



**Missouri State**  
UNIVERSITY

**BearWorks**

---

MSU Graduate Theses

---

Summer 1973

## Logography: An Appraisal of Rhetorical-Critical Implications

Isaac Edward Catt  
icatt309@comcast.net

As with any intellectual project, the content and views expressed in this thesis may be considered objectionable by some readers. However, this student-scholar's work has been judged to have academic value by the student's thesis committee members trained in the discipline. The content and views expressed in this thesis are those of the student-scholar and are not endorsed by Missouri State University, its Graduate College, or its employees.

---

Follow this and additional works at: <https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Catt, Isaac Edward, "Logography: An Appraisal of Rhetorical-Critical Implications" (1973). *MSU Graduate Theses*. 2493.

<https://bearworks.missouristate.edu/theses/2493>

This article or document was made available through BearWorks, the institutional repository of Missouri State University. The work contained in it may be protected by copyright and require permission of the copyright holder for reuse or redistribution.

For more information, please contact [BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu](mailto:BearWorks@library.missouristate.edu).

LB  
1900  
57W  
1973  
.c3

LOGOGRAPHY: AN APPRAISAL OF  
RHETORICAL-CRITICAL  
IMPLICATIONS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
the Faculty of the Graduate School  
Southwest Missouri State University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

---

by  
Isaac Edward Catt, Jr.  
July 1973

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Genesis . . . . .	1
Definition . . . . .	1
Justification for the Study . . . . .	2
Review of Literature . . . . .	5
Statement of Purpose . . . . .	8
Nature of Study . . . . .	9
1. GHOSTWRITING: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE . . . . .	13
Origins . . . . .	13
Ghosts in American History . . . . .	17
Contemporary Ghosting . . . . .	22
In politics . . . . .	22
In business . . . . .	24
In education . . . . .	26
SUMMARY . . . . .	27
2. RHETORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF LOGOGRAPHY . . . . .	29
PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS . . . . .	29
Goldwater and His Ghosts . . . . .	29
ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS . . . . .	34
Definitional Problem . . . . .	34
Whose Speech Is It? . . . . .	35

## TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

Chapter	Page
CRITICAL IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	40
Brandenburg and Braden's Criticism of Roosevelt . . . . .	42
Education and Experience of the Speaker . . . . .	42
The Preparation of Speeches . . . . .	43
Method of Developing a Speech . . . . .	44
Structure of Speeches . . . . .	45
Language and Style . . . . .	46
Delivery . . . . .	46
Critical Analysis . . . . .	46
SUMMARY . . . . .	52
3. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH . . . . .	54
Conclusions . . . . .	55
Recommendations for Further Research . . .	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	68

## INTRODUCTION

### Genesis

Marie Nichols' Rhetoric and Criticism was suggested to members of a class in rhetoric at Southwest Missouri State University as one of the landmark contributions in the field of public address. As a member of that class, this author found one article in the book particularly fascinating. It was surprising to find in spite of the countless volumes published on rhetorical criticism and public address that little had been written concerning ghostwriting. Rhetoric and Criticism contains several lectures which Marie Nichols presented at Louisiana State University fourteen years ago all of which dealt with American public address. "Ghostwriting: Implications for Public Address" concluded that more research ought to be undertaken to ascertain the origins and historical importance of ghostwriting, its extensiveness in America, and possible critical implications. Nichols strongly suggested that a major area of interest to rhetorical criticism had yet to be explored, the possibility of which was both exciting and appealing to a young student of public address.

Definition. Ghostwriting or logography, in this paper used interchangeably, is writing done by one person for publication or oral presentation in the name of someone

else. "Ghostwriting is writing actually done by one person but published as the work of another."<sup>1</sup> Lester Thonssen and others, in Speech Criticism, have said, "The term 'ghostwriting' is in popular but indiscriminate use to refer to anyone who assists another with a speech or literary production."<sup>2</sup> This paper concerns itself with speech preparation which involves more than one individual. Contributions of ghostwriters or speechwriters may vary from mere suggestions and stylistic contributions to authorship of an entire speech, but all such assistance is herein assumed to be ghostwriting and the varying amount of assistance only a matter of degree.

#### Justification for the Study

Logography, or ghostwriting, deserves serious study for at least three reasons. First, research has disclosed that ghostwriting is a recurring and pervasive aspect of contemporary public address. Secondly, the concept has received relatively little attention from rhetorical critics. And, finally, the phenomenon of ghostwriting poses grave questions concerning the validity of traditional rhetorical criticism. Donald K. Smith, who defended certain types of ghostwriting, nevertheless observed:

---

<sup>1</sup>Seneca Johnson, "In Defense of Ghost Writing," Harper's Magazine, Vol. 179 (December, 1940), 536.

<sup>2</sup>Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird and Waldo W. Braden, Speech Criticism (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1970), p. 333.

Ghostwriting and collaborative writing are widespread in our culture and the practice seems to be increasing. Such practice often carries overtones of deception, and to this extent calls for serious and sustained attention by students of speech.<sup>3</sup>

Smith's reasoning was that students of speech should be attentive to those speeches which were obviously written by ghosts but whose purpose was deceitful. How the student of speech is to determine when a speech is ghost-written or when a given speaker's use of the mode is purposely deceitful is left unanswered. Smith's article mirrored, in part, the recurring problem of evaluating a ghostwritten speech.

Marie Hochmuth Nichols, in the conclusion of a lecture delivered at Louisiana State University, stated:

Perhaps one good thing will eventually come. Some alert student of public address will take upon himself the responsibility of doing a searching study of ghostwriting in America. I hope that may be one bright spot in what otherwise appears to be absolute darkness.<sup>4</sup>

The ensuing fourteen years since this plea for more scholarly interest in ghostwriting was made have failed to produce the kind of study for which Marie Nichols called. However, ghostwriting has continued to grow and can now be said to be a characteristic phenomenon of contemporary public address. Columnist Richard L. Strout argued, "Today,

---

<sup>3</sup>Donald K. Smith, "Ghostwritten Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 47 (December, 1961), 416.

<sup>4</sup>Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "Ghost Writing: Implications for Public Address," Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 48.

speeches prepared in part by other hands are taken for granted."<sup>5</sup> Literary Digest proclaimed as early as 1934 that, "It has reached a point where the high official who writes his own speeches, radio pronouncements and magazine articles is the exception rather than the rule."<sup>6</sup> Most of the available material on the subject was written by persons other than rhetorical critics. "So common and fixed by now has become this employment of ghosts that no one, in or outside of Washington, gives it more than a passing thought."<sup>7</sup> This benign neglect is surprising, even overwhelming, in light of the profound practical, ethical, and critical implications involved when one man speaks the words of another whose identity and specific contributions to the speech are seldom revealed. Thonssen, Baird and Braden (whose contribution on the subject was a mere three pages) said, "The speech writer presents to the critic a problem he cannot ignore. As a first essential of any kind of criticism the critic must know what he is evaluating."<sup>8</sup> Nevertheless, traditional rhetorical criticism has neglected

---

<sup>5</sup>Richard L. Strout, Christian Science Monitor (September 22, 1962), cited by Lester Thonssen and others, Speech Criticism (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1970), p. 332.

<sup>6</sup>Arthur S. Draper (ed.), "News and Comment from the National Capital," The Literary Digest, Vol. 117, No. 23 (June 9, 1934), 16.

<sup>7</sup>Rufus Dart, "Ventriloquists of Washington," Scribners Magazine, Vol. 92 (November, 1932), 268.

<sup>8</sup>Thonssen, loc. cit.



to account for the speech writer in nearly all cases.

### Review of Literature

The Art of Persuasion in Greece by George Kennedy provided useful historical background in pointing up the origin of logographos. Several pages of narrative were devoted to judicial oratory which grew out of the courts which were concerned with the laws of inheritance in ancient Greece. Among the orators who became logographers for hire during this period of time were Antiphon, Lysias, and Isaeus. It is to those men and others that contemporary ghosts owe their present good fortune. The book is the best source of information concerning the origins of ghosting in antiquity and has been relied on for establishing historical perspective.<sup>9</sup>

"Ghostwriting: Implications for Public Address," published as one of a series of lectures by Marie Hochmuth Nichols in Rhetoric and Criticism, posed several provocative questions for the rhetorical critic. Nichols' concern was with the problems involved in criticism of speeches from a neo-Aristotelian point of view. Central to her discussion was the question of whose style should be evaluated, the ghost's or the speaker's, and whether the words of one man spoken by another can be taken as the thoughts of the speaker. Nichols' conclusion was that due to the

---

<sup>9</sup>George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963).

possibility that any given speech a public figure might deliver could be ghostwritten, "obviously our work as critics must be more tentative; obviously little can be taken for granted."<sup>10</sup> Nichols strongly suggested that much more work needed to be done in this area and that little had so far been accomplished in this regard.<sup>11</sup>

Robert F. Ray's "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," which appeared in the Central States Speech Journal, defended the practice for a political candidate, particularly a presidential candidate. The arguments were that a candidate lacked sufficient time to do such menial tasks as making hotel reservations, carrying his own luggage or writing his own speeches. Ray further indicated that, despite the considerable assistance they received from writers, the candidates for the presidential election of 1944 wrote their own speeches. This was true because the speeches accurately reflected the candidates' points of view. The article was typical of the defenses often given for ghostwriting, if somewhat offensive to the rhetorician's ear.<sup>12</sup>

Professors Ernest G. Bormann and Donald K. Smith became involved in a debate on the ethics of ghostwritten speeches in the Quarterly Journal of Speech in 1961. While

---

<sup>10</sup>Nichols, op. cit.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid.

<sup>12</sup>Robert F. Ray, "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," Central States Speech Journal, Vol. 8 (Fall, 1956).

both men believed the subject of utmost significance to the field of speech, Bormann gave a general indictment for all types of ghost activities, and Smith contended that public personalities such as the President should seek out advice in speechwriting as well as in all other matters. The debate was brief but ended with a reply from Bormann emphasizing their areas of agreement and particularly stressing that there is a difference between a speech a president makes for himself and a speech he makes representing the office of the presidency, the executive branch of the government, or the entire nation for which he is recognized spokesman. Bormann agreed that a speech made by the President (or another public figure) was not necessarily deceptive, if ghostwritten. However, if the speech was to be made by the public figure speaking for himself, Bormann insisted the speech should be the words of the speaker himself. The debate was enlightening but inadequate due to its brevity and its emphasis only on the ethical considerations. Smith and Bormann were rather quick to reach agreement which limited the thoroughness of their discussion. Furthermore, the suggestion that it could somehow be determined when a public figure was making a speech for himself and when he was speaking as a government official was tenuous at best. The problem of for whom the speech was given, the speaker or the government entity, within the speech itself would be compounded in a speech containing

elements of both purposes.<sup>13</sup>

This writer has been able to locate no thesis or dissertation or book which devoted itself to any significant degree to a thorough investigation of logography. Thus, research material was drawn primarily from periodicals in which various editorials on ghosting have appeared from time to time from the beginning of the twentieth century until the present day.

### Statement of Purpose

It should be made clear that it is not the author's purpose to develop, within the limited scope of the present effort, a formalized methodology for criticism which accounts for the ghostwriter. Rather, the purpose of this study is to attempt to answer the following questions posed by ghostwriting:

- (1) What are the origins of logography; who are the public figures who have relied on the form; and what is the extent of logography in contemporary America?
- (2) What are the rhetorical-critical implications of logography?
- (3) What are the possible solutions to rhetorical-critical problems posed by logography; and what suggestions could be made for further research?

Since the few articles published concerning the ghost appeared over a decade ago, a primary purpose in the

---

<sup>13</sup>Ernest G. Bormann, "Ethics of Ghostwritten Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 47 (October, 1961).

study has been to reawaken interest in an important and almost entirely neglected area of speech. Many questions once posed are largely unresolved; many more questions need to be asked. For example, is there an ethical consideration involved when a public figure speaks the words written by a logographer? From a pragmatic standpoint, what problems are manifest in ghostwriting for the political candidate or for the business executive? Has knowledge of ghostwriters on the part of the public lessened the ethical image the American public has been willing to ascribe to its leaders? Does the rhetorical critic evaluate a speech written by the ghost without considering the canon of delivery and ignoring the speaker? Or, full-well knowing that the invention, disposition, elocution, and memory are those of some anonymous individual or ghost team, does the critic evaluate only the delivery of the speaker? What happens to the credibility of government when the people are aware that it is conducted by scholars in the background who were not elected, who most often prefer anonymity, but who are the communicative organs of government? Is the general public even aware of the existence or influence of the ghostwriter?

### Nature of the Study

Chapter I considers the origin of ghostwriting in Greece, a survey of public figures and ghosts upon whom they have relied and the extensiveness of the practice in

American politics, business and education. The origin of the practice was with what the Greeks called logographos. Development of the form grew somewhat spontaneously out of judicial oratory or the practice of defending oneself in court. Greece was an oral society, and it was, therefore, natural that the phenomenon would develop there.

An examination of American political history, especially the presidency, reveals the pervasiveness of logography in this country. The mode was developing even before the Revolutionary War, but with the establishment of a form of government which did not require its rulers to be rhetors, the trend came into being. President Washington, for example, was a soldier whose every public appearance as president was an experience in stage-fright. One means of overcoming his problem was the use of behind-the-scenes writers. Most succeeding presidents followed Washington's precedent each for his own reasons. Today, President Nixon has had to rely on a team of ghosts who prepare to some extent virtually every speech he delivers.

Contemporary politics finds extensive use of speech writers which has not been limited to presidents. Senators, Representatives, Cabinet members and generals rely on undercover authors. Business executives find little time to write their own addresses to civic groups and committees, especially if an employee is found capable of handling the project at no extra charge. Educators, from university presidents and professors to high school principals

should not be surprised to find students who have turned in for a grade the work of a fellow student, because ghosts get up much material for the educators themselves.

Chapter II explores the implications of logography for the rhetorician. Three areas will be of concern: practical problems for the practicing orator, ethical considerations, and problems with which the rhetorical critic must deal. Emphasis has been given to the critical problem in an attempt to establish the validity of the traditional or neo-Aristotelian method applied to a ghostwritten speech.

Ethical considerations reside primarily in the questions of to what extent a man should speak his own words and to what degree the words of ghosts can conceivably be taken as the thoughts of the speaker. Is there a difference when the ghost's methods have been to consult the speaker and to closely go over the specific content of the speech? Whose speech is it? Can the politician unconsciously become the tool, the ventriloquist of his ghost?

Critical problems for the rhetorician are evaluated using the traditional approach as a frame of reference because it is the primary form of criticism followed since about 1920. The approach is fundamentally neo-Aristotelian emphasizing the modes of proof as they exhibit themselves in the speaker, speech, occasion, audience context. Ciceronian influence has also been

incorporated in the use of the five canons as a specific basis of analysis. An example of the criticism of an orator using the above means for analysis was found in History and Criticism of American Public Address. Brandenburg and Braden attempted the critical evaluation of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's speaking using the traditional method. However, the attention they gave to the fact that F.D.R. did not write his own speeches was cursory. Therefore, it was felt this article would provide a sufficient basis for determining whether ghostwriting had significant rhetorical-critical implications.

Chapter III summarizes the findings of the study, poses possible solutions to the practical, ethical and critical issues of logography, and poses additional questions for further research. Central to this discussion is the question of whether much research heretofore undertaken without considering the ghostwriter is, in fact, valid. What changes should be made, if any, in the approach to rhetorical criticism?



## Chapter I

### GHOSTWRITING: HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Historical perspective has always been an essential dimension of criticism. This chapter deals with the origins of logography in the classical period and with the subsequent application in American political history. The extensiveness of contemporary ghostwriting in business and education is also briefly examined. If the practice has been and is pervasive in this country, serious questions concerning the validity of all historical-critical studies of speakers must be re-examined. Rhetorical studies which have not considered the possible implications of ghostwriting may have disregarded an essential aspect of criticism.

#### Origins

Apparently, ghostwriting originated with the Greeks. It grew out of judicial oratory which had developed congruent with laws concerning inheritance rights. At that time nearly all communication was oral and individual citizens with inheritance claims were expected to defend their causes personally in the courts. Gradually, it became necessary for those whose education, literacy and persuasiveness were limited to hire the services of literary ghosts. While some of these anonymous authors limited their contributions to writing the defenses, others would actually appear and

speak for their clients. Thus, the development of the role of the trial lawyer coincided with that of judicial oratory and logography.

The practice seems to have spread rapidly and, as in many other pursuits, the Romans copied the Greek pattern of judicial oratory. Documents have revealed all of the following to have been logographers, many of them commanding handsome profits for their endeavors: Thucydides (who provided the accepted version of Pericles' "Funeral Oration"), Theodorus, Isocrates, Protagoras, Gorgias, Antiphon, Lysias, Isaeus, Polus, Tisias, Demosthenes, Dinarchus, Aeschines, Andocides, Lycurgus, Hyperides, Hirtius, and Seneca among numerous others.<sup>1</sup> George Kennedy claimed in The Art of Persuasion in Greece that "Antiphon, Lysias and Isaeus are primarily known as logographers, and the development of the form may be seen by a study of their works."<sup>2</sup> Of the three, Antiphon was least effective if today's standards of rhetoric are applied. Part of the reason was that in Antiphon's efforts "the ethos of the speaker is not used as a means of proof, and pathos is not very much developed."<sup>3</sup> Antiphon heavily relied upon logos, carefully

---

<sup>1</sup>George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 57-58, 60, 92, 126-45, 150, 175-77, 211-29, 252-57. See also Marie Hochmuth Nichols', "Ghost Writing: Implications for Public Address," Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 35-48.

<sup>2</sup>Kennedy, op. cit., p. 129.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 132.

developing his arguments from the laws of inheritance and skillfully defending his clients. In the courtroom itself, Antiphon could have been more successful had his ethical and motivational appeals been stronger.

Lysias' contribution was "ethopoia." Ethopoia was a term which described Lysias' ability to write as though he actually was the person for whom he was writing. It was a technique so carefully developed that his personality seldom showed through. He managed to assume the character of his client.<sup>4</sup>

Evidently, Isaeus' techniques obtained the desired effects, Kennedy observed:

The oratory of Isaeus is the triumph of technique. No testamentary case, for his act was specialized, seems to have been too great a challenge for him to undertake. Isaeus himself and his opinions are never evident, of course. Furthermore, the morality of the case is no concern of his. His sole object is to solve a rhetorical and legal problem, to effect persuasion out of given materials. Like the other orators he was aided by the fact that the speech would be orally delivered only once before a large jury which would have little opportunity to examine it carefully, and the particular field of testamentary law especially lent itself to his tactics since many of the cases were of limited interest and great complexity.<sup>5</sup>

Kennedy's statement reveals that technique was more important than moral considerations. The ghost writer depended on the brevity of the speech, the complex nature of the subject, and the impatience and ignorance of the audience for his effectiveness. Kennedy continued:

---

<sup>4</sup>Ibid., pp. 135-36.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 141.

It is easy to see why the litigants needed the services of a logographer and in Isaeus they undoubtedly found an authority on the delicate points of the law of inheritance. The jurors could not be expected to be deeply and personally interested nor to carry very many of the facts long in their minds. An impression of righteousness, logic and clarity for a few minutes was all that was needed, and this Isaeus could secure. Despite a deserved reputation for slyness, he seems to have been very successful.<sup>6</sup>

Seneca, best known as a dramatist, was Nero's teacher, his secretary of state, and his speech writer. In his vitriolic description of literary ghosts, John P. Sisk argued:

The ghost writer and his close relations, the literary forger and the anonymous writer, are, however, inseparable from the history of communication. According to classical scholar William T. Avery, even some of the Roman Emperors had ghosts. The rhetorician Trachalus ghosted for Otho, and the Emperor Nero's "Laudatio" at the funeral of Claudio was written by Seneca. Tacitus (expressing a thoroughly modern skepticism about the public figure's powers of articulation) was quite convinced that Nero couldn't have written the speech if he wanted to.<sup>7</sup>

Apparently, the need for the speech writer grew not only out of the practical necessity of self-defense developing into judicial oratory for the Greeks and Romans, but also out of the inability of certain public figures to adequately express themselves. There have been those who held strongly to the conviction that a public man should not be lacking in this respect. Cicero, for example, was dismayed by Marcus Antony's lack of eloquence:

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid.

<sup>7</sup>John P. Sisk, "Literary Ghosts," Commonweal, Vol. LXXIII, No. 11 (December 9, 1960), 274.

. . . you pour forth in a hurry the sentiments you have been taught by another.

You gave your physician three thousand acres; what would you have done if he had cured you? and two thousand to your master of oratory; what would you have done if he had been able to make you eloquent?<sup>8</sup>

In point of fact, even Caesar's commentaries on the Gallic and Civil Wars are of dubious authorship. Studies of the commentaries have shown the language to be less sophisticated than one might expect, and it has been suggested by one commentator that the author was a mere hack writer who managed to get hold of some Roman soldier's diary. Caesar's famous line, "Veni, vidi, vici" may well have been written for him by some hack in his employ.<sup>9</sup>

One journalist has suggested that Napoleon Bonaparte employed ghosts. "Napoleon traveled with his ghosts and much of his logic and repartee are attributed to the clever wits and scribes who surrounded him."<sup>10</sup>

### Ghosts in American History

The rhetoricians of antiquity had no monopoly on ghosting, and similarities between their methods and later Americans' are axiomatic. A survey of American political ghosts, particularly those involving the presidency, is

---

<sup>8</sup> Marcus Tullius Cicero, "The Second Phillipic," Masterpieces of Eloquence, ed. Henry Cabot Lodge and others (New York: P. F. Collier and Son), pp. 956-988.

<sup>9</sup> "Caesar's Ghost," Literary Digest, Vol. 123 (July 10, 1937), 37-38.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

illuminating. Even prior to the Revolutionary War, logography was obtaining a foothold in the colonies. Just as Thucydides had recreated the history of the Peloponnesian Wars and Pericles' "Funeral Oration," so John Adams told the story of James Otis' brilliant handling of the Writs of Assistance. Adams' diary recalled that Otis' protest was the first outcry for independence in the colonies.

Perhaps the greatest orator who advocated independence was the so-called "Orator of Nature," Patrick Henry. Henry's greatest speech was his "Liberty Speech" which is said to have been one of the final sparks igniting the Revolutionary War. Strong evidence exists which has shed considerable doubt on the textual authenticity of the "Liberty Speech." The fact is that Henry's biographer (himself an orator of repute), William Wirt, probably wrote the speech.<sup>11</sup>

Speech writing became common as American history progressed and examples of it are most evident in the office of the presidency.

Many of the state papers of George Washington, for example, are obviously the work of other hands. Some scholars are convinced that Washington's historic "Farewell Address" was, in fact, written by Alexander Hamilton.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup>Donal J. Stanton and Judy G. Jones, "The Textual Authenticity of Patrick Henry's 'Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death' Speech" (paper presented for interdepartmental seminar, speech 899, The Ohio State University, June 3, 1971).

<sup>12</sup>Peter Lewis, "Ghost Town," New York Times Magazine (April 10, 1960), 40.

Others believe that James Madison assisted Hamilton in the task. Edward Livingston wrote President Andrew Jackson's "Proclamation Against Nullification."<sup>13</sup> President Jackson also called upon Frank P. Blair, Duff Green and historian George Bancroft in formulating "Jacksonian Democracy."<sup>14</sup>

Daniel Webster, in his "Discourse in Commemoration of the Lives and Services of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson," evidently put some now famous words into Adams' mouth. Webster convinced his audience that John Adams had said, "Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I give my heart and hand to this vote" at the signing of the Declaration of Independence. The truth is that Daniel Webster wrote that moving line and it was first delivered in his commemorative address on August 2, 1826.<sup>15</sup>

Webster himself profited from what must have been a bit of ghosting. In March of 1818 he had spent most of an entire day defending in the Dartmouth College Case. Owing to his usual method, he later wrote out his account of the defense in his Works. But the part of the speech everyone remembers is the peroration which was not a part of the original speech. In Rufus Choate's memorial address

---

<sup>13</sup>Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "Ghost Writing: Implications for Public Address," Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), p. 38.

<sup>14</sup>Claude M. Fuess, "Ghosts in the White House," American Heritage, Vol. X, No. 1 (December, 1958), 46.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid.

at Hanover in July, 1853 after Webster's death, Choate cited a conclusion of Webster's "Dartmouth Speech" sent him by Chauncey Goodrich. According to Goodrich, Webster had paused for thirty seconds at the conclusion of his presentation to then turn to the Chief Justice and state: "It is, sir, as I have said, a small college--and yet there are those who love it . . . ." Chauncey Goodrich had supposedly recalled exactly at the age of 63 a speech he had heard at the age of 28. Choate and Goodrich had, through their genius, helped to immortalize Webster's speech.<sup>16</sup>

Abraham Lincoln was a highly literate, albeit a self-made man. His speeches were seldom the result of a group effort and were never entirely ghosted. Although there are those who have attempted to discredit the authenticity of some of his speeches, his great works were his own. However, it is known that Lincoln submitted his first inaugural address to William Seward and Orville Browning for their comments.<sup>17</sup>

Andrew Johnson was assisted by George Bancroft who was a likely choice considering Johnson's worship of Andrew Jackson and the fact that Bancroft had helped author what was to become known as "Jacksonian Democracy."<sup>18</sup> It is not known whether Bancroft played a significant role in the speeches which Johnson delivered on his luckless "swing

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>18</sup>Nichols, op. cit., p. 37.



around the circle."

Presidents Cleveland, Garfield, and Harding all relied on speech writers. Cleveland depended heavily upon Daniel S. Lamont and the President's famous "A public office is a public trust" was actually authored by Dorman B. Eaton. Garfield turned to his friends, T. M. Nichols, William Evarts, or Carl Schurz.<sup>19</sup> President Harding employed the talents of Judson C. Welliver, Arthur Vandenberg and Richard W. Child. Child earned an ambassadorship to Italy largely due to his contributions during a campaign. Harding, like most contemporary congressmen, began using ghosts while serving as a U.S. Senator. "Harding, when Senator, was known as 'Lazy Warren.' His secretary once exclaimed to a friend, 'Hell, except for speaking on the Senate floor, I am the gentleman from Ohio.'"<sup>20</sup>

Woodrow Wilson was one of the most erudite of all American Presidents and was an independent thinker, but unlike Theodore Roosevelt, Wilson occasionally demanded help. The "neutrality in thought" proclamation of August, 1914 was apparently not written by the President but by Robert Lansing with assistance from Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan.<sup>21</sup> Teddy Roosevelt would never allow a ghost in the White House.

---

<sup>19</sup>Fuess, op. cit., p. 47.

<sup>20</sup>Rufus Dart, "The Ventriloquists of Washington," Scribner's Magazine, Vol. XCII, No. 4 (October, 1932), 272.

<sup>21</sup>Fuess, op. cit., p. 97.

## Contemporary Ghosting

In politics. The losing candidates for high office have been committed to the use of logographers. James M. Cox, for example, spoke the words of Richard Goldsmith, and Alfred E. Smith the words of Mrs. Henry Moskowitz and Proskauer. Adlai Stevenson, who had himself once ghosted for Navy Secretary Frank Knox, employed a team of twenty writers. Among the distinguished writers who worked for Stevenson's election were Herbert Agar, Bernard DeVoto and Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. This team of speech writers was to become known as Stevenson's "Elks Club."<sup>22</sup>

Franklin Delano Roosevelt was more dependent on writers than most presidents and certainly more so than any preceding president had been. His advisors and writers included: Adolph Berle, Ben Cohen, Harry Hopkins, Robert Sherwood, Samuel Rosenmann, Stanley High, Donald Richberg, Archibald MacLeish, Rexford Tugwell, Raymond Moley, Tom Corcoran, Harold Ickes, and Charles Michelson.<sup>23</sup> Michelson prided himself in having, at that time, written more important addresses for more public figures than any other writer. Michelson's rival had been an individual

---

<sup>22</sup>Charles Roberts, "A Presidential Ghost Story," Newsweek, Vol. LXXVII, No. 2 (January 11, 1971), 21.

<sup>23</sup>Claude M. Fuess, "Ghosts in the White House," American Heritage, Vol. X, No. 1 (December, 1958), 98. See also Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "Ghost Writing: Implications for Public Address," Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 38-39.

named Bauer who headed his own ghost writing bureau, but the contemporary record holder is probably Dick Goodwin who has written for every Democratic nominee since Truman. Goodwin has also written for Eugene McCarthy, Robert F. Kennedy and Edmund Muskie.<sup>24</sup>

Truman frequently consulted Judge Rosenmann, Clark Clifford, Charles Murphy and William Hillman. Thomas E. Dewey relied on John Burton and Elliott Bell. President Eisenhower's writers were Emmett John Hughes, Arthur Larson, Kevin McCann, Gabriel Hauge, Bryce Harlow, Robert Cutler, and Malcom Moos. John F. Kennedy spoke the words of Willard Wirtz, Theodore Sorenson, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Dick Goodwin and John Kenneth Galbraith. President Lyndon B. Johnson asked Dick Goodwin to write his Vietnam turn-around speech in March, 1968 but also had had help on other occasions from a large group including: Abe Fortas, Willard Wirtz, John Steinbeck, Bill Moyers, Harry McPherson, Horace Busby, Joseph Califano, John Martin, John Roche and Douglas Cater. Raymond Price, Ben Wattenberg, Lee Huebner, William Safire and Patrick Buchanan write most of President Richard M. Nixon's speeches.<sup>25</sup> Nixon's most recent televised speech, May, 1973, defending himself in the Watergate Affair, was written by Nixon and Price while on retreat at Camp David.

---

<sup>24</sup>Roberts, op. cit., p. 22.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., pp. 21-22.

The list of ex-White House ghosts runs to at least forty names, but ghosts have not been the exclusive property of presidents; vice-presidents and many other public figures have resorted to employing speech writers.

Ghosts have made a good deal of their reputation and money during political campaigns at all levels of government. Perhaps the most interesting and humorous of these verbal campaign contributions occurred in 1956.

The ultimate in ghostly declarations was probably reached during the 1956 Presidential campaign. The Republican National Committee that year kept a ghost assigned to grinding out daily attacks against Democrats on topical subjects. When the ghost's statements were completed, and some were truly venomous, they were placed in quotation marks and attributed to various Republican Congressmen who had left their names on file with the committee as being willing to sponsor whatever billingsgate the ghost writers ground out.<sup>26</sup>

In business. Ghosts have invaded the arena of business, fulfilling the need for public speaking engagements for top executives. The full extent of ghosting in the field of business was evidenced by Peter Bart in the Saturday Review:

Literary trendspotters have devoted scant attention to what is probably the nation's busiest and fastest-growing school of communicators. These are the men who grind out a curious form of literature known as the 'business speech'--talks prepared for delivery by business leaders before civic associations, women's groups, and other organizations.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Lewis, loc. cit.

<sup>27</sup>Peter Bart, "The Busy Ghosts," Saturday Review, Vol. XLVI, No. 37 (September 14, 1963), 78.

Ideally, the businessman's ghost would work rather closely with his client. In practice, however, the executive who has neither the time nor the talent to write the speech in the first place has neither the time nor the wisdom to collaborate with his ghost. The extent of the ghosting in business is considerable and has continued to increase dramatically. Business Week reported in 1967 that:

Each of the Detroit automotive companies has its stable. Major oil companies retain a small corps of men who do nothing but keep their bosses in words.<sup>28</sup>

Business ghosts are unlike those in politics in that they have normally been kept more under wraps. However, ghostly business salaries range from twenty to forty-five thousand dollars annually. Salary ranges of that magnitude have no doubt assured the anonymity of the true authors. Many business speech writers would hesitate to reveal their identities in any case because doing so would require claiming authorship to much banal and dull material. These ghosts have revealed little respect for the businessman in concocting speeches which they feel fit the so-called "business mind." Despite all the work that goes into planning the typical business speech, public reaction has been generally negative.

. . . with all the work, skill, thought, planning, and time that go into the executive speech, Opinion

---

<sup>28</sup>"Ghost Writers Give Boss the Word," Business Week, No. 1951 (January 21, 1967), 72.

Research found among a public relations sample group that only 28% measure up as really good. More than half scored as dull, banal, or obvious.<sup>29</sup>

In education. Nowhere has the presence of the speech writer been more startling and disheartening than in the American educational system. The speeches given by valedictorians and salutatorians as well as those delivered by high school principals, college professors, and university presidents are frequently the product of anonymous speech writers. These speech writers have advertisements in catalogues and newspapers alongside advertisements for organizations seeking to write term papers, theses, and dissertations for a nominal fee of from one hundred fifty to three thousand dollars. An example of this type ghost was described in a 1962 issue of Time:

Newsom (a Chicago general practitioner of medicine) now writes seven new 1,000 word speeches a year, sends 100,000 tickler postcards to 25,000 high schools in all 50 states and Puerto Rico, sells mostly to small high schools. This year Newsom expects his pleasant diversion to gross \$9,000 and net \$6,000. He gets many letters from schools in the same town that find themselves with identical graduation speeches. Most of his orders are signed by high school principals, and more than one-half the checks he receives are drawn on school funds. In fact, his principal's address, a ringing charge to "quit yourselves like men," is one of his bestsellers. Says physician Newsom: "Most high school students get help with their speeches. Is it a sin when they pay someone?"<sup>30</sup>

American University first offered a course in

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 74.

<sup>30</sup> Time, Vol. LXXIX, No. 13 (March 30, 1962), 57-58.

ghostwriting in February, 1952. The course was designed to satisfy the desires of those whose goal in life was to put words into someone else's mouth. Dr. Walter P. Bowman, who was the instructor of the course, regarded the ghost as an "indispensible artisan."<sup>31</sup> The New Yorker appraised Dr. Bowman's course in the month of its origin:

If the course is to live up to realities, Dr. Bowman presumably will not make the mistake of preparing his lectures himself but will locate a behind-the-scenes man on the faculty to get his stuff up for him. The students, for their part, will not waste their own valuable time studying for their exams but will get some bright freshman to come up with the answers.<sup>32</sup>

#### SUMMARY

Chapter I has endeavored to provide a foundation from which the rhetorical-critical significance of logography may be evaluated. The history of ghostwriting, which apparently originated with the Greeks and judicial oratory, has been surveyed. Many other individuals likely employed such writers, but some of the more prominent historical examples have been enunciated. The extent of ghostwriting in America has been determined to be vast in politics, business and education. Certainly, a problem of such a pervasive nature should not be ignored by responsible critics of American public address. The phenomenon of

---

<sup>31</sup>The New Yorker, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1 (February 23, 1952), 23.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid.

ghostwriting is very extensive and of the utmost significance to the critic whose responsibility includes informing the public as well as assisting in the establishment of social and ethical norms.

Commonweal summarized the significance and extent of ghostwriting in this way:

Thus a predicament of our times is not only that we do not know who organizes much of the language that affects us but that our very minds are ghost-written--and not simply because we are moved by subconscious forces but because of the degree which our picture of ourselves and reality, which we take to be our own, is really the product of literary liaisons we are not aware of.<sup>33</sup>

Chapter II will attempt to focus in on specific problems the advent of ghostwriting has created for the rhetorical critic.

---

<sup>33</sup>Sisk, op. cit., p. 276.



## Chapter II

### RHETORICAL IMPLICATIONS OF LOGOGRAPHY

Previous chapters have demonstrated that logography has been practiced as long as rhetoric itself and has been employed by many prominent historical figures. The practice has grown most rapidly in American politics, yet it is also evident in business and education. With this background in mind, the rhetorical implications of ghostwriting must now be more thoroughly examined. This study will deal specifically with three crucial questions posed by ghostwriting: Does ghostwriting possess the potential to create practical problems for the speaker employing speechwriters which are not factors when a speaker writes his own speeches? What ethical problems are generated by the practice? Does ghostwriting negate the value of traditional rhetorical criticism? These are not the only questions posed by ghostwriting, but they are three of the most important.

### PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

#### Goldwater and His Ghosts

Senator Barry Goldwater's campaign for the presidency in 1964 probably provides the most dramatic example of a speaker being haunted by his former ghosts. Goldwater's dilemma clearly demonstrates the potential for a

political figure to be victimized by those employed to assist him unless he assumes the responsibility of digesting and evaluating what they have written for him in advance of publication or delivery. In the 1964 campaign for the presidency, Barry Goldwater was severely defeated by Lyndon B. Johnson. Richard Rovere has suggested that the Senator's defeat was assured, in part, by his complicated and inconsistent public image. William Scranton and Nelson Rockefeller, among many others, charged that Goldwater would have the United States withdraw from the United Nations, sell the Tennessee Valley Authority at public auction, and retaliate with nuclear weapons in dealing with brushfire wars. All this would be accomplished while the social security system and other "welfare" programs were being dismantled.<sup>1</sup> It is not at all unlikely that there were at least two Barry Goldwaters confronting the American voters.

There is, on the one hand, the senator on the hustings, the agreeable man with the easy Aw Shucks Western manner who speaks in rightist platitudes but has only a loose grip on ideology and not, apparently, much interest in it. And there is, on the other hand, the dour authoritarian polemicist whose name is signed to The Conscience of a Conservative, Why Not Victory?, and many hundreds of articles, columns, and press releases so heavily freighted with swarmy theology and invocations of Natural Law that they have won for the Senator the warm approval of Archduke Otto of Austria, and the admiration of the ranking ideologues of the Franco regime in Spain.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Richard H. Rovere, "The Minds of Barry Goldwater," Harper's Magazine, Vol. 229, No. 1372 (September, 1964) 37.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

In a sense, anyone who hires a ghost develops two personalities--the one who is publicly known through the words of the ghost and the real person. It might be said that often even people who write their own speeches develop separate "public" and "private" personalities if they hold high office. Obviously this is accentuated when ghosts are involved. Many American politicians, as evidenced in the last chapter, have relied heavily upon writers, but Goldwater's problem was a remarkable contrast between his public personality and the man himself. Unfortunately for the Senator, his speech writers did not boost his image; they turned out a very unattractive individual whose political philosophy was extremely rightist and dogmatic. Barry Goldwater became a frustrated man who could not remember all of the things he had others say for him over the years. "'Oh hell, I have ghosts all over the place,' he told Stewart Alsop of the Saturday Evening Post."<sup>3</sup>

Things got so bad late in 1963 that the staff had to take on some microfilm and punch card people to sort out what Goldwater had been saying, or had been having said for him, over the years and to determine exactly what commitments had been made for him and by him.<sup>4</sup>

Goldwater ran into problems in attempting to remain consistent with books and articles which had been ghosted for him, because "almost everything that has ever appeared under his name has been cast in a rhetoric alien to his

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid., p. 38.

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

mode of thinking and speaking."<sup>5</sup> Goldwater's rhetorical problems did not alone result in his defeat. However, George W. Dell, in an article published in the Quarterly Journal of Speech, agreed that this was a significant factor:

A reasonable conclusion is that the combination of speechwriters and Goldwater's own statements weakened his reputation for intellectual integrity . . . . Senator Goldwater probably lost the election because of, among other factors, his ambiguous rhetoric requiring subsequent attempts at clarification, his frequent inconsistencies, and his avoidance of the great issues confronting the nation.<sup>6</sup>

More important to a rhetorical study of Goldwater than the question of how much of him is to be found in his works is the question of how much of these ghosted articles is to be found in him. That is, to what extent must a man adhere to those things to which he has signed his name? While Brent Bozell, brother-in-law to William F. Buckley, Jr., and Stephen Shaddegg ghosted much of Goldwater's voluminous political philosophy, how much of this philosophy will the Senator continue to stand on? It is conceivable that Barry Goldwater is a reasonable, flexible man who might have preferred to vote for the Civil Rights Act, but because of his dogmatic attitude on the subject conveyed in some of his ghosted political philosophy, he voted

---

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 39.

<sup>6</sup>George W. Dell, "Republican Nominee: Barry M. Goldwater," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. L (December, 1964), 404.

against the bill on constitutional grounds.<sup>7</sup> The key rhetorical question of whether he was forced into his reactionary politics on such issues as civil rights and federal aid to education or whether he really believes in his overt position will probably never be answered. One can judge, however, that Goldwater's political death in 1964 resulted, at least in part, from image problems which were directly related to his use of logographers.

Perhaps candidate Goldwater could have prevented his rhetorical difficulties if he had written only those things which reflected his own personal ideology or had relied on writers who accurately interpreted them. A better choice of writers might have softened the inflexible positions taken by Bozell and others and a philosophy could possibly have emerged which allowed for compromise and was not so entirely alien to practical politics. Then, and only then, could the American people have accepted Goldwater's Conscience of a Conservative as a true testament of his own conscience and accepted or rejected him at the polls on knowledge of what Goldwater the man was really like. As history recorded the events of 1964, Senator Barry Goldwater was trapped by his own rhetoric.

---

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 42.

## ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Definitional Problem

Much of the disagreement between the critics and the defenders of logography results from a definitional problem. Critics ordinarily refer to any significant help in the preparation of a speech as ghosting. Logographers refuse to label anything short of authorship of an entire speech as ghostwritten. William Safire, a ghost for President Nixon and the author of The New Language of Politics (a book which the author called a political lexicon and which defends ghostwriting), has distinguished between speechwriting and ghostwriting.

A speech writer is a ghost who operates out in the open . . . . A ghostwriter, on the other hand, "surreptitiously prepares written and oral messages for public figures below the highest levels."<sup>8</sup>

The same kind of ambiguous and untenable delineation was made by Vogue in a discussion of the presidential and vice-presidential candidates for 1960.

Although the four candidates . . . [John F. Kennedy, Lyndon B. Johnson, Richard M. Nixon, and Henry Cabot Lodge] write their own final drafts of their speeches, all use speech writers who are not to be confused with ghost writers who do the actual writing for their chiefs whose names they sign.<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>William Safire, The New Language of Politics (New York: Random House, Incorporated, 1968), pp. 162-63.

<sup>9</sup>"The Speechwriters," Vogue, Vol. 136, No. 5 Whole No. 2045 (September 15, 1960), 159.

### Whose Speech Is It?

The logographer's veracity was never more dutifully demonstrated than by Emmett John Hughes who, after having ghosted for Eisenhower, wrote a statement for Rockefeller sharply criticizing Eisenhower's policies. Hughes was a declared Democrat who, under the auspices of President Eisenhower, delivered a major address to the 1956 Republican Convention.<sup>10</sup> (It is not known whether Hughes had hired a Republican ghost for this endeavor.)

Central to the issue has been the question of whose work a ghostwritten speech is. Most logographers contend that, once written, the speech is entirely the speaker's regardless of his contribution to the writing. Some critics have confounded the issue by insisting that a speech is a man's own only if he writes and delivers it.

Remarkably, no matter how long they toil--and sometimes it can run to a dozen drafts--most speech writers loyally maintain that when finally delivered, each effort is "pure Nixon," "pure Johnson," or unadulterated whoever-they-are-writing-for.<sup>11</sup>

Ernest G. Bormann has felt that the question of who wrote the speech "has been a perennial question for the historian but with the increase in ghostwriting in all areas of contemporary culture, it has become a much more

---

<sup>10</sup>Time, Vol. LXXV, No. 25 (June 20, 1960), 11.

<sup>11</sup>Charles Roberts, "A Presidential Ghost Story," Newsweek, Vol. LXXVII, No. 2 (January 11, 1971), 22.

important one."<sup>12</sup>

Those who rely on ghosts have defended the practice by drawing a distinction between men of action and ideas and those who put the ideas into written form. They contend that a man who knows much about diplomacy, for example, might be hard put to express his knowledge in the form of a speech or a book on the subject. Memoranda and reports written by business executives are likely to be better written if skilled ghosts are relied upon. Perhaps many policies which are perfectly sound go unheeded because their presentation is lacking. "The sad fact is that effective communication of complex material is an art not everyone has."<sup>13</sup> Is logography socially useful and has it earned the status of respectability or is it a deceitful art? Seneca Johnson, in an article entitled "In Defense of Ghost Writing," admitted that writing Ph.D. dissertations was unanimously taken to be dishonest. Yet, he himself had helped "'earn' the degree of Ph.D. for several people in different fields."<sup>14</sup> He defended ghosting as:

. . . simply a manifestation of the principle of division of labor . . . the division between those who act and those who think is at least as

---

<sup>12</sup>Ernest G. Bormann, Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Incorporated, 1965), p. 175.

<sup>13</sup>Victor M. Ratner, "Who Should Do the Writing?" Harper's Magazine, Vol. 205 (December, 1952), 91.

<sup>14</sup>Seneca Johnson, "In Defense of Ghost Writing," Harper's Magazine, Vol. 179 (December, 1940), 539.



old as history; but within the category of thinkers is it possible that we are seeing today a further fission into those who think executively, those who think reflectively, and those who think communicatively? The last of course would be our ghost writers.<sup>15</sup>

No more apt reply could have been given to this columnist than Walter Lippmann's statement:

It is, moreover, a delusion, fostered into an inferiority complex among executives by professional writers, that in an age of specialists some are called to find the right words for men of action to use. The truth is that anyone who knows what he is doing can say what he is doing, and anyone who knows what he thinks can say what he thinks. Those who cannot speak for themselves are, with very rare exceptions, not very sure of what they are doing and of what they mean. The sooner they are found out the better.<sup>16</sup>

Corollary to the question of whose speech it is is the more important issue--who will assume responsibility for what the speech says? If the speaker is to assume complete responsibility for the contents of his rhetoric, then the ghost's role is necessarily subjugated. In such an instance, will the ghost willingly accept his role of anonymity? Bill Moyers, who wrote for President Johnson, strongly advocated the belief that a political candidate who carried forth the facade that he writes his own speeches is a hypocrite. Samuel I. Rosenmann, one of Franklin Roosevelt's prominent writers, believes conversely that speech

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., p. 541.

<sup>16</sup>Walter Lippman, "Something Off My Chest," cited by William Safire, The New Language of Politics (New York: Random House, Incorporated, 1968), p. 414.

writers should remain anonymous and that their being found out might reduce the effectiveness of a given speech.<sup>17</sup> The nature of the ghost himself would seem important in this respect. Insight into the thinking of a political logographer was provided by an anonymous ghost in The Articulates. The author of an article which appeared in this book claims to have been a speech writer for several Republican candidates for the presidency. To him, "the candidates were merely expressions of me. They were the vehicles by which I expressed my art."<sup>18</sup> This particular ghost regarded the candidates for whom he wrote as a means of getting his ideas out for the people to hear. The only reason the American people believe a man to be great, in this ghost's view, is because he and others like him called the man great "until the adjective stuck."<sup>19</sup> As for the speech itself, this "intellectual gigolo" stated that it was not the candidate's nor his but was the party's. It is a sobering thought that this ghost believes his idea, that the candidate is a mere loudspeaker for the ghost's ideas, to be the attitude of nearly all ghosts. "I've never discussed the matter with other speech writers far enough up the ladder to write for

---

<sup>17</sup>Roberts, loc. cit.

<sup>18</sup>John M. Henry (ed.), "The Intellectual Gigolo Strikes Back," The Articulates (Indianapolis, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1957), p. 43.

<sup>19</sup>Ibid., p. 44.

Presidential candidates, but I daresay they have about the same attitude I have."<sup>20</sup> And what if this ghost and his client have a falling out? Do they merely dissolve their employer-employee relationship? No,

Speechwriters are "just as human" as are press photographers, for instance, who, if a candidate high-hats them, thereafter photograph only his bad profile and emphasize his shortness of stature. It is only justice asserting itself.<sup>21</sup>

Professors Donald K. Smith and Ernest G. Bormann engaged in a running debate in the pages of the Quarterly Journal of Speech. Professor Smith felt that "the president that seeks out the finest writers he can command to help him with his speeches is acting both responsibly and ethically."<sup>22</sup> Professor Bormann was indignant in his reply to Smith.

If the audience is to know a candidate through what he speaks and writes, then he must be honest with them and present himself as he really is. When he reads a speech that reveals to his audience a quiet humor, an urbane worldliness, subtle and incisive intellectual equipment, then he should be that kind of man. If his collaborators, one a man of quiet humor, another an urbane worldly man, and the third a man of subtle and incisive intellectual equipment, are responsible for the "image" revealed in the speech, and if the speaker has different qualities and intellectual fiber, the speech is a deceit and it can be labeled as ghost written and condemned as unethical.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., p. 47.

<sup>22</sup>Donald K. Smith, "Ghostwritten Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 47 (December, 1961), 418.

<sup>23</sup>Ernest G. Bormann, "Ethics of Ghostwritten Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 47 (October, 1961), 267.

Bormann reflected the view held by many other critics including historian and journalist Eric Sevareid who has said that "a man's own words are a man's own self."<sup>24</sup>

### CRITICAL IMPLICATIONS

It was felt that the most effective means for determining the critical importance of logography would be to select an example of a study which had been conducted on a speaker who had employed ghosts. For this purpose, Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo W. Braden's analysis of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's public speaking found in History and Criticism of American Public Address serves well. Not only are the authors of this article recognized authorities in speech criticism, but History and Criticism of American Public Address is one of the landmark contributions to the field of rhetoric. The selection is suitable, because it is a fairly typical neo-Aristotelian study. According to Edwin Black, "by far the dominant mode of rhetorical criticism of the present century in the United States has been neo-Aristotelianism."<sup>25</sup> Brandenburg and Braden's analysis was organized around the

---

<sup>24</sup>Eric Sevareid, Newsweek, Vol. 39, No. 5 (February 4, 1952), 71, cited by Lester Thonssen and others, Speech Criticism (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1970), pp. 333-34.

<sup>25</sup>Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism A Study in Method (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965), p. 27.

following topic headings: Education and Experience of the Speaker, The Preparation of Speeches, Method of Developing a Speech, Structure of Speeches, Language and Style, and Delivery.<sup>26</sup> The organization of the study (to be followed in this paper) and its internal method exemplify traditional rhetorical criticism in following Wicheln's formal statement describing this form of criticism:

Rhetorical criticism is necessarily analytic. The scheme of a rhetorical study includes the element of the speaker's personality as a conditioning factor; it includes also the public character of the man--not what he was, but what he was thought to be. It requires a description of the speaker's audience, and of the leading ideas with which he plied his hearers--his topics, the motives to which he appealed, the nature of the proofs he offered. These will reveal his own judgment on the questions which he discussed. Attention must be paid, too, to the relation of the surviving texts to what was actually uttered: in case the nature of the changes is known, there may be occasion to consider adaptation to two audiences--that which heard and that which read. Nor can rhetorical criticism omit the speaker's mode of expression, nor his habit of preparation and his manner of delivery from the platform; though the last two are perhaps less significant. "Style"--in the sense which corresponds to diction and sentence movement--must receive attention, but only as one among various means that secure for the speaker ready access to the minds of his auditors. Finally, the effect of the discourse on its immediate hearers is not to be ignored, either in the testimony of witnesses, nor in the record of events. And throughout such a study one must conceive of the public man as influencing the men of his own times by the power of his discourse.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>26</sup>Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo W. Braden, "Franklin Delano Roosevelt," History and Criticism of American Public Address, Vol. III, ed. Marie Hochmuth and others (New York: Russell and Russell, Incorporated, 1955), pp. 458-528.

<sup>27</sup>Herbert A. Wichelns, "The Literary Criticism of Oratory," The Rhetorical Idiom Essays in Rhetoric, Oratory, and Drama, ed. Donald C. Bryant (Ithaca, New York, 1958),

No one but Wichelns has so clearly and succinctly depicted the neo-Aristotelian method of rhetorical criticism which has been followed practically to the letter. Obviously, such a method of criticism is based on Aristotle's Rhetoric as well as the Rhetorica ad herennium, the first known work advancing the five canons. It should be noted immediately that Wichelns felt that the speaker's method of preparation and his manner of delivery were of least importance. Wichelns did not establish whether the speech was ghosted as a criterion for evaluation. However, the role of the ghost in the speaker's method of preparation is ostensibly accounted for in Brandenburg and Braden's treatment of Roosevelt and is, in fact, dealt with at some length. Roosevelt, apparently, seldom relied on anyone to write the entire text of a speech; but in the case of other public figures who did, one might well ask how the speaker could be evaluated at all except by his delivery.

Brandenburg and Braden's  
Criticism of Roosevelt

Education and Experience of the Speaker. Wichelns postulated that criticism should include elements of the speaker's personality as a conditioning factor.<sup>28</sup> Consistent with this requirement, the treatment of Franklin

---

pp. 38-39, cited by Edwin Black, Rhetorical Criticism A Study in Method (New York: Macmillan Company, 1965), pp. 31-32.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

Roosevelt described his early upbringing including his study of languages and his family's world travels. The young Roosevelt attended Groton and studied the classics but "did not particularly distinguish himself as a student or as a leader."<sup>29</sup> He was interested in oral interpretation of literature, journalism, and he studied law. Significantly, the conclusion of this section was that his experience had led him to develop four themes in his later rhetorical efforts: "social justice, internationalism, hemispheric solidarity, and the interdependence of all people."<sup>30</sup> Whose issues were these? Would Roosevelt's choice of different speech writers have changed his basic themes? Were the experiences and education of his writers dissimilar to his own? Were these themes, perhaps, the culminative effort of many advisors and many ghosts?

The Preparation of Speeches. Roosevelt explained his own method of preparing addresses in this way:

. . . I have called on many different people for advice and assistance . . . . On various subjects I have received drafts and memoranda from different people, varying from short suggestions as to a sentence here and there to a long memoranda of factual material, and in some cases complete addresses.<sup>31</sup>

Brandenburg and Braden admit that determining the exact origin of specific concepts is difficult in Roosevelt's speeches. They point out various phrases claimed

---

<sup>29</sup>Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 460.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid., p. 464.

<sup>31</sup>Ibid.

by different advisors on whom the President relied. For example, Harold Ickes claimed authorship of the "quarantine" expression, Adolph Berle, Sr., was author of "political skywriting," and M. L. Wilson of "shadow of peasantry."<sup>32</sup> Roosevelt maintained a file of expressions and thoughts to be used in the texts of his speeches, and his many advisors made frequent contributions to it. Brandenburg and Braden conclude that,

The final manuscript from which he spoke was in some instances very close in substance and in form to his first plans. In other cases most of the ideas and work did not come from the President.<sup>33</sup>

Method of Developing a Speech. This part of the article, entirely congruent with Wichelns, deals with "the leading ideas with which he plied his hearers--his topics, motives to which he appealed, the nature of the proofs he offered."<sup>34</sup> Roosevelt's appeal to reason was mainly "inductive in logical procedure."<sup>35</sup> He used enthymematic logic and infrequent but effective deduction. His use of ethical appeals was frequent and skillful. "His character was made a cause of persuasion in his speeches."<sup>36</sup> He relied more on personal and emotional proof than on logical appeals. While his consistency in

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 466.

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., p. 479.

<sup>34</sup>Wichelns, loc. cit.

<sup>35</sup>Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 482.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., p. 494.



use of the logical mode is frequently questioned, few would question his ethical stature and his ability to appeal to the emotions of his listeners. But Wichelns had said that, "these [proofs] will reveal his judgment of human nature in his audiences, and also his judgment on the questions which he discussed (emphasis added)."<sup>37</sup> Was it his judgment of human nature or the specific judgment of the man who authored the speech? Was it the composite group judgment of Roosevelt and his team of ghosts which presented opinions on the questions he discussed? When an individual ghost contributed a word or phrase or paragraph intended as a specific appeal, should these critics have evaluated the appeal as Roosevelt's own?

Structure of Speeches. Wichelns argued that "the speaker's mode of arrangement and his mode of expression" should be ascertained and evaluated.<sup>38</sup> No particular pattern of development was characteristic of President Roosevelt's speeches but his speeches always seemed to be clear.

Since his addresses were given careful attention both by him and by his advisors and were typically revised several times, they contained such essentials as effective transitions and an adherence to principles of relevancy and sequence . . . . Roosevelt and his advisors appreciated the value of good introductions and conclusions to speeches.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Wichelns, loc. cit.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

<sup>39</sup>Brandenburg, op. cit., p. 504.

Language and Style. At the heart of Roosevelt's consciousness of style was insistence upon perspicuity.

Concrete, simple language, vivid descriptions, striking phrases and epigrammatic statements, frequent allusions to the Bible and occasional short, terse sentences contributed impressiveness to what he said.<sup>40</sup>

His style was effective but the critic must further consider what contributions were his own and what belonged to his many ghosts.

Delivery. The article effectively evaluates the personality, appearance, voice, and pronunciation of Franklin Roosevelt concluding that he was very effective.

Critical Analysis. It is with Brandenburg and Braden's conclusive evaluation of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt's public speaking that the critic must take exception. They stated:

There can be little doubt that Roosevelt called upon others to write almost in toto many of his minor efforts . . . . But it also must be recognized that Roosevelt planned, directed, and supervised carefully the preparation of his major addresses. Moreover, before the address was finished much of his language and his compositional preferences went into the speech. Roosevelt was directly responsible for what he said and how he said it. They were his speeches.<sup>41</sup>

The conclusion of the analysis of Roosevelt's speaking was not unique to this article. Historian Eric F. Goldman concluded his discussion of F.D.R.'s ghosts with the

---

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., pp. 505, 514-15.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., p. 528.

following:

Finally, came the climax of the Roosevelt contribution, with F.D.R. before the microphones, by his manner of delivery transforming the manuscript totally into his own and transforming it with maximum impact.<sup>42</sup>

Goldman, although admittedly not a rhetorician, seemed to feel the speech could be evaluated as though it completely belonged to Roosevelt solely on the basis of one canon--delivery. Wichelns thought delivery was one of the least important considerations. Goldman's underlying assumption is similar to that of Brandenburg and Braden, because Roosevelt had hand-picked writers who agreed with his ideas and had himself made some contributions to the speech, the speeches were indeed an expression only of the president.

Following an evaluation of Dewey and Roosevelt's speaking in the 1944 campaign, Dr. Robert F. Ray concluded:

Insofar as the end products reflected the points of view, desired word arrangement, style and intent of the speakers, the 1944 candidates for the presidency "wrote their own speeches."<sup>43</sup>

The attitude that the delivery of the speech makes it the speaker's own pervades business as well as politics. Alan Koehler, in The Madison Avenue Speech Book, typified

---

<sup>42</sup>Eric F. Goldman, "Party of One," Holiday, Vol. 31, No. 4 (April, 1962), 18.

<sup>43</sup>Robert F. Ray, "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," Central States Speech Journal, Vol. 8 (Fall, 1956), 11.

the outlook with his statement that:

Some people can't be bothered writing their speeches. . . . The Madison Avenue speaker never lets pride or jealousy of authorship deter him from calling upon a ghost; he knows that the act of delivering a speech convinces any speaker he really wrote it all himself.<sup>44</sup>

There is a particularly intricate relationship which exists between a man's thoughts and his language. That is, the peculiar manner by which a man expresses himself is inextricably bound to the meaning he wishes to convey. Ghostwriters have disturbed this important relationship. Roosevelt's intellectual capabilities, his moral and ethical character, and his goodwill were not adequately assessed by Brandenburg and Braden, because they, like so many other critics, have failed to place the role of the ghost in proper critical perspective. Their conclusion that the speeches were, at the time of delivery, Franklin Roosevelt's own and should be evaluated as such underplays the significant part his contributors played in the development of those speeches. To this extent, the education and experience of the speaker may not be as relevant as those of any number of his ghosts. Brandenburg and Braden's conclusion that Roosevelt's primary issues were the natural result of his education and experience comes into serious question. The topics to which President Roosevelt adhered, the motives to which he

---

<sup>44</sup>Alan Koehler, The Madison Avenue Speech Book (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 71.

appealed, and the nature of proofs in the development of his speeches cannot be evaluated as though they were distinctly Roosevelt. His arrangement, language and style were not his own. Only Franklin Roosevelt's delivery has been adequately criticized. Ernest Bormann reflected on the matter this way:

Even when the ghostwriter does little more than change the language of a document, he introduces difficulties for the historian . . . . When the ghostwriter changes the style of a speaker or writer, he makes it much more difficult to discover the authentic statements and ideas of a historical figure. The ghostwriter often obscures the clues that a man's style can give to his character and intellectual abilities.<sup>45</sup>

When the rhetorical critic assumes that rhetoric is a humane study, and attempts to gain insight into Roosevelt, the man, through criticism of his speeches, what emerges is the group mind of Adolph Berle, Raymond Moley, Tommy Corcoran, Harold Ickes, Benjamin Cohen, Harry Hopkins, Robert Sherwood, Samuel Rosenmann, Stanley High, Donald Richberg, Archibald MacLeish, Rexford Tugwell and Charles Michelson. Marie Nichols would agree for she believes that when the ghost is employed:

. . . individuality has gone out of the speaking situation altogether so far as substance is concerned. The speech represents not the individual but the group. The reality of the character of the speaker passes into the pen of the ghostwriter. The speech bears no necessary relation to the thought of anyone. So far as assessing the character of the speaker as an aspect of rhetorical criticism is concerned, the critic appears

---

<sup>45</sup>Bormann, Theory, loc. cit.

to be in an almost hopeless position, and we may well ask: "Is rhetorical criticism possible?"<sup>46</sup>

Corollary to the critic's problem in evaluating the ghosted speech is the question of the subliminal influence the ghost writers may have on the minds of those public personalities for whom they write. Such an influence obviously possesses significant ramifications when applied to the presidency and other high offices; John P. Sisk provided the following assessment:

One of the worst things about ghost writing is that it lends itself to this kind of history-making. Ideally, the ghost writer is a midwife to truth. Actually, he is often called in because someone who doesn't know all the truth of the matter thinks that he does and that he simply lacks time or professional ability to put it into words. What the skilled ghost then makes out of fragments and a combination of his own and his employer's interpretation is a picture so superior in its clarity to his employer's relatively inarticulate picture that it immediately becomes truth for both of them. The danger of the ghost then is his ability to use his powers of articulation to make his employer his creature--not necessarily out of any malicious intent but simply through his ability to organize words into patterns so satisfactory that no alternatives seem possible.<sup>47</sup>

What Sisk has suggested applied to the speaker before the actual delivery of his speech. The speaker may very well increase his commitment to a particular cause due to the phenomenon of self-persuasion. Self-persuasion is induced by the ethos of the ghost in the mind of the

---

<sup>46</sup>Marie Hochmuth Nichols, "Ghost Writing: Implications for Public Address," Rhetoric and Criticism (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963), pp. 44-45.

<sup>47</sup>John P. Sisk, "Literary Ghosts," Commonweal, Vol. LXXII, No. 11 (December 9, 1960), 274.

speaker, by the repetition of the ideas expressed in the speech and by the success of the speech. Thomas M.

Scheidel explains:

Another potential effect on a speaker is an increased commitment. A number of experimental studies have pointed to the occurrence of self-persuasion--the influence of the presentation of a speech upon the speaker himself.<sup>48</sup>

The speaker also frequently adapts his thinking to fit the audience reaction to his speech. It should be kept in mind that the audience acceptability is to the ghost's speech, not to the speaker. Scheidel concluded:

If the speaker modifies his position in adapting to his listener and that modification is rewarded by listener response, it can easily be seen how the speaker's belief and attitude structures could be slightly altered by the persuasive speaking occasion. His proposition may be the same, but his emphasis may be changed. Following the speech event he may see different aspects as the more salient.<sup>49</sup>

The significant danger of the use of ghosts to the degree which President Roosevelt relied on them cannot be overstated. The rhetorical implications of this non-rhetorical phenomenon were clearly surmised by Edwin Black:

One of the many nonrhetorical forces at work in cases of spoken exhortation may be the condition of the auditor as a member of an audience. In such a case, the auditor's private emotions pass into a public domain. He will have accepted beliefs sanctioned by the acceptance of others, and this certainly will sustain him in his new belief. If he is thrown into a group of believers, a certain

---

<sup>48</sup>Thomas M. Scheidel, Persuasive Speaking (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967), p. 86.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid.

odium will attach to his skepticism, and this will apply additional pressure on him to believe. If he believes, he not only escapes the odium, he is also rewarded by a relief from the burden of personal responsibility. He need no longer suffer ideological solitude.<sup>50</sup>

#### SUMMARY

The rhetorical implications of logography are threefold. Practical problems for the practicing rhetorician were demonstrated by Senator Barry Goldwater in his 1964 campaign for the presidency. Ethical considerations, readily apparent in a discussion of Goldwater's difficulties, involve a definitional problem, the question of who has written the speech, and the issue of to whom the public should ascribe responsibility for the substance of the speech. Critical implications are multifarious and serious if rhetoric is to be considered a humane study. President Franklin D. Roosevelt's public speaking has not been adequately evaluated by Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo W. Braden even though they were aware of some of Roosevelt's ghosts. The article on Roosevelt substantially underestimated the influence of his ghosts when it concluded that the final version was his and his alone. Brandenburg and Braden should at least be commended for their efforts since many critics have not considered ghosts whatsoever.

The essential issue remaining is what should be done to reestablish the validity of the neo-Aristotelian

---

<sup>50</sup>Black, op. cit., p. 146.



method of criticism. That issue is the substance of the final chapter.

## Chapter III

### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The purpose of this paper, delineated at the outset, was to attempt to answer three important questions:

- (1) What were the origins of logography; who are the public figures who have relied on the form; and what is the extent of logography in contemporary America?
- (2) What are the rhetorical-critical implications of logography?
- (3) What are the possible solutions to rhetorical-critical problems posed by logography; and what suggestions could be made for further research?

Questions one and two have been dealt with at some length in preceding chapters. It is apparent that some disagreement exists as to what constitutes ghostwriting. Critics probably would agree that when an entire speech has been written by someone other than the speaker, it has been ghostwritten. On the other hand, when a speaker has merely sought advice in the preparation of speeches, he has engaged in a normal process of invention. Between these two extremes are the speakers who rely upon a team effort in which they participate. Thus, the question of what is ghostwritten and what is not is a matter of degree. The term logography, or ghostwriting, is imprecise, and perhaps too much time has been allotted by critics to this semantic

issue. The label may be less crucial than identifying the process by which the message was constructed. With this in mind, question three will now be explored.

### Conclusions

The extensiveness of logography throughout history and the broad acceptance of the speechwriter contemporarily raises the obvious question of why rhetorical critics have all but evaded the issue. This study has indicated that nearly all comment on the subject has been by journalists in editorial columns of popular periodicals. Only a few rhetorical critics have attempted even superficial examination of ghostwriting and no one in the field has provided an authoritative study. Furthermore, the few critics who have discussed the issue did so fourteen or more years ago and have subsequently neglected ghostwriting as an important rhetorical consideration.

Practical considerations resulting from the use of speechwriters by political candidates should lead to careful reflection on the part of the many politicians who employ them. If the employment of ghosts can cause a presidential hopeful such as Goldwater problems significant enough to contribute to his defeat, the public speaker should beware of the possibility of being victimized by his "hired eloquence." He should hire assistants who accurately mirror his opinions, carefully and diligently scrutinize and evaluate ghostly declarations before

publication, and maintain close file of the statements he has made and those which have been made for him. Or, recognizing that his audience expects to hear his thoughts expressed in his own words, the public figure might even consider writing his own speeches, thereby presenting his true self to the public.

What of a Government of the United States so riddled with ghost-work that nobody knows who does what? It turns public representatives cynical toward their trusts, and the public cynical toward its servants. Even as a social phenomenon it is a stinging commentary on the times in which it appears to be rooted.<sup>1</sup>

Ethical issues focus on a single question posed by Orville Hitchcock: "Does this [ghostwriting] make it too easy for people to escape the responsibilities of their suggestions?"<sup>2</sup> The first problem is in determining whether a given speech is ghosted. Although many logographers have been identified by an alert news media, most public figures discourage this form of publicity. Prominent ghostwriters often prefer anonymity. Once a speech is determined to have been a group effort, who is the public to hold accountable for what has been said? For example, in the case of Senator Goldwater, should the public have believed the "dour polemicist" of Why Not Victory?, or should they have believed Goldwater, the presidential candidate? Perhaps

---

<sup>1</sup>Rufus Dart, "The Ventriloquists of Washington," Scribner's Magazine, Vol. XCII, No. 4 (October, 1932), 274.

<sup>2</sup>Orville Hitchcock, review of The Articulates, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLV (April, 1959), 219.

the American electorate answered this question at the polls. In many cases, the critic and the public will never know how much of a given speech accurately reflects the thinking of a political candidate and how much is the result of group efforts or of a single speechwriter.

Orville Hitchcock's review of The Articulates provided some pointed questions concerning the advent of the ghostwriter as an influential factor in American public speaking:

In the last analysis, can the man really be separated from the thought? Since we are so dependent upon others for our information, can we completely evaluate a thought without knowing something about its source--about the background, prejudices, and motives of its author? Would an easy acceptance of the philosophy of anonymity tend to "freeze" the utterances of public figures at the level of the images of themselves and their thinking that they have established with their audiences? Would it be better for our society if we discouraged the use of the mask and insisted that our communicators speak out courageously and that their audiences listen objectively and evaluatively, with a full realization of the interplay among the basic elements of the communicative situation?<sup>3</sup>

Certainly, Earnest Brandenburg and Waldo W. Braden's analysis of Franklin Delano Roosevelt exemplified the traditional approach to rhetorical criticism. An analysis of their critical technique has, however, exposed the article for its obvious limitations. Wicheln's formula for evaluating rhetoric proved unsatisfactory because Roosevelt's speaking represented something more than an individual

---

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

effort.<sup>4</sup> The ethical, logical, and pathetic appeals the president so successfully employed were the culminative product of many individuals. Likewise, the invention, disposition, and elocution expressed the group conglomerate. Pinpointing contributions of specific advisors or writers may be possible in some instances, but the final assessment of the product in its entirety must admit group authorship in most cases. In short, the conclusion that Franklin Roosevelt's speeches were his own and should be evaluated as such is inaccurate. It is more precise to say that the speeches represented the work of a staff of writers and contributors who, through their combined rhetorical abilities, presented their recognized spokesman, the president, to the public. This is not to suggest that F.D.R. did not thoroughly believe what he was saying; on the contrary, it assumes that he and his advisors were advancing the views of the administration then in office. Further, this view does not mean to imply that a strong figure such as Roosevelt did not play a leading role in

---

<sup>4</sup>Although only one critical method has been examined here, other methods exist. The author chose to enunciate difficulties the ghost poses for neo-classical criticism because it is the predominant method employed in this country. Also, some other systems of criticism are indebted to the traditional method. Kenneth Burke's concept of consubstantiality, for example, focuses on the speaker-speech-audience contextual relationship. The roots of such a system in the classical format are obvious. The point is that any critical method which involved the speaker-speech-audience context would appear to face similar problems if the speech under analysis was ghostwritten.

the speech preparation process. It does suggest that it might be more valuable, in terms of criticism, to evaluate the speeches as group products, rather than to assume that a strong personality will prevail in a group decision-making effort.

Criticism has characteristically evaded the possibility of an error in textual authenticity due to the logographer; the example of Roosevelt is not atypical. Three highly respected members of the speech field: Carroll C. Arnold, Douglas Ehninger and John C. Gerber, provided a further example in The Speaker's Resource Book. They admitted the text of Pericles' "Funeral Speech" did not survive, but they pass this fact off as relatively unimportant. Thucydides "probably heard the speech when it was delivered," they said. Thucydides apparently wrote the speech and attributed its authorship to Pericles.<sup>5</sup> In discussing Franklin Roosevelt's speaking, the same authors depict his "unusual resourcefulness as a campaign orator" without so much as mentioning that he was surrounded by resourceful men who contributed to his oratorical ability.<sup>6</sup> An assessment of Adlai Stevenson as a rhetor indicated that "whenever possible he wrote his own speeches . . . ." <sup>7</sup> The analysis of Stevenson never

---

<sup>5</sup> Carroll C. Arnold, Douglas Ehninger and John C. Gerber, The Speaker's Resource Book (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company), p. 191.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., p. 219.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid.

mentions his famous "Elk's Club" of speechwriters. Virtually the same comments can be made in regard to Arnold, Ehninger, and Gerber's studies of Richard Nixon and John F. Kennedy, both of whom are known to have employed ghost-writers.

A random survey of professional journals is revealing. R. Windes, Jr., wrote in the Quarterly Journal of Speech: "The finished product that reached the ears of Stevenson's listeners . . . was something all Stevenson's own regardless of who worked on it."<sup>8</sup> This was an interesting conclusion considering the number of speechwriters Windes admitted Stevenson employed. J. Randolph's analysis of Harry S. Truman never mentions the fact that Truman relied on numerous ghosts.<sup>9</sup> W. R. Underhill examined President Truman's use of "containment of communism" topoi. The article assumes the policy statement was developed exclusively by Truman.<sup>10</sup> In 1948, W. A. Behl evaluated Thomas Dewey's campaign speaking strategies without considering authorship.<sup>11</sup> "Ethos, Eisenhower, and the 1956

---

<sup>8</sup>R. Windes, Jr., "Adlai E. Stevenson's Speech Staff in the 1956 Campaign," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLVI (February, 1960), 43.

<sup>9</sup>J. Randolph, "A Winning Speaker," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XXXIV (December, 1948), 421-24.

<sup>10</sup>W. R. Underhill, "Harry S. Truman," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLVII (October, 1961), 268-74.

<sup>11</sup>W. A. Behl, "Thomas E. Dewey," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XXXIV (December, 1948), 425-31.



Campaign," by Austin J. Freeley, tacitly assumed the General's numerous ghostwriters played no part in his ethos building.<sup>12</sup> A two-part symposium, written by numerous authorities, concerning the speechmaking of Nixon and Kennedy in the 1960 presidential campaign, examined the issues as though no one but the candidates had developed them.<sup>13</sup> Donald Wolfarth conducted a study comparing John Kennedy's inaugural address to other inaugurals. One comparison he could have drawn but did not was the role of the ghost.<sup>14</sup> Harold Barrett's treatment of President Kennedy's position on religion and the presidency implicitly ascribes the thoughts to Kennedy alone.<sup>15</sup> Ample examples of other studies which should have dealt with logography are available. The above are representative examples.

The analysis strongly suggests that the neo-classical critical method, heretofore the predominant technique, is largely inapplicable in the case of ghost-

---

<sup>12</sup>Austin J. Freeley, "Ethos, Eisenhower, and the 1956 Campaign," Central States Speech Journal, Vol. IX (Spring, 1958), 24-26.

<sup>13</sup>"Presidential Campaign 1960: Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLVI (October, 1960 and December, 1960), 239-52 and 355-64.

<sup>14</sup>Donald L. Wolfarth, "John F. Kennedy in the Tradition of Inaugural Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLVII (February, 1961), 124-32.

<sup>15</sup>Harold Barrett, "J.F.K. Before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association," Central States Speech Journal, Vol. XV (November, 1964), 259-66.

written speeches. The traditional system generally has focused on an attempt to analyze a speaker, his times, his work, and their reciprocal effect upon one another. Either the critic has emphasized the orator's influence on history or the influence of the times upon the man's oratory. This delineation may appear superfluous, but it serves to raise an issue. If it is the rhetorician's primary purpose to gain insight into history, and not the man, one might legitimately raise the question--Is the logography factor relevant? The problems of gaining insight into the character, personality, and goodwill of the speaker who employs ghosts are nearly insurmountable. But would it matter to the historian that many advisors or a single speechwriter were responsible for a given speech? This author thinks not. For example, the critic is aware that neither Pericles nor his wife Aspasia authored the "Funeral Oration" which is attributed to him. Therefore, the critic whose purpose in evaluating the "Funeral Oration" is to gain knowledge of Pericles' character, personality, or goodwill cannot succeed. He can succeed in analyzing Thucydides as an excellent speechwriter. Conversely, the critic whose purpose is to seek knowledge and understanding of the Athenians of 431 B.C. could profit from studying the substance, style and method of the same speech. In a time in which ghostwriters have "become as much a part of the furniture of modern government as the Mimeograph machine"

such a distinction would seem efficacious.<sup>16</sup>

Most traditional criticism appears to emphasize rhetoric as a humane study focusing on gaining some knowledge about the nature of the man within his historical setting. Witness, for example, most studies in History and Criticism of American Public Address which concern themselves in great detail with the sort of personality-character inquiry common to American criticism. In Robert F. Ray's opinion, the problem of attempting the study of men who have relied upon speechwriters can be overcome.

. . . the critic of contemporary presidential campaign speeches has the responsibility to investigate thoroughly the matter of authorship. In addition to the established canons of criticism it is incumbent upon the critic that he knows the character of those who assist in speech preparation and, to the extent possible, the degree of their influence in the speech preparing process.<sup>17</sup>

The most obvious defect in Ray's projected solution is that the critic does not always know when a speech is ghosted, who the advisors were, or their specific contribution. When all the contributors are found out, is Professor Ray really suggesting that each writer's character be assessed? That could be a task of considerable difficulty, particularly in the case of politicians such

---

<sup>16</sup>"The Trouble with Ghosts," Time, Vol. 54, No. 23 (December 5, 1949), 25.

<sup>17</sup>Robert F. Ray, "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," Central States Speech Journal, Vol. 8 (Fall, 1956), 11.

as Franklin Roosevelt, Adlai Stevenson, Dwight Eisenhower and others who have depended on a large gathering of ghosts. On the other hand, some solution must be found because seeking advice from a team of writers, who contribute phrases, stylistic features, or even entire speeches, adds a new and complex dimension to the invention process.

Perhaps Professor Donald K. Smith should have expanded on an idea he advanced several years ago. Smith said:

. . . speech itself is a social phenomenon before it is an individual possession. It belongs to a culture as much as to a man. It manifests itself as a behavior linked not only to the action of a person, but also linked to the social context within which the person acts.<sup>18</sup>

Although Donald Smith was addressing himself to Ernest Bormann's ethical arguments on ghostwriting, the statement has important critical implications. If speech is, indeed, as much a "social phenomenon" as is suggested, then perhaps the key would be to examine the behaviors of the persons involved in the preparation of a speech within the social context which they create. Such an approach would tend to validate the contemporary communicologist's interest in social psychology and his study of group behavior patterns. In other words, rather than evaluating an individual speaker's methods, his speech and his "effect" upon a given audience on a specific occasion, a more

---

<sup>18</sup>Donald K. Smith, "Ghostwritten Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. 47 (December, 1961), 419-20.

appropriate rationale might discover the group relationships, their patterns of consistency, their methods of speech development, and their effect as a group upon the audience. A critical methodology which deemphasizes individual aspects and finds group behavior more salient would appear the most realistic for analyzing ghosted speeches. The education and experience of the speaker, his method of preparing speeches, arrangement, language, and style, and perhaps even delivery would become categories described in relation to interpersonal relationships evident in the group who devised the speech. The sharing of ideas and the effect each member's behavior plays in the invention process could be described. The arrangement of the entire presentation could be seen as the evolution of group process by which several men decide the proper ordering of arguments for maximum impact. The style of the address is certainly more aptly evidenced by a system which openly and frankly admits to being a group product, not an individual one. No longer would the critic need to concern himself with a diligent search bent on locating each phrase or term which belongs to a specific member of the group. Ethical, logical, and pathetic appeals would be more realistically assessed for what they are. The development of a particular candidate's ethos would represent the development of the team or group reflecting the viewpoint of the entire office from which it is espoused. The argumentative appeals used or pathos

relied upon would serve to characterize the group's intent and intellectual bent. And, seen in this social context, rhetorical tendencies, more relevant than idiosyncratic descriptions, could be ascertained. The trend of thinking evident in a given period and evinced by a particular office of government might find its rightful place as more important to rhetoric than a single individual's speaking habits.

Such a method would seem more fitting for a society in which the public figure who writes his own speeches is an exception. There would be additional advantages such as the prospect of bringing rhetorical criticism into a modern setting using the new knowledge communicologists have gained in their recent studies of human behavior. While criticism might receive a "breath of air" from this suggested new dimension, social psychologists would have opened a new and vital interest in an area deserving of much more research.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

Further research into criticism should pursue the possibility of observing group preparation of speeches. (One way to investigate the matter might be field studies in which critics accompany politicians on the campaign trail.) Experimental studies might seek to answer the question of whether public knowledge of a politician's ghostwriters lessens the speaker's ethos. At this point,

it is not even known if the general public is aware of speechwriters. The effect of ghostwriting on various methods of criticism should be studied. More research certainly needs to be conducted to ascertain whether speeches in history should be reevaluated when original criticisms did not consider the ghost. The possibility of using general systems theory and concentrating on describing relationships between members of the speech-writing group is an interesting prospect. Ghostwriting's predominance in political circles has overshadowed its use in other areas such as business and education; these should be more thoroughly analyzed. Studies conducted on students who use ghostwriting agencies might reveal enlightening social as well as rhetorical phenomena. The quality of ghostwritten material compared to individual efforts has not yet been determined.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arnold, Carroll C., Douglas Ehninger and John C. Gerber.  
The Speaker's Resource Book. Chicago: Scott, Foresman  
and Company, 1961.
- Bart, Peter. "The Busy Ghosts," Saturday Review, XLVI, 37  
(September 14, 1963), 78.
- Barrett, Harold. "J.F.K. Before the Greater Houston Minis-  
terial Association," Central States Speech Journal, XV  
(November, 1964), 259-66.
- Behl, W. A. "Thomas E. Dewey," Quarterly Journal of Speech,  
XXXIV (December, 1948), 425-31.
- Black, Edwin. Rhetorical Criticism A Study in Method. New  
York: Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Bormann, Ernest G. "Ethics of Ghostwritten Speeches,"  
Quarterly Journal of Speech, 47 (October, 1961), 267.
- Bormann, Ernest G. Theory and Research in the Communica-  
tive Arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,  
Incorporated, 1965.
- "Caesar's Ghost," Literary Digest, 123 (July 10, 1937), 37-  
38.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. "The Second Phillipic," Master-  
pieces of Eloquence, ed. Henry Cabot Lodge and others.  
New York: P. F. Collier and Son, n.d.
- Dart, Rufus. "Ventriloquists of Washington," Scribner's  
Magazine, 92 (November, 1932), 268-274.
- Draper, Arthur S. "News and Comment from the National  
Capital; Ghost Writing System at Washington," Literary  
Digest, 117 (June 9, 1934), 16.
- Freeley, Austin J. "Ethos, Eisenhower, and the 1956 Cam-  
paign," Central States Speech Journal, IX (Spring,  
1958), 24-26.
- Fuess, Claude M. "Ghosts in the White House," American  
Heritage, 10 (December, 1958), 45-47.



"Ghost Writers Give Boss the Word," Business Week, 1951 (January 21, 1967), 72.

Goldman, Eric F. "Party of One," Holiday, 31, 4 (April, 1962), 18.

Henry, John M. (ed.). "The Intellectual Gigolo Strikes Back," The Articulates. Indianapolis, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1957.

Hitchcock, Orville. Review of The Articulates. Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLV (April, 1959), 219.

Hochmuth, Marie, Donald C. Bryant, and W. Norwood Brigrance. A History and Criticism of American Public Address. New York: Russell and Russell, Incorporated, 1955.

Johnson, Seneca. "In Defense of Ghostwriting," Harper, 179 (December, 1940), 536-43.

Kennedy, George. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Koehler, Alan. The Madison Avenue Speech Book: For People Who Are Scared to Make a Speech and Don't Want to Show It. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Lewis, Peter. "Ghost Town," New York Times Magazine (April 10, 1960), 40.

The New Yorker, XXVIII, 1 (February 23, 1952), 23.

Nichols, Marie Hochmuth. "Ghost Writing: Implications for Public Address," Rhetoric and Criticism. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1963.

"Presidential Campaign 1960: Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVI (October, 1960 and December, 1960), 239-52 and 355-64.

Randolph, J. "A Winning Speaker," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXIV (December, 1948), 421-24.

Ratner, Victor M. "Who Should Do the Writing?" Harper, 205 (December, 1952), 91.

Ray, Robert F. "Ghostwriting in Presidential Campaigns," Central States Speech Journal, 8 (Fall, 1956), 11.

Roberts, Charles. "A Presidential Ghost Story," Newsweek, LXXVII, 2 (January 11, 1971), 21.

Rovere, Richard H. "The Minds of Barry Goldwater," Harper, 229 (September, 1964), 38.

Safire, William. The New Language of Politics. New York: Random House, Incorporated, 1968.

Scheidel, Thomas M. Persuasive Speaking. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1967.

Sisk, John P. "Literary Ghosts," Commonweal, LXXIII, 11 (December 9, 1960), 274.

Smith, Donald K. "Ghostwritten Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 47 (December, 1961), 418.

"The Speechwriters," Vogue, 136, 5, 2045 (September 15, 1960), 159.

Stanton, Donal J., and Judy G. Jones. "The Textual Authenticity of Patrick Henry's 'Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death' Speech." Paper presented for interdepartmental seminar, speech 899, The Ohio State University, June 3, 1971.

Time, LXXV, 25 (June 20, 1960), 11.

Time, LXXIX, 13 (March 30, 1962), 57-58.

Thonssen, Lester A., Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden. Speech Criticism. New York: Ronald Press Company, 1970.

Underhill, W. R. "Harry S. Truman," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVII (October, 1961), 268-74.

Wolfarth, Donald L. "John F. Kennedy in the Tradition of Inaugural Speeches," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVII (February, 1961), 124-32.

Windes, R., Jr. "Adlai E. Stevenson's Speech Staff in the 1956 Campaign," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLVI (February, 1960), 43.