



## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This study evaluates the content methodology developed by Roderick P. Hart and the generic characteristics of doctrinaire rhetoric he identified. Nine of the critical tests developed by Hart were applied to the rhetoric of Daniel DeLeon, a prominent figure in the Socialist Labor Party at the turn of the century. The sample for this study consists of excerpts from thirty-eight addresses and articles written by DeLeon.

In addition, this study examines three specific addresses by DeLeon to markedly different audiences using traditional textual analysis. These chapters investigate Hart's claim that doctrinaire speakers may be unable to adapt to audiences not indoctrinated to the speaker's ideology.

The conclusions reached suggest that many of Hart's generic criteria are not sufficiently developed in order to define doctrinaire rhetoric as a unique genre. In addition, DeLeon's rhetoric belies Hart's claim that doctrinaire speakers are unable to adapt to non-indoctrinated audiences. Finally, this research suggests that content analysis methodology has few benefits for rhetoric critics and that other methodologies may engender more insightful criticism.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to extend my sincerest appreciation for the assistance of Professors Ellen Reid Gold, Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Wil Linkugel, and Michael C. Leff.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT OF THESIS . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
CHAPTER I . . . . .	1
ENDNOTES . . . . .	14
CHAPTER II . . . . .	17
ENDNOTES . . . . .	28
CHAPTER III . . . . .	29
ENDNOTES . . . . .	48
CHAPTER IV . . . . .	51
ENDNOTES . . . . .	64
CHAPTER V . . . . .	65
ENDNOTES . . . . .	80
CHAPTER VI . . . . .	82
ENDNOTES . . . . .	91
APPENDIX A . . . . .	92
APPENDIX B . . . . .	93
APPENDIX C . . . . .	94
APPENDIX D . . . . .	95
APPENDIX E . . . . .	96
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	97

## Chapter One

It is necessary for most of us these days to have some insight into the motives and responses of the true believer. For though ours is a godless age, it is the very opposite of irreligious. The true believer is everywhere on the march, and both by converting and antagonizing he is shaping the world in his own image. And whether we are to line up with him or against him, it is well that we should know all we can concerning his nature and potentialities.<sup>1</sup>

Doctrinaire rhetoric, the rhetoric of the true believer, has received minimal attention from critics. Among the few who have examined this type of rhetoric is Roderick P. Hart, who after subjecting fifty-four contemporary addresses to nineteen types of analysis, has concluded that doctrinaire rhetoric forms a unique genre. Hart defines doctrines as "systematic bodies of belief that have been formally stated in writing and publicly proclaimed."<sup>2</sup> He has suggested that doctrine generates a unique type of rhetoric regardless of the ideology it espouses.

The primary purpose of this study is to further research the genre of doctrinaire rhetoric and secondly, to apply, critique, validate, and broaden the applicability of Roderick Hart's methodology. To accomplish these ends I shall analyze the rhetoric of Daniel DeLeon, a prominent American Marxist in the late 1800s and early 1900s, using the content analysis developed by Hart. In addition, I shall textually analyze three addresses by DeLeon in order to examine the strategic techniques used by a doctrinaire rhetor that can not be studied through content analysis.

Daniel DeLeon: Doctrinaire Socialist

Although Daniel DeLeon is not well remembered today, his influence is still discernible:

American radicals . . . live with the heritage of DeLeon almost as much as they do with the heritage of Debs. They are stronger for his insights and weaker because of his faults and blunders. Had DeLeon never lived today's American radicalism would be different than it is -- for better and for worse. And tomorrow's radicalism if it is to be an intellectually serious movement, will be unable to blanket him with condemnation or consign him to memory-hole oblivion, it will need to strike a true balance of his work.<sup>3</sup>

Daniel DeLeon spent a major part of his adult life advocating socialist doctrine. Born in Curacao, Venezuela and educated in Europe, DeLeon came to the United States in 1872. He obtained degrees in political science and law at Columbia College and won a prize lectureship in International Law. For six years DeLeon served as a lecturer on Latin American Diplomacy at Columbia. He resigned when the administration, angered at his political affiliations, refused to grant him full professorship.

DeLeon's first political involvement was in the Cuban Movement for Independence. DeLeon, with a group of revolutionary Cuban exiles, acted as associate editor for a paper supporting the movement's efforts. In 1886 DeLeon became involved in the Henry George Single Tax Movement, an effort to eliminate poverty by controlling speculating and profiteering in land. Soon disenchanted with this plan, DeLeon joined the Nationalist Party in 1889. This movement was spawned by Edward Bellamy's

utopian novel, Looking Backward, which argued for peaceful reform to reverse social stratification. Frustrated by the realization that the all-labor party envisaged by the Nationalists was not to be realized, DeLeon joined the Socialist Labor Party in 1890.

The Socialist Labor Party, comprised primarily of German immigrants, was founded in 1877 and was the first American Marxist party to survive over a long span of years. In 1892 Simon Wing and Charles H. Matchett ran as the Socialist Labor Party (SLP) candidates for the offices of United States president and vice-president, the first presidential ticket put up by a socialist party. The candidates were on the ballot in six states and polled 21,512 votes.<sup>4</sup> The party reached its peak in 1898 with a membership of 6,000, and during that same year the party's state and congressional candidates received more than 82,000 votes.

Although DeLeon never held an elected national office within the party, he was active in party affairs and his influence was pervasive. Appointed the Socialist Labor Party's national lecturer in 1891, he campaigned for the governorship of New York and ran for the New York State Assembly and Congress. Also an international voice for socialism, DeLeon served as the party's chief delegate to the Congresses of the Second International in Europe, attending conclaves held in Zurich (1893), Amsterdam (1904), Stuttgart (1907), and Copenhagen (1910).

In 1891 the party organ, The People, was formed with DeLeon as associate editor; six months later he was appointed editor, a post he held until his death in 1914. In his role as editor, DeLeon wrote approximately 6000 short essays. In addition, he helped establish the New York Labor News Press, the first press in America to publish revolution-

ary books and pamphlets on a large scale. Despite his numerous writings and translations, DeLeon did not copyright any of his works nor did he draw any royalties from them. He did this to blur "any distinction between himself and the organization that might have arisen on this account."<sup>5</sup> Despite his attempts to minimize personal importance, DeLeon's influence over party philosophy was great:

. . . the will of the Party was, more often than not and more frequently as time went on, DeLeon's faithful echo . . . He, as a talented, well-educated, English-speaking radical who had already achieved some prominence as a writer and speaker in left-wing circles, was regarded as an especially valuable acquisition for the movement and was enthusiastically received by its membership. Given the situation it was probably inevitable that DeLeon's energy, ability, and strength of personality would, for the most part, shape policy. Hence, instead of his identity disappearing in the collective identity of the SLP, the latter tended to become the responsive reflex of the former . . . 6

DeLeon effected fundamental changes in the SLP which will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent chapters.

In addition to his involvement in the SLP, DeLeon was active in the labor movement. He was a member and delegate of the Knights of Labor, a crafts organization, from 1891 until 1895 when the organization rejected his credentials and refused to seat him at the convention. In 1895 DeLeon founded the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance which committed the SLP to a policy of dual unionism, competing with established unions for membership. Ten years later, DeLeon with Eugene Debs and Bill Haywood founded the influential Industrial Workers of the World (IWW). "Many contemporaries believe that his role as a prime mover in forming the IWW was the crowning achievement of his career."<sup>7</sup>

The primary reason DeLeon was ousted from these organizations was his intolerance for persons who varied from his proscribed philosophies:

It took DeLeon only three years of active participation in the socialist movement to hammer out what seemed to him Marxian solutions to all the problems that had plagued the [Socialist Labor] party since its founding. Having hardened Marxian theory into a fixed dogma, DeLeon was not one to tolerate the "unscientific" speculations of those who differed with him. Members and organizers unable to agree with the principles and tactics of The People's editor found themselves the public objects of DeLeon's biting sarcasm and fertile invective.<sup>8</sup>

DeLeon's rigid nature eventually resulted in a split within the SLP and the subsequent decline of the party. Morris Hillquit, who led the departing faction in 1899, referred to DeLeon as "a petty tyrant who sought as much omnipotence in the socialist movement as the Pope held in the Catholic Church."<sup>9</sup> DeLeon did not regret the departure of the "fraudulent socialists":

There are no short cuts to revolution! Compromise of the principle inescapably spells compromise with capitalism, and treason to the working class! Compromise is the surest way to defeat, whatever be your monetary success! Numbers without knowledge and understanding amounts to recruiting for the army of reaction! Better 3,000 strong than 3,000,000 weak!<sup>10</sup>

DeLeon's dogmatism had personal as well as political consequences. DeLeon disowned his own son, Solon, over a disagreement with regard to the proper interpretation of Marxist theory. Regardless of the criticism he received or the adverse consequences that were wrought, DeLeon adhered to his principles.

DeLeon's principles and philosophical position were derived pri-

marily from Marxist and socialist theory. Referred to as the Americanizer of Marx, DeLeon was considered an authority on socialist theory and was admired by many great socialist leaders and theorists including V.I. Lenin:

L.G. Raisky, Professor, Dept. of History, Leningrad University, wrote in his monograph on DeLeon: "Lenin added that he was mightily impressed by the sharp and deep criticism of reformism given by DeLeon in his 'Two Pages from Roman History,' as well as by the fact that as far back as April, 1904, DeLeon anticipated such an essential element of the Soviet system as the abolition of parliament and its replacement by representatives from productive units."<sup>11</sup>

John Reed, a socialist journalist, commented upon returning from Russia, "Premier Lenine [sic] . . . is a great admirer of Daniel DeLeon, considering him the greatest of modern Socialists -- the only one who has added anything to Socialist thought since Marx."<sup>12</sup> DeLeon's rhetoric reflected his reliance on socialist and Marxist doctrine as will be revealed in later chapters.

DeLeon was an active spokesperson for the socialist and labor parties. He made frequent public addresses and crossed the country several times while on the campaign trail. A biographer summarizes DeLeon's speaking style:

He had a clear, sharp voice, very exact in enunciation and deliberate in delivery. He did not shout, or "holler." He spoke in a warm, emotional tone, ranging from sympathetic appeal to revolutionary anger. He was always well informed on the happenings of the day and illustrated his points vividly with references to them . . . His appeal was to the good sense and intellect of his hearers. He spoke convincingly.<sup>13</sup>

DeLeon was intent on reaching his audiences with his message and was generally well received by the public. Kassian Kovalcheck provides examples demonstrating DeLeon's popularity as a speaker:

He [DeLeon] had constant demands for engagements. During the month of January, 1895, DeLeon had eight invitations to speak including a three day tour of Montreal, Canada. Between September 24 and October 11, 1894, he made eighteen agitation speeches. During the 1890s he spoke whenever he had the opportunity and was normally well received. Elmer G. Synder pleaded with DeLeon to give another speech because after his first speech everyone in his neighborhood was talking about Socialism. Daniel DeLury of Minneapolis wrote that after a speech by DeLeon some men threw away their Bryan buttons and came over to the S.L.P.<sup>14</sup>

DeLeon's addresses would regularly draw a greater response from the crowds than those of other SLP agitators.<sup>15</sup> The quantity and quality of DeLeon's addresses and writings, as well as the significant role he played in both the labor and socialist movements, provide justification for studying his rhetoric. In addition, DeLeon's rigid character and his unrelenting adherence to doctrine indicate the appropriateness of studying his rhetoric in an analysis of the doctrinaire genre.

### Generic Criticism

Generic criticism is a valuable tool for the rhetorical critic as it reveals "the conventions and affinities that a work shares with others."<sup>16</sup> Although Aristotle and other classical theorists identified several different genres, the widespread use of genre as a critical tool is a relatively recent phenomenon. In the late 1960s generic criticism blossomed largely due to the fact that genres were defined loosely.

Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson explain this phenomenon:

. . . critical interests and concerns culminated in an explosion of articles describing "genres," "rhetoric," or the salient formal attributes of certain groups of rhetorical acts. Retrospectively, it appears that, in most cases, the use of "genre" or "rhetoric of" was a matter of convenience rather than an assertion of the existence of a discrete type of symbolic act . . . While these phrases "rhetoric of the New Left," "rhetoric of confrontation," "rhetoric of black power" do touch on the strategic and substantive elements that ordinarily serve to define genres, they seem to have been used somewhat casually, in many cases, as the most succinct way in which to entitle the body of rhetorical acts the author wished to discuss without necessarily entailing a fully developed claim to generic particularity.<sup>17</sup>

Recognizing that generic criticism generally lacked an "adequate and consistent method of specifying the distinctive features of genres hypothesized,"<sup>18</sup> Roderick Hart hoped to remedy this difficulty by developing "a consistent methodology focusing on a single variable for distinguishing speech types, concentrating solely on the characteristics of messages, and conscientiously inductive in approach."<sup>19</sup>

Through the use of nineteen types of analysis, including content analysis, Hart identified doctrinaire rhetoric as a unique generic form. The specific details of his methodology and the numerical results derived from the application of this methodology to the rhetoric of Daniel DeLeon will be discussed in Chapter Two. After careful analysis, Hart identified four general features that doctrinaire addresses share. First, doctrinaire speakers count on listeners to make rhetorical contributions. The speaker relies on the audience to fill logical gaps, to provide the connection between the problems being discussed and doc-

trine. The doctrine defines the nature of the rhetorical relationship between the speaker and the audience. The word "we" is used frequently as the speaker represents doctrine as the product of group thinking. The doctrine also defines the intellectual resources used by its spokespersons, providing the arguments, evidence, and even the language used. Doctrinaire speakers rarely use fresh or inventive ideas or strategies and merely repeat stock arguments, a characteristic which may explain why this type of rhetoric has received minimal attention. Finally, the doctrine defines the role of the speaker. Functioning in the role of agents, doctrinaire speakers seldom offer their own views. Instead they serve as mouthpieces for the doctrine.

Although Hart clearly defined the procedures he used, his methodology and results have not been critiqued or further tested in order to verify the validity of his classifications. Hart himself has indicated a need for additional research:

Furthermore, since the "norms" of genres of discourse have only been suggested by this study, it is necessary to see whether the specifications of speech types here developed have any predictive ability.<sup>20</sup>

As described earlier, this study will attempt to validate Hart's methodology as well as to broaden its applicability. Hart used an inductive approach in developing his genres, deriving five generic classifications from an analysis of fifty-four speeches.<sup>21</sup> This study will adopt a deductive methodology. The characteristics identified by Hart will be used to test and classify rhetoric which, given the nature of the speaker and the speaking situations, should be doctrinaire. The rhetoric of DeLeon, spokesperson for the Socialist Labor Party, proponent of

Marxist theory, and a man unrelentingly committed to ideology, should be doctrinaire and should demonstrate the characteristics isolated by Roderick Hart.

Beyond evaluating the predictive ability of Hart's generic classification, this study will attempt to broaden its applicability in three ways. This study will examine rhetoric from a different era, will analyze both written and oral rhetoric and will follow one speaker across his career. Hart's study dealt entirely with contemporary rhetoric. He deliberately limited his sample so that "significant differences or similarities that are found cannot be attributed to gross differences in time."<sup>22</sup> Despite this statement, Hart offers no reason suggesting why time might be a confounding variable. Theoretically, time should not significantly alter the nature of a generic classification. Campbell and Jamieson explain:

When a generic claim is made, the critical situation alters significantly because the critic is now arguing that a group of discourses has a synthetic core in which certain significant elements . . . and the perception of the situation are fused into an indivisible whole. The significance of this fusion of forms for the critic is that it provides an angle of vision, the dynamic within the rhetorical acts of human beings in different times and places, responding in similar ways as they attempt to encompass certain rhetorical problems . . . 23

Although comparing Hart's numerical data to data gained by analyzing rhetoric from a different time is not statistically valid, the rhetoric should still demonstrate the characteristics of the doctrinaire genre. Differences found between doctrinaire and non-doctrinaire rhetoric should be significant regardless of the period being studied. Therefore, theo-

retically, DeLeon's rhetoric from the late 1800s and early 1900s should reflect the same doctrinal characteristics as addresses given from 1958 to 1968.

Second, this study will apply Hart's methodology to written rhetoric by analyzing thirteen articles written by DeLeon in the Daily People, in addition to testing twenty-five oral addresses. Hart analyzed only oral rhetoric in which indoctrinated speakers addressed indoctrinated audiences. In contrast, DeLeon spoke to a wide variety of audiences including the general public. Although he spoke to heterogeneous audiences, the articles he wrote for the Daily People were directed to indoctrinated audiences. Since the people subscribing to the party's organ were likely to be avid socialists, DeLeon's written rhetoric should also strongly reflect the doctrinaire characteristics isolated by Hart. If such is the case, Hart's methodology may be used fruitfully to analyze both written and oral rhetoric.

Third, this study will trace the rhetoric of a single speaker across his speaking career. Hart explains the potential significance of such an investigation:

Another approach is to look at the rhetoric of a single speaker who is constantly forced to face radically different groups and hence to adapt his rhetoric repeatedly . . . do such rhetors tend to carry their orthodoxies to unorthodox listeners? 25

Application of Hart's methodology to the rhetoric of a single speaker across a wide variety of speaking situations should determine whether a speaker committed to an ideology is able to adapt his rhetoric to a particular audience. Hart theorizes, "Such research might hint that

there are psychological limits to our ability to adapt discourses to one another."<sup>26</sup> This study will investigate the ability of a doctrinaire speaker to adapt to heterogeneous audiences. In addition to the data derived from the content analysis, I shall analyze the texts of addresses given to three very different audiences: Socialist Labor Party members, New York state legislators, and suffragists. Examination of the address to SLP members will provide the clearest test of Hart's generic classifications, and will serve as a bench mark from which to evaluate whether DeLeon varies his strategies when addressing non-indoctrinated audiences. I have chosen speeches DeLeon gave to markedly different audiences in order to examine his ability to adapt. The New York state legislators, accustomed primarily to reasoned discourse on policy issues, were unlikely to be swayed by dogmatic, ideological statements. The suffragists, advocates of a competing ideology, may have constituted the most difficult test of DeLeon's rhetorical skills. Committed to their own doctrine, the suffragists were unlikely to be receptive to socialist dogma. In addition to evaluating the speaker's ability to adapt, this research may isolate the unique characteristics of an individual's speaking style. If a speaker adapts to varying audiences, the variables that remain constant across speaking situations should constitute the rhetor's unique style.

Finally, I contend that the use of content analysis alone is an insufficient method of studying doctrinaire rhetoric. Content analysis can only count and classify the words a rhetor uses. It cannot analyze the argumentative or aesthetic strategies a speaker employs. Although Hart devised tests other than content analysis to isolate his genres,

they are not as easily replicated as the content analysis.<sup>27</sup> Therefore, in order to analyze the rhetorical strategies used by a doctrinaire speaker, I shall engage in a textual analysis of three specific addresses given by DeLeon.

The format of this study is as follows. Chapter Two discusses the content analysis methodology and reports the numerical data gathered by this study of DeLeon's rhetoric. Chapter Three is a textual analysis of an address entitled "Reform or Revolution" given to an audience of Boston socialists. Chapter Four is a textual analysis of an address entitled "Workers Guard the Ballot" given before the New York State Legislature. Chapter Five is a textual analysis of an address entitled "Woman Suffrage" given to an audience of women suffragists. Finally, Chapter Six summarizes and offers suggestions for future research.

## Notes

- 1 Eric Hoffer, The True Believer (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1951), p. xiii.
- 2 Roderick Hart, "The Rhetoric of the True Believer," Communication Monographs, 38 (1971), 249.
- 3 Harvey Goldberg, ed., American Radicals: Some Problems and Personalities (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957), p. 199.
- 4 Nathan Fine, Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States 1828 - 1928 (New York: Russell & Russell, 1961), p. 179.
- 5 L. Glen Seretan, The Odyssey of an American Marxist (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1979), p. 84.
- 6 Seretan, p. 85.
- 7 Carl Reeve, The Life and Times of Daniel DeLeon (New York: Humanities Press, Inc., 1972), p. 105.
- 8 Ira Kipnis, The American Socialist Movement 1897 - 1912 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 25.
- 9 Kipnis, p. 28.
- 10 Arnold Petersen, Daniel DeLeon: Social Architect Vol. 1 (New York: Labor News Press, 1941), p. 203.
- 11 Petersen, p. 246 footnote.
- 12 National Executive Council Socialist Labor Party, Daniel DeLeon (New York: Labor News Press, 1926), p. 81.
- 13 Reeve, p. 7.
- 14 Kassian Kovalcheck, Jr., "Daniel DeLeon: The Rhetoric of Rationalization," Diss. Indiana U. in 1972, pp. 40-41.

<sup>15</sup> Daily People, "Lectures Had by Section New York Last Winter," June 28, 1913, p. 2. "At each lecture a collection was taken. The total amount was \$130.05, which was \$2.05 in excess of the total rent . . . The four Daniel DeLeon lectures and the Carlson-Boyd debate netted the large collections without which this showing could not have been made. The DeLeon meetings collections averaged \$13.19. The debate collection was \$13.39. Four other lectures also brought in over \$6 a lecture."

<sup>16</sup> Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, ed., Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action (Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1978), p. 20.

<sup>17</sup> Campbell and Jamieson, p. 18.

<sup>18</sup> Roderick Patrick Hart, Jr., "Philosophical Commonality and Speech Types," Diss. Pennsylvania State Univ. in 1970, p. 2.

<sup>19</sup> Hart, diss., pp. 3-4.

<sup>20</sup> Hart, diss., p. 232.

<sup>21</sup> Hart, diss., p. 227. "The results of the critical examination revealed five general 'clusterings' of speeches. The groupings were distinctive and the speeches within each grouping were similar -- thus, we can tentatively call these groups 'speech types'." The five types of speeches Hart identified are: Doctrinal Speaking -- The Rhetoric of Certainty; Quasi-Doctrinal Speaking -- The Rhetoric of Ambivalence; Organizational Speaking -- The Rhetoric of Practicality; Speaking to the Uncommitted -- The Rhetoric of Uncertainty; and Speaking to Hostile Audiences -- The Rhetoric of Caution.

22 Hart, diss., p. 7.

23 Campbell and Jamieson, p. 21.

24 Hart, diss., p. 90. The following speakers and speeches were classified by Hart as doctrinaire: Donald E. Williams, "Protest Under the Cross: The Klu Klux Klan Presents Its Case to the Public"; Gerald Sloyan, "Second Sunday in Lent"; Nathan E. Tanner, "On Law and Order"; John J. Krol, "The Primacy of Charity"; James E. Jackson, "Our Party and the World Communist Movement"; William E. Cousins, "Christian Conscience and Community in Crisis"; Gus Hall, "Our Work Begins"; Robert Welch, "Republics and Democracies"; Edwin A. Walker, "The American Eagle is not a Dead Duck"; Hugh B. Brown, "On Communism"; Claude Lightfoot, "The Negro Question Today."

25 Hart, diss., p. 237.

26 Hart, Communication Monographs, p. 261.

27 Hart, diss., pp. 15-18. Hart used a modified Toulmin analysis to examine how speakers utilized data, warrants and claims within their addresses and to answer six questions he proposed. As isolating claims and warrants is difficult and may vary from researcher to researcher, I have chosen to use just Hart's content analysis methodology, which is easily replicated.

## Chapter Two

Roderick Hart devised nineteen critical tests which he used to analyze fifty-four addresses. This study uses nine of these tests to analyze the rhetoric of Daniel DeLeon. Several of Hart's critical tests have been omitted from this study due either to the difficulty involved in replicating the test or because the particular test failed to reveal a unique characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric. In this chapter I shall critique Hart's methodology, describe the particular tests he devised, report his results, and finally, report the results of my research.

Roderick Hart used an inductive methodology in order to analyze contemporary rhetoric and isolate five types of rhetoric. The use of induction as a scientific methodology is problematic for any researcher. Induction evaluates data and then derives a theory. Through the use of content analysis Hart discerned that the speeches he studied tended to fall within five groups. As Hart suggested, "These 'types' are simply groupings of speeches according to perceived rhetorical similarity . . . in most cases, these speeches seem to me to go together."<sup>1</sup> One wonders whether Hart would have derived seven types of speeches if the data had tended to fall into seven rhetorically similar groupings, eight types if the data had tended toward eight groupings, etc.

Although Hart deliberately chose to use an inductive methodology, this choice lessens the theoretical strength of his conclusions. The difficulties associated with the use of induction are commonly recognized and have been the focus of much debate within the social sciences

and humanities. Within our own field, Wayne Thompson, in the February, 1963 issue of the Quarterly Journal of Speech commented:

How much confidence can be ascribed to a generalization based upon a given set of studies? Absolute answers to such questions are impossible, for the theory of induction is unsatisfactory even in fields less complex than rhetoric. Logicians and philosophers from Aristotle through Francis Bacon and John Stuart Mills to Keynes have found the problem of induction too slippery to permit the formation of a satisfactory theory.<sup>2</sup>

The strength of Hart's generic classifications is weakened because of his use of induction.

The use of deduction, rather than induction, is more commonly accepted as the most valid scientific methodology. Rather than deriving the theory from the data, the theory is first postulated and then the data is examined in order to test the theory. Based upon the research results the theory is subsequently either accepted or rejected. Karl Popper, an Austrian philosopher of natural and social sciences, indicates the significance of a deductive methodology:

One might say that progress can ' . . . come about only in two ways: by gathering the new perceptual experiences and by better organizing those which are available already.' This is too reminiscent of Bacon's induction: too suggestive of his industrious gathering of the 'countless grapes, ripe and in season', from which he expected the wine of science to flow: of his myth of a scientific method that starts from observation and experiment and then proceeds to theories. (This legendary method, by the way, still inspires some of the newer sciences which try to practice it because of the prevalent belief that it is the method of experimental physics.)

. . . experiment is planned action in which every step is guided by theory. We do not stumble upon our experiences, nor do we let them flow over us like a stream. Rather, we have to be active . . . It is we who always

formulate the questions to be put to nature; it is we who try again and again to put these questions so as to elicit clear cut 'yes' or 'no' . . . And in the end, it is again we who give the answer.<sup>3</sup>

Hart could have used a deductive method in his study. For example, he could have first hypothesized that doctrinaire speakers use more absolutistic language and do not speak in uncertain terms due to their rigid belief in doctrine. After advancing his hypothesis, he could then have tested his theories through the use of the critical tests he had developed.

Even Roderick Hart recognized the theoretical weaknesses of his study. He stated that the value of his content analysis is to suggest hypotheses rather than to report scientifically verifiable results:

. . . my attempt is not to report scientifically reliable findings but rather to assemble data that may suggest hypotheses. The "data" that are reported here are "pre-scientific." That is, the following chapters will report general trends that I have, for the most part subjectively perceived. This is not to say that this type of study can contribute nothing to the theories of human communication. On the contrary, before empirical research can be attempted, (1) plausible hypotheses must be suggested and (2) analytical tools must be developed and given their initial tests by practicing critics.<sup>4</sup>

Despite his acknowledgement of the weakness of his study, Hart published an article based upon his dissertation results entitled "The Rhetoric of the True Believer"<sup>5</sup> in which he advanced doctrinaire rhetoric as a unique genre. Although many of the characteristics isolated by Hart seem intuitively correct, it is only through subsequent testing that the validity of these characteristics can be demonstrated.

One method by which to test the strength of Hart's findings is to

apply his methodology and criteria to the rhetoric of individuals who espouse doctrinal philosophies. If Hart's generic traits are valid, they should have some predictive value. Through the deductive application of Hart's hypotheses to specific addresses, the strength of his generic classifications can be determined.

As previously mentioned, this study employs nine of the tests developed by Hart. Seven of these tests, which use a computerized content analysis, are applied to all thirty-eight samples of DeLeon's addresses and articles.<sup>6</sup> The two tests which involve a closer textual analysis are applied only to the three specific addresses detailed in subsequent chapters.<sup>7</sup> The samples for the content analysis are one thousand word samples taken from the middle of each address and article. The words are arranged into alphabetical order and the number of times each word is used in the sample is calculated. From the data, the following questions developed by Hart are answered.

1. To what extent is "absolutism" reflected in the language the speaker used? In order to calculate the degree of absolutism, the uses of the verb "to be" (am, are, be, been, being, is, shall, was, were, will) were counted. From this number the verbs indicating hesitancy or qualification (can, could, may, might, ought, should, would) in addition to other qualifying words (although, but, if, though, unless) were subtracted. This resulting number Hart labelled the absolutism index. The significance of the absolutism index indicates the degree of absolutism. The larger the value, the more often the speaker used absolute language as defined by Hart.

Hart concluded that the language used by doctrinaire speakers tended

to be extremely absolute and dogmatic. He suggested, "The language is straight to the point, inflexible, and 'authoritative.' The rhetoric seems to presume that indoctrinated listeners know they have 'the truth' and so feel there's no sense in their leaders quibbling."<sup>8</sup> My data also demonstrated this tendency although the value derived was not as significant as that derived by Hart. The data are summarized in Appendix A. Interestingly, the absolutism index calculated from DeLeon's rhetoric varied depending on the nature of the audience and the format. As would be suspected, DeLeon's language was more absolutistic when he addressed indoctrinated audiences (22.54) as opposed to non-indoctrinated audiences (20.13). Dogmatic language spoken to an audience not committed to socialism could be alienating, and hence, DeLeon appears to have adapted to his audience by minimizing his use of absolutistic language. DeLeon's use of absolute language was most significant when he engaged in a debate format (36.00). This seems intuitively logical when the purpose of a debate is considered. Both DeLeon and his opponent were trying to convince the audience of the validity of their positions. Using absolute language would demonstrate the strength of the speaker's convictions to the audience.

An additional question Hart advanced was: (2) What person(s) or thing(s) are consistently referred to in the speech? In order to answer this question, Hart calculated the relative frequency with which pronouns appeared in the samples. He counted the number of:

- (1) Speaker references: I, me, my, mine, myself.
- (2) Audience references: you, your, yours, yourself, yourselves.
- (3) Group references: our, we, us, ourselves, (ours).<sup>9</sup>

(4) References to others: they, them, themselves, their, themselves, theirs.

(5) Neuter references: it, its, itself.<sup>10</sup>

From the data, Hart drew two conclusions. First, that doctrinaire speakers rarely refer to themselves. The speaker acts as an agent for the doctrine:

Knowing that their doctrines are of ultimate significance, more important than either the speaker or his listeners, it would not be unreasonable for these spokesmen to feel that citing their personal views would be an impertinence and a rhetorical miscue.<sup>11</sup>

The second characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric derived from this data is that doctrinaire speakers attempt to develop a sense of groupness. One strategy speakers adopt to accomplish this end is the frequent use of the word "we." This pronoun presumes unity among the audience members and the speaker. The data derived from the analysis of DeLeon's rhetoric also reflect these characteristics, although once again, the absolute numbers differ from those derived by Hart. The data are summarized in Appendix C.

Next Hart asked: (3) Is there any characteristic pattern in the word choice of the speaker? Relying on the theories suggested by Kenneth Burke, Hart attempted to isolate the "God" and "Devil" terms used by various types of speakers. To identify these terms, Hart isolated every significant word used more than 1% of the time. As might be suspected, Hart discovered that the "God" terms used by doctrinaire speakers tend to reflect the doctrine being advanced. My data also reflected this tendency. The terms used by DeLeon more than 1% of the

time include such words as "socialism," "unionism," and "classes." These words are pertinent to socialist doctrine. This data, however, raises one question. That is whether any significance can be given to this characteristic other than that these terms are relevant to the subject matter being discussed by the speaker. For instance, when DeLeon addressed an audience of New York State legislators concerning proposed election reforms, the word "ballot" was isolated as a significant term. Frequent occurrence of terms specific to the rhetor's topic seems sensible. Perhaps this characteristic is not unique just to doctrinaire addresses, but could be found in any indepth discussion of a specific topic. In support of this hypothesis, the study of DeLeon's rhetoric reveals that addresses to both doctrinaire and non-doctrinaire audiences contain significant terms, and in three instances, these terms are the same. The data are summarized in Appendix E.

Hart's fourth query is: (4) How specific are the speaker's remarks (as revealed in his language)? To answer this question Hart calculated the amount of numerical data used by the speakers. This test involved counting the number of dates, totals, and monetary units the speakers cite. Hart concluded from his research that:

The cluster of speakers now under consideration rarely . . . indicate [sic] specific sums, refer to exact dates, or enumerate specific factors. If the audience didn't already know the facts, they had somehow to "admit them into evidence" with only the barest indications from the speaker. We have seen that listeners in doctrinal situations have to . . . either "supply" much data or have no need for such data because doctrine has organized the world of facts.<sup>12</sup>

The data derived from DeLeon's rhetoric did not support this con-

clusion. DeLeon used a great deal of specific data in his addresses and articles. If Hart's conclusions were valid, a speech to an indoctrinated audience should contain less specific data than an address to a non-indoctrinated audience since the indoctrinated audience has no need for specific data to support their beliefs. DeLeon's rhetoric demonstrates the opposite tendency. He used specific data 15.23 times to indoctrinated audiences, 10.13 times to non-indoctrinated audiences. Further research is necessary in order to determine whether DeLeon's rhetoric is an anomaly, or whether Hart's conclusion is invalid.

A fifth question Hart researched is: (5) To what extent does the speaker use the comparative and superlative degrees of adjectives? He suggested that doctrinaire speakers use these adjectives infrequently and attributed this characteristic to the belief of the indoctrinated that the doctrine is the best world view, and therefore, there is no need for comparisons. To answer this question Hart counted all uses of "more," "less," and words ending in "er" as indicative of the use of comparative adjectives, and all uses of the adjective "very" and words ending in "st" to denote superlative adjectives. Hart concluded that only modest generalizations could be derived from his data.

With regard to this question Hart's hypothesis seems weak and is not supported by my data as Appendix B indicates. Although DeLeon used the comparative and superlative adjectives infrequently, he used them more frequently when addressing indoctrinated audiences. As the degree of this difference is slight, further testing is necessary in order to determine the relevance of this finding.

The next question Hart seeks to answer is: (6) To what extent does the speaker use the past and future tense of verbs? To determine the use of the past tense Hart calculates the number of times the words "had," "was," "were," and all words ending in "ed" were used. Use of the future tense is calculated by counting the words "will," "shall," and all words ending in "'ll." Using these calculations Hart concludes the doctrinaire speakers "tend to point to the past when supporting their assertions, using precedent consistently."<sup>13</sup> Little reliance is placed on the future and a "pattern of historicity appears."<sup>14</sup> The data derived from DeLeon's rhetoric support this conclusion. Although the absolute numbers differ from Hart's data, the same general tendency is evident as indicated in Appendix B.

The final question answered by the content analysis is: (7) To what extent does the speaker use "doctrinal" phrases? Hart suggests that, "The ending 'ism' seems to be a construction which might serve as a clue to the relative amount of doctrinality in rhetoric. The ending is therefore taken as a signal of doctrinal orientation."<sup>15</sup> As may be expected, Hart concludes that doctrinaire speakers frequently use words ending in "ism." Data derived from DeLeon's rhetoric are consistent with Hart's conclusions, but DeLeon tends to use words ending in "ism" more frequently than the speakers studied by Hart. Appendix D reports these results.

The final two tests used in this study require more detailed analysis of the rhetorical text than the content analysis allows. Therefore, I shall summarize the methodology used in these two tests and the conclusions that Hart draws from his data. I shall discuss my results in

the three chapters which deal with specific addresses given by DeLeon.

One question Hart asks is: What solutions are offered for listeners' problems and anxieties? In answer to this question, Hart evaluates the type of anxieties the speaker raises and the type of solutions the speaker offers. Hart's data indicate that doctrinaire speakers tend to advance more anxieties than solutions. However, these rhetors need not suggest specific solutions for every anxiety because "doctrines are inherently bodies of answers, they prescribe courses of action, indicate ways out of trouble, and define options."<sup>16</sup> In addition, when a speaker does advance a solution, it is derived directly from and consistent with the doctrine. Finally, Hart concludes that the speakers he studied particularly stressed threats that developed from within the group. He theorizes that since the doctrine is regarded as "the supreme and most powerful good" no outside threat will be "ultimately damaging."<sup>17</sup> As will be seen in Chapter Three, DeLeon often spoke of the dangers to socialism from those within the party.

The final question developed by Hart to be included in this research is: Do the sources quoted and the quotations given in the speech reveal any important patterns? Hart's data reveal that most of the doctrinaire speakers used quotations from doctrinal sources as support material. Concurrent with this result, the speakers rarely qualify their sources. Since the speaker uses primarily doctrinaire sources there is no need to provide their qualifications because audiences will be familiar with them already. An example of this is found in DeLeon's rhetoric when he cites Marx without qualifications for his audience, a doctrinal source with whom they are likely acquainted.

The next three chapters are devoted to a more traditional critique of individual addresses by DeLeon. Although the content analysis can provide some information concerning doctrinaire characteristics and audience adaptation, many important factors will not be revealed. For instance, the speaker's use of metaphor and other stylistic devices, what values are used as premises for various arguments, and the types of evidence and supporting material a speaker uses are all important rhetorical considerations which remain hidden from the content analysis. Textual analysis of three addresses will examine the doctrinal characteristics of DeLeon's address and will evaluate whether he is able effectively to adapt his partisan message to three very different audiences.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Roderick Patrick Hart, Jr., "Philosophical Commonality and Speech Types," Diss. Pennsylvania State Univ. in 1970, pp. 45-6.

<sup>2</sup> Wayne N. Thompson, "A Conservative View of a Progressive Rhetoric," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 49 (1963), p. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Karl R. Popper, The Logic of Scientific Discovery (1959; rpt. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968), pp. 279-80.

<sup>4</sup> Hart, p. 46.

<sup>5</sup> Roderick Hart, "The Rhetoric of the True Believer," Communications Monographs, 38 (1971), p. 249.

<sup>6</sup> The samples are one-thousand word excerpts taken from the middle of the rhetorical artifact.

<sup>7</sup> The two tests requiring a textual analysis ask: 1) What solutions are offered for the listeners' problems and anxieties?, and 2) Whether the sources quoted within the speeches reveal any important patterns?

<sup>8</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 73.

<sup>9</sup> Hart did not list the word "ours" as being included in this category. It seemed appropriate to include this term as well.

<sup>10</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 37.

<sup>11</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 79.

<sup>12</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 61.

<sup>13</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 82.

<sup>14</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 82.

<sup>15</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 45.

<sup>16</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 56.

<sup>17</sup> Hart, Diss., p. 83.

### Chapter Three

On January 26, 1898 in Boston's Well's Memorial Hall, DeLeon addressed the Massachusetts socialists on the topic, "Reform or Revolution." DeLeon hoped to minimize friction among the various sections of the Socialist Labor Party and to encourage Boston socialists to discontinue supporting reformist rather than revolutionary policies. DeLeon outlined the purpose of his address:

. . . I drew the conclusion that part of the purpose of the invitation was for me to come here to tell you upon what lines we "wicked" Socialists of New York and Brooklyn gave the capitalist class last November the 16,000 - vote black eye . . .

I think the best thing I can do to aid you in organizing is to give you the principles upon which the Socialist sections of New York are organized. To do that I shall be able step by step, to point out how it is we do it, and how you ought to do it.<sup>1</sup>

Through an indepth analysis of Marxist doctrine, DeLeon demonstrated that reform efforts were detrimental to the successful development of a socialist society and that only revolution would bring about the desired classless community.

This address is a typical example of doctrinaire rhetoric as defined by Hart. DeLeon, a doctrinaire speaker addressed an indoctrinated audience on a topic related to socialist doctrine. The content analysis of this address reveals doctrinal characteristics identified by Hart. The data suggests that DeLeon tends to use absolutistic language, indicating his commitment to doctrine. DeLeon uses the pronoun "we" rather than "I," although he most frequently uses second person pronouns.<sup>2</sup>

This observation, though contrary to Hart's findings, is not suprising

as DeLeon was advising this particular group of socialists on what course of action they should take. Use of the pronoun "you" is natural when addressing a group. Although the data from the content analysis provide some information regarding the nature of the address, a closer textual analysis should provide a more stringent test of Hart's observations on doctrinaire rhetoric.

An additional characteristic of the doctrinaire genre Hart observed was that many doctrinaire speakers focus their attention upon threats developed from within the group. Infighting and contention over the issue of ideological purity seem to be a common characteristic of revolutionary organizations, and the Socialist Labor Party in the late 1800s was no exception. During the 1890s the Socialist Labor Party in Massachusetts experienced internal discord due to sectarianism and ideological disputes. Discrimination against immigrants was common in this period and, as a consequence, the state's socialists were organized according to nationality. Bedford reports the effect this segregation had upon the SLP:

Boston, for instance, had German, Jewish, American and Flemish sections at various times during the '90's. This solution was not completely successful at minimizing disharmony, since separate sections gave jealousies an official, institutional recognition. Rarely could Boston's Socialist organizations work together.<sup>3</sup>

The Socialists not only suffered from internal competition, but they also reflected the ideological influence of other political parties

At the 1894 Massachusetts Socialist Labor Party convention the delegates adopted a platform which reflected the policies of other

parties rather than remaining faithful to ideological dicta.

The platform advocated a mixture of political, social, and economic reforms that reflected Populist ancestry. The most radical planks echoed the Nationalists: public ownership of transportation and public utilities . . . The Socialists also took the Populists' solution to the "money question" with a plank declaring that only the federal government could constitutionally coin money.<sup>4</sup>

The leadership of the national Socialist Labor Party did not approve of the actions of the Massachusetts Socialists and when Daniel DeLeon was invited to speak in Boston, he endeavored to correct their ideological meanderings.

According to Hart's theory, DeLeon's philosophical position should closely reflect Marxist doctrine. As Hart explained:

Doctrine suggests the things to say as well as ways in which to say them . . . doctrine affects rhetoric from beginning to end . . . Doctrine seems to coach the actors, write the script, and even (by setting the rhetorical potentialities) close the curtain at the propitious moment.<sup>5</sup>

Hence, Marxist doctrine should have dictated the language DeLeon used, the arguments he made, and the solutions he offered. Analysis of this speech reveals that although many of DeLeon's arguments were derived from Marxist theory, the main focus of the address, the need for revolution rather than reform, was inconsistent with the theoretical stance of Marx and Engels.

Three of the topics DeLeon discusses are drawn directly from Marxist philosophy: "Government -- The State;" "Materialism -- Morality;" and "The Class Struggle." In the section entitled "Government -- The State"

DeLeon describes the historical development of the state, as well as the purpose it should serve. DeLeon emphasizes the importance of this topic:

Not until you know and understand the history of the "State" and of "Government" will you understand one of the cardinal principles upon which Socialist Organization rests, and will you be in a condition to organize successfully.<sup>6</sup>

Relying on Henry Morgan's anthropological explanation of the development of man, DeLeon explains how the state developed. He argues that humans learned that survival became easier when they cooperated and thus a Central Directing Authority was developed "to direct the co-operative or collective efforts of the communities."<sup>7</sup> DeLeon describes how economic classes were developed and how the function of the state subsequently was altered when tools of production were developed. These ideas are directly drawn from and consistent with Marxist thought. The language DeLeon uses to discuss this topic closely resembles the language used by Marx. In a letter to Joseph Weydremmer, Marx described his theoretical additions to socialist dogma:

(1) that the existence of classes is connected only with certain historical struggles which are characteristics of the development of production (2) that the class war inevitably leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat (3) that this dictatorship is only a transition to the destruction of all classes and to a society without classes.<sup>8</sup>

Consistent with Hart's theory, DeLeon's description of revolutionary change in this address closely parallels Marx's description. DeLeon explains:

And it [socialism] proceeds to show that, when the instruments of production shall be owned no longer by the minority, but shall be restored to the Commonwealth; that when as a result of this, no longer the minority or any portion of the people shall be in poverty, and classes, class distinctions and class rule shall, as they necessarily must, have vanished, that is when the Central Directing Authority will lose all its repressive functions . . . .<sup>9</sup>

In 1896 DeLeon's theory of the state was consistent with that of Marx. Later, after DeLeon's theoretical development of Industrial Unionism, his theory of the state deviated from standard Marxist doctrine.<sup>10</sup>

In the section entitled "Marxism -- Morality," DeLeon also draws heavily on socialist theories, in particular socialist materialism and the socialist philosophy of history. Materialism is defined generally as the belief that physical matter, its movements and modifications, constitutes the only reality and everything in the universe, including ideologies and emotions, can be explained in terms of physical laws. This theory combined with the Marxian view of history -- movement steadily toward the single goal of the moral, intellectual, and physical perfection of man<sup>11</sup> -- provides the basis for Marxian historical materialism which holds that history moves steadily forward guided by physical or natural laws.

DeLeon relies on historical examples to illustrate that morality is contingent on material conditions. As one example, DeLeon discusses the abolition of slavery in America.

The immorality of chattel slavery became clear to the North just as soon as, standing upon that higher plane that its higher material condition raised it to, it acquired a better vision. The benighted South, on the con-

trary, that had not machinery, remained with eyes shut, and she stuck to slavery . . . 12

The point of DeLeon's argument is that morality must be consistent with scientific principles and that the revolutionary socialist standing upon a higher material ground must avoid "those malarial fevers that reformers love to dignify with the name of 'moral feelings'."<sup>13</sup>

The third "nerve centre of Socialism" DeLeon discusses is the class struggle between capitalists and the working class. DeLeon, consistent with the theory of historical materialism, demonstrates the scientific validity of sectarianism. He argues, "The laws that rule sociology run along lines parallel with and are the exact counterparts of those that natural science has established in biology."<sup>14</sup> DeLeon uses biological analogies to argue that humans should view themselves as a class similar to a species in biology, and that evolution, the law of growth in biology, applies to sociology as well. DeLeon describes the "assimilation by the ruthless process of expulsion of all elements that are not fit for assimilation."<sup>15</sup> Although Marx did claim that "man is a species being" in his Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844, the theory of social evolution is DeLeon's addition to doctrine. Perhaps DeLeon relies on this theory in order to justify his own rigid sectarian perspective and his expulsion of non-conformist persons from the SLP.

Consistent with Hart's theory, DeLeon derived many arguments directly from Marxist doctrine. In addition, DeLeon used language very similar to that of Marx. For example, DeLeon extended a metaphor developed by Marx to explain the purpose of a Central Directing Authority. DeLeon explained:

The Socialist, in the brilliant simile of Karl Marx, sees that a lone fiddler in his room needs no director . . . But just as soon as you have an orchestra, you must also have an orchestra director -- a central directing authority. If you don't you may have a Salvation Army pow-wow, you may have a Louisiana negro breakdown, you may have an orthodox Jewish synagogue, where every man sings in whatever key he likes, but you won't have harmony -- impossible.<sup>16</sup>

Although this speech displayed many characteristics of doctrinaire rhetoric as identified by Hart, several of DeLeon's theories were not consistent with Marxist doctrine. In fact, as mentioned earlier, the entire purpose of this speech, to dissuade reformist efforts, was contrary to the philosophy of Marx and Engels.

DeLeon believed that reform efforts were to be avoided because they lessened the drive toward revolution. DeLeon developed a lengthy biological metaphor explaining the difference between reform and revolution:

Whenever a change leaves the internal mechanism untouched, we have Reform: whenever the internal mechanism is changed, we have Revolution.

Of course no internal change is possible without external manifestations. The internal changes denoted by revolution or evolution of the lizard into the eagle go accompanied with external marks. So with society. And therein lies one of the pitfalls into which dilettantism or "Reforms" invariably tumble. They have noticed that externals change with internals; and they rest satisfied with mere external changes without looking behind the curtain.<sup>17</sup>

In contrast to DeLeon's efforts, Marx and Engels actively worked to achieve reforms in the treatment and conditions of the working class. Donald McKee describes the difference between DeLeon's and Marx and Engels' attitudes toward reform.

As for the specific arguments DeLeon advanced to support his position, this much may be said about them; whatever their validity as Marxist principles, the fact was that, despite them, Marx and Engels advocated almost all important temporary demands which DeLeon refused to support . . . Unlike DeLeon, the two German Socialists did not absolutize their theories of industrial concentration and the oppressive nature of the state to the point where no reform was considered possible. As a matter of fact, they even pointed to actual benefits which accrued to labor from such measures. . . For the fact was that Marx supported almost all the reform legislation which DeLeon used theoretical economic principle to disparage.<sup>18</sup>

These observations suggest that DeLeon was more dogmatic than even Marx. DeLeon's abhorrence of reformist efforts can be found throughout his rhetoric. One could claim that this characteristic is consistent with Hart's thesis as DeLeon's own doctrinal principles dictated his arguments against reforms. However, technically this claim would be inaccurate. DeLeon identified himself as a Marxist and was so committed to doctrine in other respects that he disowned his own son for deviating from standard doctrine. Hence, his variance from Marxist interpretations in this area constitutes an anomaly and contradicts Hart's claim that doctrine dictates the rhetor's arguments and language.

One example of the difference between DeLeon and Marx's attitudes toward reform was the issue of the nationalization of the railroads. The Massachusetts Socialists had voted to include the Populist demand for public transportation in their 1894 platform. In his address to the Bostonians DeLeon harshly criticized the demands by Populists for a nationalized railroad:

The Socialist revolution demands, among other things, the public ownership of all means of transportation. But,

in itself, the question of ownership affects only external forms . . . Now, up step the Populists -- the dupers, not the duped among them -- with a plan to nationalize the railroads. The standpoint from which they proceed is that of the middle class interests as against the interests of upper capitalists or monopolists. The railroad monopolists are now fleecing the middle class; these want to turn the tables upon their exploiters; they want to abolish them, wipe them out, and appropriate unto themselves the fleecings of the working class.<sup>19</sup>

DeLeon concluded that had the revolutionary socialists combined with the Populist reform efforts, the working class would not have benefitted and ultimately the revolutionary efforts would have been compromised.

Marx, on the other hand, supported immediate efforts to gain nationalization. Donald McKee described the Marxist perspective:

. . . the Marxists urged governmental nationalization of industry even under capitalism. Marx himself insisted that the workers should "compel the Democrats to encroach as far as possible upon the existing system in order to interfere with its regular development and thus . . . to force as many of the productive forces, transportation, means of production, factories, railroads, as possible into the hands of the State."<sup>20</sup>

DeLeon was unwilling to accept piecemeal efforts to attain the revolutionary state, whereas Marx believed that such efforts might hasten the revolutionary state. DeLeon believed that reform efforts would merely placate the masses and reduce the revolutionary fervor.

Later in his address, DeLeon described specific reform movements that had bred "disappointment, stagnation, diffidence, hopelessness in the masses."<sup>21</sup> DeLeon contended that socialism had not expanded as rapidly in the United States as in Europe because Americans had been discouraged and misguided by rival movements. He explained:

. . . here in the U.S., one charlatan after another, who could speak glibly, and who could get money from this, that or the other political party, would go among the people and upon the tablets of the minds of the working classes he scribbled his crude text. So it happens that to-day, when the apostle of Socialism goes before our people, he cannot do what his compeers in Europe do, take a pencil and draw upon the minds of his hearers the letters of science; no, he must first clutch a sponge, a stout one, and wipe clean the pot-hooks that the charlatans have left there.<sup>22</sup>

DeLeon indicted four specific reform movements: The Knights of Labor, the American Federation of Labor, the Single Tax Movement, and Populism. An examination of DeLeon's relationship with these various organizations may help explain his theoretical bias against reform efforts.

The Knights of Labor, organized in 1869, was initially a secret organization open to all workers regardless of race or occupation. DeLeon described the Knights of Labor as an organization which did not remain "perfectly sound" and contended that "The Knights of Labor, was meant by Uriah Stephens, as he himself admitted, to be reared upon the scientific principles of Socialism."<sup>23</sup> Professor Norman J. Ware, historian for the Knights of Labor, revealed that DeLeon's view of Stephens' ideology was inaccurate:

Certainly there is little in Stephens' philosophy of labor that has anything in common with Marxism, and he himself was opposed to the policies of Sorge [SLP member] and other American Marxists and was against having anything to do with them either individually or as a body.<sup>24</sup>

Despite Stephens' professed opposition to socialism, his theory of labor organizations was very similar to DeLeon's theory of industrial unionism. Labor historian Philip S. Foner described Stephens' theory:

Stephens put great emphasis on the word "solidarity" . . . The only organization of labor which could meet the power of capital was one which united workers of all trades, and was universal in scope.

Through cooperation the Knights would achieve better conditions, and the gradual substitution of the co-operative system for capitalism. Improvement of working conditions would come through trade assemblies based on craft union organization, and the replacement of the capitalist system by the co-operative system was the task of the mixed assemblies that united workers regardless of craft.<sup>25</sup>

DeLeon's theory of industrial unionism held that unions should be organized by trade rather than craft. He felt that this form of organization would prevent members of one craft union from scabbing against the striking members of another union.

DeLeon became a delegate to the District Assembly 49 of the Knights of Labor in July 1891. In 1893 through the combined efforts of Jewish unions and other socialist unions, DeLeon was chosen as a delegate to the General Assembly. DeLeon, in alliance with James Sovereign, combined with other socialists to oust Terence Powderly, the leader of the Knights for the prior fourteen years. The alliance was based upon a promise by Sovereign that Luciel Saniel, an SLP member, would become editor of the National Journal of the Knights of Labor. Editorial control of the Journal would provide the SLP with an additional propaganda tool. Once in control, Sovereign changed his mind and offered Saniel a different position within the organization. Angered, DeLeon ordered the withdrawal of all socialists from the Knights of Labor. Foner described DeLeon's reaction:

. . . DeLeon ordered the Socialists to break with the Knights and called upon "all self-respecting members of

of the order to do the same." The whole organization was "rotten to the core," and had been reduced to a "nest of crooks," who had "prostituted it to their own base ends." The Socialist-led unions accordingly withdrew their 13,000 members from the Knights, and left the remaining seventeen thousand to find their own way to oblivion.<sup>26</sup>

In December 1895, the Knights of Labor officially expelled DeLeon. DeLeon's attempt to ensure the Knights followed Marxist dicta had failed and DeLeon began to denounce the organization.

The second organization DeLeon berated in this address was the American Federation of Labor. The American Federation of Labor was formed on December 6, 1886 as a reaction to the anti-union policy of Terence Powderly, head of the Knights of Labor. The SLP had worked to influence the American Federation of Labor before DeLeon was a member. Many disputes existed between Samuel Gompers, head of the American Federation of Labor, and DeLeon. The initial controversy resulted when Gompers refused to grant a charter to the Central Labor Federation, comprised of 38 trade unions and one section of the SLP, because of the Federation's political affiliation. Controversy again rose in 1893 at the American Federation of Labor convention when Thomas J. Morgan proposed an eleven-point program which included in Plank Ten a call for the collective ownership of all means of production and distribution by the people. With a vote of 2,244 to 67 the convention voted to hold a referendum. At the 1894 convention the American Federation of Labor leadership ignored the result of the referendum and altered Plank Ten so that it demanded only the abolition of the monopoly system of land holding. Furious, the Socialists joined with the mineworkers

to overthrow Samuel Gompers and elect John McBride, a conservative from the miner's union, as head of the American Federation of Labor. The Socialists succeeded, but the change in leadership was only temporary as Gompers was re-elected in 1895. Angered Gompers, denied Luciel Saniel, the SLP delegate, a seat at the 1895 convention. Following this rejection the SLP withdrew from the American Federation of Labor, and DeLeon formed the Socialist Trade and Labor Alliance, a rival union organization.

After the SLP's withdrawal from the American Federation of Labor, DeLeon criticized the organization bitterly. DeLeon described the organization to the Boston socialists as:

. . . another idiosyncrasy -- the American Federation of Labor, appropriately called by its numerous English organizers, the American Federation of Hell . . . It is a ship, never seaworthy, but now stranded and captured by a handful of pirates; a tape-worm pulled to pieces, contemned by the rank and file of the American proletariat. Its career only filled still further the worker's measure of disappointment, diffidence, helplessness.<sup>27</sup>

Gompers denied that he was to blame for the animosity between the American Federation of Labor and the SLP. He believed that the harshness of DeLeon's criticism was to blame. Gompers wrote:

. . . until the advent of Professor DeLeon in the Socialist movement we managed matters so that we could at least work together. This man's characteristics of intolerance to everyone that does not adopt his policy, his venom and spite crop out at every opportunity and that makes it impossible for anyone that has any self respect to have any dealings with him or those for whom he speaks. He has simply widened the chasm between the different wings of the labor movement.<sup>28</sup>

Although Gompers probably minimized the disagreements that had existed between himself and the SLP prior to DeLeon's entrance into Socialist politics, it was true that the personal animosity between Gompers and DeLeon essentially prevented any successful socialist influence on American Federation of Labor policy.

Engels disapproved of DeLeon's controversy with the American Federation of Labor. He felt that the SLP should have worked from within the Federation. He wrote in an 1891 letter to Herman Schlueter:

I see clearly enough that things are going downhill with the SLP . . . I should have thought it would have been well to keep on good terms with Gompers who has more workers behind him at any rate than the SLP . . . where do you find a recruiting ground if not in the trade unions?<sup>29</sup>

Engels and Marx, supporting cooperation with reform movements, seemed to be less concerned with how change occurred so long as it did occur. DeLeon, disappointed when he was unable to achieve immediate changes through cooperation with other organizations, became increasingly convinced that only correct revolutionary means should be used to achieve the socialist state.

The last two organizations DeLeon discussed were the Henry George Single Tax movement and Populism. DeLeon lambasted the Henry George Single Tax movement which he described as "another of those charlatan booms, that only helped still more to dispirit people in the end."<sup>30</sup> The Single Tax movement formed in 1886 was an effort to eliminate poverty by controlling speculating and profiteering in land. DeLeon's involvement in this movement in 1886 aroused the ire of the Columbia

College's Administration and led to DeLeon's subsequent resignation from the College. DeLeon became disenchanted with the "half-antiquated, half-idiotic reasoning of the Single Tax theory" and left the movement following his exposure to scientific Marxism. The final movement DeLeon criticized was Populism. This group was particularly relevant for the Boston audience because many Massachusetts socialists were affiliated with the Populists and the 1894 Massachusetts platform included Populist reforms. Although DeLeon was never personally involved in the Populist movement, it did constitute a threat to the SLP. DeLeon described the ephemeral nature of the Populists' success in New York:

If bluff and blarney could save a movement, the People's Party would have been imperishable. But it went up like a rocket, and is now fast coming down a stick. In New York State it set itself up against us when we already had 14,000 votes, and had an official standing. It was going to teach us "dreamers" a lesson in "practical politics." Well, its vote never reached ours, and last November when we rose to 21,000 votes, it dropped to 5,000, lost its official standing as a party in the state, and as far as New York and Brooklyn are concerned, we simply mopped the floor with it.<sup>31</sup>

By illustrating the weakness of the People's Party, DeLeon implicitly minimized the value of the reforms the party supported.

DeLeon's rejection of reform efforts weakens the validity of Hart's conclusion that "doctrine affects rhetoric from beginning to end."<sup>32</sup> The reasons for DeLeon's adamant convictions with regard to reformist efforts are unknown, but Donald McKee provides a plausible explanation:

What led DeLeon to formulate these principles [that reform efforts were misguided] appears to have been partly a reaction against the various rival movements which tended to attract to their ranks people who might otherwise have

joined the S.L.P.; in part, it seems to have been the result of his observation that revolutionists participating in such reform movements tend to become so involved in mitigating the evils of capitalism that they no longer work to abolish it.<sup>33</sup>

Another reason for DeLeon's vehemence may have been his own personal difficulties with organizations such as the Knights of Labor and American Federation of Labor. DeLeon had attempted to work from within established trade organizations and his efforts failed miserably. Given DeLeon's commitment to socialism, his rejection of reformist projects may have been for emotional as well as theoretical reasons.

Three additional tests of doctrinaire rhetoric developed by Hart also are not reflected in DeLeon's address. For instance, Hart concludes that doctrine defines the sources speakers use. Hart theorizes that because speakers draw their sources from the doctrine, qualifications are rarely cited:

Presumably, qualifications are cited in rhetoric in order to improve the credibility of the quoted matter and, ultimately of the speaker himself. Where doctrine is shared, however, we may reasonably expect the need for building up credibility to be minimal.<sup>34</sup>

In this address DeLeon quoted nine different individuals for a total of thirteen times. DeLeon recited qualifications or enhanced the authoritativeness of five (55%) of his sources: Marx, Morgan, Artemus Ward, Engels, and Benjamin Franklin, as compared with 17% of the sources in Hart's research. One example of how DeLeon enhanced the credibility of his sources is revealed in the following excerpt:

One of our great men, a really great man, a man whom I consider a glory to the United States -- Artemus Ward --

with that genuine, not bogus, keen Yankee eye of his saw, and with that masterpen of his excellently illustrated this scientific truth with one of his yarns.<sup>35</sup>

Generally the qualifications DeLeon gave did not identify the sources for the audience; instead, he praised their accomplishments. Although praise may be a weak way of enhancing authority, this seems inconsistent with Hart's contention that "the speaker has little need to enhance their authoritativeness."<sup>36</sup> One authority DeLeon did identify for his audience was Lewis Henry Morgan, whom DeLeon described as "the great writer -- the only great and original writer on this question."<sup>37</sup> Although DeLeon often referred to the work of Morgan in his addresses, it was unlikely the audience would be familiar with either Morgan, an American ethnographer of the Iroquois Indians, or his work, Ancient Society, published in 1877. That DeLeon identified Morgan for his audience is consistent with Hart's thesis because Morgan was not a doctrinal source. In summary, DeLeon tended to give extensive qualifications for sources whom he believed his audience would be unfamiliar with. However, inconsistent with Hart's hypothesis DeLeon also tried to enhance the credibility of doctrinaire sources. Perhaps DeLeon felt this was necessary because the Boston socialists had strayed from the doctrinal fold.

Hart also concluded that doctrinaire rhetors rarely used specific numerical data since it was unnecessary to validate the doctrine for true believers. The content analysis for this specific address reveals that DeLeon used specific data five times. Hart's data revealed doctrinaire speakers used specific data 2.28 times. An example of how DeLeon used numerical data to support his argumentation is illustrated in the following excerpt:

There is no exploiter like the middle class exploiter. Carnegie may fleece his workers -- he has 20,000 of them -- of only fifty cents a day and yet net, from sunrise to sunset, \$10,000 profits; the banker with plenty of money to lend can thrive with a trifling shaving of each individual note; but the apple woman on the street corner must make a hundred and five hundred per cent. profit to exist. For the same reason, the middle class, the employer of few hands, is the worst, the bitterest, the most inveterate, the most relentless exploiter of the wage slave.<sup>38</sup>

Again, DeLeon may have felt it necessary to supplement the doctrine with numerical data because he perceived the Boston Socialists had wandered from the correct path. However, regardless of the audience he addressed, DeLeon tended to use more numerical data than the speakers studied in Hart's research.

A final characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric observed by Hart was the tendency for doctrinal rhetors to focus on anxieties rather than solutions. As mentioned earlier, DeLeon's address tended to focus on the threats from within the organization by reformist elements. He also warned of the threats posed by enticements from other reform movements. The solution DeLeon suggested was derived directly from the doctrine, in fact, it involved a stricter, more rigid devotion to revolutionary efforts than that demanded by Marx or Engels. DeLeon advised:

. . . I call upon you, in the name of the 6,000 "wicked," revolutionary Socialists of New York and Brooklyn, upon the genuine revolutionary plan. Your state is a large manufacturing State; there can be no reason why your vote should not grow, except that, somehow or other, you have not acted as revolutionists. Every year that goes by in this way is a year wasted. Never forget that every incident that takes place within your, within our, ranks is noted by a large number of workers on the outside. Tamper with discipline, allow this member to do as he likes,

that member to slap the party constitution in the face, yonder member to fuse with reformers, this other to forget the nature of the class struggle and to act up to his forgetfulness -- allow that, keep such "reformers" in your ranks and you have stabbed your movement at its vitals. With malice toward none, with charity to all, you must enforce discipline if you mean to reorganize to a purpose.<sup>39</sup>

Although DeLeon did not become very specific, for example, advising which party members to discipline, it was likely that his audience could perceive what should be done. Faith in revolutionary doctrine was DeLeon's mandate for the Boston Socialists.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Daniel DeLeon, Reform or Revolution (New York: New York Labor News Press, 1961), p. 1.

<sup>2</sup> DeLeon made seven self references, nine group refernces and sixteen audience references in this address. The absolutism index for this speech was 9.0.

<sup>3</sup> Henry F. Bedford, Socialism and the Workers in Massachusetts 1886-1912 (Amherst, Massachusetts: U. of Massachusetts Press, 1966), p. 35.

<sup>4</sup> Bedford, pp. 37-8.

<sup>5</sup> Roderick Hart, "Rhetoric of the True Believer," Communications Monographs, Nov. 1971, p. 261.

<sup>6</sup> DeLeon, p. 4.

<sup>7</sup> DeLeon, p. 5.

<sup>8</sup> Carl Reeve, The Life and Times of Daniel DeLeon, (New York: Humanities Press, 1972), p. 143.

<sup>9</sup> DeLeon, p. 7.

<sup>10</sup> Initially DeLeon adopted a very Marxist perspective toward the state as suggested in this chapter. Following creation of the Industrial Workers of the World, DeLeon revised his doctrine. Under his new theory industrial unions were to constitute the government of the new order.

<sup>11</sup> Donald Egbert and Stow Persons, eds., Socialism and American Life (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 197.

<sup>12</sup> DeLeon, pp. 9-10.

<sup>13</sup> DeLeon, p. 10.

14 DeLeon, p. 10.

15 DeLeon, p. 11.

16 DeLeon, p. 7.

17 DeLeon, p. 3.

18 Donald Kennedy McKee, "The Intellectual and Historical Influences Shaping the Political Theory of Daniel DeLeon," Diss. Columbia University in 1955, pp. 165-6.

19 DeLeon, pp. 11-12.

20 McKee, pp. 145-6.

21 DeLeon, p. 20.

22 DeLeon, p. 19.

23 DeLeon, p. 20.

24 Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States Vol. 1 (New York: International Publishers, 3rd ed. 1947, 1962), p. 435.

25 Foner, pp. 435-6.

26 Philip S. Foner, History of the Labor Movement in the United States Vol. 2 (New York: International Publishers, 1955), p. 296.

27 DeLeon, pp. 20-1.

28 Charles M. Rehmus, Doris B. McLaughlin and Frederick H. Nesbitt, eds., Labor and American Politics (Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan University Press, 1978), p. 139.

29 Reeve, p. 55.

30 DeLeon, p. 21.

31 DeLeon, p. 22.

32 Hart, p. 261.

33 McKee, p. 174.

34 Roderick Patrick Hart, "Philosophical Commonality and Speech  
Types," Diss. Pennsylvania State University in 1970, pp. 62-3.

35 DeLeon, p. 13.

36 Hart, Communication Monographs, p. 261.

37 DeLeon, p. 4.

38 DeLeon, pp. 12-3.

39 DeLeon, p. 24.

Chapter Four

Two years following his address to the Boston socialists, Daniel DeLeon addressed the Joint Judiciary Committee of the New York State Legislature. In March 1898, the legislature introduced a Primary Election Bill designed to eliminate campaign fraud. Near the end of the nineteenth century New York State politics was riddled with corruption. Majority rule was often openly ignored and incidents of campaign fraud were common:

. . . party enrollments were one-half fraudulent and caucuses were controlled by the worst elements of the party which recognized no rule other than that of the mob . . . One instance in point was the "open flagrant proceedings at the Onondaga town caucus on August 14, 1894" where a "herd of Italians, southern Negroes and other men" employed by a city contract were "marched to the polling place" and were beaten off only "after a fierce struggle" in which "the stalwart young Onondaga farmers forced the mob back again and barred the door with an old plow and a crow bar."<sup>1</sup>

The New York Legislature proposed to eliminate fraudulent conventions by implementing primaries for the selection of party candidates. All political parties polling at least 10,000 votes in the previous election were required to hold a primary. On March 10, 1898 DeLeon spoke in opposition to the Primary Bill.

Although DeLeon's address to the Boston socialists constituted a typical example of doctrinaire rhetoric according to Hart's definition, his address to the legislators does not. Rather it is an example of an indoctrinated speaker carrying his "orthodoxies to an unorthodox audience."<sup>2</sup> Data from the content analysis reveals that this address does not fall within the doctrinaire genre, and this contradicts Hart's

contention that doctrinaire speakers may be unable to adapt to non-indoctrinated audiences. The two strongest indicators of this conclusion are: (1) DeLeon's language in this address was less absolutistic than in addresses to indoctrinated audiences, and (2) DeLeon made significantly more self references, a characteristic inconsistent with the doctrinaire genre.<sup>3</sup> These linguistic differences suggest that DeLeon altered his language and style in order to adapt to his audience of legislators.

DeLeon faced a difficult task when addressing this audience. The political and social ideologies of DeLeon and the legislators differed greatly, and this audience was unlikely to be receptive to a socialist's message. In order to increase the likelihood that the audience would listen openmindedly, DeLeon had to adapt his message. As discussed earlier, speakers often base their arguments on values and premises accepted by their audiences and develop well-evidenced arguments using familiar and credible sources in order to adapt a message to a particular audience. Although audience adaptation is important, a speaker addressing a hostile audience must be wary of appearing too compromising. If speakers hide or compromise their own publicly acknowledged values in order to ingratiate themselves to their audiences, it is likely that the audience will either perceive the speakers as being weak and, hence, not credible or as being manipulative and, hence, to be viewed with suspicion. The legislators were aware that DeLeon was a socialist and any attempt by him to conceal this fact would lessen his credibility. DeLeon strikes an interesting balance in this address. Although he does adapt to his audience through the use of well-developed arguments based upon

premises accepted by the legislators and supported with credible evidence, DeLeon most certainly does not ingratiate himself to his audience. DeLeon's attitude toward capitalism is readily apparent as he laments "the depths of poverty and resulting bestiality that capitalism has thrust large layers of our people into."<sup>4</sup> DeLeon perhaps best describes his demeanor when he states: "Gentlemen, the Socialist Labor party is not in the habit of threatening, neither is it in the habit of suppressing its views."<sup>5</sup> By not compromising his opposition to capitalism, DeLeon appeared neither weak nor insincere.

DeLeon adopted several rhetorical strategies to achieve a balance between remaining principled and adapting to the legislators. First, DeLeon stressed values and concerns shared by both the legislators and socialists as American citizens. Second, he questioned whether the Primary Bill would be effective in eliminating campaign fraud. These two strategies reflect DeLeon's attempt to adapt to his audience. Finally, DeLeon emphasized the unique problems faced by socialists and the working class as a result of the proposed legislation. This strategy demonstrated DeLeon's commitment to socialist doctrine. Through these techniques DeLeon increased the likelihood that the state legislators would be receptive to his message and would respect him as a principled person.

DeLeon based his arguments on ideological beliefs generally shared by American citizens and, theoretically, deeply held by the legislators, representatives of the government and American ideology: the importance of secret ballots, uncorrupt elections, constitutional rights and democratic principles. The purpose of the Primary Election Bill was to eliminate political corruption, and as DeLeon began his address he em-

phasized the Socialist Labor Party's support for this goal:

. . . the Socialist Labor Party yields to none in a warm desire and earnest endeavor for the purity of the ballot and all that thereby hangs. The party has long bled and still bleeds from the results of the existing impurity of the ballot.<sup>6</sup>

Through this statement DeLeon suggests that he and the authors of the bill both recognize the need for reform, but disagree as to whether the Primary Bill will achieve the desired end. This suggestion was designed to persuade the legislators that DeLeon's motive for criticism sprang from a sincere regard for the electoral process. DeLeon further justifies his criticisms by metaphorically suggesting that he would not have opposed the bill if its flaws had not been major:

. . . I wish to premise my argument with the statement that, in opposing this Primary Bill, the Socialist Labor Party does not oppose it simply on the fact that the bill is not "perfect." The best of ships makes bilge water. If all that ailed this bill were that it makes some bilge water, we would leave it to experience to improve. But we hold that the ship of this bill makes bilge water only. We oppose it in toto, as structurally, fundamentally wrong.<sup>7</sup>

Through his total rejection of the bill as structurally flawed, DeLeon emphasizes the importance of his following arguments and indicates to the legislators that he is arguing in good faith.

DeLeon's main argument against the bill was that it was unconstitutional because it violated the New York constitutional provision guaranteeing secrecy of the ballot. Since Americans generally accept the importance of constitutional rights, this strategy motivates the audience to listen to DeLeon's objections. Interestingly, although he bases his

arguments on the importance of a secret ballot, DeLeon denies the ultimate value of secrecy:

Let me not be misunderstood. In standing for the secrecy of the ballot, the Socialist Labor Party does not hold this view, strangely held in many a quarter, that a secret ballot is in itself a good thing and a badge of democracy. On the contrary, it holds that the secret ballot is a bad thing and a badge of disgrace. But the party looks at facts and recognizes that, given the conditions created by the capitalist system, the secret ballot is a necessary evil.<sup>8</sup>

In this passage, DeLeon both appeals to beliefs held by his audience and remains ideologically pure by explaining the manner in which his beliefs differ. The secret ballot "a necessity, so palpable, undenied and undeniable"<sup>9</sup> under a capitalist system is needed to ensure that the working class will not be persecuted because of their political preferences.

DeLeon argues that this bill violates the constitutional provision for secrecy because voters must declare their party preference as they register to vote in the primary elections. When Senator Lexow, chairman of the Judiciary Commission, interrupts DeLeon to argue that this flaw had been remedied by an amendment which allowed voters to reveal their preferences in a sealed wrapper given to the inspector of elections for safekeeping, DeLeon responds that this measure is insufficient. The Primary Election Bill makes the registration rolls available to the public following the election, and hence, persecution is still possible. Legislators agreeing with the premise that the ballot should be kept secret are likely to be receptive to this argument. The fact that the legislators had already attempted to remedy this problem suggests that they viewed secrecy of the ballot as a valid concern and

indicates that this was a salient issue for them.

Concurrent with the importance of a secret ballot, DeLeon emphasizes the importance of guaranteeing the right to vote to all eligible citizens. DeLeon argues that this bill discriminates against the working class and hence violates a fundamental principle of democracy. He suggests that workers will be unable to vote because the primary elections would be held at inconvenient hours:

Election Day is a holiday; but the days for primary elections are not; and, what is more, the hours within which such elections are to be held are not workingmen's hours, they are capitalist hours. Gentlemen of elegant leisure may interrupt their convivial pastimes in their clubs, or may interrupt their business, if they have any, to go to the primaries; but workingmen cannot. A suspension of work to them means the loss of a job, and that means almost instantaneous suffering. Thus your bill takes an additional precaution to encompass the disenfranchisement of the worker.<sup>10</sup>

The version of the primary bill which became law mandated that the polls be open from 8 a.m. to 10 p.m. Although it was likely that working persons could get to the polls despite the longer working hours in 1898 (often ten to twelve hours a day), it was probably true that many persons would be deterred from voting.

As additional evidence that the working class was being discriminated against, DeLeon referred to the Biennial Elections Bill that had been passed recently. This bill substituted biennial elections for annual elections, and DeLeon claimed:

. . . we shall next have triennial, quennial, and centennial elections; -- until the working class will have no way left of ridding itself of its capitalist oppressors and officeholders other than by physically seizing them by

the neck, and kicking them out. This Primaries Bill supplements that Biennial Elections Bill, and both are steps steadily being pursued in the same direction -- that disenfranchisement of the American working class.<sup>11</sup>

This hyperbolic argument is weaker than DeLeon's first argument, yet it suggested a trend toward discrimination against the working class. DeLeon strengthened this argument by stressing the importance of the democratic process, a premise accepted by most Americans. DeLeon explicitly details the dangers impinging upon the freedom to vote.

The time was when our Constitutional jurists, in the language of Washington, and standing upon better ground than he, prided themselves in that we, differently from European peoples, needed no physical force, no bloodshed, to change our laws and institutions AS WE PLEASED: the ballot held by a free people was then pointed to as a weapon, and we prided ourselves in that then distinctly American feature of our land, that with us, the weapon of peace, not that of war, was the weapon to dictate our progressively changing social and political convictions.

. . . it seems that we are also to see introduced here those European political convictions that our Constitutional Law jurists used to make our people feel proud for not being subject to.

. . . the Socialist Labor Party warns you that your course is leading the country down the slope that invites bloodshed.<sup>12</sup>

References to "our Constitutional Law jurists" and "Washington" enhance the credibility of DeLeon's argument. Through the use of the pronouns "we," "us" and "our" DeLeon identifies himself with the legislators as sharing this belief in the democratic process. DeLeon concludes dramatically with an implicit threat, warning the legislators of potential violence that might result from adopting the Primary Bill. As DeLeon delivers the warning, he uses the pronouns "you" and "your," a lin-

guistic choice which places the responsibility upon the legislators and separates DeLeon from them. Interestingly, through the use of accepted value-oriented premises, DeLeon portrays a bill designed to increase popular participation in the political process as doing the opposite and potentially destroying American democracy.

The final arguments DeLeon developed contended that the campaign bill would not meet its intended goals -- decreased campaign fraud and increased voter participation. These arguments were premised on the belief that campaign corruption was bad and should be avoided. Given the purpose of the Primary Bill, DeLeon could presume that the legislators would share this belief, and in this address he explicitly mentioned this presumption. After arguing that fraud would continue within the Republican and Democratic parties, DeLeon commented, "Surely, none of you can deem me insulting for making this supposition: It is one of the theories from which this bill proceeds that corruption is now practiced in your parties by their capitalist chieftains."<sup>13</sup>

DeLeon argued that the bill would not prevent fraud because a voter need only declare that he was in "general sympathy" with a party to participate in its primary. Someone could easily sabotage a party by packing its primary with confederates and electing a candidate unsympathetic to the party's political ideology. DeLeon asked rhetorically, "What is there to prevent a Republican or a Democratic capitalist from packing with his hirelings a Socialist Labor party primary?"<sup>14</sup> DeLeon suggested that such sabotage was not possible under a convention system since the delegates would be known to other members of the party. Although DeLeon's argument may have been valid for the SLP, it was not for

the Republican and Democratic party conventions where fraud frequently occurred when various party factions were not given the floor and valid nominations were ignored. DeLeon illustrated this point:

And how would the case stand with the Democratic and Republican parties themselves? No better! The primaries of those, in many a constituency, would resolve themselves into a single contest between the purses of the opposing capitalist candidates within a party itself, and between the candidates for nominations in the opposing parties. The longest purse will win, its corruption fund will carry the day.<sup>15</sup>

As evidence for this argument, DeLeon referred to a New York Sun editorial that stated men were available in New York who would commit murder for two dollars. DeLeon analogized that if men would commit murder for two dollars, surely there were men who "for a dollar, or a drink would sell themselves to whatever capitalist, Republican or Democrat, happens to be in need of their services."<sup>16</sup> Through this argument, DeLeon denied that the bill would eliminate fraud and argued that it would actually increase corruption. This argument also implicitly indicted the principles of capitalism. The imagery of "buying" votes and the metaphor suggesting that the "longest purse will win" connected election fraud with capitalism. Through DeLeon's strategic linguistic choices, the logic of the pragmatic argument becomes imbued with an ideological statement.

DeLeon made two additional minor arguments against the bill. The Primary Election Bill was directed only to municipal areas with populations over five thousand. DeLeon argued that rural areas were not immune from fraud and "the distinction lacks scientific underpinning."<sup>17</sup>

Several senators shared DeLeon's concern over this distinction. Senator Tibbits of Rensselaer County commented:

I heartily agree with Senator Ellsworth in his demand for reform of the rural primaries, and I hope the bill will be amended so as to give every voter in the state, rural or city, a chance to express his will at the primaries, and to have his vote honestly counted. The same reasons exist for granting it city voters. There is the same fraud, the same bribery, at rural primaries as at city primaries.<sup>18</sup>

The commonality between DeLeon's arguments and those of the other senators enhanced the impression that DeLeon was critiquing the bill in good faith, and may have lessened the objectionable character of his ideological arguments.

Secondly, DeLeon argued that the bill would not increase popular political participation. He additionally impuned the motives of those backing the bill by suggesting they were personally lazy, believing that voting was easier than being involved in the convention process. DeLeon contended that this problem would remain even if the bill passed as members of the ruling class would still be too lazy to participate. He theorized:

. . . the bill is an attempt on the part of men of ease, of people, too indolent and fastidious for continuous political activity, to escape the natural result of their indolent and fastidious characteristics. Since the days of Plato, "the punishment that good men (if they are good) suffer for abstaining from active political life, is to be governed by bad men." This bill will not meet the expectations of this element among its backers. No bill on this subject can meet their expectations that does not carry the primary box, together with the election day ballot box, to their bedsides or their bathtubs.<sup>19</sup>

Although this characterization was an insulting portrayal of "men of ease," DeLeon's belief that participation would not increase after passage of the bill was correct. Harold F. Gosnell reported the effect the Primary Bill had upon voter participation.

It was supposed that this law would greatly increase participation of the voters in the primaries . . . The new law did not change conditions materially. In 1903, in an assembly district which gave a majority to the mayoralty candidate supported by the Republican party, only nine per cent of the Republican voters took part in the primary. In the fashionable Brownstone district of New York City, only thirteen per cent of the Republicans availed themselves of the privilege of participating in the primary election. As it was remarked in the New York Tribune after the first primary under the new law: "The reformers were allowed to enroll if they wanted to; the machine men were made to."<sup>20</sup>

Although these two arguments did not comprise a large part of DeLeon's address, they were among the most valid. Empirically campaign fraud did occur in rural areas and the bill did not increase voter participation in the political delegate selection process.

The content analysis of DeLeon's language and the textual analysis of his arguments reveal that DeLeon altered his strategies when addressing the New York State legislators. These findings conflict with Hart's thesis that doctrinaire speakers would be unable to adapt to non-indoctrinated audiences. Two additional criteria developed by Hart also suggest that DeLeon altered his strategies when addressing this audience. Hart argues that doctrinaire speakers focus more on problems (anxieties) than solutions. That DeLeon's address displays this characteristic is not surprising. DeLeon was speaking to a legis-

lative committee against a particular bill, not testifying on alternatives to stop campaign fraud. Thus, although DeLeon's address reflected this criterion of doctrinaire rhetoric, the results are not conclusive given the purpose of the address.

Another of Hart's criteria is that doctrinaire speakers rely on doctrinal sources. This address did not display this characteristic. Instead, the sources DeLeon used reflected a further attempt to adapt to his audience. When arguing the Primary Election Bill was unconstitutional, DeLeon referred to sources such as the New York State Constitution which made secret ballots mandatory; the events at the New York constitutional convention; and Chancellor Kent, a respected New York political figure. When he discussed the potential for campaign fraud under the provisions of the bill, DeLeon referred to incidents from the McKinley-Bryan election and editorials from the New York Sun. His examples suggested the Prohibition Party, the Republican Party, and the Democratic Party would be affected as well as the Socialist Labor Party. If DeLeon had relied on doctrinal sources, his arguments would have been less credible for the legislators. Through reliance on sources accepted by his audience, DeLeon enhanced the potential effectiveness of his message.

Contrary to Hart's hypothesis, Daniel DeLeon demonstrated that a doctrinaire speaker can adapt to a non-indoctrinated audience. DeLeon premised his arguments against the Primary Election Bill on traditional American values -- not socialist ideology -- and thus was able to adapt to this audience. Despite DeLeon's efforts to adapt his arguments, he did not mince words nor hide his views on capitalism in order to avoid

offending the legislators. He presented an honest, well-reasoned critique of the Primary Election Bill to a potentially unreceptive, hostile audience. As every critic knows, one cannot judge an address by its effectiveness. Although DeLeon was able successfully to adapt his address without compromising his belief in socialist ideology, his efforts were in vain. Political support for election reform was great and the Primary Election Bill was passed unanimously by the New York State Legislature.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Harold F. Gosnell, Boss Platt and his New York Machine (Chicago: U. of Chicago Press, 1924), p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> Roderick Patrick Hart, Jr., "Philosophical Commonality and Speech Types," Diss. Pennsylvania State Univ. in 1970, p. 237.

<sup>3</sup> The percentage of self references in this address was fifteen percent compared to an average of twelve percent in DeLeon's other rhetoric.

<sup>4</sup> Daniel DeLeon, The People, "Workers Guard the Ballot," March 20, 1898, p. 3.

<sup>5</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>6</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>7</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>8</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>9</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>10</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>12</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>13</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>14</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>15</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>16</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>17</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>18</sup> Gosnell, p. 86.

<sup>19</sup> DeLeon, p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Gosnell, pp. 86-7.

Chapter Five

On May 8, 1909, Daniel DeLeon presented an address entitled "Woman Suffrage" at Cooper Union. Invited to speak by the Socialist Women of Greater New York, DeLeon attempted to convince suffragists that the socialist revolution would solve their problems, thereby bringing new converts into the socialist fold. The Daily People advertised the address claiming:

Every man and woman of progressive thought will greatly profit and be highly benefitted by hearing this subject discussed by America's foremost sociologist. Questions in writing handed to the chairman will be answered by the lecturer. FREE ADMISSION.1

The advertisement was answered and the address was attended primarily by persons not indoctrinated to socialist philosophy. The Daily People reported:

The big hall was filled to the doors with new and interested faces, and the lecturers's [sic] letting proofs sank home to many to whom socialist philosophy was previously a sealed book.2

This audience of suffragists provided an even more difficult test of DeLeon's ability to adapt than the New York legislators. The suffragists were committed to their own doctrine and unlikely to be receptive to socialist dogma. Whereas DeLeon addressed the legislators on a relatively neutral topic -- election reform legislation -- the subject matter of his address to the suffragists was extremely partisan. DeLeon hoped to convince the suffragists to abandon their cause and become socialists.

One important consideration in audience adaptation is the degree of knowledge the audience has concerning the topic. If the suffragists had prior knowledge of socialist theory or were favorably disposed toward socialism, DeLeon's task would have been easier since he could rely somewhat on his audience's prior awareness. Although it is difficult to evaluate the knowledge of DeLeon's specific audience, the general availability of socialist doctrine can be ascertained.

The period from 1902 to 1912 is often referred to as the "golden age" of socialism. Around the turn of the century numerous varieties of socialism emerged: Utopian socialism, Bellamite Nationalism, the Socialist Party, the Socialist Labor Party, and the American Fabian Society. Although each group varied somewhat in philosophical tenets, all wished to eliminate class distinctions. The Socialist Party, the primary rival of DeLeon's SLP, grew rapidly from 1901 to 1912. Its membership increased from 10,000 to 118,000, and the number of votes cast for socialist presidential candidates such as Eugene Debs increased from 100,000 to 900,000. By 1920 there were 56 socialist mayors, over 300 socialist aldermen, a number of socialist state legislators, and a socialist congressman in the House of Representatives. Although the average person may not have been knowledgeable about the specific details of socialist philosophy, he or she was probably aware of the socialist movement.

Women were active in the socialist movement. Eight of the initial 125 members of the Socialist Party were women, and the number of women members grew eventually to 2,000 out of a total of 50,000 dues paying members. Although statistics are unavailable indicating the female mem-

bership of the SLP, women such as Olive M. Johnson and Ella Reeve Bloor played an active role in the party. This level of involvement by women may seem insignificant, but as Philip S. Foner notes:

. . . women made up almost 10 percent of the membership of the Socialist Party in these early years, were present at national conventions, constituting from 6 to 10 percent of the accredited delegates and participated in the party "with a level of involvement that surpassed that of women in the major American parties . . ."3

Independent women's clubs which advocated various forms of socialism also sprang up in many cities, including New York, Chicago, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Philadelphia. Although their numbers were small, more women participated in socialist politics than in the major parties. This level of involvement may reflect the more prominent position women were afforded by socialist theory.

The Socialist Women of Greater New York, the organization under whose auspices DeLeon gave this 1909 address, was founded in 1905. A report to the 1910 International Socialist Congress described the organization's progress:

. . . the organization known as the Socialist Women of Greater New York was organized with the aim of reaching and educating the women proletarians in this city and gradually to extend their activities to all parts of the country . . . The Socialist Women of Greater New York have carried on a systematic propaganda of education in the shape of discussion meetings, distribution of literature at meetings, upon the streets and at factory doors. Thousands of women have already received our message.4

The group was comprised primarily of women involved with the Socialist Labor Party, although women not affiliated with the SLP belonged as well.

In 1908 the Socialist Party created a Women's National Committee (WNC) that developed programs designed to reach various groups of women: working women, farmers' wives, women's clubs, etc. The WNC published 22 pamphlets that sold over a million and a half copies. The Socialist Party itself circulated 43 articles on women which were estimated to have reached approximately three million readers. Socialist propaganda was fairly widespread. Thus, when DeLeon addressed his audience of suffragists in 1909, he could expect them to be aware of the general goals of socialism, though perhaps not of the specific attitude of socialists toward the suffrage movement.

Both the socialist and suffrage movements hoped to better the social status of women, but by differing methods. For socialists, capitalism was the cause of women's subordination. Elimination of capitalism and the class rule inherent within it would afford women equal status with men. Suffragists wished to attain social equality for women by obtaining the ballot, thereby ensuring women greater participation in the political system. Individual suffragists reacted toward socialism in various ways. Many famous suffragists, including Frances Willard, Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Fanny Wright, were socialists; however, the suffrage movement as a whole "proved itself to be a bourgeois movement."<sup>5</sup> Many suffragists were either indifferent or hostile to socialism. Most suffragists were sensitive to criticism implying an association between socialism and suffrage, a common technique used by anti-suffragists. Women generally denied having socialist associations. The response by Harriot Stanton Blatch, daughter of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, was typical:

The fact is no suffrage organization has an economic programme, and no political proposal other than the extension of the franchise to women. Some individual suffragists are socialist, just as some are Republicans and some are Democrats, and undoubtedly if all women voted they would be of as many minds as the proverbial man.<sup>6</sup>

In other words, if DeLeon were to succeed in drawing suffragists into the socialist movement, he had to adapt to his audience rather than rely on socialist doctrine alone. Merely reciting standard socialist dogma without explaining its pertinence for suffragists would very likely have alienated DeLeon's audience.

The content analysis data indicates that this address is not a typical example of doctrinaire rhetoric which suggests DeLeon was able to adapt to his audience.<sup>7</sup> Yet despite DeLeon's adaptation, some general traits of the doctrinaire genre were evident in this speech. As noted earlier, Hart suggests that doctrinaire speakers draw their arguments, philosophy and language from the doctrine. DeLeon's address did use arguments drawn from socialist dogma and hence could be classified as doctrinaire in this respect. However, rather than being a reflection of doctrinality, this characteristic may merely be a consequence of the topic of the address. As DeLeon was attempting to persuade suffragists to become socialists, his arguments and language were derived from socialist doctrine. Rather than relying solely on content analysis data, investigation of the ways in which DeLeon made socialist dogma pertinent for suffragists is relevant to demonstrate audience adaptation.

In attempting to persuade suffragists, DeLeon relied on the socialist theories of materialism, determinism, and the socialist philosophy

of history. Historian Donald Egbert explains the concept of historical determinism:

The socialist theory holds that the course of history is in large degree causally determined and that whatever is to happen in the future -- even the socialist society itself -- has to a great extent been already foreordained by events in the past . . . Historical determinism does not imply, and is not ordinarily understood by socialists to imply, the total inefficacy of the human will.<sup>8</sup>

DeLeon's address incorporated this concept of historical determinism.

He stated:

Remorseless as the law of gravitation, the imperious and ultimately benevolent law that propelled mankind towards the ever more perfect, the ever more powerful, the ever more fruitful tool of production . . . another sociological law, a law that given material conditions, may be said to dictate the Class Struggle as an early racial necessity.<sup>9</sup>

DeLeon repeated the phrases "material conditions" and "law of progress" often within the discourse and drew from the theory of determinism as he discussed the inevitability of the human condition:

The race marches obedient to certain laws; the more backward it is the less of a hand does it take in the application of these laws . . . Only when far advanced, with a fund of past experience that gives him prescience, does man take evolution by the hand, so to speak, and perform an active part in the process.<sup>10</sup>

Likewise DeLeon's historical analysis of the subjugation of women and his proposed solution were derived primarily from the works of Lewis Henry Morgan and Friedrich Engels, theorists who provide the framework for the socialist view of women. Morgan, an American ethnographer of

the Iroquois Indians, published his text Ancient Society in 1877. In this work he described the Golden Age of Women as a time when women were given superior status. Morgan described this as a time of primitive agriculture and organized hunting centered around a relatively primitive domicile. He theorized that the subordination of women was a relatively recent phenomenon which coincided with the overthrow of the Mother-right and the establishment of private property.

Friedrich Engels, inspired by the work of Morgan, expanded the theoretical explanation of the decline of women's position in The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (1884). Engels theorized that the development of tools controlled by males resulted in the overthrow of the matriarchal society. Engels stated, "The first class opposition that appears in history coincides with that of the female sex by the males."<sup>11</sup> He emphasized that the oppression of women would end only when they were allowed once again to enter the public sphere.

Although DeLeon relied on Morgan and Engels' theories, he wished to convince suffragists that class -- not sex -- was the basis for their lowered status. He argued, "Women's disenfranchisement is an incident in the division of society into classes, the consequent Class Struggle, and the rise of Class Rule."<sup>12</sup> Although DeLeon claimed to rely on Morgan and Engels' theories, he actually distorted them in several ways. DeLeon's departure from standard socialist theory is inconsistent with Hart's contention that a doctrinaire speaker derives his arguments from doctrine, yet is an indication of audience adaptation.

The first deviation occurred as DeLeon attempted to demonstrate that

the condition of women was due to physical size rather than sex:

Those physically powerful enough to wield the then most fruitful tool became an aristocracy; those who could not, fell below. The line of cleavage was accordingly, not sex, but physique. Of course, sex qualities contributed to mark the female sex the weaker. Nevertheless, it was not as Woman that she was subordinated.<sup>13</sup>

DeLeon contended that both physically weak males and females became oppressed. Also inconsistent with the views of Engels, DeLeon ignored the double exploitation that women suffered both as a sex and as workers. Engels argued:

The overthrow of the mother-right was the world historical defeat of the female sex. The man took command in the home also, the woman was degraded and reduced to servitude, she became the slave of his lust, and a mere instrument for the production of his children.<sup>14</sup>

This alteration was significant because a separate women's movement would be necessary if women suffered a unique form of discrimination. DeLeon's inference that weak men were also suppressed was his own addition to the Morgan-Engels theories. By presenting the degraded position of women as solely a class rather than a sex issue, DeLeon negated the need for a distinct women's movement.

DeLeon's contention that a women's movement was unnecessary also conflicted with the views of Marx, whom DeLeon quoted as an authority on socialist theory. Marx supported the advancement of women's rights.

Carl Reeve<sup>15</sup> discussed Marx's position:

He [Marx] wrote to Kugelmann on December 12, 1868, on women. He felt that the level of women's rights was a measure of the extent of social progress, and applauded

the record of American labor in this regard . . . his basic appraisal of the need for the struggle for women's rights as a necessity for the working class was apparent.<sup>16</sup>

Lenin also urged the development of mass struggles for women's rights, but DeLeon did not.

Secondly, DeLeon argued that reform movements were harmful to revolutionary efforts. He suggested:

Blind to the origin and development of the classes; blind to the history of Suffrage; blind, accordingly, to its intimate connection with the great Social Question of our generation -- the Suffragist Movement imagines itself not a separate orbit all of its own, but imagines itself a planet that is wholly disconnected from the social planetary system. Laboring under this fatal error the Woman Suffrage Movement -- as the typical arguments it delights in indicate -- mainly wastes its ammunition in a cannonade of dialectics against phantom targets raised by the arguments of the Antis . . . <sup>17</sup>

Once again DeLeon's view ran counter to the theoretical stance of Marx and Engels, both of whom, as noted in Chapter Three, saw great value in reform efforts. Carl Reeve noted:

Marx and Engels had provided different guidelines [dealing with reform movements] from DeLeon's theories here . . . Marx wrote Dr. Ludwig Kugelmann in 1866, "The Reform Movement here (for universal suffrage) which our Central Council called into existence (and in which I played a great part) has now reached immense and irresistible dimensions.<sup>18</sup>

DeLeon altered standard socialist doctrines with regard to the reason for the lowered status of women and the value of reform movements in order to persuade suffragists to support socialism. If DeLeon was unable to convince the women that their difficulties stemmed from capitalism,

not sex discrimination, he could not convince them to join the socialist cause. If DeLeon had merely stated standard socialist dogma on the issue of women's subjugation, it is unlikely that he would have been able to persuade women to abandon the cause of suffrage. It is in these alterations that DeLeon veers from Hart's contention that speakers derive their theory solely from established doctrine.

As mentioned earlier, since socialism was the topic of DeLeon's address, the speech reflects several characteristics of the doctrinaire genre. For instance, DeLeon's language reflected socialist doctrine. He used the terms "class struggle," "capitalism," and "communism" all of which are drawn from socialist ideology. DeLeon also used collective nouns such as "ruling class," "bourgeois," and "ruled class" another characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric identified by Hart. As another trait of the genre, Hart suggests that doctrinal speakers elaborate anxieties and only rarely discuss solutions. DeLeon reflected this characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric as well in his suffrage address. He explained in great detail the need for a Socialist Revolution, the fallacious reasoning given by those opposed to suffrage to justify the unequal status of women and why women were denied suffrage. DeLeon described the Socialist Revolution as the solution to the problems women faced; however, true to the form of doctrinaire rhetoric, he did not elaborate on how the issue of woman's suffrage would be resolved following the revolution.

Although DeLeon's suffrage address clearly reflects some characteristics of the doctrinaire genre, it adapts beautifully to his suffrage audience. This speech differs from doctrinaire rhetoric in three

major ways. First, Hart suggests that doctrinaire rhetoric depends on the listeners to fill in gaps in logic, to provide the links (warrants) between the data and claims. For obvious reasons, DeLeon could not rely on his audience to fill in the speaker's logical gaps. Most members of his audience were not socialists, hence he needed to provide both the link between socialism and the problems faced by women and to convince them of the validity of that relationship. In his arguments DeLeon clearly detailed the links between suffrage and socialism. For example, he stated:

. . . Suffrage is not denied to woman as a sex; it is being denied to her as a proletarian. The women who are not proletarians care not for the ballot themselves anymore than the male members of their class, and realize full well with their male fellows, that by foregoing this, to them, indifferent privilege, they bar out the overwhelming members of their sex who are proletarians. I have yet to hear an argument from the Antis that does not proceed from Ruling Class interests -- consequently, that does not help to light the movement for Woman Suffrage the road that it should tread.<sup>19</sup>

In this excerpt DeLeon established that the motives of those opposed to suffrage stemmed from their opposition to the working class.

Another characteristic of the genre Hart identified is that speakers present doctrine as a product of the group as indicated by the use of the word "we." DeLeon rarely uses the word "we" in this address. Since members of DeLeon's audience were not socialists, they had not participated in the formation of the doctrine. For DeLeon to prematurely assume a relationship with his audience that they did not perceive might have been viewed as presumptuous by the suffragists and perhaps alienating.

Finally, Hart contends that doctrinal speakers rarely use specific numerical citations to bolster their arguments. If indoctrinated, the audience would find specific data unnecessary; they already have faith and believe. When doctrinal speakers use data it is normally to support already held beliefs. On the other hand, argument and evidence are essential for non-indoctrinated audiences. DeLeon strengthened his claims through the frequent use of specific data. For example, DeLeon quoted statistics taken from four states where women had achieved the vote to illustrate that despite the fact women could vote, the amount of woman and child labor had actually risen in these areas, and that the difference between the average man's and woman's wages had increased. DeLeon also referred to specific individuals such as Marx, Chancellor Kent, T.J. Dunning, Benjamin Bristow, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Henrietta Crosman, George Eliot, and others. Such citations serve several functions. First, statements by Marx and T.J. Dunning, an English economist, provide authoritative evidence on the topic of capitalism. Second, references to suffragists such as Crosman and Gilman demonstrated to the audience that some suffragists were already cognizant of the problems DeLeon discussed and supported socialism. Finally, using names familiar to the audience served to gain their attention and good will. In addition to testimony, DeLeon used many specific examples to validate his arguments. For instance, he used Australia as an example of a country which had universal suffrage yet still suffered from the problems which result from capitalistic wage-slavery. Specificity and a large amount of supporting material helped to clarify and substantiate DeLeon's position and made his theory more concrete for the audience.

DeLeon adapted to his specific audience in other ways not discussed by Hart. Analogies are a special type of supporting material that explain complex ideas through comparison to situations, objects, or ideas more familiar to the audience. DeLeon used analogies freely throughout his address. For example, he compared the condition of women to the condition of all the proletariat and he compared the arguments used against suffrage to the arguments used against socialism:

"Woman has no experience or knowledge of political matter" -- exactly the language of King George and his Parliament toward the colonists in revolt -- exactly the language of Oeil de Bouefanent the bourgeois who demanded a voice in the affairs of the Old Regime -- exactly the recent language of the Abdul Hamid towards his people tired of autocratic rule.<sup>20</sup>

DeLeon also used figurative analogies as illustrated in the following excerpt:

One thing at a time may or may not be easier to secure than a whole lot. That depends. It is easier to secure one dollar than a million; it is, however, harder to secure a railroad piecemeal than to secure a whole line.<sup>21</sup>

DeLeon's use of analogy is a clear indication of audience adaptation. This is not meant to imply that doctrinaire speakers do not use analogies; rather that DeLeon used fresh analogies easily accessible to his audience. For instance, he compared the relationship between the union of suffrage and socialism to the relationship of the veins to the heart, ". . . hearts and veins are so intimately connected that neither can be thoroughly understood without understanding both."<sup>22</sup> DeLeon used analogies to appeal to the imagination of the suffragists as well as to clarify his position.

DeLeon also adapted by appealing to values and ideals shared by his audience as exemplified by his praise of persons and values esteemed by the audience. For example, DeLeon complimented the efforts of the American Revolution to provide equality for all before the "economic social laws that underlie the private ownership of the necessaries for production" asserted themselves and proceeded to "shake and then shatter the card-house of the Revolution's illusions concerning freedom."<sup>23</sup> Within his proposal DeLeon retained the ideals of democracy and representative government: "The Social Revolution disentangles 'Political Government' from 'Representative Government' and discards the former."<sup>24</sup> DeLeon also indicated his support of the suffrage ideals -- "movements of the dignity and import of that of Woman Suffrage"<sup>25</sup> -- and conveyed his high personal regard for certain suffragists ("distinguished Henrietta Crosman," "Olive Schreiner, a brilliant advocate of Woman's rights"). Rather than accuse suffragists of malice, DeLeon suggested that they were merely uninformed as to the harmful nature of the statements they made:

I can think of no Suffragist of the many whom it has been my privilege to meet, whose heart would not feel like breaking at finding herself and her cherished movement so cruelly tricked.<sup>26</sup>

In summary, although DeLeon's address resembles doctrinaire rhetoric in some respects, he did deviate from the generic characteristics to adapt to his audience. The actual effectiveness of DeLeon's attempt to recruit suffragists is difficult to evaluate, but evidence exists to demonstrate that DeLeon did not alienate indoctrinated socialists by his adaptations.

Seven months following DeLeon's address, the Socialist Women of Greater New York refused to join or work with the organized suffrage movement.

The New York Times, December 20, 1909 reported:

The resolution that was adopted (at the meeting of the Socialistic Women of New York at the Labor Temple on Eighty-four Street) said, that the ballots of the women would undoubtedly bring them "into frequent conflict with the organized suffrage movement," and that the work of the Socialistic Women for suffrage must be carried along separate and different lines. The women socialists declared themselves with one voice to be woman suffragists but they say the organized women belong to the capitalistic class and can never have anything in common with them. They do not believe in the millionaire women who are assisting the suffragists.<sup>27</sup>

The language of the Women Socialists echoed the tenets of DeLeon's address. As evidenced by this address, DeLeon could adapt his doctrine to an audience comprised primarily of non-believers while simultaneously strengthening the views of true believers. Whether addressing Boston socialists, New York State legislators or woman suffragists, DeLeon was able to advance the principles of socialism.

## Notes

- 1 Daily People, May 1, 1909, p. 1.
- 2 Daily People, May 9, 1909, p. 1.
- 3 Philip S. Foner, Women and the American Labor Market (New York: Free Press, 1972), p. 270.
- 4 Daily People, "Report of the Socialist Women of Greater New York," Sept. 4, 1910, p. 5.
- 5 Mari Jo Buhle, "Feminism and Socialism in the U.S. 1820 - 1920," Diss. U. of Wisconsin in 1974, p. 198.
- 6 Aileen S. Kraditor, Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement (New York: Columbia University Press, 1965), p. 6.
- 7 The absolutism index for this address was 19. DeLeon made one self reference and two group references.
- 8 Donald Egbert and Stow Persons, eds., Socialism and American Life (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952), p. 197.
- 9 Daniel DeLeon, The Ballot and the Class Struggle (1909; rpt. New York: New York Labor News Press, 1947), pp. 6-7. Upon publication this addressed was retitled "The Ballot and the Class Struggle."
- 10 DeLeon, pp. 7-8.
- 11 Friedrich Engels, The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (13th ed. 1942; rpt. New York: International Publishers, 1971), p. 58.
- 12 DeLeon, p. 39.
- 13 DeLeon, p. 6.
- 14 Carl Reeve, The Life and Times of Daniel DeLeon (New York: Humani-

ties Press, 1972), p. 169.

<sup>15</sup> Reeve, pp. 10-11. Oakley C. Johnson comments: "Carl Reeve is the youngest son of Ella Reeve [Mother] Bloor, a member of the Socialist Labor Party for four years (1897-1902) who worked closely with DeLeon. Carl Reeve has put in years of study on DeLeonism and the Socialist Labor Party. Numerous articles by him on this subject have been reprinted in the Soviet Press and world press. He is undoubtedly the ablest all-round expert today in the United States on DeLeon's ideas and role in history."

<sup>16</sup> Reeve, p. 169.

<sup>17</sup> DeLeon, p. 39.

<sup>18</sup> Reeve, p. 168.

<sup>19</sup> DeLeon, p. 26.

<sup>20</sup> DeLeon, pp. 23-4.

<sup>21</sup> DeLeon, p. 38.

<sup>22</sup> DeLeon, p. 4.

<sup>23</sup> DeLeon, p. 13.

<sup>24</sup> DeLeon, p. 42.

<sup>25</sup> DeLeon, p. 38.

<sup>26</sup> DeLeon, p. 47.

<sup>27</sup> New York Times, "Woman Socialists Rebuff Suffragists," December 20, 1909, p. 5:2.

## Chapter Six

In concluding, I shall examine several issues raised in the course of this research: (1) the viability of Hart's conclusion that doctrinaire rhetoric forms a unique genre; (2) whether the applicability of Hart's methodology can be broadened; (3) the value of content analysis as a methodology for the rhetorical critic; and finally, (4) suggested areas of additional research.

As indicated in the first chapter, one purpose of this study was to examine whether Hart's criteria for the doctrinaire genre have predictive ability. That is, whether deductive application of Hart's methodology to the rhetoric of a doctrinaire socialist would yield results consistent with Hart's findings. Several of Hart's conclusions were replicated in this study. First, as Hart suggested, when Daniel DeLeon addressed indoctrinated audiences he tended to use absolutistic language and relied primarily on group references as indicated by the pronoun "we." In addition, socialist dogma influenced the language DeLeon used. He used "God" and "Devil" terms derived from the doctrine, doctrinal sources, and doctrinal phrases such as "socialism." DeLeon tended to focus on the past as indicated by his use of the past tense of the verb "to be." Finally, an examination of the three specific addresses by DeLeon demonstrated that he elaborated on anxieties and difficulties while rarely offering detailed solutions.

Several of Hart's criteria were not replicated by this analysis of DeLeon's rhetoric. For example, DeLeon used superlative and comparative adjectives more frequently when addressing indoctrinated audiences than

non-socialist audiences. This is the opposite of Hart's conclusion, and may indicate either that this is not a valid characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric or that DeLeon's rhetoric constitutes an anomaly. I suggest that this is not a valid characteristic of doctrinaire rhetoric. Hart's explanation for this characteristic (those indoctrinated believe the doctrine is best and there is no basis for comparison) is weak. Because Hart used an inductive methodology, he was forced to explain his data ex post facto. Contrary to Hart's suggestion, it would seem that even indoctrinated rhetors would view some aspects of the world in relative terms. For example, a doctrinaire speaker could suggest that a particular issue was of greater or lesser concern for the indoctrinated.

Two additional criteria of doctrinaire rhetoric isolated by Hart are also not reflected by DeLeon's rhetoric. Contrary to Hart's hypothesis, DeLeon used many pieces of specific evidence when addressing both the true believers and mass audiences. Secondly, although DeLeon did rely on doctrinal sources, he made many literary, political, biblical, and scientific references as well. In these respects DeLeon may have been an anomaly. Hart describes doctrinaire speakers as mere "mouthpieces" for the doctrine. DeLeon was not a mere mouthpiece, but an actual creator of socialist dogma. Donald McKee explains this attribute of DeLeon:

Obviously, one outstanding characteristic of DeLeon as a philosopher was his ability to change his theory when it appeared inadequate. It is certainly to his credit that he did not cling blindly to his earlier Marxism but deviated from it when its shortcomings became apparent and other theoretical approaches seemed

more suitable for the problems which confronted him. In his capacity as intellectual spokesman for his party; he was constantly reexamining his philosophy and searching for new ideas; and it was precisely this which enabled him to formulate a social theory which did not merely duplicate the words of Marx. For this theoretical flexibility the American Socialist has not been given sufficient recognition.<sup>1</sup>

DeLeon devoted his life to making the socialist state a reality in America. When necessary, DeLeon would alter standard Marxist doctrine in order to adapt it to the unique aspects of American society, hence DeLeon's title, the "Americanizer of Marx." In addition, DeLeon was a well-educated man who had been exposed to literature, philosophy, science, etc. Due to his academic training he had a wide variety of sources from which to draw illustrations, quotations, etc. DeLeon's legal training and his role as an instructor may explain his tendency to use specific data as supporting material for his arguments. Biographer L. Glen Seretan notes the imprint DeLeon's education had upon his rhetoric.

Nevertheless it [the academic world] left its indelible imprint on him, its style and manner, and some of its ideals became integral to him. Such can be noted in the nature and structure of many of the addresses he gave during his career in the movement. Replete with classical allusions, literary references, scientific analogies, and reams of statistics, they frequently bore a close resemblance, in all but message, to college lectures.<sup>2</sup>

Whether DeLeon's rhetoric constitutes an anomaly can be determined only by examining the addresses of other doctrinaire rhetors.

In his concluding chapters, Hart suggested that doctrinaire speakers may be unable to adapt their rhetoric to non-indoctrinated audiences due

to the shaping forces of the doctrine. DeLeon's rhetoric denies this hypothesis. DeLeon displayed a remarkable ability to adapt to his various audiences. When addressing New York state legislators, DeLeon based his arguments upon constitutional and democratic principles. When addressing the suffragists, DeLeon used statements by suffragists as supporting material. DeLeon's language, examples, and the sources he quoted were all altered depending upon whom he was addressing. Once again, the issue raised is whether DeLeon was an anomaly. I suggest that in this respect DeLeon's rhetoric does not constitute an anomaly. Rather, any good speaker should be capable of adapting his or her message to virtually any type of audience. None of the doctrinaire speakers Hart studied -- Gus Hall, Nathan Tanner, Edwin Walker, Hugh Brown -- stand out as great orators, and this may explain his hypothesis.

An additional purpose of this study was to broaden the applicability of Hart's methodology. Hart examined only oral rhetoric and contemporary speakers. This study examined both oral and printed rhetoric and examined a speaker from a different historical period. As suggested earlier, one would expect articles published in a doctrinaire newspaper to reflect the characteristics of the doctrinaire genre because its articles are directed primarily to the indoctrinated. Articles written by DeLeon and published in the party organ, The People, reflected the traits of the doctrinaire genre; in fact, in many cases they more closely replicated the generic criteria than DeLeon's addresses. For example, the articles used the smallest amount of specific data and had the most significant doctrinal terms. Since DeLeon was addressing an ideal, indoctrinated audience in his articles, he was not required to adapt his message

as he would to a particular audience in a particular setting. These results are summarized in Appendixes A through E.

Secondly, despite Hart's concern that time might prove a confounding variable, his methodology can be applied to rhetoric from different eras. Campbell and Jamieson have suggested that generic traits should be evident across time, and analysis of DeLeon's rhetoric supports this conclusion. Although a strict comparison of the exact numerical values derived from Hart's and my research is not possible, the data does reveal similar trends. This finding seems intuitively correct. To the extent that the generic characteristics are shaped by the rhetorical situation and audience expectations, one would expect doctrinaire rhetoric from different historical periods to share common characteristics.

Finally, Hart suggested that evaluating a single speaker over his or her speaking career could reveal the speaker's unique style. The content analysis is not a very fruitful methodology in this regard. Because this methodology examines rhetoric at the level of the word rather than at the sentence or discourse level, it is difficult to discern a speaking style. A critic can examine the sources and type of data a speaker uses with this method. For example, DeLeon made frequent references to Humorist Artemus Ward in his rhetoric. Despite these observations, other critical methodologies are better suited to evaluating a speaker's style. For example, a traditional close textual critique will reveal not only the types of sources and data a speaker uses, but the rhetor's unique argumentative strategies, sentence structure, and metaphoric choices as well.

This observation raises a serious question regarding the value of

content analysis as a critical tool. In many respects I believe content analysis is of limited value for the rhetorical critic. Content analysis can provide a scientific way in which to test one's theories about a particular genre. For example, Hart suggested that doctrinaire speakers tended to use more absolutistic language and a numerical comparison of doctrinaire and non-doctrinaire rhetoric bore out this hypothesis. Beyond this, the actual numbers serve little purpose. Although numerical data from DeLeon's rhetoric reflected trends similar to Hart's data, the actual numerical values varied. Evaluation of whether these difference between Hart's data and my own are statistically significant is impossible given the insufficiency of the sample size and lack of a control group. Perhaps if additional data were amassed such statistical tests would be possible, but the value of such an endeavor is questionable. Rhetorical criticism should involve a much richer analysis than mere numerical tabulations. Roderick Hart recognized this when he included tests derived from Toulmin's model of argumentation. However, despite this recognition, Hart indicates his positivistic bias when he suggests, "Perhaps this method of analysis [Toulmin] will always be a subjective enterprise, but if different persons can consistently produce the same answers using this mode of investigation, confidence in its reliability would be increased."<sup>3</sup>

I believe that rhetorical criticism can not become a scientific enterprise and that critics should resist positivistic impulses. The richness of human language should be celebrated by a critic and the method of content analysis is sterile. Close textual readings can reveal many more interesting aspects of a given rhetorical artifact.

For example, I believe a metaphorical analysis of DeLeon's address "Reform or Revolution" would provide interesting insights into the way in which the oration operates. This address to the Boston socialists, examined in Chapter Three, focused on the issue of ideological purity. The metaphors DeLeon used throughout the discourse emphasized an internal versus external distinction. He spoke of the differences between a poodle with ribbons which manifests external changes versus the evolution of a lizard to an eagle which manifests both internal and external changes. He warned against reformists who would stab the movement in its vitals -- another metaphor suggestive of the internal rather than external. DeLeon's message that party members should remain within the party ideology rather than communicate with outside movements is reflected by his metaphorical choices. This illustration is not complete; rather it is meant to illustrate how a content analysis can mask other productive critical approaches.

Obviously these methods are not mutually exclusive, and a good critic should be able to draw fruitfully from many critical methods. However, if content analysis is to be helpful for the critic much more testing needs to be done in order to more clearly define the categories Hart has developed. Many more deductive applications of his doctrinal generic criteria should be conducted in order to determine the theory's predictive ability. The following suggestions are just a few ways in which this research could be continued.

As mentioned, the specific numerical data from DeLeon's rhetoric differed from that gathered by Hart. Perhaps this is a reflection of the man or of the era. One approach would be to test the rhetoric of

other socialists from DeLeon's era such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Frances Willard, Eugene Debs, or James Connolly, in order to determine whether the data from their speeches closely replicated those of DeLeon's. In addition a control group from this period in history is necessary. A content analysis should be conducted on the rhetoric of other public speakers from traditional political parties, government, or religious organizations. The data would provide a basis from which to examine whether doctrinaire rhetoric varies from the norms of that era. If sufficient data were gathered, determination of whether any differences are statistically significant or mere chance variations would become possible.

Finally, I suggest further research is necessary in order to evaluate Hart's contention that doctrinaire rhetors may be unable to adapt their rhetoric to non-indoctrinated audiences due to the constraints imposed by the doctrine. As I have suggested, DeLeon's rhetoric clearly refutes this hypothesis. Perhaps DeLeon represents an anomaly; perhaps his rhetoric differs because he participated in the creation of doctrine rather than being a mere mouthpiece for its tenets. One way in which to resolve this issue would be to examine the rhetoric of other persons -- Lenin, Stalin, Joseph Smith -- who have played a role in the formation of doctrine.

The approach Roderick Hart has offered is novel and attempts to make rhetorical criticism more "scientific." Although I question the value of such an endeavor, Hart's methodology has provided some interesting insights into doctrinaire rhetoric as a genre. Hart's motivation was

to define a more precise test for generic classifications. In order to achieve this goal more rigorous testing is necessary in order to scientifically validate his theory. This analysis of Daniel DeLeon's rhetoric provides only a beginning.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Donald Kennedy McKee, "The Intellectual and Historical Influences Shaping the Political Theory of Daniel DeLeon," Diss. Columbia University in 1955, pp. 388-9.

<sup>2</sup> L. Glen Seretan, The Odyssey of an American Marxist (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1979), p.

<sup>3</sup> Roderick Patrick Hart, "Philosophical Commonality and Speech Types," Diss. Pennsylvania State University in 1970, p. 234.

APPENDIX A

Data	Absolute Verbs	Qualifying Language	Absolutism Index*
Hart's Doctrinaire Data	46.20	14.00	32.00
<u>DeLeon's Data:</u>			
Doctrinaire Addresses (13 addresses)	36.00	13.46	22.54
Non-Doctrinaire Addresses (8 addresses)	38.88	18.75	20.13
Total Addresses (21 addresses)	37.10	15.48	21.62
Debates (4 debates)	50.75	14.75	36.00
Articles (13 articles)	37.00	13.54	23.46
Total DeLeon Data	38.50	14.74	23.76

\* The Absolutism Index is calculated by subtracting the Qualifying Language numerical value from the Absolute Verbs numerical value.

APPENDIX B

Data	<u>Adjectives</u>		<u>Verb Tense</u>	
	Use of Superlative	Use of Comparative	Use of Past Tense	Use of Future Tense
Hart's Doctrinaire Data	4.00	3.80	33.00	4.90
<u>DeLeon's Data:</u>				
Doctrinaire Addresses (13 addresses)	2.77	4.85	30.31	2.62
Non-Doctrinaire Addresses (8 addresses)	2.25	3.50	29.88	5.75
Total Addresses (21 addresses)	2.57	4.33	30.14	3.81
Debates (4 debates)	4.25	4.50	43.75	4.75
Articles (13 articles)	1.61	5.62	39.31	2.69
Total DeLeon Data	2.42	4.79	34.71	3.53

\* These figures represent the frequency with which these types of terms were used within a thousand word sample.

APPENDIX C

<u>Data (References)</u>	<u>Self</u>	<u>Group</u>	<u>Audience</u>	<u>Others</u>	<u>Neuter</u>
Hart's Doctrinaire Data	11%	41%	11%	14%	23%
<u>DeLeon's Data:</u>					
Doctrinaire Addresses (13 addresses)	6%	17%	6%	33%	38%
Non-Doctrinaire Addresses (8 addresses)	21%	14%	6%	27%	32%
Total Addresses (21 addresses)	14%	15%	6%	30%	35%
Debates (4 debates)	22%	22%	8%	20%	28%
Articles (13 articles)	6%	6%	10%	22%	56%
Total DeLeon's Data	12%	18%	10%	25%	35%

APPENDIX D

Data	Specific Data	Significant Terms	Doctrinal
Hart's Doctrinaire Data	2.28	2.60	2.20
<u>DeLeon's Data:</u>			
Doctrinaire Addresses (13 addresses)	15.23	1.92	3.23
Non-Doctrinaire Addresses (8 addresses)	10.13	1.25	1.88
Total Addresses (21 addresses)	13.29	1.66	2.74
Debates (4 debates)	15.00	.50	4.25
Articles (13 articles)	9.61	2.23	6.46
Total DeLeon Data	12.47	1.74	4.15

\* These figures represent the average frequency with which each category occurred in the thousand word sample. Significant Terms are those appearing over 1% of the time. Doctrinal Terms are those ending in "ism."

Appendix ESignificant Terms

<u>Doctrinaire Addresses</u>	<u>Non-Doctrinaire</u>	<u>Debates</u>	<u>Articles</u>
capitalist	ballot	percent	capitalist
class(es)	class	union(s)	class(es)
economic	contract		craft
figures	craft(s)		convention(s)
Labor	home(s)		industrialism
leader	men		labor
movement	secret		movement
party(ies)	union(s)		party(ies)
press	worker(s)		political
produce(s)			price(s)
socialist(s)			principle(s)
union(s)			referendum
vote			SLP
wages			socialist
wealth			supply
worker(s)			tool(s)
			union(s)
			wage(s)
			worker(s)
			workingmen

\*Significant terms comprised more than one percent of the terms used in the thousand word samples.

## Bibliography

- Bedford, Henry F. Socialism and the Workers in Massachusetts 1886-1912.  
Amherst, Massachusetts: U. of Massachusetts Press, 1966.
- Buhle, Mari Jo. "Feminism and Socialism in the U.S. 1820 - 1920." Diss.  
University of Wisconsin 1974.
- Campbell, Karlyn Kohrs, and Kathleen Hall Jamieson. Form and Genre:  
Shaping Rhetorical Action. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication  
Association, n.d.
- DeLeon, Daniel. "An Address to Members of the Socialist Trade and Labor  
Alliance." Daily People, 13 April 1905, p. 5.
- . "Address to the Voters of Duluth, Minnesota." Daily People,  
28 January 1900, p. 1.
- . "An Address to Wage Workers." Daily People, 24 September  
1905, p. 5.
- . The Ballot and the Class Struggle. 1909; rpt. New York:  
New York Labor News Press, 1947.
- . The Burning Question of Trades Unionism. 1904; rpt. New  
York: New York Labor News Press, 1960.
- . "The Debate: Are Opportunities Equal in the United States?"  
Daily People, 22 September 1895, p. 1.
- . Debate on the Solution of the Trust Problem. 1915; rpt.  
New York: New York Socialist Literature Co., 1933.
- . A Debate on the Tactics of the ST&LA Toward Trade Unions:  
DeLeon v. Harriman. New York: Socialist Literature Co., 1909.

- . "Delegate's Report." Daily People, 6 August 1893, p. 1.
- . "DeLeon's Closing Speech." Daily People, 3 October 1906,  
p. 1.
- . "DeLeon's Speech in Reply to Bryan and Cochran." Daily  
People, 6 September 1896, p. 1.
- . "The Evolution of Unionism." Daily People, 15 January 1906,  
p. 3.
- . "Haywoodism and Industrialism." Daily People, 13 April 1913,  
p. 5.
- . "Helpless Labor." Daily People, 11 October 1896, p. 1,3.
- . "Letter of Acceptance." Daily People, 7 October 1902, p. 1.
- . Marx on Mallock. New York: New York Labor News Co., 1908.
- . "National Editor's Report: To the National Convention of the  
SLP," Daily People, 4 August 1912, p. 1.
- . "New Year's Greeting." Daily People, 1 January 1903, p. 2.
- . "Open Letter by Daniel DeLeon." Daily People, 20 September  
1908, p. 1.
- . "Open Letter to Charles Moyer." Daily People, 2 February  
1907, p. 1.
- . "Party Ownership of the Press." Daily People, 16 July 1899,  
p. 1.
- . "Plain Words to Boston Workingmen, Jew and Gentile." Daily  
People, 19 December 1897, p. 3.
- . Reform or Revolution. 1899; rpt. New York: New York Labor  
News Press, 1961.
- . "Report of the SLP to the International Socialist Congress  
of Amsterdam." Daily People, 14 August 1904, p. 1.
- . "Report of the SLP of the United States to International

- Socialist Congress held at Stuttgart." Daily People, 18 August 1907, p. 1.
- . Socialism Versus Anarchism. New York: New York Labor News Co., 1901.
- . "The Socialist Labor Party." Daily People, 1 May 1906, p. 2.
- . "Socialist Labor Party Report to the International Socialist Congress of Copenhagen." Daily People, September 1910, p. 1.
- . "The Socialist Movement in America." Daily People, 2 August 1908, p. 4.
- . Socialist Reconstruction of Society. New York: New York Labor News Co., 1905.
- . "Stenographic Report of the Chicago Convention, June 27 - July 8, 1905: Speech of Daniel DeLeon." Daily People, 3 August 1905, p. 3.
- . The Trust. New York: National Executive Committee of the SLP, 1889
- . "Two Pages From Roman History." Daily People, 13 April 1902, p. 5.
- . Unity. New York: New York Labor News Co., 1914.
- . "The Voice of Madison." The Nationalist, August 1889.
- . What Means This Strike? New York: New York Labor News Co., 1898.
- . "Work!!!" Daily People, 4 February 1894, p. 1.
- . "Workers Guard the Ballot." Daily People, 20 March 1898, p. 3.
- Egbert, Donald, and Stow Parsons, eds. Socialism and American Life. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952.
- Engels, Friedrich. The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State. 1971; rpt. New York: International Publishers, 1971.

- Fine, Nathan. Labor and Farmer Parties in the United States 1828-1928.  
New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.
- Foner, Philip S. History of the Labor Movement in the United States.  
Vol. I. 1947; rpt. New York: International Publishers, 1962.
- . History of the Labor Movement in the United States. Vol II.  
New York: International Publishers, 1955.
- . Women and the American Labor Market. New York: Free Press,  
1972.
- Goldberg, Harvey, ed. American Radicals: Some Problems and Personalities.  
New York: Monthly Review Press, 1957.
- Gosnell, Harold F. Boss Platt and his New York Machine. Chicago: Uni-  
versity of Chicago Press, 1924.
- Hart, Roderick P. "The Rhetoric of the True Believer." Communication  
Monographs. 38 (1971), p.249.
- . "Philosophical Commonality and Speech Types." Diss. Pennsyl-  
vania State Univ. 1970.
- Hoffer, Eric. The True Believer. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers,  
1951.
- Kipnis, Ira. The American Socialist Movement 1897 - 1912. New York:  
Columbia University Press, 1952.
- Kovalcheck, Kassian, Jr. "Daniel DeLeon: The Rhetoric of Rationaliza-  
tion." Diss. Indiana U. 1972.
- Kraditor, Aileen S. Ideas of the Woman Suffrage Movement. New York:  
Columbia University Press, 1965.
- "Lectures Had by Section New York Last Winter." Daily People, 28 July  
1913, p. 2.

- McKee, Donald Kennedy. "The Intellectual and Historical Influences Shaping the Political Theory of Daniel DeLeon." Diss. Columbia University 1955.
- National Executive Council Socialist Labor Party. Daniel DeLeon. New York: Labor News Press, 1926.
- Peterson, Arnold. Daniel DeLeon: Social Architect. Vol. I. New York: Labor News Press, 1941.
- Popper, Karl R. The Logic of Scientific Discovery. 1959; rpt. New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1968.
- Reeve, Carl. The Life and Times of Daniel DeLeon. New York: Humanities Press, Inc., 1972.
- Rehmus, Charles M., Doris B. McLaughlin and Frederick H. Nesbitt, eds. Labor and American Politics. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Michigan University Press, 1978.
- "Report of the Socialist Women of Greater New York." Daily People, 4 September 1910, p. 5.
- Seretan, L. Glen. The Odyssey of an American Marxist. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Howard University Press, 1979.
- Thompson, Wayne. "A Conservative View of a Progressive Rhetoric." Quarterly Journal of Speech. 49 (Feb. 1963), p. 1.
- "Woman Socialists Rebuff Suffragists." New York Times, 20 December 1909, p. 5:2.