. The Presidency, Congress, regulatory agencies, the nuclear industry itself, and the press, all facing the real possibility of nuclear accidents, must now deal responsibly with the problems of nuclear energy.

Hart's fourth "lesson" asserts that America is in fact dependent on nuclear energy now, and will depend on it more in the future. He says, "we can't have it both ways--we can't have our energy extravagant lifestyle and do without nuclear energy now or in the future." To document his assertion and lend it credence, Hart quotes not one but three sources of statistics on future energy needs: the nuclear industry, the Department of Energy, and the Council on Environmental Quality. All three sets of statistics show the future need for "the continued operation of all nuclear plants already built and operation of all 94 plants for which construction permits have been issues," even with the
most minimal growth of future energy demands. Hart realizes that we need nuclear energy production. As he says, "unless Americans are willing to undertake drastic revisions in lifestyle, demands for immediate rejection of nuclear energy seem . . . at best misinformed and at worst misleading."

Hart's fifth "lesson" concerns the cost of nuclear energy. According to Hart, "the economic equation on which nuclear energy is based must be recalculated"; "upon that recalculation . . . rests the answer to the question of nuclear energy." Hart refutes nuclear energy experts who claim the cost efficiency of nuclear power by showing how repair and clean-up costs for nuclear accidents can require more than the savings generated by using nuclear power.

The cost issue is further complicated by the lack of appropriate waste disposal. According to Hart, the price of waste disposal "was never anticipated or factored into the economic justification for nuclear power."

To emphasize the knowledgeableness displayed by his "lessons," Hart sprinkles allusions to his rational, common-sense approach throughout the speech. His capsulized account of the nuclear accident is "based on the facts as we know them." Twice Hart refers to statistics documenting our dependence on nuclear energy as the "energy facts of life." He can't judge the future of nuclear energy until the "investigation is completed" and "sober judgments rendered."
The nuclear accident demands a "reassessment" of nuclear energy, but one which "cannot be carried out overnight." As Hart says, "There are no easy answers." Yet we can learn from Three Mile Island.

Since the nuclear energy issues are to Hart "critical," he claims that his committee work investigating the accident "takes on special meaning." Hart then divides the functions and goals of the committee into ten stages, reemphasizing his command of the situation.

Hart also underscores his objectivity by contrasting his ideas with the misconceived ideas of others, though he doesn't use this strategy here to the degree he does in other speeches. He shows the experts who failed to predict an accident like the one at Three Mile Island to be mistaken. He debunks popular ideas about the supplemental nature of nuclear power with three sets of statistics, which also expose the weakness of arguments to halt nuclear power production. By showing the exorbitant expense of cleaning up a nuclear accident, Hart contradicts nuclear energy officials who claim that nuclear power is "cost effective."

Knowledge and good sense provide the basis for a series reforms Hart calls for at the end of the speech. While a thorough evaluation of nuclear power will take time, some action is needed now:
Federal action to deal with the most serious aspects of the Three Mile Island accident, and of nuclear power development generally, cannot await the outcome of this and other inquiries. There are fundamental reforms that should be undertaken or given serious consideration prior to completion of our work.

The nine reforms concern safety. Specifically, these nine reforms require closer monitoring of the nuclear industry by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Hart also requests definitions concerning the authority and liability of both government and industry in the event of a nuclear accident.

The last six paragraphs of the address appeal not for government reforms, but for reforms in people's attitudes about nuclear energy. To assess the future of nuclear energy, citizens must reconsider their "definition of the quality of life," decide "what constitutes acceptable risks to our society," examine "fundamental values," and define "the nature of . . . moral obligation to future generations."

Hart implies the image of good moral character as a function of his logical arguments. He seems to look beyond the "easy answers" to expose the truth beneath the surface. Certainly the breakdown of so many areas of thought—the accident scenario, the list of "lessons," the detailed reforms—suggests an honest appraisal. Hart's quoting of statistics also underscores his honesty, for he supplies the authority of not one but three sets of figures to document his position.
Hart projects good will towards the audience through his topic choice. His concern for the problems and hazards of nuclear energy production puts him on common ground with the audience, for the subject area relates directly to their future, and their safety. Hart explicitly asserts his common ground with audience when he says, near the end of the speech, "We all live in Harrisburg," the site of the Three Mile Island plant.

Yet even with a common bond established between speaker and audience, Hart still distances himself from some auditors by playing the role of teacher. The relationship between Hart and the audience is as that of teacher and student. Hart reveals "meaning" in the form of "lessons" that we learn from and act upon. He instructs the audience on reforms to be made, in actions and attitudes. Though the concerns of speaker and audience are similar, Hart clearly has a superior grasp on the issues in question. Moreover, he does little to expand the emotional common ground between himself and the audience. The speech is devoid of both humor and warmth.

Speech delivered to the National War College--July 23, 1980

In this speech on defense, addressed to the National War College, Hart delivers a lecture on how America should provide for defense. The motive behind this speech is reform
in attitudes about the "defense debate," reform of America's defense policies and plans. The ethical image projected by Hart in this speech forms around his good sense, specifically his knowledge of defense issues, his pragmatic approach, and his call to action. To make his new ideas on defense appear more rational, Hart portrays traditional ideas about defense unfavorably. He then juxtaposes these negatively connoted positions with his own enlightened observations. The difference appears to be between poorly thought out traditional policies and Hart's logical, systematic new ones.

Hart uses the speech to present a comprehensive, cohesive defense plan to satisfy America's need for a consistent defense program. Hart's ideas are designed to revitalize our "inadequate" defense debate. He clusters several negative references to America's current defense policy in the speech's opening paragraphs to create a context for his new ideas.

According to Hart, dealing with both "familiar" and "unfamiliar" enemies is complicated "by internal problems we inherited from the 1970s and before." He calls current security plans a "vacuum . . . filled with a variety of unsatisfactory substitutes for consistent policy." Some Americans, suffering from what Hart labels "remnant reflexes of Vietnam," no longer distinguish between "threats and
opportunities." The bulk of the problem resides, however, in "invalid arguments about defense issues." Hart calls arguments to raise or cut defense spending "a gravely inadequate debate." Across-the-board increases in defense spending are "indiscriminate"; "they make no more sense than indiscriminate efforts to cut military spending." All spending is ineffective unless it goes for the "right things."

To fill the need for a comprehensive defense policy, Hart proposes "our real task": to find "a basis for determining just what 'better' really is. We need a basis for establishing some priorities in defense."

The rest of the speech details Hart's defense priorities. His policy is in fact a series of reforms in contrast to traditional thinking about defense. Although Hart calls creating a sound defense policy "a very difficult task--one of the most awesome challenges of the 1980s," he proposes "three ideas which I believe hold some promise in filling this national security vacuum." Hart appears to know what we need.

First, he proposes to control Soviet expansionism not just in the traditional, direct fashion, but "indirectly," by supporting countries that "independently choose" to reject Soviet expansion.

In tandem with an indirect approach to Soviet expansion, Hart recommends "an increased maritime strategy." This
strategy, explained in a document issued earlier by Hart and Senator Robert Taft, "might move us from the policy void of recent years and . . . might help redefine our defense debates."

Hart's third suggestion "fits with the other two. We should re-think our doctrine of warfare." To replace the traditional "firepower/attrition" style of warfare, with its goal of inflicting more damage and casualties than it receives, Hart suggests "maneuver warfare," with its goal of disrupting "the enemy's vital cohesion." According to Hart, since our present economy isn't as easily converted to producing war materials as it was during World War II, maneuver warfare might provide our defense with flexibility and the quick action needed to combat a rapid Soviet assault.

Hart enhances his knowledge of the issues and his researched ideas with allusions to his reasonable judgments. His ideas won't completely fill the "void" of defense policy, but they can offer consistency:

They can help us redefine the terms of the defense debate. They can give our defense planning coherence. They offer one logically integrated conception of what is better in defense.

His ideas on defense will "put priorities on certain qualities which we should seek to incorporate in our forces." Hart elaborates on four priorities, reforms in opposition
to traditional concepts on defense.

First, we should design weapons to "implement" our military concepts and doctrine, not vice versa. Rather than jump on the technological bandwagon, we should develop weapons consistent with our overall strategy. Second, we must plan for combat readiness. As Hart sees it, sophisticated weapons demand more funds for maintenance than has been spent. To restore the readiness that has suffered as a result, Hart recommends that we re-budget for maintenance. Additionally, Hart suggests we "re-think our fascination with technological complexity." Rather than buy more complex arms, Hart thinks we should buy weapons that perform with "greater simplicity, and therefore greater reliability and maintainability." Hart's third reform involves buying enough equipment, and the right kinds. Fourth, Hart believes we should exploit technology to force our enemies to keep pace with our rapidly changing armed forces. This will force our adversaries to spend for obsolete weapons and equipment.

Although Hart acknowledges that his ideas will cost money, he asserts that "we will be spending for effectiveness. And, by setting logical priorities, we will be able to reduce funding in some areas while increasing it in others."

Hart's address is less a speech than a sermon, teaching the audience the real needs we must meet in order to provide for a sound defense. Rather than lessons to be learned,
there are judgments to be made, reassessments about what we should do to maintain defense. The speech contains over twenty appeals for reform of attitudes and actions, in order to replace old concepts about defense with Hart's new ones. To redefine the defense debate, we should "re-think our doctrine of warfare," "re-think our fascination with technological complexity," re-think "our defense strategy, force structure, and military doctrine." In keeping with his role of instructor, Hart includes nineteen uses of the imperative words "should" and "must," further underscoring the need for reform.

However, developing a consistent defense strategy, regardless of the number of innovations make, will fail unless we make one more, basic reform: "we must re-unite our country." Hart isolates the right way to re-unite our nation by contrasting it with the wrong way. He says "we should not anticipate, or desire, a consensus built around obsolete concepts, concepts likely to fail the acid test of conflict." Instead, we must seek common ground. Yet Hart implies that the common ground is around his ideas, ideas he proposes in this speech:

This is the fundamental challenge of the 1980's—to reunite ourselves around fresh, viable, logical ideas about defense.

Hart's image of good moral character springs out of
his speech's development. His thorough analysis of the problems of defense policy, and his rational proposals towards providing for a sound defense show Hart unwilling to accept easy answers; indeed, he digs beneath the surface of the defense issues to uncover our true needs.

His image of good will grows out of the topic of the speech. His audience, the National War College, would probably enjoy a discussion of defense strategies. And with the implied larger audience, Hart shares a common concern for America's defense. But as we have seen before, Hart does little to establish much common ground between himself and his audience. He strikes no common chord of warmth with his auditors. No views save his own are shown to have any credence. Rather than seek the common ground he encourages the audience to accept, Hart suggests that the common ground be around his ideas. Movement towards common ground applies not to Hart, but to his audience.

Speech on Nuclear War--November 11, 1981

This speech, delivered at Cornell University, is one of Hart's more stylized addresses. In the manner of Roosevelt and Kennedy, Hart includes ten instances of anaphora in this speech (the repetition of a word or group of words at the beginning of successive clauses or sentences: "the Lord giveth, and the Lord taketh away."). Eight of the ten uses
lend emotional emphasis to the first half of the speech, the part portraying the potential horror of nuclear war.

But underneath the stylistics, the same Hart mannerisms emerge. His ethical image centers on good sense, and knowledge forms the basis of that good sense. Hart knows the dangers of nuclear war. To stress this point, he quotes an authority on war, General Douglas McArthur, who laments the horror and tragedy of nuclear weapons. Hart also describes what a nuclear attack might cause: "tens of millions dead," millions more "severely burned," inadequate medical facilities, "millions more blinded, wandering sightless in a post-attack world, simply because they looked up when the first flash came."46

Hart realizes that political leaders have not dealt with the threat of nuclear war. He implies that some of our leaders think a nuclear war is winnable. Compounding that problem, more and more nations possess nuclear capabilities, increasing the risk of nuclear arms use. Moreover, perpetuating the arms race between the superpowers does not deter other nations from building nuclear weapons, according to Hart, nor does continued weapons testing, the stockpiling of weapons, or the selling of nuclear material to nations capable of converting it into nuclear arms.

To prevent the dangers of nuclear war, and to address problems in preventing it, Hart advances reforms in attitudes
about nuclear war. The reforms show Hart confident in his judgments, and ready to act on his decisions. Rather than refuse to negotiate, we need to limit the size of nuclear arsenals. According to Hart, unilateral disarmament might elicit "dangerous miscalculations by nations we seek to deter," so we must maintain a small quantity of nuclear weapons. He says, "the very terror and certainty of these weapons is necessary to prevent their use." Rather than separate the two, Hart next argues to consider the spread of nuclear arms around the world as part of the arms race between the superpowers, for we cannot expect restraint from other nations unless we use restraint ourselves.

Hart next poses "common-sense steps" to reform government positions on nuclear war. Each step, divided into smaller parts, stresses Hart's command of the issues. The reforms Hart posits for government positions are essentially the same as the reforms in attitudes he calls for earlier in the speech.

The Senator enhances his knowledgeable image by contrasting his arguments with unfavorably connotated opposing arguments. The contrast makes his arguments appear even more reasonable. The first few lines of the speech establish erroneous attitudes about nuclear war:

I am honored to be part of this nationwide convocation on the prevention of nuclear war. There is no more important issue before our society. For nearly forty years, nuclear weapons have
posed the gravest threat to our society; today, they are becoming an immediate threat to our survival.

For nearly forty years, nuclear weapons have had the power to render war unthinkable; today, there are those who think about a limited nuclear war—and think it can be won.

For nearly forty years, our nation has sought to lead the world away from the abyss of nuclear war; today, we have managed—incredibly—to cast aside that sense of purpose.

Today there are almost no constraints on the nuclear arms race between the superpowers. The spread of nuclear weapons worldwide is unchecked. And major governments lack the will to pull us back from the edge of nuclear abyss.

Later in the speech, Hart asserts that some of our nation's leaders believe "fantasies of a limited nuclear war." While our leaders fantasize about nuclear attack, leaders of other nations dream "nightmares" about nuclear war. Additionally, an "ultimate nuclear nightmare" confronts us—the threat of nuclear terrorism, "not nation making war on nation, but an isolated terrorist group imposing its will on the world."

People who refuse to think about nuclear holocaust are as wrong as dreamers of nuclear nightmares, for they "entrust our survival" to people less than capable of sound decisions: to "think-tank theoreticians with pocket-size bomb damage calculators," to those "who believe nuclear war would merely throw our economy back to the 1920s," and to leaders "who believe that limited nuclear war can be fought and won—and who might act on that belief."
Hart also rejects the ideas of those who believe nuclear war to be impossible, calling their ideas "sheer arrogance":

It is sheer arrogance to believe the United States and Soviet Union can increase their nuclear forces beyond any rational level, and still expect other nations to forego these weapons themselves.

It is sheer arrogance to talk of exploding a nuclear bomb as a demonstration of strength, and expect our allies and adversaries not to be concerned.

It is sheer arrogance to believe that arms can be piled on arms without consequence--this on a globe where once distant countries are today's neighbors, where the weapons we have today will be the weapons others have tomorrow.

It is sheer arrogance to believe we can promote the spread of nuclear materials around the globe and not one day see the Fifth Horseman of nuclear terrorism ride upon some American or European or Israeli city.

All this is sheer arrogance and it is dangerous arrogance.

Hart counters each of these unsound positions with his objective, deliberate approach. Current policies concerning nuclear war are "incompatible with the security of America; they are incompatible with the dream of America; and they are incompatible with the survival of America." The concept of limited nuclear war is "an attempt to rationalize insanity."

The combination of Hart's detailed arguments, his allusions to his rationality, and his confidence in his judgment neatly contrast the image he paints of the arrogance of those who don't believe nuclear war to be possible, who fantasize
about limited nuclear war, who dream nightmares about it, who through believing in limited nuclear war, "attempt to rationalize insanity." Hart's good sense is a deliberate foil to the misdirected, mistaken efforts of others, and the gap between his image and the others enhances Hart's good sense.

To reform attitudes of "sheer arrogance," Hart proposes we "banish three pervasive errors" concerning nuclear arms. With these reforms, Hart intends to replace what he considers inaction or wrong action with right action.

Not only is action needed, it is needed immediately. Hart says, "it is time to wake those who believe nuclear war simply can never happen"; "it is time to reawaken our leaders to their most solemn responsibility--the prevention of nuclear war"; "it is time to apply the full strength of our nation to the byzantine nuclear threat." Any pause in renewing arms talks is "too long to wait"; "it's time--now--to resume arms negotiations." Further delays in serious discussion "squander[ing] the brief moments left to prevent the further spread of nuclear arms." While the calls for action project Hart's good sense, they also contrast the inaction and wrong action of government leaders.

Hart's image of moral character grows from his good sense too. He looks beyond simple answers. In preventing nuclear holocaust, as he says, "the simple truth is that
there is no simple plan." The contrast of his ideas in this speech with unfavorably connotated, opposing ideas projects an aura of honesty around Hart's arguments; he seems to be searching beneath the surface of problems to expose the real problems, in order to advance real solutions.

Hart's good will towards the audience stems from the subject of the speech. The first line of the speech, "I am honored to be a part of this nationwide convocation on the prevention of nuclear war," establishes a common ground between Hart and the audience. They share the desire to prevent nuclear arms use. But Hart sets himself apart from the audience, too. He accepts no position on any nuclear war issue save his own. He portrays opposition viewpoints negatively. He argues to completely reform his opposition's attitudes in the image of his own appraisal. Hart also fails to set up any emotional common ground between himself and his auditors. His speech lacks warmth and humor.

Emergency Farm Bill Speech—March 26, 1976

Hart delivered this speech on the floor of the Senate in support of the Emergency Farm Bill, a bill to guarantee farmers financial aid if needed in the coming year. Typically, Hart's ethical image forms around his good sense, specifically his knowledge of the situation, and his call for action.

Showing his knowledge of agricultural life, Hart dissects
the problems of farmers, then charges his description with suggestive language to stress the severity of farm life. Indeed, insecurity seems to form an inescapable part of that life. Grain farmers contend with "astronomically" rising costs, "to the point where many farmers cannot make an adequate profit to stay in business." Shortages of fuel, fertilizer, and other basic necessities all contribute to the "specter of uncertainty." Hart says he has never seen such "insecurity." The problems of farmers, notably rising costs and unstable crop sizes, have been "further exacerbated by the ravages of inflation and shortages." According to Hart, the people growing "our amber waves of grain" face a "rough and an uncertain voyage into the future."

Dairy farmers and beef producers shoulder equally heavy burdens. They suffer "high feed grain costs," "skyrocketing costs of production and depressed cattle prices." Hart tells us that due to the growing number of bankruptcy cases, the "small dairy farmer" has almost been "wiped out." Excessive beef imports have caused our beef producers to suffer a market of "severe competition."

Hart also realizes that agriculture has received little attention from federal government. The first two paragraphs of the speech set up this theme of inaction:

Mr. President, I urge my distinguished colleagues gathered here today to give a strong vote of
approval for H. R. 4296 as reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It is also my hope that President Ford will pay close attention to the statement of the House and Senate in reporting this legislation and will forego the anticipated veto of this crucial measure.

I strongly support this legislation. Action is long overdue on providing adequate assurances to the agricultural community that Government policies are being designed to help and not hurt this vital part of our economy. For too long we have taken the abundant wealth provided by the greatest agricultural producing system for granted. The 20-some-odd years of price stability for the consumer have lulled us into complacency in regard to the growing needs of our food suppliers.

Hart later claims that "agriculture has not received the attention it deserves," and that ignoring their work or their needs "is at the peril of our future."

Hart recognizes that government policies regarding agriculture hamper farmers more than inaction. Farmers need to know "Government policies are being designed to help and not hurt this vital part of our economy." The production capacity of American farms, jeopardized by dwindling numbers of farmers, will be further jeopardized "if we fail to develop a strong food policy." Agricultural production plans have been thwarted by vacillating "Government export policies." The restrictive trade policies of the Ford administration have hurt wheat growers. Negotiations restricting beef imports, actually raising the amount of beef that can be imported, are to Hart "grossly insensitive" and
"indefensible." "Import policies at the expense of our domestic industries is intolerable," he adds. In fact, by maintaining a high ceiling on beef imports, the State Department shows that their "concern for the twelve nations exporting meat to the United States is greater than that for domestic producers." Hart further implies a comparison between inaction or misguided action and the lazy grasshopper of the grasshopper/ant fable, the grasshopper that didn't plan for the future.

In opposition to the inaction and inconsistent actions of previous legislators, Hart appears in the speech as a man of action--the right action--support of the farmers. Like the ants in the fable, we must take "every precaution" to secure our future. The speech contains nine other appeals to the action of passing this bill. As Hart says, "This nation can only lose from inaction and misdirected farm policies."

The contrast of Hart's call for action with inaction and wrong action accents the rationality of his arguments. Hart supports a definite, stabilizing action rather than inaction or worse, a vacillating action. Hart additionally underscores the farmers' need for this bill by juxtaposing sixteen references to the strength, support, and stability this legislation would provide with ten references to the insecurity and uncertainty farmers now face. The needy
farm community also contrasts the lack of support government has previously shown to farmers. To make his point clearer, Hart creates yet another contrast.

Hart's arguments subtly equate non-support of this bill (and the agricultural community) with a lack of citizenship, and a lack of vision. If we don't provide "assurances" for dairy farmers, "we may be forced to turn to foreign markets to meet our needs for this high protein staple of the American diet."

The strategic and economic implications," Hart says, "are obvious." The failure of an insecure agricultural industry to lure young people into its ranks "heralds a tragedy for our country because the future of these young people relates directly to the future of our Nation and its economic security." American farmers, the backbone of our economy, "will play an increasingly important role in our future and in the future of the world." But mismanagement, inaction, or misguided action "will have drastic repercussions in the not too distant future."

The topic and the arguments provide the basis for Hart's image of good moral character. His austere portrait of agricultural life reveals his admiration for the virtue of hard work. Hart also projects a sense of fair play in this speech. He argues for passing the farm bill not because of its utility or pragmatism, but because it will right a wrong.

Hart does and doesn't project good will towards his
audience in this speech. As in other addresses, Hart creates opposing positions here, then tries to persuade those holding the opposing views to move towards his position. The Senators opposing this bill for one reason or another are cast into opposing camps, supporting wrong action or inaction; this speech attempts to move them to Hart's position—support of this "right" bill. But rather than identify with his initial audience, the Senators, Hart directly opposes their ideas. He criticizes past and present government policies, equates non-support of this bill with non-citizenship, and casts himself as a sort of middleman, ironically, between the farmer and the government of which he is a part. Hart establishes little common ground between himself and his fellow Senators. This is standard in Hart's rhetoric.

The unusual thing in this speech is the overwhelming emotional plea, and Hart's total identification with one of the opposing camps he creates, the farmers. By dissecting the problems of their work, by opposing the inaction and wrong action of past legislators, and by vehemently supporting the bill, Hart identifies strongly with their camp. This alignment with one of the opposing camps, so unlike most of Hart's other speeches, results from Hart's support in this address of a group of people rather than a group of concepts. The speech persuades towards action to aid real people, not change ideas or attitudes. The support of people, explicit
in this speech, gives this address an emotional richness lacking in Hart's other rhetoric.
Analysis of the Ceremonial Speeches

These ceremonial addresses, like Hart's deliberative speeches, project the ethical image of a cerebral, reasoning man. Of the five speeches included in this section, four praise other people, and one Hart delivers in acceptance of an award for environmental leadership.

The address accepting the environmental leadership award closely resembles Hart's deliberative speeches, for Hart uses the speech to teach the audience about errors in environmental attitudes, and to suggest remedies for these wrong ideas.

The other four speeches, in praise of others, can be used as a yardstick to measure what traits Hart finds admirable in others. As Hart says in his tribute to Mike Mansfield, "We all reveal ourselves most clearly in the words we choose for others." Not surprisingly, Hart's ceremonial addresses applaud virtues such as honesty, hard work, self-sacrifice, and the capacity to adapt—virtues that require the discipline and rigor of an intelligent, reasoning mind. The more emotional qualities such as compassion, empathy, and love are unmentioned. Rather than help Hart project a more rounded image, these speeches confirm the extremely rational, less than emotional image found in the deliberative speeches.
Tribute to Mike Mansfield--September 16, 1976

Hart projects ethical image in this speech by showing respect for virtue and disdain for unethical tactics. He displays both simultaneously here by contrasting the valueless, hostile environment unfavorably with the virtuous career of Senator Mike Mansfield. Hart creates the contrast immediately:

Mr. President, we live in an age when honesty seems out of fashion. I do not believe this to be true. But even if it were, Senator Mansfield would go down as one of the last honest men.

All around us now scandal has raised public attention before honesty. The arrogance of a few is treated as the rule, and old-fashioned virtue truly goes unwarranted.

But Senator Mansfield is living proof that power need not corrupt. He is further proof that power need not rob us of our humanity.48

In addition to being honest in a dishonest world, Mansfield is also a scrupulous politician. In contrast to the "generally held belief" that aspirations to power are accompanied by political "deals" and "daggars in the back," Mansfield has never "resorted to the knife or the deal to pursue his goal. The phrase 'get even' is not even a part of his vocabulary."

Hart praises not only Mansfield's ethical behavior, but his soft-spoken manner, his patience, and the way he "conserves his anger," all attributes requiring a disciplined mind.
If, as Hart says towards the end of this very short speech, "we all reveal ourselves most clearly in the words we choose for others," then Hart clearly wants to project his own integrity, honesty, patience, and slowness to anger.

Although Hart finally mentions Mansfield's "good heart from which the laughter came" (actually a quote from Mansfield's eulogy for John Kennedy), the emphasis in this address is on more cerebral qualities--honesty, patience, directness, integrity--the qualities a man of reason and discipline would possess.

Tribute to Olympic Athletes--July 30, 1980

In this speech, delivered on the Capitol's west steps to Olympic athletes, Hart's ethical image is based on the admiration of virtue. Hart additionally identifies with the action taken by the athletes, the decision to pursue a goal, regardless of potential costs.

Hart begins his address with a quote from John Kennedy, which lends authority and eloquence to the speech:

Almost twenty years ago, John F. Kennedy said: "There are risks and costs to a program of action. But they are far less than the long-range risks and costs of comfortable inaction."

Those of you here today to receive Congressional medals have taken the risks and accepted the costs of a program of action. You have denied yourselves the pleasures of an easy life, and accepted adversity as a challenge to be met.
In their action of pursuing excellence, the athletes have practiced self-denial, overcome adversity, "defeated apathy, indecision, aimlessness." Hart praises their talent, their self-discipline, "the long hours of training with no glory in sight," and their commitment. Hart also admires their courage and strength "for having pushed back the boundaries of your lives and added to your personal freedom."

More than their self-discipline and hard work, Hart praises the model they exhibit for all Americans to follow:

At a time when America's ability to meet enormous challenges, our commitment to excellence, our strength and courage as a nation are being tested, you prove we have it within us to be exceptional.

At a time when apathy and comfort test our commitment to goals beyond immediate gratification, when avoidance of difficulties threatens to become a way of life, your bright talent and gritty determination are a torch for all of us to see, and light a path toward excellence for all of us to follow.

Hart's speech provides yet another example of contrasts, this time between aimlessness, laziness, the desire for immediate gratification, and the "gritty determination," self-sacrifice, and commitment of the Olympic athletes. The disciplined approach to life taken by the athletes should supply an example for all of us. Clearly, Hart values the self-discipline, sacrifice, and determination more than their alternatives. Moreover, the values Hart emphasizes most in this address are the virtues requiring discipline and
self-denial in the face of temptation. They are attributes steeped in reason.

Tribute to Senator George McGovern--December 30, 1980

As in the Mansfield speech, Hart projects with this address a respect for virtue and integrity with his praise for Senator George McGovern, his old boss. Hart salutes McGovern's hard work, commitment to principle, and deep concern for humanity by describing many of McGovern's achievements.

McGovern is a virtuous man devoted to the American people. He "has always been a passionate, articulate spokesman for basic American ideals." His efforts have insured "an adequate diet for the poor and elderly, and for the improved health of all Americans."

McGovern has championed the underprivileged. He "brought the needs of the disadvantaged groups who lack political power to the attention of Congress." He toiled to alleviate the "severe malnutrition problems ... among infants and children in the poorer sections of our major cities and in rural poverty regions." He supported the small American farmer in times of need to assure their survival.

McGovern is scrupulous and virtuous in his ideas and actions. Hart details McGovern's dedication to the "people of South Dakota and America." Moreover, McGovern never
abandoned his beliefs, "although at times it would have been politically prudent to do so." Even though, as Hart says, "it is sometimes said that high ideals and practical politics do not mix," McGovern has always had "commitment to principle."

But the characteristic of McGovern Hart praises most is hard work. In this short speech, Hart includes six references to the hard work and effort of McGovern, more than to any other single trait. McGovern has worked in the Senate for eighteen years, was "a dedicated public servant long before that," and has always worked for America's disadvantaged. McGovern "labored tirelessly to assure an adequate diet for the poor and elderly," and "worked hard" as chairman of the Democratic Party's reform commission. Hart ends his speech calling for more Senators like McGovern—"dedicated, principled men with the foresight and fortitude to make courageous political judgments and successfully work for human concerns."

The address shows Hart admiring McGovern's moral stance, his vision, and his stamina in the light of adversity. Even though Hart does stress McGovern's humanitarian side, Hart equally respects the more disciplined characteristics of McGovern's personality: diligence, hard work, sacrifice, and idealism.
Tribute to Franklin D. Roosevelt--January 28, 1982

On the anniversary of Roosevelt's hundredth birthday, Hart delivered this speech in the Senate. The remarkable thing about this eight paragraph speech is the kinds of attributes Hart chooses to admire in Roosevelt.

Many people view Roosevelt as an icon for the compassionate politician, championing the causes of the common man, sympathizing with their lot. There exists a wide common ground between Roosevelt and the common man. As James Kinneavy says, "the broad emotional appeal of Roosevelt to the common man of America . . . probably contributed heavily to the fixed idea in this century that the Democratic Party is the party of the common man" (Kinneavy, p. 258).

Hart uses this tribute to admire Roosevelt's virtues, but Hart doesn't mention Roosevelt's compassion or empathy for the common man. Instead, Hart praises Roosevelt's pragmatism, his ability to adapt, and his belief in action.

The state of the Union at the time of Roosevelt's inaugural speech demanded a strong leader. According to Hart, Roosevelt responded to a depressed economy and a depressed populace by using "creative ideas over rigid ideology":

Roosevelt's leadership combined flexibility with a solid sense of what was right. Perhaps that mixture was the key to his achievements. A sense of adventure tempered by a deep belief
in his responsibility to fellow human beings. Willingness to admit fault and resistance to dogma or rigid structure left him open to experimentation. F. D. R. was never afraid to try anything new. But sheer experimentation for the sake of it was not what he valued. F. D. R. did not see experimentation as an end in itself, and never lost sight of the desired solution to whatever problem he was confronting.

Hart also praises Roosevelt's "extraordinary capacity for adaptation, innovation, and flexibility," as well as his "unfailing confidence, humor, and strength."

While Hart mentions Roosevelt's "sense of what was right," and his "deep belief in his responsibility to fellow human beings," this is a far cry from admiring Roosevelt's emotional ties with his constituency. Indeed, as Hart words it, Roosevelt had a deep belief in his responsibility rather than a deep belief or concern for the people.

Moreover, Hart emphasizes in this speech attributes of Roosevelt that can be applied to the ethical image of Hart himself: the capacity for change, the resistance to dogma, and a belief in innovation. The picture Hart paints of Roosevelt is one of a rational man who takes action, but action tempered by thought. It is exactly the same image Hart projects in his deliberative speeches.

Speech Accepting the Environmental Leadership Award--October 9, 1979

As with the deliberative speeches, Hart projects the
image of a teacher and reformer with this address, delivered in acceptance of the annual environmental leadership award presented by Pollution Engineering Magazine. In the speech, Hart exposes mistaken attitudes concerning environmental protection, then enumerates a series of reforms to advance environmental protection.

Hart knows the situation. After two decades of efforts to protect the environment, the status of environmentalism is, in Hart's terms, "at a crossroads." Environmental issues which fostered "public health issues" during the 1970s are now in danger of becoming "the victims of the 1980s." Even though public support for environmental protection laws is still high, some people desire a reduction in environmental programs, and more emphasis placed on "energy development and economic progress."

Hart argues a position in contrast to those wanting continued environmental protection at all costs, and also in contrast to those favoring reduced protection and more economic growth:

These goals—economic development and environmental protection—need not be in conflict. And the challenge of the 1980's will be to achieve these goals without sacrificing our environmental goals—and public health and safety—in the process.

Rather than forfeit efforts to preserve the environment, Hart suggests that we need to reform the way we approach our
goals. We need to continue environmental protection so we won't "sacrifice our responsibility to future generations," because there is still work to be done. Showing his typical command of the issues, Hart provides statistics revealing that "only one of the nation's 105 largest cities has healthy air," and that "visibility has declined 10 to 40 percent across the nation." Additionally, there still exists no acceptable way to dispose of nuclear waste, no way to deal "with the horrors of chemical waste leaking into our food and water supplies."

The concluding third of this address proposes Hart's ideas on reforming attitudes towards pollution and environmentalism, based on the knowledge he exposes here. Our government and our citizens need to work harder to control pollution. Hart recommends that "we must avoid the arbitrary and false alternatives--jobs versus livable environment, energy production versus clean air, industrial progress versus preservation of our national heritage." Hart also stresses our responsibility to future generations, and for the environment we "will" them.

Hart transforms the acceptance of this award into a soapbox on which to teach the true state of environmentalism, and to suggest reforms in attitudes and actions in order to preserve environmental gains and perpetuate our work. Hart uses his authority as winner of this award to instruct the
public about the continuing need for environmental protection.

As with his deliberative speeches, Hart seeks to provide an honest judgment of environmentalism, thereby projecting his good moral character. The image of good will, suggested by the content of the address, shows Hart sharing the concerns of many Americans about the environment. His stance as a teacher and reformer, together with his position at a remove from other positions, distances him from some of his audience, and at the same time, displays his objective appraisal of the situation.
Conclusion

A consistent ethical image emerges from the body of Gary Hart's speeches. His is the image of a man who weighs the issues on the scales of reason. In a sense, his deliberative addresses resemble dialogues about the nation's concerns, for in each of these speeches he examines both his own and alternative answers to the problems we face. Invariably, Hart finds the arguments he opposes lacking the considerable thought and scrutiny he applies to his own positions. He therefore presents his audiences with a series of reforms based upon his knowledge, his research, and his deliberate evaluation.

Hart's image of good sense dominates the other two components of ethical image, though his good moral character is more pronounced than his good will towards the audience. Knowledge forms the core of his good sense, a knowledge that recalls the work of modern rhetorician Karl Wallace. Wallace thinks rhetoric should be based on "good reasons," on statements supporting ought positions, but grounded in thorough, deliberate, rational thought.

Good reasons saturate Hart's deliberative addresses. His speech on big government, for example, is the fruit of much research into the actual size, shape, function, spending patterns, and tax structure of the federal bureaucracy.
The address on defense reveals a similar level of research. Hart is knowledgeable enough to co-author a document on defense policies, confidently discuss different styles of warfare, expose shortcomings of our defense policies, and extend detailed technical reforms to establish priorities in defense spending.

In his discussion of nuclear war, showing knowledge of the situation, Hart factors in all of the components influencing the dilemma we face. He describes potential effects of nuclear fallout. He notes that nuclear weapons have spread around the world, with no controls existing to limit their number. The arms race continues to escalate. Inadequate responses to the situation include refusing to consider nuclear war, believing a nuclear war winnable, and fantasizing about nuclear nightmares.

Hart's address on nuclear power, equally knowledgeable as the other speeches, provides a detailed scenario of the accident at Three Mile Island. He evaluates in detail a series of lessons resulting from the unfortunate accident. Hart suggests several specific reforms in the way we control nuclear energy, and in the way we think about it, all based on his statistics, his deliberations, and on his committee's investigation of the nuclear accident.

Hart's argument results from good reasons, from carefully researching the issues, then assessing the mix of thought and
research objectively. Quoting statistics and the authority of world leaders, for example quoting General Douglas McArthur on nuclear war, lends credence to Hart's good reasons.

Although the good reasons forming the core of Hart's image of good sense are not themselves illusions, they do create an image. By providing research findings, by quoting authority, by bringing complex concepts like bureaucracy and nuclear power down to earth, and by commanding enough knowledge to divide both problems and solutions into tiny component parts, Hart projects an aura of knowledgeableness. His judgments bespeak a man with good sense.

Hart enhances this image of good sense with connotative language, the use of contrast, and with his calls for action. Each of the deliberative speeches (and one ceremonial address) contrast one or more unfavorable connotated positions with Hart's favorably drawn arguments. In the speech on the Emergency Farm Bill, for example, Hart and the "insecure" farmers oppose Senators and the American public who haven't supported agriculture in the past, or who have supported agriculture but with inconsistent policies. In the speech on big government, Hart reveals carefully researched, statistically verified arguments to oppose the "cocktail party abuse" and "campaign rhetoric" of unfair critics of bureaucracy. In the address on nuclear power, it's Hart against the nuclear power industry, ineffective government programs,
and misinformed segments of the general public. On defense priorities, Hart opposes experts on defense as well as government officials who haven't developed a cohesive defense strategy. In the nuclear war speech, Hart contradicts almost anyone who doesn't see the issues exactly as he does: those refusing to think about nuclear war, those dreaming fantasies or nightmares about it, those ignoring the possibility of it, those not working to prevent it, and those opposing his specific calls for action.

The juxtaposition of these negative assessments of opposing positions and Hart's sound, rational ideas creates a context drawing attention to the reasonableness of his judgments. As in a play or a novel, the positions he opposes act as a foil to his ideas, making his reasoned attitudes and proposals look better because they contrast unsound positions.

Hart's allusions in his speeches to his own rational judgments add another layer to his image of good sense. In the deliberative speeches, he makes several references to the facts, to his common sense, to his "even-keeled" approach, and to being "reasonable." He brings big government "down-to-earth," cuts it "down-to-size," in order to show what government really does. He exposes the "meaning" behind the accident at Three Mile Island in a series of "lessons," and reveals "pervasive errors" in our policies on nuclear arms.
Hart defines the "real task" for providing for defense, enumerates "common-sense" steps to extend peace efforts, and in the address on nuclear power, details "the energy facts of life."

Hart continually calls for action. Congress needs to pass the Emergency Farm Bill because farmers need assurances "now." "It is time to come to grips" with federal bureaucracy. Action on nuclear power regulations "cannot await" further investigation. It is critical to "resume" serious discussion on limiting nuclear arms.

These small actions generally form only a part of a larger action Hart desires: reform. Indeed, it seems Hart wants to overhaul all ideas about each issue he discusses. To create a context for reform, Hart teaches.

Combining the "good reason," the arguments in juxtaposition to unfavorably presented foil positions, the connotative references to his own rationality, and the calls for action, Hart teaches his audiences the need for passing the Farm Bill, the true nature of bureaucracy, the "lessons" and "meaning" of Three Mile Island, the real foundation for sound defense spending, the true horror lurking under the surface horror of nuclear war.

In each address save the Emergency Farm Bill speech, Hart suggests not one but a series of reforms. For example, in the speech on nuclear war, we must awaken those not
thinking about nuclear war, reawaken those ignoring the possibility, correct the attitudes of those dreaming of nuclear war, and also make smaller, more specific reforms. We must have some nuclear arms rather than none. We must remove missiles from Europe rather than keep them there. We must resume arms limitations talks, reorienting them to the purpose of preventing their use. All of these actions, changes in attitudes, will provoke thought about the issues: thought will lead to adopting Hart's ideas about preventing nuclear war.

Analysis of the deliberative speeches uncovers Hart's overwhelming dependence on the good sense component of ethical image. The image of good sense, constructed around a core of "good reasons," is enhanced by the use of connotative language, contrast, by Hart's allusions to his own good sense, and by his posture as a teacher and reformer. The very process of reasoning, the objective way he seems to look at things, also adds a dimension to the image of good sense.

The addresses contain a resemblance to dialogues about the issues, and this too implies an objective approach, although the contrast isn't presented objectively. The negatively connotated opposing positions are in fact a foil for Hart's well-considered good reasons.
Hart's image of good moral character, the second component of the ethical image, grows from his good sense. The deliberative speeches contain contrasts to this end. The refutation of opposing ideas makes Hart look as if he is rejecting the easy answers most people accept. In a sense, he seems to reveal truth, since his ideas always look logical and lucid in comparison to the negative portrayal of his opposition. In addition, Hart states explicitly that he doesn't settle for easy answers. He takes tough positions, and he works hard to validate his positions. There is no "simple plan" to prevent nuclear war. Defining the "real" basis for defense priorities is "one of the most awesome challenges of the 1980s." "There are no easy answers" to the questions about nuclear power. Hart's positions seek long range solutions to America's problems. His image of moral character is also buttressed by his admiration of virtue in his ceremonial addresses. Hart identifies with the attributes of dedicated, disciplined people: self-restraining, self-denial, honesty, patience, and adaptability.

What good will Hart generates towards his audience grows out of his good sense, primarily from the issues he discusses. The subject choices establish a common ground between Hart and his audience; Hart and his auditors share concern about the growing federal bureaucracy, nuclear energy, nuclear war, and defense.
But Hart erodes this common ground. Ironically, his image of good sense causes most of the erosion. The opposing positions Hart creates in his deliberative speeches, while emphasizing the rationality of his arguments, unavoidably alienate some of the people he addresses. For example, the big government speech contradicts those guilty of criticizing bureaucracy with "cocktail party abuse." The speech on nuclear war disputes every position and every attitude about nuclear war not consistent with Hart's position. In the speech on the Emergency Farm Bill, Hart even implicitly equates failure to support the bill with non-citizenship. Refutations like these, occurring in each deliberative speech in this study (and in one ceremonial speech) cannot help but put off segments of the audience.

Moreover, the contrasts in the addresses prevent Hart establishing more common ground with his audience. There never exists any common ground between Hart and his audience except for the mutual concern for the particular subject being addressed. Every deliberative speech studied calls for a movement of attitudes away from "mistaken" or "mis-conceived" positions towards Hart's well-reasoned, right position.

While others are encouraged to seek common ground, Hart holds his ground. For instance, Hart corrects misconceptions about big government to elicit support for his own conception
of our bureaucratic problem—"inflated expectations." The lessons of Three Mile Island provide the basis for Hart's nuclear energy reforms. In his address on defense, Hart refutes the "invalid defense debate" to establish a context for his own extensive military reforms. Although Hart ends his speech with an appeal to opposing parties to search out common ground on defense issues, it is common ground centered around "fresh, viable, logical ideas about defense," ideas like the reforms he recommends in this address.

Hart also fails to balance the heavy rationality of his rhetoric with humor or emotion. Humor is virtually non-existent, and his emotional appeals aim at the more intellectual emotional reactions, like safety, health, and pragmatic spending. What results is the ethical image of a man who reasons well, who shares the audience's concerns for the nation's problems, and who thinks issues out thoroughly. But emotionally, little common ground exists between Hart and his auditors, and what there is focuses on emotional responses requiring discipline and strength of character.

The addresses of praise do little to help Hart present a more balanced image. The attributes he admires are again qualities requiring emotional discipline and rigor. His speech praising Franklin Roosevelt is emblematic of this group of speeches. Rather than salute Roosevelt's compassion for the common man, Hart chooses to praise Roosevelt's
adaptability, his belief in innovation, and his actions to solve problems. He even labels the empathy Roosevelt displayed for the common man as a "deep belief in his responsibility" towards human beings.

Perhaps most damaging to Hart's ethical appeal is his repeated posturing as a teacher and a reformer. All the deliberative speeches imply the roles of teacher and students. In three of the addresses, the teaching role is explicit. The speech on big government, the speech on nuclear war, and the address on nuclear power all concern "erroneous charges," "pervasive errors," and of course, "lessons" and "meaning."

All of the speeches call for extensive reform, often groups of smaller reforms building up to a large one. Hart's emphasis on reform also distances him from his audience. He appears superior, removed from them, always suggesting wholesale reforms for others to adopt. Essentially he is a teacher talking down to mistaken students. He therefore is at a distance from his audience not only emotionally, but intellectually as well.

Overall, Hart projects the ethical image of an extremely cerebral man--knowledgeable, calculating, deliberate, rigid in his beliefs. His ethical image limits his effectiveness, though, because the good sense he projects overshadows his image of good moral character, and especially overshadows his image of good will towards the audience. His superior
posture as a teacher and reformer, along with his lack of emotional warmth, creates a distance between Hart and the people he seeks to serve.

Merely being a "good man" is not enough for a political speaker, for the ethical image speaks as loudly as "good reasons." The man may speak the words, but the words bespeak the man.

While there is a need in rhetoric to train good men and women, people respecting the means and ends of the persuasive art, there also exists a need for speakers to understand that what they say makes them see a particular way, whether the impression is intended or not. Planned or unplanned, the ethical image emerges.

One way to prevent an unbalanced ethical image is to work towards projecting what Wayne Booth calls a "balanced stance." Though Booth finds it difficult to describe exactly what the "balanced stance" is, he does suggest that it can be achieved by presenting arguments in such a way as to suggest "a man passionately involved in thinking an important question through, in the company of an audience." A speaker must be "engaged with men in the effort to solve a human problem."

In Gary Hart's case, balancing his rhetorical stance might require a change from talking down to the audience to discussing a subject with the audience. By projecting
a more balanced ethical image, and by broadening the common ground between himself and his audience, Hart might find a more favorable reception for his articulate, substantial "good reasons."
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