Brigham Young University
BYU ScholarsArchive

Theses and Dissertations

1968

Methods of Support Used in the Senate Debate on the Seating of Reed Smoot: A Content Analysis

Beverly Alice Berry
Brigham Young University - Provo

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd

Part of the American Politics Commons, Models and Methods Commons, and the Political Theory Commons

BYU ScholarsArchive Citation
Berry, Beverly Alice, "Methods of Support Used in the Senate Debate on the Seating of Reed Smoot: A Content Analysis" (1968). *Theses and Dissertations*. 4526.
https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/etd/4526

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

L-2

METHODS OF SUPPORT USED IN THE SENATE DEBATE ON THE SEATING OF REED SMOOT: A CONTENT ANALYSIS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Speech and Dramatic Arts

Brigham Young University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Arts

by

Beverly Alice Berry

May, 1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Without the help and support of many people, this paper would have been impossible. The author would extend special appreciation to:

Dr. Robert Boren, who, with firm encouragement, high standards, and sincere friendship, guided her graduate studies and prepared her for the writing of this thesis.

Dr. Jesse Reeder whose counsel and willing service on her committee was greatly appreciated.

The Horace Quinn family for their generous help.

Carol Williams for typing this paper and lending moral support.

ReNee for her patience and help.

Her parents for their abiding interest and concern, encouragement and love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS. i

LIST OF TABLES iii

Chapter

Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. METHODS OF SUPPORT 12

III. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND 24

IV. SUMMARY OF THE DEBATE 47

V. USE OF METHODS OF SUPPORT 64

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 87

BIBLIOGRAPHY 100

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Methods of Support 23

2. Affirmative Methods of Support 67

3. Affirmative Variety of Methods of Support . 69

4. Negative Methods of Support 71

5. Negative Variety of Methods of Support . . . 72

6. Percentage-distribution for Affirmative side 74

7. Percentage-distribution for Affirmative Speakers 76

8. Percentage-distribution for Negative Side . 77

9. Percentage-distribution for Negative Speakers 78

10. Affirmative Number of Supports per Assertion 80

11. Negative Number of Supports per Assersion . 82

12. Affirmative Assertion-Support Relationship . 84

13. Negative Assertion-Support Relationship . . 85

14. Summary of Methods of Support 91

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Language developed in response to a social need. Man needed to be able to communicate with those around him. Once man was equipped with a good method of communication, it became clear that this method could also provide a way of settling disputes. Since the beginning of the spoken word, recourse to debate, oral persuasion, has always provided a peaceful alternative to force.

Some societies placed greater value on free discussion of ideas than did others, and there seemed to be a relationship between the type of government and the quantity and quality of public speaking which was practiced. Freedom to debate has been an essential part of democratic societies.

Every member of a free society is influenced by conflicting arguments which demand his attention. The subject of the arguments may be as trivial as a television commercial or as weighty as a referendum or a Presidential campaign. Whenever there are two different sides of a subject presented by those interested in persuading people to the rightness of their position, it becomes debate. Debate could be defined as competitive advocacy, either written or oral, between pro and con sides of a proposition and taking place with or without limitations of time, place

or form.[1]

The practice of debating played as important a part in the formation of the United States Government as did force. It took argument to convince the people that a fight was necessary and some of the most eloquent words were uttered in that cause. It took oral persuasion to form a constitutional basis for government after independence was won. And there was by no means immediate agreement as to the structure the new government was to have. Later, it was through the debate process that laws were passed for the welfare of the combined States of the Union. The situation has not changed. Today, as has always been the case in America, representatives of the people engage in debate prior to the passing of federal, state and local laws.

As long ago as 460 B.C. there were people who studied the principles of effective public speaking and debate.[2] They became the teachers of rhetoric to those who would learn to be effective lawyers and politicians. Today the art of debate remains a skill which requires knowledge of debate theory and ability in its practice.

It must be recognized that the debates which occur

---

[1]Glen. E. Mills, Reason in Controversy (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964), p. 7.

[2]Andrew T. Weaver, Gladys L. Borchers and Donald K. Smith, The Teaching of Speech (New York: Prentice Hall, 1952). p. 29.

in the United States Senate and the House of Representatives differ from the academic or educational debate as practiced in high schools and colleges. In educational debate emphasis is placed on winning the arguments with logical reasoning and abundant evidence. In the Senate, this continues to be an important goal, but there is also a concern for making a good public speech, pleasing the galleries, appeasing the home constituiencies, and sometimes for merely consuming time. In teaching public speaking as a useful discipline for the politician, the teacher or the ordinary citizen, it is not enough to teach the principles repeated in textbooks through the years. It is necessary to bridge the gap between theory and practice. It is important to discover what principles are most useful in actual practice and incorporate this knowledge into the teaching of debate and public address.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

A persuasive speech could be analyzed in terms of many different elements: the organization, the language style, the emotional appeals, the supportive material, the logical arguments, the quality of reasoning, or any number of others. Nevertheless, the content of any persuasive discourse can be summed up by the enumeration of two essential parts: (1) the arguments or assertions and (2) the material which develops them. Both elements are equally important.

> Human beings, especially when they compose an aduience, are not inclined to accept abstract ideas, bare and unadorned. Nor will they easily believe a proposition or act upon a proposal without proof or stimulation.[1]

Since these elements are so essential, it is important to inquire about the ways in which they work together in persuasive speech situations.

One debate forum responsible for government policy formation is the United States Senate. The debate on the seating of Reed Smoot was an important controversy in that body about the turn of the century, and it was a significant one to the Mormons. At the time of the hearings the Washington Evening Star wrote, "It is generally believed that the determination of the Smoot case will...result in fixing the status of Mormons elected to the Senate for all time."[2] The debate did, indeed, determine the right of Mormons to hold senatorial office; it was also an important landmark for tolerance of the political rights of individuals of all religious faiths. The support materials available for the speeches in this debate were plentiful because of the extensive hearings previous to the opening of the debate.

For these reasons, the senate debate on the seating of Reed Smoot was chosen for a quantitative analysis of methods of support and their relationship to the statements

---

[1]Alan H. Monroe, Principles and Types of Speech, (Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1962), p. 195.

[2]The Washington Evening Star, March 2, 1904.

supported. This author felt that it would be valuable to know how support materials were used in an actual legislative debate. It is important to know how the textbook theories actually function in practice.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM:

The purpose of this study was to determine how methods of support functioned in the senate debate on the seating of Reed Smoot. In order to clarify the directions of the study, answers to the following questions were sought:

1. How extensively were methods of support used by each side?

2. What was the frequency of supports per assertion by each side?

3. How was the use of support materials distributed among the speakers?

4. How many different methods of support were used by each side?

5. What were the most frequently used methods of support by each side?

6. What were the least frequently used methods of support by each side?

7. Did the methods of support which were used differ from the methods discussed in public speaking textbooks?

8. Did the winning side differ in the use of methods of support from the losing side?

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS STUDIES

There have been many studies in the field of public address which deal in some way with supporting materials. It would be difficult to mention the number which discuss methods of support as part of their analysis of the speaking

of one particular public figure. These studies are useful, but they are of a qualitative character. They usually attempt to evaluate the quality of the methods of support, rather than the quantity.

Several experimental studies have begun the process of inquiry about the relationship between the use of evidence and audience reactions. Between 1953 and 1958 there were four studies which are reviewed by Dresser in 1963. He points out that in none of them was there a "statistically significant difference between the persuasiveness of clearly identified evidence and a) either assertion or b) material presented without a citation of source."[1] One of these studies, by Gilkinson, Paulson, and Sikkink, indicates that there was "no significant difference between authority and non-authority presentations on attitude shift, retention, or convincingless rating."[2] Approximately these same results were again reported in a study by Sikkink who used two speeches which contained authority citation and two which did not.[3]

The one study which proved an exception to most of

---

[1]William Dresser, "The Effects of 'Satisfactory' and 'Unsatisfactory' Evidence in a Speech of Advocacy," Speech Monographs, XXII (1955), 303.

[2]Howard Gilkinson, Stanley F. Paulson, and Donald E. Sikkink, "Effects of Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XL (1954), 183-192.

[3]Donald Sikkink, "An Experimental Study of the Effects on Listeners of Anti-Climax Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech," Southern Speech Journal, XXII (1956) 73-78.

the other research was the one by R. S. Cathcart. He varied the use of evidence to produce three forms of one speech and found that the speech with no evidence received high ratings in evidence and argument from those in the audience who originally favored the proposal..[1]

One of the most recent studies was by William Dresser, 1963. Dresser was not concerned with the use of evidence *per se*, but rather with the question of whether audiences could distinguish between "satisfactory and "unsatisfactory" evidence, and whether this made any difference in their willingness to change opinion. The results of this experiment indicated that "'satisfactory' evidence was *not* more successful in changing audience attitudes than was 'unsatisfactory' evidence!" and that "the different specific types of 'unsatisfactory' evidence did not differ significantly in their power to change audience attitudes."[2]

Erwin Paul Bettinghause also experimented by varying the use of evidence to determine the effect on an audience. He found that the identification of certain material as evidence contributed to the persuasive effect as measured by a shift of opinion survey.[3]

---

[1]Robert S. Cathcart, "An Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Four Methods of Presenting Evidence," *Speech Monographs*, XXI-XXII (1954-1955), 227-233.

[2]Dresser, p. 306.

[3]Erwin Paul Bettinghause, Jr. "The Relative Effect of the Use of Testimony in a Persuasive Speech upon the Attitudes of Listeners," (unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Speech, Bradley, 1953).

Conclusions of these studies need further verification, but are contributing to the knowledge available about the practical application of evidence-theory. Even so, they are concerned with only the part of support material known as evidence and they are done in experimental forums. There is still a need to know about the types of evidence which actually are used in naturally-occuring situations and what effect they have had upon the listeners.

Recently there have been a few content-analysis studies which have dealt, at least in part, with methods of support. Robert Boren's recent study of the speaking in the Utah Constitutional Convention, among other things, analyzed which methods of support were used most frequently. He found that the methods used in these debates were quite brief and general and used to emphasize rather than prove.[1] Harold Allen Miller studied forms of support used in contemporary American pulpit addresses. He studied the variety of methods used in representative protest pulpit addresses and compared their use with those used in other contemporary American public addresses.[2] This sort of quantitative content analysis of methods of support has not

---

[1]Robert R. Boren, "An Analysis of the Speaking in the Utah Constitutional Convention, 1895," (unpublished PhD. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, Purdue University, 1965.).

[2]Miller, Harold Allen, "A Comparison of the Forms of Support used in Contemporary American Protest Pulpit Addresses with the Forms of Support Used in Other Contemporary American Public Addresses: A Content Analysis," (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Speech, University of Minnesota, 1962.)

been applied to many historical debates.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The United States Senate debate on the seating of Reed Smoot was a significant event in the history of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints as well as an intricate part of the early political history of Utah. It, therefore, seemed appropriate to study the historical setting of the debate.

The study of early Utah history was done by referring to the Utah newspapers and periodicals of the time. This author relied heavily on microfilm copies of the Deseret News, the Salt Lake Tribune, and the Salt Lake Herald from 1900 to 1907. As soon as Senator Smoot was elected and a protest against his seating filed, the national papers began to cover the event. Of particular value was The New York Times from 1903 to 1907.

This author also referred to the unpublished letters of Carl A. Badger, private secretary to Reed Smoot from 1903 through 1907, in which he relates significant events as they happen in Washington. Also referred to were several volumes of news clippings kept for Reed Smoot from 1902 to 1907.

In January of 1904 the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections began hearings on the Reed Smoot case. The hearings were not declared closed until April 1906, and during this time four volumes of testimony covering 3,429 pages were taken. These hearings give a very good background

to the issues involved in the debate and also provide a great deal of the supporting material used by the senators in their speeches.

The Congressional Record from June 1906 through February, 1907 contains the committee reports and the speeches made on the floor of the Senate. The speeches were also available in individually bound copies which were distributed for the use of the Senate and for limited release to the public. The texts of the speeches in the record and in the separately bound copies were examined and found to be the same.

In designing a procedure for analyzing the supporting material used in these speeches, the first task was to define the nature of support material and the various forms which it might take. As a basis for these definitions ten texts on public speaking were examined. Every method of support which they discussed was listed in chart form. Then this author formulated a concept of supporting material as well as definitions of each method of support mentioned in the texts.

Each of the seventeen speeches was outlined in detail. Every statement which was supported or developed in any manner was noted. Then the particular method or methods of support used were counted and recorded. The resulting information was examined to see what conclusions could be drawn about the use of supporting material by the senators in this debate.

It was not the purpose of the study to show any causal relationahip between the use of supporting materials by the speakers and the decision of the Senate in the matter. In drawing conclusions from the analysis the author was concerned with learning to what extent supporting material was used in the debate by each side, and methods used most frequently by each side.

CHAPTER II

METHODS OF SUPPORT

In order to first arrive at an understanding of the nature of supporting material, ten textbooks on public speaking were examined.[1] Most of them were in agreement as to the general purposes of supporting material and

---

[1]A. Craig Baird, General Speech (New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1949), pp. 106-131.

Jane Blankenship, Public Speaking: A Rhetorical Perspective (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), pp. 56-81

William Norwood Brigance, Speech (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952), pp. 244-267.

Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960), pp. 97-128.

Milton Dickens, Speech: Dynamic Communication (New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963), pp. 83-102.

Giles Wilkeson Gray and Waldo W. Braden, Public Speaking (New York and Evanston: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963), pp. 286-315.

Alan H. Monroe, pp. 194-207.

Charles S. Mudd and Malcolm O. Sillars, Speech: Content and Communication (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 80-96.

Keith R. St. Onge, Creative Speech (California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1964), pp. 164-175.

Eugene E. White. Practical Public Speaking (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965), pp. 135-178.

defined it in terms of its purposes. According to these texts any material used to clarify, intensify, amplify or prove an assertion is supportive. The theory is that the basic unit in the speech is the unsupported assertion. An assertion is simply a declarative statement of fact or opinion. If the statement is then dropped and not discussed further it is an unsupported assertion. When the assertion is developed or expanded in any way, it is done by using some method or type of support. These ways of developing a statement cannot be classified according to purpose, however, because one method could serve several of those purposes. An example could serve to clarify if it were used by way of definition of an obscure term, or it could serve as factual proof for a conclusion.

Although the preceding definition of supporting material would technically include material which was visual as well as verbal, for the purpose of this study only the verbal methods of support will be considered. All forms of visual aids (charts, diagrams, pictures) will be excluded from this analysis.

In recording the methods of support discussed by each text, it was found that different authors used different labels to indicate virtually the same method of support. In talking about the method of support by which the speaker describes a vivid picture of a situation, some authors call the method "description," some "imagery," some "details" or some "particulars." What some authors

call "illustration" is discussed under "long example" by others and under "stories and anecdotes" by others. In all such situations more attention was paid to the text's discussion of the technique rather than to the labeling of it.

The following definitions were formulated by this writer for the purposes of the study. It should be noted that the writer started with this list because they were methods discussed in the texts surveyed. This did not preclude the possibility that methods of support not here defined might be found. In such an occurrence the method was described and recorded under the new description.

DEFINITION AND EXPLANATION

There are many ways of defining a term or concept, but they all have the same purpose. Any attempt to give meaning to a term or concept by showing specific traits or characteristics which distinguish it from other related terms or ideas is definition. Specific ways of defining a word or concept are: (1) through the use of authority, (2) by negation--showing what the term does not mean, (3) by etymology, (4) by synonyms and antonyms, (5) by example or illustration, (6) by classification, (7) by explanation.

Explanation as used in this study is very closely related to definition having practically the same purpose. It is used to add to the meaning or clarity of a term or idea by use of a simple, "concise, exposition setting forth the relation between a whole and its parts or making clear

an obscure term."[1] An example of a definition making use of both explanation and authority would be the following:

> Freud, who named the Oedipus complex, described it as a conflict based on the sexual competition between son and father for the undivided love of the mother-wife.

LITERAL COMPARISON

For use in this study comparison means what has been called analogy and antithesis by some authors and comparison and contrast by others. Comparisons show both likenesses and differences between things or ideas which are being discussed. In the case of the literal comparison, the things or ideas which are being compared must belong to the same class; rivers must be compared with other rivers, governments with governments, and diseases with diseases.

An example of this type of comparison would be a demonstration that the state of New York in all significant aspects is very much like the state of California. This type of comparison would support an assertion that a medicare program, which worked in New York, would work in California.

FIGURATIVE COMPARISON

The figurative comparison stresses relationships between things or ideas of different classes. The compar-

---

[1]Monroe, p. 197.

ison can be either short or extended. A good example of an extended figurative comparison is found in The Art of Enjoying Music.

> Music has often been compared to language itself, and the comparison is quite legitimate...Music has its own alphabet, of only seven letters, as compared with twenty-six of the English alphabet. Each of those letters are complete words in themselves, so certain notes may stand alone, with the force of a whole word. . . . In most modern music the notes may take the form of actual chords. So it may be said that a chord in music is analogous to a word in language.[1]

Shorter comparisons falling into the figurative category are metaphores and similes. "Sleeping on a Beautyrest mattress is like sleeping on a cloud" or, "Instituting this program in two steps is like trying to leap a chasm in two jumps," are examples of shorter comparisons.

FACTUAL SPECIFIC INSTANCE

A factual specific instance is a short citation of a true case or incident which serves to confirm a more general assertion. This method of support is often called example in speech texts. If a botany professor were pointing out that the citrus family of fruit is high in citric acid and usually has a thick rind and pulpy flesh, he might say that oranges, lemons, and grapefruit are examples of citrus fruit. Oranges, lemons and grapefruits are factual specific instances and notice that they are only briefly

---

[1]Sigmund Spaeth, The Art of Enjoying Music, cited by James M. McCrimmon, Writing With a Purpose, (3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963), p. 73.

mentioned. A factual specific instance may consist of one word or at most one sentence.

HYPOTHETICAL SPECIFIC INSTANCE

A hypothetical instance is one which is created for the occassion and does not claim to correspond to fact. If a speaker were advocating one particular brand of aspirin he might mention the hypothetical case of Jane Knox, an ordinary housewife, who by taking two of Biddolf's aspirin one hour before her husband came home from work, felt like a million dollars by dinner time. Usually there should be some indication that the case is a hypothetical one rather than factual.

FACTUAL ILLUSTRATION

An illustration as used in this study means a detailed example or specific instance. It is longer than the specific instance and tells the full story. A factual illustration could be any extended narration of a true occurrence. One of the favorite stories of the Mormon Church could serve as an example of a factual illustration.

> When the prophet and founder of the church, Joseph Smith, was imprisoned by his enemies in Richmond, there was with him a man who was extremely ill with a high fever. All the prisoners including this man were compelled to sleep on the floor with a chain and padlock around their ankles. They were guarded by some extremely foul-mouthed men who took great pride in telling of the horrible deeds they had performed. So loud was the joking and bragging that the prisoners could not sleep. After listening for hours to obscene jokes and horrible oaths, Joseph Smith arose and rebuked the guards in the name of Jesus Christ telling them to be silent. Although he was in chains and without a weapon, the guards shook before him and cowered into a

> a corner where they remained silent until they were relieved by others.

Notice that the instance is in narrative form and tells more details than a specific instance which is only a brief mention of a case.

HYPOTHETICAL ILLUSTRATION

A hypothetical illustration is an extended specific instance which does not conform to actual fact. It may be any kind of a story made up by the speaker for the purpose of the speech or it may be a fictional story from literature. Fables, literary stories, and anecdotes are included here.

STATISTICS

Statistics give the numerical facts bearing on a subject. They enable a speaker to use large numbers of examples and make comparisons among examples easily. If a public relations man for United States Steel Company wanted to impress the audience with the philanthropic efforts of the U. S. Steel Corporation, he might use statistics. He could explain that of $5.3 million contributed by U. S. Steel in 1965, 49 percent went to education, science and research; 38 percent to social welfare, civic and cultural causes; and 13 percent to medical, hospital and health work.[1]

---

[1] L. L. Golden, "Philanthopic Endeavors," Saturday Review (December 10, 1966), p. 96.

EXPERT TESTIMONY

This method is a presentation of the words, thoughts or ideas of an authority in the particular field being dealt with. It may be an exact quotation of his words or it may be a paraphrased form of his ideas. The main purpose of expert testimony is to confirm the speaker's assertions with the opinions of observations of someone else who is in a position to know the facts. The Bible and other scriptures will be considered expert testimony to the doctrinal beliefs of a particular church.

A speaker might use the opinion of Anthony Eden on Vietnam if this was his subject. His speech might go something like this: Anthony Eden, one-time prime minister of England and a man with wide experience in international affairs gives his opinion of Ho Chi Minh's attitude,

> For Ho Chi Minh the pursuit of the Union of the two Vietnams, which he now has faith must be the ultimate outcome of the conflict, however long it is postponed, could be of more account than the problematic future of the international Communist revolution.[1]

QUOTATION

This method of support includes presentation of any quoted material from people who are not experts in the subject at issue. It may be a literary quotation or it may be lay testimony.

A speaker might wish to use Carl Sandburg's poetry

---

[1]Anthony Eden, "Toward Peace in Indochina," Harpers (August, 1966), p. 39.

to enhance a point. If this occurs in the Smoot debate, this author will classify the method as use of quotation.

CAUSAL REASONING

There are two basic types of causal reasoning: from cause to effect and from effect to cause. The basic assumption of each is that the same cause will always produce the same effect. Whenever a speaker attempts to explain why a certain thing happened or will happen, he is using causal reasoning. Whenever he talks about results or effects coming from a particular source, he is also using causal reasoning, but the focus is on the effect. When a speaker explains that when water taps aren't turned completely off the dripping wears out the gasket and causes a constantly leaking faucet, he is using causal reasoning.

DESCRIPTION

The description which is meant here is not the same as imagery. When the purpose of the descriptive matter is to reinforce or clarify or prove a point it will fall into this category, but if the sole purpose is to add glitter and create beautiful pictures in the listener's mind it will not be classified here. By description is meant the detailing of a person, place or thing.

> For example, a man is on trial for drunken driving; the arresting officer and other witnesses testify that the defendant's breath smelled of alcohol, and he wobbled when he walked.[1]

---

[1]Dickens, p. 92.

This sort of description provides the circumstantial evidence needed to prove the charge that the man was drunk. In similar cases such description may provide evidence or support for a speaker's general assertions.

RESTATEMENT OR REPETITION

Restatement says the same thing over again in a somewhat different phraseology. Repetition uses the identical phrasing over again. This technique is mainly a reinforcement and intensifying technique.

> In his tribute to the late President Kennedy, delivered before the draped bier at the Capitol rotunda, Senator Mike Mansfield used this poignant phrase five times: "And so, she [Mrs. Kennedy] took a ring from her finger and placed it in his hands."[1]

John F. Kennedy used restatement many times in his speech to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association in an attempt to assure them that his religion would not interfere with his Presidency. At one time he said, "I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute. . ." then later, "I believe in an America that is officially neither Catholic, Protestant nor Jewish. . ." and further on, "I believe in an America where religious intolerance will someday end. . ."[2] All of these phrases were merely restatements of one idea.

---

[1] White, p. 167.

[2] John F. Kennedy, Speech before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association, Rice Hotel, Houston, September 12, 1960.

INTERROGATION

Sometimes this method is referred to as the "rhetorical question." This is a question asked by the speaker who expects no immediate vocal answer. He asks it to emphasize, dramatize, or challenge. This method is similar to repetition or restatement in that it does not add evidence, but serves to emphasize or intensify. An example of such a question might be, "Do you have a place of shelter to use in the case of an atomic bomb attack?"

This concludes the presentation of the methods of support recommended by prominent writers in the field of public address. A summary of this analysis is presented in Table 1. The next chapter will address itself to biographical and historical information relative to the setting of the debate.

TABLE I

METHODS OF SUPPORT

Methods of Support	Authors										Totals
	Baird	Blankenship	Brigance	Bryant and Wallace	Dickens	Gray and Braden	Monroe	Mudd and Sillars	St. Onge	White	
Definition and Explanation	X	X		X	X	X	X	X		X	8
Literal Compasison	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	9
Figurative Comparison	X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	8
Factual Specific Instance	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	9
Hypothetical Specific Instance	X			X	X			X		X	5
Factual Illustration	X	X	X	X		X	X	X		X	8
Hypothetical Illustration	X			X	X	X	X	X		X	7
Statistics	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
Expert Testimony	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	10
Quotation	X					X			X	X	4
Induction*						X					1
Causal Reasoning	X			X		X					3
Description	X		X		X	X					4
Restatement or Repetition				X	X	X	X			X	5
Interrogation	X					X					2

*Omitted by this study. Examples used to prove an assertion or conclusion were classified under specific instances.

CHAPTER III

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

BIOGRAPHY OF REED SMOOT

Reed Smoot was born in Salt Lake City, Utah on January 10, 1862. He was the son of Abraham Owen Smoot and Anne Kristene Morrison.[1] Abraham O. Smoot had joined the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, commonly known as the Mormon Church, in Kentucky and was one of the leaders of the westward movement. Anne Kristene Morrison came west with an early handcart company. When she became acquainted with Abraham O. Smoot in Salt Lake City, she consented to become the fourth wife in his polygamous family.[2]

Abraham O. Smoot was a successful businessman as well as a leader in community and church affairs. He was elected mayor of Salt Lake City and acted in this capacity for ten years. Then the church officials called him to go to Provo and help in the settling of that area. When Reed was ten years old, the family moved to Provo where his father served as mayor for fourteen years. Here Abraham

---

[1] O. F. Whitmer, "Apostle Reed Smoot," Lives of Our Leaders (Salt Lake City: Deseret News Publishing Co., 1901), p. 254.

[2] Ibid., p. 256.

Smoot also served his church officiating as President of the Utah Stake[1] for over twenty years.[2]

When Reed Smoot had finished his early education, he entered the newly established Brigham Young Academy. He was a member of the first graduating class in 1879.[3] Upon graduation he went to work for his father who owned Provo Woolen Mills. By the time he was twenty-three, he was manager of the Woolen Mills which was the largest concern of its kind in the intermountain area. Reed Smoot seemed to have a natural talent for business and he soon became the first president of Provo Commercial and Savings Bank. He was also president of Victoria and Grand Central Mining Companies. At the age of thirty-five he had a quarter of a million dollars.[4]

Alpha Mae Eldredge, daughter of Horace S. Eldredge, became the wife of Reed Smoot on Septemer 17, 1884.[5]

---

[1]A Stake is an administrative subdivision of the Mormon Church which contains several wards. Wards are similar to parishes or congregations.

[2]Milton Reese Merrill, "Reed Smoot, Apostle in Politics" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Political Science, Columbia University), p.ii.

[3]Nels Anderson, "Pontifex Babbitt," The American Mercury VIX (October, 1926), 177.

[4]Merrill, p. iv.

[5]U. S., Congress, Senate, Committee on Privileges and Elections, hearings, In the Matter of Protests Against the Right of the Honorable Reed Smoot to Hold His Seat, 59th Cong., 1st Sess., 1905-06, III, 183.

They had six children. Although polygamy, the practice of taking more than one wife was not abandoned by the Mormon Church until the official proclamation in 1890, Reed Smoot never took a plural wife. He did, however, remarry after Alpha Mae's death. Alpha Mae was an invalid from 1920 until her death in November 1928. Reed Smoot married Alice Taylor Sheets in July of 1930.[1]

In the controversy over Reed Smoot's right to a seat in the United States Senate, his church affiliation became the paramount issue. He was born into a polygamous Mormon family and taught the doctrines of that church from his youth, yet he was "not what is called spiritually minded"[2] during his younger life. He turned down two mission calls in the 1880's because he was too busy in business. The third call came in the fall of 1890, and he decided to go. The call was to Great Britain. While he was there most of his assignments were administrative in nature. After he had been out ten months his father became ill and Smoot returned home.[3]

In 1895 he became counselor to President Edward Partridge in the Utah Stake. In 1900 Reed Smoot was named an Apostle, a member of the twelve highest administrative authorities in the Mormon Church. His appointment was

---

[1]Merrill, p.v. [2]Whitmer, p. 225.

[3]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 259-260.

confirmed in a conference of the Church held April 9, 1900,[1] and he served in this capacity until his death.

Reed Smoot's politics, also, played an integral part in the debate over his right to a seat in the United States Senate. His father was a rabid Democrat, but Smoot wanted to choose his political party independently. He wasn't sure which party he preferred, so he decided to subscribe to two New York newspapers, one Republican and one Democratic. After reading both of these papers for one year, he decided to be a Republican.[2] From then on his loyalty to that party was unwavering.

On January 30, 1903 a Republican state legislature elected him to the United States Senate.[3] Many Gentile citizens of Utah protested his right to a seat. They charged that his duties as a Mormon Apostle conflicted with his loyalty to the office of senator. They protested that the Mormon Church was in politics and that the election of an Apostle constituted a union of church and state.[4] It was also charged that Reed Smoot was himself a polygamist.[5] It took four years to definitely settle the question of his

---

[1]Whitmer, p. 262.

[2]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, III, 185.

[3]Utah, Senate Journal, 5th Sess., 1903, p. 69.

[4]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I, 1-12.

[5]Ibid., p. 29.

seating, but once he was finally seated he served for nearly thirty years.

In 1930 Reed Smoot was the oldest United States Senator in terms of length of service, and he was referred to as the "Dean of the Senate." In 1926 the American Mercury carried a feature article on Senator Smoot which stated:

> Today, it is probable, he has more real power in his hands than any other man in Washington, not even excepting Dr. Coolidge. He knows more about the actual workings of the government than any of his colleagues. In all national legislation, and especially when it relates to finance, he has become a dominating influence.[1]

In the election of 1932 he was defeated, and he also suffered a decline in his personal fortunes that year. He continued to lead an active life until his death which came while he was on vacation to St. Petersburg, Florida on February 9, 1941.[2] He was seventy-nine years old.

HISTORY OF UTAH POLITICS

In order to understand the significance of the United States Senate debate on the seating of Reed Smoot it is necessary to review the political background of Utah from its settlement to the 1900's. Utah was settled by the members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, nicknamed Mormons because of their belief in an

---

[1]Nels Anderson, "Pontifex Babbitt," The American Mercury, VIX (October, 1926), 177.

[2]Merrill, p. x.

additional scripture called the Book of Mormon. From Utah's early settlement in 1847 until 1870 there was only one political party, the People's Party.[1]

The President of the Mormon Church, Brigham Young, was also the governor of the territory. Most of the population was Mormon and it seemed logical to them that the leaders in the Church should also lead them in their government and civic affairs.

> For the first twenty years, political activity in Utah was based upon this theocratic philosophy. Elections were held but they did not mean much. A single list of properly selected candidates would be submitted to the people who would go through the motions of voting for them.[2]

An investigation of the official returns from these early elections shows very little dissatisfaction with the candidates. The voting was either unanimous or nearly so.[3]

As the non-Mormon population of the state grew, political differences between the Gentiles and the Mormons became more apparent. In 1870 the non-Mormon citizens formed an anti-church party called the Liberal Party.[4] From this time on, there were bitter struggles between the two. During the period from 1870 to 1890, when the People's Party and the Liberal Party predominated, Utah was still a

---

[1] Ibid., p. 1.

[2] Stanley S. Ivins, The Moses Thatcher Case, (Salt Lake City: Modern Microfilm Co., n.d.), p. 2.

[3] Ibid. [4] Merrill, p. 1.

territory.

The Mormon Church, at this time, was preaching and practicing the doctrine of plural marriage. At the same time the Federal Government was becoming increasingly hostile toward the practice. In 1862 Congress passed the Morrill Antibigamy Law, in 1882 the Edmunds law, and in 1887 the Edmunds-Tucker Act.[1] All of these statutes imposed more and more stringent regulations and punishments on the practice of polygamy. Between 1884 and 1889, thirteen thousand leading Mormon men were imprisoned, hundreds were in hiding, and thousands were disfranchised because of polygamy.[2]

In 1890 the manifesto on polygamy was announced by the President of the Mormon Church, Wilford Woodruff. This document was designed to put an end to the official church sanction of plural marriage and polygamous cohabitation. Although for a number of years the declaration was not printed in any of the standard scriptures of the Church, it is now printed at the conclusion of the Doctrine and Covenants.

> Inasmuch as laws have been enacted by Congress forbidding plural marriages, which laws have been pronounced constitutional by the court of last resort, I hereby declare my intention to submit to those laws and use my influence with the members of the Church over which I preside to have them do like-

---

[1]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I., 51.

[2]Merrill, p. 2.

> wise....And now I publically declare that my advice to the Latter-day Saints is to refrain from contracting any marriage forbidden by the law of the land.[1]

This manifesto was accepted by church members at general conference in October of 1890.

After the manifesto was accepted Utah's relationship with the Federal Government became friendlier. President Cleveland and President Harrison issued amnesty proclamations, confiscated church property was returned, and in 1894 the act to enable Utah to become a state was passed. By 1896 Utah was declared to be in general compliance with the provisions of the Enabling Act. On the fourth of January, 1896 Utah became the forty-fifth state in the Union.[2]

After an early history of bitter church anti-church politics it seemed inevitable that the Mormons would continue to be accused of dominating the political life of the state. Even so, the People's Party was finally dissolved about 1891,[3] and in June of 1893 the Liberal Party met the same fate.[4] After this date, the political interests in the state began to reorganize along the lines of the larger national parties. Nevertheless in the first campaign following statehood charges of church influence still obscured the larger national issues.

---

[1]Wilford Woodruff, Doctrine and Covenants (Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1961), p. 257.

[2]U. S., Statutes at Large, XXIS, 876, (1896).

[3]Roberts, p. 298. [4]Ibid., p. 313.

During this period in history senators and representatives were elected by the state legislatures rather than by the direct vote of the people. In the fall of 1895 the Democratic Party nominated Brigham H. Roberts for the House of Representatives. For the Senate they nominated Joseph L. Rawlins and Moses Thatcher. Rawlins was a non-Mormon but Roberts was one of the seven Presidents of the Seventy and Thatcher was an Apostle. Neither Thatcher nor Roberts consulted with the Twelve before announcing their candidacy. In addition, all of the candidates spoke out against church influence in politics.

Thatcher and Roberts were reproved by the church authorities for not asking permission to run for an office which would require much of the time they had previously committed to their church duties. Naturally "the censure of these brethren [sic] was seized upon by the opposing party as indicating that they were out of favor with the church authorities and that their political defeat was desirable."[1]

In April of 1896 the political manifesto was announced and accepted by the people of the Mormon Church. Henceforth any high church official could run for political office without obtaining the consent of the Church by resigning his religious office. If the church official wished to hold his ecclesiastical office while running for

---

[1] Ibid., p. 332.

a political office which would require him to abandon or neglect his ecclesiastical duties, he must first obtain the consent of the authorities of the Church.[1] B. H. Roberts signed this political manifesto, but Moses Thatcher refused to sign and continued his tirade against the political participation of the Church. For this and other reasons, he was subsequently dropped from his position of Apostle in the Quorum of the Twelve.[2]

In 1897 there was a general trend toward the Republican Party, but the Democrats still managed to keep a majority in the Utah Legislature. The first task was to elect the new congressmen. On the fifty-third ballot for Senator, Rawlins won over Thatcher (32 to 29).[3] This outcome only served to heighten the clamor over church influence.

At this same legislature Brigham H. Roberts was elected as United States Representative. When this happened the Salt Lake Ministerial Association protested his admission on the grounds that he was a polygamist. His polygamy was a well known fact, and since it was a violation of Federal law, the United States House of Representatives voted to exclude him from that body.[4]

---

[1]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I, 168-171.

[2]Merrill, p. 4. [3]Ivins, p. 9.

[4]U. S., Congressional Record. 56th Cong, 1st Sess. 1900, XXXIII, Part 2,1217.

During the period following statehood until about 1905 the two paramount issues in Utah politics continued to be polygamy and the Mormon Church in politics. In 1901 when Thomas Kearns, a Gentile, was elected to the Senate there were widespread charges of a deal between Kearns and President Lorenzo Snow of the Mormon Church. Thomas Kearns had recently bought the Salt Lake Tribune and it was alleged that in return for church support, he promised not to publish anti-Mormon invective. Neither Kearns nor the Church was ever completely free of this charge. It plagued the Church during the years of the Smoot hearings, and in his last speech in the Senate Kearns was still trying to deny it.[1]

HISTORY OF THE REED SMOOT CASE

Against this background, Reed Smoot, Apostle in the Mormon Church, announced his intention to run for the United States Senate. He had previously obtained the consent of the Twelve and his official announcement came at the meeting of the Ladies Republican Club of Provo on May 14, 1902. Senator Kearns spoke afther him and supported his candidacy. On May 15, 1902 the Salt Lake Tribune, owned by Kearns, approved of him in an editorial.[2]

---

[1] New York Times, March 1, 1905, p. 5.

[2] Salt Lake Tribune, May 15, 1902, p. 1.

During that summer Smoot worked for the election of Republicans who would support him in the state legislature. It was understood that a Republican vote meant a vote for Smoot as senator. It was to his advantage that President Theodore Roosevelt was very popular in Utah and the Republican Party was making gains.

The Republicans carried the state and a Republican legislature was elected. Once his party was safely in power, Senator Kearns shifted his support and the Salt Lake Tribune started questioning the advisability of electing an Apostle. The other local newspapers had various views. Goodwin's Weekly bitterly opposed Smoot's election. The Deseret News, the recognized church organ, took it for granted. The Salt Lake Herald said his election was assured.

The Salt Lake Ministerial Association met November 24, 1902 and passed a resolution opposing Smoot's election,[1] and it was a well known fact that the editor of the Tribune approved of their actions. Once the party was elected Senator Kearns even made public an unfavorable comment which was supposedly made by President Roosevelt about Smoot's candidacy.[2] Goodwin's Weekly, and extremely anti-church paper commented;

---

[1] Deseret News, "Ministers Oppose Smoot," November 23, 1902, p. 1.

[2] Deseret News, "Kearns Don't Want Smoot," January 10, 1903, p. 1.

> The reason there is a vast majority of the legislators-elect who stand ready to vote for him, is because the Utah theocracy, proceeding under the forms of the Republic, performed its perfect despotic work to secure for him a legislature to elect him.[1]

In spite of this intense anti-Smoot sentiment, the vast majority of the legislators were Republican and there was little doubt that he would be elected.

When the state legislature met in January, 1903 they elected Reed Smoot on the first ballot.[2] The reaction of the anti-Smoot faction was immediate. As in the case of B. H. Roberts a protest was drawn up to be submitted to the United States Senate. The document was quite lengthy, discussing the various points which allegedly disqualified Smoot from the office of senator. It quoted as evidence Mormon scriptures and speeches of church authorities. The protest was submitted by nineteen Salt Lake Citizens on January 26, 1903. The main points were as follows:

> I. The Mormon priesthood, according to the doctrines of that church is vested with supreme authority in all things temporal and spiritual.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> II. The First Presidency and twelve apostles are supreme in the exercise and transmission of the mandates of this authority.
>
> . . . . . .

---

[1] Goodwins Weekly, "Smoot not a Citizen," November 22, 1902, p. 1.

[2] Utah, Senate Journal, 5th Sess. (1903), p. 69.

> III. As this body of men has not abandoned the principles and practices of political dictation, so also it has not abandoned belief in polygamy and polygamous cohabitation.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> IV. That this is the attitude of the first presidency and apostolate, even since the suspensory manifesto of 1890, is evidenced by their teachings since then.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> V. The supreme authorities in the church, of whom Senator-elect Reed Smoot is one, to wit, the first Presidency and the twelve apostles, not only connive at violations of, but protect and honor the violators of the laws against polygamy and polygamous cohabitation.[1]

On February 23, 1903 Senator Kearns reported Smoot's credentials to the Senate. Senator J. C. Burrows introduced the Citizen's Protest and it was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections of which Burrows was chairman.[2]

A few days later, on February 26, 1903 Senator Burrows introduced another protest against Smoot.[3] This one was submitted by John L. Leilich, a Methodist minister and a member of the Salt Lake Ministerial Association. His protest contained two additional charges. He said that "Senator-elect Smoot is a polygamist,"[4] and that "the oath

---

[1]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I, 1-12.

[2]U. S., Congressional Record, 57th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1903, XXXVI, Part 3, 2496.

[3]Ibid., p. 2688.

[4]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I, 27.

of office required of and taken by the said Reed Smoot as an apostle. . .is of such a nature. . .that he is thereby disqualified from taking the oath of office required of a United States Senator."[1]

The introduction of this protest caused quite a stir of public opinion. The president of the Salt Lake Ministerial Association, Reverend Richard Wake, hastened to state that Dr. Leilich had submitted the protest on his own volition and not as a representative of the association. Reverend Wake also stated that he did not believe that Smoot was a polygamist and that he didn't know what proof Dr. Leilich could have to substantiate his charge.[2]

Joseph F. Smith, president of the Mormon Church, issued an emphatic statement that "Mr. Smoot has never had but one wife at any time."[3] A press dispatch from Washington to the Deseret News on the following day quoted Senator Smoot as saying, "the charge of Reverend Leilich that I am a polygamist is absolutely false. It is pitiable to see a man so lost to all honor as he is."[4] This same dispatch goes on to report:

---

[1] Ibid., p. 28.

[2] Deseret News, February 27, 1903, p. 1.

[3] Deseret News, February 26, 1903, p. 1.

[4] Ibid., February 27, 1903, p. 1.

> A number of prominent members of the house, in speaking about the charges filed by Leilich in the Senate yesterday, say that they will have no weight in the senate.[1]

The United States Senate convened on March 5, 1903 for the swearing in of new senators. Senator Hoar read a statement from the Committee on Privileges and Elections which suggested that Senator Smoot should be sworn in and act in his capacity while the committee was considering his case. Senator Smoot was then sworn in, taking the oath of office with the other newly elected senators.[2]

During the summer of 1903 all kinds of women's groups began to crusade against Smoot. By late November petitions seeking his exclusion from the Senate were arriving in a steady stream. Anti-Mormon articles appeared in the newspapers and old stories about polygamy were revived.

In late November, 1903 the Committee on Privileges and Elections finally asked for a written defense from Senator Smoot. Legal counsel was found in the persons of A. S. Worthington and Waldemar Van Cott, both from Utah. Senator Smoot's reply was prepared and filed on January 4, 1904. He answered by claiming that there were only two of the charges which, if true, could legally disqualify him from office. These two were that he was a polygamist

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] U. S., Congressional Record, 58th Cong., Spec. Sess., 1903, XXXVII, Part 1, 1-2.

and that he had taken some oath which conflicted with the oath administered to a United States Senator. Both of these charges Reed Smoot denied. He also denied the other charges but contended that the others in the Citizen's Protest could not legally disqualify him from office even if they were true.[1]

On January 16, 1904 the committee heard the opening statements of the attorneys. The protestants were represented mainly by John G. Carlisle and Robert W. Taylor with A. B. Critchlow and C. M. Owen, both of Salt Lake, acting in an advisory capacity.[2] In presenting his opening statement Mr. Taylor said he represented only the nineteen citizens who had filed the first protest and not John L. Leilich. He said that the protestants whom he represented did not make the charge that Smoot was a polygamist. There was no one there to represent Leilich or press the charges outlined in his protest.[3]

After the opening remarks in January the hearings didn't actually begin until March 2, 1904. There was

---

[1]Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I, 31.

[2]Washington Evening Star, "The Reed Smoot Case," March 2, 1904.

[3]U. S., Senate, Committee on Privileges and Elections, Views of the Minority in the Matter of Protests Against the Right of the Honorable Reed Smoot to Hold His Seat, 59th Cong., 1st Sess., 1906, p. 8.

great interest in their opening, particularly since the president of the Mormon Church, Joseph F. Smith was to be the first witness. The Washington Post reported that "The committee room on the gallery floor was crowded to its capacity. There were several women among the spectators, outside of those who had been summoned as witnesses."[1] The committee room was a small one holding only about fifty people at the most. This meant that many spectators were forced to listen outside the committee room doors.

Joseph F. Smith was on the stand for three days and the major newspapers in the country gave his testimony front page coverage. Most regarded his statements as damaging to Senator Smoot's position. In his testimony Joseph Smith admitted that although he had married his wives prior to 1890, he had been cohabiting with them since the manifesto. He said that he had had eleven children by his five wives since 1890. He admitted that his course of action had been both illegal and against the Manifesto of the Mormon Church. He explained that he preferred "to meet the consequences of the law rather than to abandon his children and their mothers."[2] He also said that he planned to continue living with his wives "knowing the responsibility" and knowing himself "amenable to the law."[3]

---

[1] Washington Post, "Probe Mormon Faith, March 3, 1904.

[2] Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, I, 129.

[3] Ibid.

Mr. Smith did say that no new plural marriages had been performed with the consent or knowledge of the Church since 1890 when the manifesto was issued.[1] He also denied that he had interfered in any way with the election of Reed Smoot.

After President Smith, followed many other members of the Mormon Church, including apostles and other high officials. There also came many embittered apostates who, because of their personal grievances, were willing to tell all that they knew and some things which they only suspected. Some of the apostles would not appear and, since they had been accused of being polygamists, this tended to cast a suspicious light on them.

As the hearings recessed on May 2, 1904 the news media still seemed generally unfavorable to Smoot although some recognized that the case was more a trial of the Mormon Church than of Reed Smoot.

> The charges are against the governing authorities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, and Reed Smoot must bear the brunt, because he is one of them and is asking for recognition as a senator of the United States . . . . If the corporation is convicted he must be the sacrificial lamb.[2]

When the hearings reopened, December 12, 1904,

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] The Eagle (Brooklyn), "Mormon Church on Trial in the Smoot Hearings," March 13, 1904.

the protestants brought twenty-one more witnesses.[1] At the conclusion of their testimonies the defense began bringing their witnesses--forty-two including Senator Smoot. Reed Smoot was called to the witness stand on January 20, 1905.

Senator Smoot answered questions dealing with his family and personal life, his church background and his political career. The New York Sun called him an effective and interesting witness saying that he "fully held his own."[2] His inquisitors had tried to gain a damaging admission from Smoot by asking, "What would you do if a Mormon revelation should conflict with the law of the land," and similar questions. Smoot replied that he would obey the revelation and if it conflicted with the law of this country he would go to another land.[3]

This line of questioning brought less than desirable results for the protestants. It served to bring forth comments favorable to Smoot's stand from many newspapers. Smoot had said that he put the laws of God before the laws of the land and the New York papers seemed to think that most Christians would feel the same way.

---

[1]Merrill, p. 74.

[2]New York Sun, "Senator Smoot Testifies," January 21, 1905.

[3]Democrat and Chronicle (Rochester), "Human and Divine Law," January 25, 1905.

> In all fairness, is not this substantially the position of the majority of Christian ministers and sincere church members . . . . As a general thing, the exponents of almost any religion will contend that divine law is above human law, and Senator Smoot, with all his alleged faults seems to be in harmony with this view.[1]

Shortly after Senator Smoot's testimony the committee took a recess which lasted from January 28, 1905 until February 27, 1906. The defense took from February to April in concluding their list of witnesses. The final arguments from both sides were heard on April 13, 1906.[2] On the sixth of June, 1906, Senator Dubois, from Idaho, moved that the committee adopt the resolution "that Reed Smoot is not entitled to a seat as a Senator of the United States from the State of Utah."[3] The motion carried with seven in favor and five against.[4]

Senator Burrows made an oral report to the Senate in June suggesting that the Senate consider the resolution on June 11, 1906. Senator Teller objected.[5] The Republicans were opposed to a vote during that session. On June eleventh two written reports were filed with the Senate.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections, Smoot Hearings, IV, 410.

[3] Ibid., Report of the Majority, p. 32.

[4] The Ledger (Philadelphia), "Smoot and the Senate," June 3, 1906.

[5] U. S. Congressional Record, 59th Cong., 1st Sess., XL, Part 8, 7716.

The majority report was by Chairman J. C. Burrows and the minority report by Senator J. B. Foraker. The resolution was not considered by the Senate during that session.

The second session of the fifty-ninth Congress began in December, 1906 and it was during that session that the debate on Reed Smoot's senate seat finally came to a head. The resolution from the committee was introduced on December 11, 1906 by Chairman Burrows who opened the debate by speaking in favor of the committee report.[1]

There were a total of nine speeches made in favor of unseating Senator Smoot. Some of those who spoke in favor of the resolution included J. C. Burrows and Fred Dubois, both powerful speakers and men of influence in the Senate.

There were eight speeches against the resolution and in favor of Senator Smoot. Speakers on the Senator's side included Albert J. Beverirdge and Philander C. Knox, both well known for their legal abilities, and J. B. Foraker, one of the ablest debators in the Senate at that time.

On the twentieth of February, 1907, four years after Senator Smoot first took his seat, it was decided by the United States Senate that he was entitled to that

---

[1]U. S., Congressional Record, 59th Cong., 2nd Sess., 1906, XLI, Part 1, 241.

seat and could retain it.[1] To the Mormon people this decision meant that even their highest church officials could hold political offices and represent the state in the law-making bodies of the Federal Government. To all Christian faiths it meant that a man who holds allegiance to God's law supreme could still sit in the Senate of the United States.

---

[1] Ibid., Part 4, 3429. The vote was 22 in favor of the resolution and 49 opposed.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF THE DEBATE

The summary of the senate debate on the seating of Reed Smoot will involve a description of the format, including the order of speakers and the chronology of the debate. It will also include a little about each speaker's background, as well as the major arguments which each side supported.

THE FORMAT

In this particular senate debate, there were no formal rules governing the length of the speeches or the order of speaking. There was, however, a limit on the total amount of time to be reserved before the vote. Senator Burrows moved that a vote be taken not later than the afternoon of February 20, 1907 and that motion passed. With this in mind it would be well to review the chronology of the debate.

On December 11, 1906 Senator Burrows presented the majority report and spoke in favor of the resolution, "That Reed Smoot is not entitled to a seat in the Senate as a Senator of the United States from the State of Utah." On December 13, 1906 he was followed by another affirmative speaker, Senator Dubois. Senator Hopkins spoke against the resolution on January 11, 1907 and Senator Sutherland, on January 21, also spoke in the negative. These two

affirmative and two negative speeches might be called the constructive speeches. On February 11, 1907 Senator Berry spoke favoring the resolution and Senator Knox spoke against it on February 14, 1907. There were two negative speakers on February 19, the day before the debate. They were Senator Smoot and Senator Dillingham. On the day of the vote there was a motion to limit debate so that each side could have a fair share of the time, but it was defeated. Senator Dubois was the first speaker for the resolution; he was followed by Senator Beveridge (negative), Bacon (affirmative), Dolliver (negative), Burrows and Newlands (both affirmative. The outline of the format would look like this:

SPEAKER	SIDE	DATE
Burrows	Affirmative	Dec. 11, 1906
Dubois	Affirmative	Dec. 13, 1906
Hopkins	Negative	Jan. 11, 1907
Sutherland	Negative	Jan. 22, 1907
Berry	Affirmative	Feb. 11, 1907
Knox	Negative	Feb. 14, 1907
Smoot	Negative	Feb. 19, 1907
Dillingham	Negative	Feb. 19, 1907
Dubois	Affirmative	Feb. 20, 1907
Beveridge	Negative	Feb. 20, 1907
Carmack	Affirmative	Feb. 20, 1907
Hansbrough	Affirmative	Feb. 20, 1907
Foraker	Negative	Feb. 20, 1907
Bacon	Affirmative	Feb. 20, 1907
Dolliver	Negative	Feb. 20, 1907
Burrows	Affirmative	Feb. 20, 1907
Newlands	Affirmative	Feb. 20, 1907

Notice that the speeches were almost evenly divided between the sides and that the affirmative had both the first and last speech. There was also good alternation

between the sides. By February 20, the voting day, only half of the speeches had been given although the debate had been open for two and one-half months.

THE SPEAKERS

Before we discuss the issues involved in the debate it would be in order to introduce the speakers and make a few comments about their respective roles in the debate. The affirmative speakers will be presented first and then the negative.

AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKERS

Julius C. Burrows.[1] -- Senator Burrows received his early education in the midwest and later went to Michigan to teach school and to practice law. He soon gained local prominence by his campaign stump speaking. Burrows spoke for abolition in the first and second Lincoln campaigns. In 1873 he was elected to the House of Representatives on the Republican ticket where he served until his election to the Senate in 1894. In both the House and the Senate he worked to achieve effective anti-polygamy laws. He was serving as chairman of the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections when the Reed Smoot case developed. In 1908 the North American Review said that Burrows "had inherent--almost pre-natal--antagonisms against all things Mormon which incited him to leave no stone unturned to carry out

---

[1]Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), Dictionary of American Biography, I (4th ed.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958), 226-227.

the effort"[1] to unseat Smoot.

Carl Badger, who was private secretary to Reed Smoot, comments about both of Burrow's speeches in letters to his wife. Regarding Burrows first speech, he said that it

> made a very strong impression. He /Burrows/ has spent a long time in its preparation, and it was strongly put together. We think that he has placed the worst light on everything, and has falsely put some things, but it will take a strong speech to undo what he has done. Some of the Senator's Smoot's friends are doubtful as to whether they can support him. They have been shaken by Burrows.[2]

On the day of the vote Burrows spoke again and this time Badger wrote that "no more sarcastic phillipic has been heard in the Senate for a long time."[3] Senator Beveridge is said to have remarked, "Burrows of Michigan is up for re-election and until recently had opposition; and like a certain class of public men is playing to the galleries."[4]

Fred Dubois[5]-- Senator Dubois' dealings with the Mormons began in 1882 when he was appointed U. S. Marshall in Idaho; this same year Congress passed the anti-polygamy law. He was elected to the Senate in 1890 on the Republican

---

[1] "Men We Are Watching," The Independent, LXII (February 28, 1907), 493.

[2] Carl Badger, Letter to wife, December 16, 1906.

[3] Ibid., February 21, 1907.

[4] Albert J. Beveridge, Letter to Charles Coffin, March 24, 1904, as quoted in Claud G. Bowers, Beveridge and the Progressive Era (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1932), p.257.

[5] All biographical information has been taken from the same source. Jay R. Lowe, "Fred Dubois, Foe of the Mormons," (unpublished Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, Dept. of Political Science, 1960), pp. 1-10.

ticket, but was not returned in 1896. In 1900 he joined the Silver Republican Party and with the aid of a Democratic coalition was again elected to the Senate. After his election he announced that he would henceforth be a Democrat. By 1902 the free silver and anti-imperialism issues were obsolete and Dubois found his new platform in anti-Mormonism.

Dubois was a member of the Committee on Elections and Privileges and in 1904, during Smoot's hearings, wrote, "This is the fight of my life. I have been engaged in it practically for twenty years and have organized the present contest and am in complete control of it."[1] Although his real objection to the Mormon Church was their attempted political domination he "made use of polygamy...as our great weapon of offense and to gain recruits to our standard."[2] In the Senate Dubois spoke twice on the Smoot question. Badger says his first speech was "regarded more as a campaign harangue than a dignified consideration of the right of a sovereign state to its lawfully chosen representative."[3] His second speech was better, more compact and more direct. "He was uncompromising in his statements, would not submit to interruption for information or

---

[1]Dubois Collection, Number III, Office Letters, p. 92, as quoted in Lowe, p. 9.

[2]Fred Dubois, "Autobiography," p. 25 as quoted in Lowe, p. 4.

[3]Badger, Letter to Clove, December 20, 1906.

correction. . . a strong speech."[1]

James H. Berry[2] -- Senator Berry entered public life as the youngest man in the Alabama state legislature in 1886. He was a member of the Democratic party and a lawyer by profession. In 1882 he was elected governor of Alabama, and, after serving one term, he went to the United States Senate where he served until his defeat by Jeff Davis in 1907.

In the Reed Smoot debate he spent most of his time describing in detail the outrages committed by the Mormons in the Moutain Meadows Massacre. Reed Smoot had previously stated that the Mormon Church was the same today as it had always been. Berry used this statement to reason that if they committed such atrocities in the past they were a criminal organization that might do similar things again. Carl Badger describes it this way:

> I cannot tell you how I felt while Senator Berry was talking. Congressman Howell came over and sat down by me, and as he did so said--his face showing that he meant it: "This is horrible." I have always thought that we would never get away from the Mountain Meadow Massacre until we admit the facts....I do not think that Berry changed any votes; the only influence of his speech was to let loose that uncontrollable rage in the hearts of those who are swayed by sentiment and prejudice.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., Letter to wife, February 21, 1907.

[2] Johnson, I, 226-227.

[3] Badger, Letter to wife, February 13, 1907.

Edward Ward Carmack[1] -- After nine years in journalism and local politics Carmack was elected to the Senate. There he represented Tennessee from 1900 to 1906. He was an active prohibitionist and in 1907 ran for governor of Tennessee against an anti-prohibitionist. After his defeat he still kept up his campaign for prohibition. So bitter were the feelings in this struggle that in 1908 Carmack was shot in Nashville by supporters of the anti-prohibitionist governor. In the Smoot debate he spoke only a few minutes. He was one who favored the expulsion of Smoot by two-thirds vote. He believed this was the constitutional way of dealing with him.

Henry Clay Hansbrough[2] -- Senator Hansbrough began his career in newspaper publishing in California and from there moved to Wisconsin then to North Dakota where he finally located permanently. In Dakota he became a widely respected Republican and was elected to the Senate in 1891. He served three terms there. He spoke only a few minutes in the Smoot debate. Carl Badger had little good to say about the speech, calling it the "shame of the day," and saying that in all probability it had been written for him by the women's organizations in the galleries.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., II, 490.

[2] Marquis, VIII, 1024.

[3] Badger, Letter to his wife, February 21, 1907.

Agustus O. Bacon[1] -- Senator Bacon of Georgia was a lawyer before entering politics. He had served several terms in the state legislature when, in 1894, he became the Democractic senator for Georgia. He served until his death in 1914. In the Reed Smoot debate he spoke on the day of the vote and consumed very little time. He was also in favor of expelling Smoot by two-thirds vote.

Francis G. Newlands[2] -- In 1903, Senator Newlands, Democrat from Nevada, took his seat in the United States Senate. He had previously been a member of the House of Representatives and a member of the Silver Party. Senator Newlands spoke at the very last minute, after Senator Burrows had supposedly closed the debate for the affirmative. He rose mainly to explain his vote. He believed that the Mormons in politics meant an unhealthy union of Church and State.

NEGATIVE SPEAKERS

Albert J. Hopkins[3]-- After practicing law in Chicago for some twenty years, Hopkins was elected to the House of Representatives. From 1885 until his election to the Senate in 1903, he served the Republican party and the State of

---

[1] Johnson, I, 474-475.
Savoyard, "Senator Agustus O. Bacon," Washington Evening Post, 1904.

[2] Arthur B. Darling, The Public Papers of Francis G. Newlands, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932).

[3] Albert Nelson Marquis (ed.), Who's Who in America, VI, 1910-1911, (Chicago: A. N. Marquis & Company, 1899), 939-940.

Illinois in that body. Senator Hopkins was an Elections Committee member and opened the debate for the negative. Carl Badger evaluates his speech as follows:

> The Senator showed considerable lack of familiarity with the details of the local situation, but he was by no means as far from the mark in his picture of conditions in Utah, as Burrows and Dubois were. . .He was interrupted several times by Burrows and Dubois and each time they went away with scars.[1]

George Sutherland[2]-- George Sutherland was born in England, but his family immigrated to the United States and settled in Provo, Utah, He received an LLD. degree at Columbia University and did further legal study at the University of Michigan as well as George Washington University. In 1900 he was elected to the House of Representatives from Utah but declined renomination. In 1905 he was elected to succeed Kearns in the Senate. By 1916 he was also President of the American Bar Association. In 1922 President Harding nominated him to succeed Justice Clark on the Supreme Court, and he was assigned to the seventh circuit.

Sutherland's speech on the seating of Reed Smoot was his first speech in the Senate and he spoke for two hours. He received many congratulations on the speech. In speaking of Sutherland's speech "Senator Frye told Senator Smoot that

---

[1]Badger, Letter to wife, January 12, 1907.

[2]John L. Clarke, "Constitutional Doctrines of Justice George Sutherland," (unpublished Master's Thesis, Brigham Young University, 1932), pp. 1-20.

he had never listened to a better speech. . ."[1] Senator Knox, who was a great joker, told Sutherland: "If I had made that speech for you, I would have charged you two dollars."[2]

Philander C. Knox[3] -- Senator Knox had twenty-five years of law practice behind him when he entered the Senate in 1904. In addition he had served as Attorney General under President McKinley. As a Senator he was credited with being the most widely read man in that body and one of the "brainiest men in the Senate."[4] He later served as Secretary of State for President Taft. Knox was also a member of the Elections Committee and after his speech favoring the seating of Senator Smoot the Inquirer remarked, "Not for a long time has any public address, whether in or out of Congress, attracted so much notice and produced such a deeply favorable impression."[5] He spent half of his speech on the legal aspects of exclusion versus expulsion and the

---

[1]Badger, Letter to wife, January 23, 1907.

[2]Ibid., February 14, 1907.

[3]Edwin S. Stuart, "Philander Chase Knox," North American Review, CXXXLVII (May 1908), p. 650.

"Men We Are Watching," The Independent, LXII February 28, 1907), 492.

Herbert F. Wright, Reprint of Article on Philander C. Knox from The American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy, (Alfred Knopf, Inc., 1929).

[4]"Men We Are Watching," p. 492.

[5]Inquirer (Philadelphia, February 21, 1907.)

other half on the question of Smoot's loyalty to the Constitution and to the law.

Reed Smoot -- The pertinent facts about Senator Smoot's life have already been discussed in Chapter III. It was on the 19th of February that Smoot rose to defend himself, his church, and his right to a seat in the United States Senate. It was not without weeks of preparation in writing and practicing the speech. His negative colleagues had been plainly worried about his speaking. At the time he was not an experienced public speaker and the ability did not come naturally to him. His private secretary tells a little of the background.

> We have been trying to hold him down to forty minutes. . .but the Senator wants to talk for two hours. There is plenty to say, but the question is whether he can say it to advantage. I am inclined to think he cannot, but of course, he thinks he can. Senator Foraker has asked him to submit what he intends to say to him for criticism, so we can be sure that the Senator will say only that which will be of interest. The trouble is that the Senator will be asked questions by Burrows and especially, Dubois, and Heaven only knows where he will get off at in such a contingency.[1]

In spite of all the doubtful advisability of Smoot speaking for his own case, he finally decided to do so. He spoke briefly and the result was pleasantly surprising to all concerned. Carl Badger reports that it did "decided the wavering votes of Long and Curtis, Kansas Senators, and

---

[1]Badger, Letter to wife, December 23, 1905.

determined that Dolliver would vote for the Senator."[1]

The Washington Evening Post said:

> It was a plain, straightforward declaration of his views and beliefs, and it attracted the attention of the senators, who listened to all that he said. . .He was not interrupted, but was warmly congratulated by Senators as he took his seat.[2]

William P. Dillingham[3]-- As a student of law Dillingham studied under the Governor of Vermont, which, of course, facilitated his entry into politics. He served four terms in the Vermont state legislature then was elected Governor of Vermont on the Republican ticket. On October of 1900 Dillingham was elected to the Senate to fill a vacancy. He served in the Senate for twenty years and was a member of the Elections Committee at the time of the Smoot hearings.

Albert J. Beveridge[4] -- Senator Beveridge began his own law practice in 1887 and soon had acquired a considerable reputation for his legal ability. It seemed obvious that he would eventually take to politics. "When a college boy, Beveridge's fame as an orator was wide enough to cover both his native and adopted state, and it was inevitable that he should go on the stump in political campaigns."[5]

---

[1]Badger, Letter to his wife, February 21, 1907.

[2]Washington Evening Post, February 20, 1907.

[3]Johnson, III, 311.

[4]Savoyard, "Beveridge of Indiana," Washington Evening Post, 1904.

[5]Bowers, p. 257.

So it was that he became the Republican senator from Indiana in 1899 and served until 1922. Beveridge became a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections and was one of the signers of the minority report. As the senate debate progressed he rose to defend his views and the right of Reed Smoot.

> It was in this atmosphere, heavily charged with prejudice and fanaticism, that Beveridge rose to champion the cause of Smoot. Casting aside discretion, he rose to heights of eloquence never surpassed by him and seldom equaled.[1]

Jospeh D. Foraker[2] -- Senator Foraker graduated from Cornell University and studied law with Sloane and Donham in Cincinnati. He was eventually elected to the bench of the superior court of Cincinnati. In 1885 he ran on the Republican ticket for governor of Ohio and was elected. He was appointed to fill a vacancy in the Senate in 1897. It was said that he never talked without sufficient information. The North American Review called him his "party's ablest debater."[3] Senator Foraker was the author of the minority report of the committee, and so he had reviewed and carefully analyzed all of the testimony which had been taken.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 257.

[2] Charles Dick, "Foraker," North American Review, CXXXLVII (May 1908), p. 660.

[3] Joseph Benson Foraker, Notes on a Busy Life, (Cincinnati: Steward & Kidd Company, 1916).

Jonathan P. Dolliver[1] -- Senator Dolliver went to West Virginia University where he was a schoolmate with P. C. Knox. Dolliver was chosen "Philosophical orator" for the class of 1875. He read law after graduation and then went to Iowa to practice. In 1900 he was elected to represent that state in the Senate. At the time of the Smoot hearings he was a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. Dolliver had promised certain Republican party leaders to vote for Smoot in the committee. At the last minute he was strongly pressured by the Iowa ministers and in fear of his re-election he voted for the majority report, reserving the right to re-examine the evidence and modify his opinion. By the time of the Senate vote, he had changed his mind, and even spoke against the report. Badger said that the fact that he had been safely re-elected probably "had much to do with his courageous change of front."[2]

THE ISSUES

The major issues in the debate seemed to focus on three main aspects. One concerned the Mormon Church, the other Reed Smoot himself, and the third concerned the power of the Senate to exclude by a majority vote a man who had already been sworn into office.

---

[1] Ibid.

Thomas Richard Ross, Jonathan Prentiss Dolliver, (Iowa City: State Historical Society of Iowa, 1958).

[2] Badger, Letter to wife, February 21, 1907.

AFFIRMATIVE CONTENTIONS

Regarding the actions of the Mormon Church, the affirmative claimed that the Church had been hostile to the government in the past. They said the Church had resisted the territorial government's attempts to wipe out polygamy. They cited the Mountain Meadows Massacre as an indication of the lawlessness which prevailed. They also contended that the Mormon Church hierarcy dominated the political life of Utah and Idaho. Here they pointed out that Mormons who failed to get church consent to run were defeated (Thatcher) and said that Smoot, himself, had had to obtain consent to run. They further charged that the Church still believed in polygamy and that a number of plural marriages had taken place since the manifesto. The affirmative had no trouble proving their last contention against the Church, that the members were practicing polygamous cohabitation. The president of the Church, himself, had admitted it to the committee.

About Senator Smoot, himself, there was no direct charge made. The affirmative, instead, contended that as a member of the Quorum of the Twelve Apostles, he was involved in a criminal conspiracy to encourage polygamy. They also said that Smoot had taken an endowment oath inconsistent with loyalty to the United States. This was the so-called "oath of vengance" against the nation. The other contention against Smoot was that his belief in the supremacy of revelation conflicted with his senatorial oath to

obey the Constitution as the highest law of the land.

The legal issue was a technical one, dealing with the constitutional power of the Senate in the matter. The affirmative claimed that even though Smoot had been sworn in, he could be excluded by a majority vote.

NEGATIVE CONTENTIONS

The negative contended that the Mormons had proven their loyalty to the government in the past, especially in the war with Mexico and the war in the Phillippines. They contended that the crimes of the early Church were not relevant to the present situation. The negative said that the Church did not dominate the politics of the state. They explained that the political rule of the Church only required that high church officials gain consent to run for political office if they also desired to maintain the church office. The negative contended that the mere belief in polygamy was not criminal and that the Church had ceased to perform plural marriages in 1890. They contended further, that time was the best way to eliminate polygamous cohabitation and, in fact, was doing so.

The negative contended that Smoot himself was of blameless character and should not be punished for the acts of his associates. They claimed that he had never taken an oath against the nation and that his belief in revelation was not inconsistent with his ability to loyally serve in the Senate. Smoot had said that in case of a conflict between a revelation from God and the laws of the

land, he would obey God, but would do so in another land. The negative said this was no more or less than any God-fearing man could answer.

Regarding the legal issue, the negative argued that since Smoot possessed all the qualifications for the office of senator, he could not be constitutionally excluded by a majority vote but only a two-thirds vote. This concludes the summary of the debate. The next chapter will be an analysis of the methods of support used in the debate.

CHAPTER V

USE OF METHODS OF SUPPORT

The analysis of the methods of support used in the Reed Smoot debate shows how each side used the methods and how their usage compares with one another. The kind, quantity, and timing of the support materials by each side were analyzed. The relationship between the use of methods of support and the statements which they develop was also explored. In order to facilitate the reporting of this material, the discussion of the results will be organized as follows:

I. Methods of support used by the affirmative side.
   A. Number of support materials used by the affirmative side.
   B. Distribution of support material among the speakers.
   C. Number of times each method of support was used by the affirmative.
      1. Total used by the affirmative side.
      2. Total used by the individual speakers.
   D. Variety of methods of support used.
      1. Number of different methods used by the affirmative side.
      2. Number of different methods used by the individual speakers.

II. Methods of support used by the negative side.
   A. Number of support materials used by the negative side.
   B. Distribution of support materials among the speakers.
   C. Number of times each method of support was used by the negative.
      1. Total used by the negative side.
      2. Total used by the individual speakers.
   D. Variety of methods of support used.
      1. Number of different methods used by the negative side.

2. Number of different methods used by the individual speakers.

III. Comparison of methods of support.
   A. Comparison of the number of support materials used by each side.
   B. Comparison of the distribution of supporting materials among speakers on each side.
   C. Comparison of the number of times each method of support was used by each side.
   D. Comparison of the variety of methods of support used by each side.

IV. Percentage-distribution of affirmative methods of support.
   A. Percentage of total affirmative supports represented by each method.
   B. Percentage of individual speakers supports represented by each method.
   C. Comparison of the variety of different methods used with the percentage-distribution of the methods used.

V. Percentage-distribution of negative methods of support.
   A. Percentage of total negative supports represented by each method.
   B. Percentage of individual speakers supports represented by each method.
   C. Comparison of the variety of different methods used with the percentage-distribution of the methods used.

VI. Comparison of the affirmative and negative percentage distribution.
   A. Percentage comparison of the affirmative use of each method of support with negative use of each method.
   B. Comparison of affirmative and negative relationships between the variety of methods used and the percentage-distribution.

VII. Number of supports per assertion.
   A. Number of supports per assertion by the affirmative side.
   B. Number of supports per assertion by the negative side.
   C. Comparison of the number of affirmative and negative supports per assertion.

VIII. Methods of support for assertions.
- A. Affirmative assertions supported by the four most frequently used methods.
- B. Negative assertions supported by the four most frequently used methods.
- C. Comparison of affirmative and negative methods of support for assertions.

METHODS OF SUPPORT USED BY THE AFFIRMATIVE SIDE

On December 11, 1906 Julius C. Burrows began the debate for the affirmative side. He was supporting the resolution "That Reed Smoot is not entitled to a seat in the Senate as a Senator of the United States from the State of Utah." There were eventually eight other affirmative speakers on this resolution. A summary of the methods of support and the frequency with which they were used by the affirmative is shown in Table 2.

There was a total of 935 supports used by the affirmative side.[1] It is interesting to note that 472 of these supports, 50 per cent, were used in the first two speeches. Seventy-eight per cent of the total number of supports (728 of 935) were used by Burrows and Dubois in their four speeches. There were only 107 supports used by the other five speakers combined.

---

[1]If a speaker used eight different authorities to support one assertion this was counted as eight supports. A detailed description of each of the methods of support referred to in this chapter is found in Chapter II.

TABLE 2

AFFIRMATIVE METHODS OF SUPPORT

Methods of Support	Burrows	Dubois	Berry	Dubois	Carmack	Hansbrough	Bacon	Burrows	Newlands	Total use of Method by Side
Defin. and expl.	5	7								12
Lit. comp.		3	2							5
Fig. comp.		1	2							3
Fac. Spc. Inst.	54	13	3	7				10		87
Hypo. Spc. Inst.		1	6					6		13
Fac. Illus.	7	8	8	3				7		33
Hypo. Illus.	2		3	1	1	2		1		10
Statis.	6	10		1						17
Exp. Test.	77	36	21	24			1	57		216
Quot.	2		1					1		4
Caus. Reas.	8	1	3	1				1	1	15
Restment. and Rep.	28	8	6	2			1	10		55
Inter.	3	8	3	1	6			5		26
Asser.	35	149	60	69	10	29	22	49	16	439
Total use of methods by speaker	227	245	118	109	17	31	24	147	17	
Total methods used by side										935

The most popular method of support used by the affirmative was assertion[1] which was used 439 times. Expert testimony was the method used with the second highest frequency (216 times), then came factual specific instance (87) and restatement (55). These four methods together account for 797 of the supports used, 85 per cent of the total. The least frequently used method of support was figurative comparison (3 times), then came quotation (4) and literal comparison (5). Interrogation, causal reasoning, statistics, hypothetical illustrations, factual illustrations, definition, and hypothetical specific instance all received moderate usage.[2]

The use of each method of support by the individual affirmative speakers follows almost the same pattern as their use by the side as a whole. The most frequently used method of support by all but one speaker was assertion. Burrows, the exception, used expert testimony more than assertion in his first speech. The method of second preference was expert testimony for all but three of the speakers. Burrows' second preference was factual specific instance and Carmack's was interrogation. Hansbrough used hypothetical specific instance as his only method other than assertion. There were only two speeches which made use of definition, two which used

---

[1]This is a method of support not discussed in the textbooks surveyed. Its description can be found in the concluding section of this chapter.

[2]See Table 2 for totals.

literal comparison, and two which used figurative comparison. Hypothetical specific instance, statistics, and quotation were each used in three different speeches.

For a summary of the variety of methods used by the affirmative speakers see Table 3. The greatest variety in the use of methods of support was shown by Dubois (first speech)and Berry who both used 12 different methods. Burrows used 11 methods in his first speech and 10 in his second. Dubois used 8 in his second speech. Carmack used 3 different methods, as did Bacon. Hansbrough and Newlands used only 2 different methods. It is interesting that the speaker who used the greatest number of supporting materials also used the greatest variety (Dubois, first speech) while the speaker who used the smallest number of supports also used the least variety in his choice of methods (Newlands).

TABLE 3

AFFIRMATIVE VARIETY OF METHODS OF SUPPORT

SPEAKERS	NUMBER OF DIFFERENT METHODS	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUPPORTS
Burrows	11	227
Dubois	12	245
Berry	12	118
Dubois	8	109
Carmack	3	17
Hansbrough	2	31
Bacon	3	24
Burrows	10	147
Newlands	2	17

METHODS OF SUPPORT USED BY THE NEGATIVE SIDE

There were eight speakers who favored the seating of Senator Reed Smoot and opposed the resolution against him. Together these speakers used a total of 1,075 support materials. A summary of the methods of support used by the negative and the frequency with which they were used in the debate is shown in Table 4. Nearly half of the negative support materials occurred in the first two speeches, 498 supports. The four speakers who used the most supporting material accounted for 829 supports, 77 per cent of the support materials used by the negative.

Assertion was the method of support used most frequently. It was used as supporting material 570 times. Expert testimony was used 208 times, factual specific instance 76 times, and both restatement and factual illustration 44 times. These four methods together represent 88 per cent of the total supports used (942 of 1,075). The least frequently used methods of support were: quotation (1), hypothetical illustration (4), and factual comparison (7). The other methods of support were used moderately.[1]

Assertion was the most popular method of support used by all but one of the negative speakers. Dillingham used expert testimony more frequently than he used assertion. Expert testimony was the second most frequent method used by

---

[1]See Table 4 for totals.

TABLE 4

NEGATIVE METHODS OF SUPPORT

Methods of Support	Hopkins	Sutherland	Knox	Smoot	Dillingham	Beveridge	Foraker	Dolliver	Total use of method by side
Defin. and exp.	4	5	4	1	3				17
Lit. comp.	8	2	8		1		2		21
Fig. comp.		3	1			3			7
Fac. spc. inst.	7	16	3	15	19	10	6		76
Hypo. spc. inst.	5	7							12
Fac. illus.	6	12		2	11	9	2	2	44
Hypo. illus.	1	1						2	4
Statis.	4	6		6	10	1	1		28
Exp. test.	31	64	18	2	74	14	5		208
Quot.		1							1
Caus. reas.	5	3	2	2		1			13
Restment. and rep.	7	12	3	4	6	10	2		44
Inter.	14		4	1	5	4	1	1	30
Asser.	98	176	91	43	68	36	32	26	570
Total use of methods by speaker	190	308	134	76	197	88	51	31	
Total use of methods by side									1075

all the speakers except Dillingham, who used it most, Smoot and Foraker. Smoot and Foraker both used factual specific instance more frequently than expert testimony. Only one speaker made use of quotation and only two used hypothetical specific instances. Factual comparison and hypothetical illustration were each used in three of the speeches.

Table 5 records the variety of methods of support used by each speaker. Sutherland, who used 13 different methods of support, used the greatest variety on the negative side. Hopkins was next with 12. There were four speakers who utilized 9 different methods and one who used 8. Dolliver, who used only 4 different methods, had the least variety. It is interesting to again note that the negative speaker who used the greatest number of supports also used the greatest variety and that Dolliver, who had the smallest number of supports, also used the smallest variety of methods.

TABLE 5

NEGATIVE VARIETY OF METHODS OF SUPPORT

SPEAKERS	NUMBER OF DIFFERENT METHODS	TOTAL NUMBER OF SUPPORTS
Hopkins	12	190
Sutherland	13	308
Knox	9	134
Dillingham	9	76
Smoot	9	197
Beveridge	9	88
Foraker	8	51
Dolliver	4	31

COMPARISON OF METHODS OF SUPPORT

In comparing the methods of support used by the affirmative and negative sides it was found that the negative side used 140 more supports than the affirmative. Approximately half of the support materials presented by each side came in the first two speeches given by that side. On each side there seemed to be four speakers who presented the greatest bulk of the supporting material. On each side these four speakers presented nearly 80 per cent of the total support materials used.

Both the affirmative and negative side used the same number of different methods of support (14). The differences to be noted come in the way that the individual speakers used the various methods. There were four affirmative speakers who used 3 methods or less. On the negative side there was only one speaker who used under 8 different methods and he used 4.

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF AFFIRMATIVE METHODS OF SUPPORT

The table showing the percent of total supports represented by each method of support used has been called the percentage-distribution for the purposes of this paper. This distribution for the affirmative side can be found in Table 6. There were only 4 methods which represented over 5 percent of the total number of supports used. Assertion made up the largest percentage of the total supports used by the side (46 per cent). Twenty-three per cent of the supports was expert testimony, 9.3 per cent was factual

TABLE 6

PERCENTAGE-DISTRIBUTION FOR AFFIRMATIVE SIDE

Methods of Support	Number of times used	Per cent of total supports
Definition and explanation	17	1.6
Literal comparison	21	1.5
Figurative comparison	7	.5
Factual specific instance	76	7.1
Hypothetical specific instance	12	1.0
Factual illustration	44	4.7
Hypothetical illustration	4	.2
Statistics	28	2.6
Expert Testimony	208	19.4
Quotation	1	.05
Causal reasoning	13	1.1
Restatement or repetition	44	4.7
Interrogation	30	2.6
Assertion	570	53.0
Total	1075	100.0

specific instance, 6 per cent was restatement. Together the other ten methods accounted for only 14.7 per cent of the total number of supports used by the affirmative.

For a summary of the percentage-distribution of methods of support for individual speakers turn to Table 7. Attention should be drawn to the speeches of Hansbrough, Bacon, and Newlands, who used the least variety of support methods. In their speeches assertions accounted for over 90 per cent of the supports they did use. Those speakers who used a greater variety of support methods used assertions from 15 per cent to 63 per cent of the time.

PERCENTAGE-DISTRIBUTION OF NEGATIVE METHODS OF SUPPORT

The summary of the percentage of total negative supports represented by each method, Table 8, reveals only 3 methods of support which represented more than 5 per cent of the total number of supports used. Assertion made up the largest percentage of the total supports used by the negative (53 per cent). Expert testimony accounted for 19.4 per cent of the supports used and factual specific instance accounted for 7.1 per cent. Together the eleven other methods represented 21.4 per cent of the total number of supports used.

The percentage distributions for each individual speaker are found on Table 9. Notice that in Dolliver's speech, which used only 4 different methods of support, 83 per cent of the supports were assertions while in the

TABLE 7

PERCENTAGE-DISTRIBUTION FOR AFFIRMATIVE SPEAKERS

Methods of Support	Burrows	Dubois	Berry	Dubois	Carmack	Hansbrough	Bacon	Burrows	Newlands
Defin. and expl.	2.2	2.9							
Lit. comp.		1.2	1.9						
Fig. comp.		.4	1.9						
Fac. spc. inst.	23.6	5.3	2.8	6.4				6.8	
Hypo. spc. inst.		.4	5.1					4.1	
Fac. illus.	3.1	3.3	6.8	2.8				4.8	
Hypo. illus.	.7		2.6	.9	5.9	6.4		.7	
Statis.	2.6	4.1		.9					
Exp. test.	33.8	14.7	17.6	22.0			4.2	38.7	
Quot.	.7		.4					.7	
Caus. reas.	3.5	.4	2.6	.9				.7	5.9
Restment. and rep.	12.9	3.3	5.1	1.8			4.2	6.8	
Inter.	1.5	3.3	2.6	.9	35.3			3.4	
Asser.	15.4	60.7	50.6	63.3	58.8	93.6	91.6	33.3	94.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

TABLE 8

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE NEGATIVE SIDE

Methods of Support	Number of times used	Per cent of total supports
Definition and explanation	12	1.3
Literal comparison	5	.5
Figurative comparison	3	.3
Factual specific instance	87	9.3
Hypothetical specific instance	13	1.5
Factual illustration	33	3.5
Hypothetical illustration	10	1.1
Statistics	17	1.5
Expert testimony	216	23.1
Quotation	4	.4
Causal reasoning	15	1.7
Restatement or repetition	55	6.0
Interrogation	26	2.9
Assertion	436	46.9
Total	935	100.0

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE-DISTRIBUTION FOR NEGATIVE SPEAKERS

Methods of Support	Hopkins	Sutherland	Knox	Smoot	Dillingham	Beveridge	Foraker	Dolliver
Defin. and expl.	2.1	1.7	3.0	1.3	1.5			
Lit. comp.	4.2	.6	6.0		.5		3.9	
Fig. comp.		1.0	.7			3.4		
Fac. spc. inst.	3.7	5.2	2.2	19.7	9.6	11.4	11.8	
Hypo. spc. inst.	2.6	2.3						
Fac. illus.	3.2	4.0		2.6	5.6	10.2	3.9	6.5
Hypo. illus.	.5	.1						6.5
Statis.	2.1	2.0		7.9	5.2	1.1	2.0	
Exp. test.	16.4	20.8	13.4	2.6	37.6	15.9	9.8	
Quot.		.1						
Caus. Reas.	2.6	1.0	1.5	2.6		1.1		
Restmt. and rep.	3.7	4.0	2.1	5.3	3.0	11.4	3.9	
Inter.	7.4		3.0	1.4	2.5	4.5	2.0	3.2
Asser.	51.5	57.2	67.9	56.6	34.5	41.0	62.7	83.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

speeches which utilized a greater variety of methods, the percentage of supportive assertions ranged from 34.5 per cent to 67.9 per cent.

COMPARISON OF AFFIRMATIVE AND NEGATIVE PERCENTAGE-DISTRIBUTIONS

On the affirmative side there were only 4 methods of support which represented over 5 per cent of the total number used and on the negative there were only 3. On both sides assertion made up the largest percentage of the total with expert testimony coming next followed by factual specific instance. The affirmative and negative percentage distribution of the various methods was very similar. With the affirmative, assertion accounted for 53 percent of the total number of supports used while the negative use of the methods was 46.9 per cent. The affirmative use of expert testimony was 19.4 per cent of the total while the negative was 23.1 per cent. The affirmative used factual specific instance 7.1 per cent of the time while the negative per cent was 9.3.

There was a notable relationship on both the affirmative and the negative side between the variety of methods of support used and the percentage of supportive assertions used by each speaker. It seemed that the greater the variety of support methods used, the smaller the percentage of support material composed of assertion became.

NUMBER OF SUPPORTS PER ASSERTION

The affirmative side supported a total of 174 assertions as shown in Table 10. The total number of supports

TABLE 10

AFFIRMATIVE NUMBER OF SUPPORTS PER ASSERTION

Speaker	Total Supported Assertions	Total Number of Supports	Number Supports Per Assertion
Burrows	62	227	3.7
Dubois	59	245	3.1
Berry	14	118	8.4
Dubois	9	109	12.1
Carmack	4	17	4.3
Hansbrough	4	31	7.8
Bacon	5	24	4.8
Burrows	13	147	1.1
Newlands	4	17	4.3
Total	174	935	5.7

they used was 935. This means that the affirmative speakers together averaged 5.7 supports per assertion. The average number of supports per assertion varied greatly with each individual speech. Burrows used an average of 1.1 supports per assertion in his second speech and Dubois used an average of 12 supports for each assertion in his second speech.

An interesting occurrence on the affirmative is the fact that both Burrows and Dubois gave two speeches favoring the resolution. It is interesting that Burrows used an average of 3.7 supports per assertion in his first speech but only averaged 1.1 in his second. Dubois, on the other hand, only averaged 4.1 supports per assertion in his first speech while he gave an average of 12.1 for each assertion in his second speech.

The negative side supported a total of 163 assertions using 1,075 supports. This, as shown on Table 11, is an average of 6.6 supports for each assertion. Again the average number of supports per assertion varied among the speakers. It ranged from 5.1 per assertion to 8.8 per assertion.

While the negative averaged more supports per assertion, the difference between the averages of the two sides was not great. The affirmative had a greater range of average supports per assertion among the speakers than did the negative, who had very little deviation in the quantity used by each speaker.

TABLE 11

NEGATIVE NUMBER OF SUPPORTS PER ASSERTION

Speaker	Total Supported Assertions	Total Number of Supports	Number of Supports per Assertion
Hopkins	36	190	5.3
Sutherland	50	308	6.2
Knox	17	134	8.0
Smoot	10	76	7.6
Dillingham	24	197	8.2
Beveridge	10	88	8.8
Foraker	10	51	5.1
Dolliver	6	31	5.1
Total	163	1075	6.6

METHODS OF SUPPORT FOR ASSERTIONS

Tables 12 and 13 show the number of assertions which are supported with each of the most frequently used methods of support. Of the 174 supported statements of the affirmative, 98 were supported at least in part by assertion (56 per cent). This does not mean assertion was the only supportive method used under those 98 statements. In fact there were only 38 affirmative statements which used assertion as the single method of support. Seventy four, or 42 per cent, of the statements were supported at least in part by expert testimony. Factual specific instances were used to support 15 per cent of the assertions while restatement was used in support of 18 per cent of the affirmative assertions.

The negative made 163 supported statements. Assertion was used at least as part of the support materials for 108 of the statements (68 per cent), and in 32 cases it was the only method of support used. Expert testimony was used to support 41 per cent of the statements. Factual specific instances were used in support of 17 per cent of the assertions and restatement was used in supporting 14 per cent of the negative assertions.

The affirmative used assertion in supporting 56 per cent of their statements and the negative used this method in supporting 68 per cent of their statements. The percentage of assertions supported by expert testimony, factual specific instance, and restatement was nearly the same for

TABLE 12

AFFIRMATIVE ASSERTION - SUPPORT RELATIONSHIP

Methods	Number of Assertions Supported by each Method									Aff. Assertion Supported by each Method	% Aff. Assertions Supported by each Method
	*Bu	Du	Be	Du	Ca	Ha	Ba	Bu	Ne		
Asser.	18	38	10	9	1	4	5	10	3	98	56%
Expt. test.	39	12	7	7			1	8		74	42%
Fac. spc. inst.	10	12	3	1				1		27	15%
Restmt. and rep.	16	3	5	2			1	4		31	18%

*Key: Bu = Burrows

Du = Dubois

Be = Berry

Ca = Carmack

Ha = Hansbrough

Ba = Bacon

Ne = Newlands

TABLE 13

NEGATIVE ASSERTION - SUPPORT RELATIONSHIP

Methods	Number of Assertions Supported by each Method								Neg. Assertions Supported by each Method	% Neg. Assertions Supported by each Method
	*Ho	Su	Kn	Sm	Di	Be	Fo	Do		
Asser.	21	34	13	7	15	5	8	5	108	68%
Exp. test.	13	17	9	2	18	6	2		67	41%
Fac. spc. inst.	5	7	1	4	4	4	3		28	17%
Restmt. and rep.	5	7	2	1	2	4	2		23	14%

*Key: Ho = Hopkins

Su = Sutherland

Kn = Knox

Sm = Smoot

Di = Dillingham

Be = Beveridge

Fo = Foraker

Do = Dolliver

both the affirmative and negative side. The affirmative used expert testimony on 42 per cent of the supported assertions; the negative used it on 41 per cent. The affirmative used factual specific instances in support of 15 per cent of their assertions; the negative used it in supporting 17 per cent. The affirmative used restatement on 18 per cent of the assertions and the negative used it on 14 per cent.

Here it should be noted that the use of assertion as a method of support is a concept which was not discussed in any of the textbooks reviewed by this study. The assertion has already been defined as simply a declarative statement of fact or opinion by the speaker. This statement can be used as an organizational structure from which to append supportive and developing material, in which case it would not be considered a method of support. However, it can also be used in the development of another statement, in which case its function would be supportive. It is interesting to note that this method, which was not discussed in the ten textbooks analyzed by this writer, accounted for half of the total supports used in this debate.

This ends the discussion of the analysis of the data. The next chapter will give a summary of these results, point out any possible conclusions and implications derived from them, and discuss recommendations for further study.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The summary of the results of this study will provide answers to the eight questions posed in Chapter I. The first two questions are so closely related that they will be discussed together.

1. How extensively were methods of support used by each side?

2. What was the frequency of supports per assertion by each side?

In the senate debate on the seating of Reed Smoot, methods of support were used a total of 2,010 times. The number of supported assertions made by the affirmative and the negative side did not differ significantly, 174 for the former and 163 for the latter. The affirmative used and supported more assertions, but used less supportive material in developing them than did the negative. This meant that the affirmative averaged a slightly smaller number of supports per assertion than did the negative.

The negative, in comparison, used methods of support 1,075 times to average 6.6 supports for each supported assertion. The negative used methods of support one and one tenth times as much as the affirmative. This could be partly explained by the fact that all the negative speakers were either on the committee or intimately involved in the hear-

ings whereas only two of the affirmative speakers, together responsible for four speeches, were in such a position. The negative was also in the defensive position and perhaps felt a greater obligation to support their arguments with proof.

3. How was the use of support materials distributed among the speakers?

Although there were eight negative speakers and nine affirmative speakers, the quantity of support material was not distributed evenly among them on either side. Rather the first two speakers on each side presented approximately half of the total methods of support used by their side. Both sides, therefore, presented a disproportionate amount of their support materials in the first two speeches. This would perhaps be in line with the concept of the constructive speeches as the place where the bulk of the evidence should be presented. After these first speeches the others can be more refutative in nature.

On each side there were four speakers who used significantly more support materials than the others. On both the affirmative and the negative side these four speakers used nearly 80 per cent of the total supports.

4. How many different methods of support were used by each side?

There appeared to be a wide variety in the number of different methods of support which were used in the debate, but the meaning of this variety is camouflaged by

the mere statement of that number. Fourteen different methods of support were used by each side, but five of the speakers used four different methods of support or less. The top four methods of support accounted for eighty-three per cent of the total number of supports used in the debate. This means that the remaining ten methods were used very seldom.

The individual negative speakers used a wider variety of methods of support than did the affirmative speakers. Again, part of the reason for this could be that all of the negative speakers had been in committee, were familiar with the case and had prepared to give speeches for some time previous to the day the spoke. Four of the affirmative speakers gave extemporaneous speeches, endeavoring more to explain their vote than to persuade others to vote for the resolution. It may be, and seems logical, that with more preparation a greater variety of support materials are incorporated into the speeches.

5. What were the most frequently used methods of support by each side?

The methods of support listed in order of most frequent use beginning with the most popular would be: (1) assertion, which accounted for half of the supports used in the debate, (2) expert testimony, which accounted for nearly one-fourth of the total supports, (3) factual specific instance, (4) restatement, (5) factual illustration,

(6) interrogation, (7) statistics, (8) definition, (9) causal reasoning, (10) literal comparison, (11) hypothetical specific instance, (12) hypothetical illustration, (13) factual comparison, (14) quotation. Table 14 shows the total number of times each method of support was used during the debate.

The four most frequently used methods of support were analyzed to see what percentage of the total supported affirmative assertions and total supported negative assertions each method represented. For this summary see Table 15. When this affirmative analysis was compared with the negative it was found to be extremely similar. The only place of significant difference between the affirmative and negative was the use of assertion as a method of support. On the affirmative side, assertion was used as a method of support for ninety-six per cent of all the supported assertions while on the negative side the figure was only sixty-eight per cent.

It is easy to understand why assertion, expert testimony, factual specific instance, and restatement received such frequent use. Many of the men who spoke were authorities on the subject. Sutherland, Smoot, Dubois, and Newlands were from Utah, Idaho, and Nevada and had had first hand experience with the Mormon situation in those states. Many others had been attending committee hearings on the subject. It is not unusual that they would use many supportive assertions without bothering to give verification

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF METHODS OF SUPPORT

Methods of Support	Total Times used by Aff.	Total Times used by Neg.	Total Times used in debate
Asser.	439	570	1009
Exp. test.	216	208	424
Fac. spc. inst.	87	76	163
Restmt. & rep.	55	44	99
Fac. illus.	33	44	77
Inter.	26	30	56
Statis.	17	28	45
Defin.	12	17	29
Caus. reas.	15	13	28
Lit. comp.	5	21	26
Hypo. spc. inst.	13	12	25
Hypo. illus.	10	14	14
Fac. comp.	3	7	10
Quot.	4	1	5
Total	935	1075	2010

other than their own word. It is also interesting, however, than in the speeches of the non-committee members, assertion made up a greater percentage of the total supports used. It might be concluded that all speakers relied on assertions as support material, but that those who had less knowledge of the subject used it more frequently.

It is also easy to see why expert testimony received so much use. In the first place, the committee hearings had provided four volumes of testimony from which to draw this evidence. Secondly, eight of the seventeen speakers had been members of the Committee on Elections and Privileges and were extremely familiar with the hearings and the testimony which they provided. In addition to these eight committee members there was Sutherland, who had followed the hearings very closely, and Smoot himself. It is natural that the ten speakers thoroughly familiar with the committee evidence would draw a good deal of their supporting material from this expert testimony. Most of the factual specific instances were also drawn from the committee testimony or from the personal experiences of the speaker.

6. What were the least frequently used methods of support?

The least frequently used methods of support were quotation, figurative comparison, hypothetical illustration, and hypothetical specific instance. Quotation is the use of the words of someone who is not an authority in the subject for debate. Figurative comparison is not a

logical method of proof because it seeks to compare phenomena which are not even in the same class. Both of the other methods are ones which could not be considered evidence or logical proof because they are not factual examples but merely conjecture. Since the speakers were attempting to make logical arguments relative to the propriety of the seating of Smoot, it might be expected that those methods of support would receive the least frequent use.

7. Did the winning side differ in the use of methods of support from the losing side?

The winning side, the negative, differed in their use of support from the losing side in a number of ways. They used a greater total number of supports; they averaged more supports per assertion, more of the speakers used a large variety of different methods, and they developed less of their assertions with assertion as a method of support. It would be difficult to say that any one of these factors, or even all of them together, caused the negative to win the debate. In any question before the Senate, there are many outside factors which influence the voting. There are the feelings of home constituencies to consider, coming elections, public pressure, and individual prejudices and convictions which might not be amenable to change by persuasive arguments. It is interesting, however, to note the relationship between the way support materials were used and the outcome of the debate. It can also be hoped that men in decision-making bodies are persuaded by logi-

cally supported arguments and that their use does have some influence on the outcome of government policy.

8. Did the methods of support which were used differ from the methods described in public speaking textbooks?

There was one method of support, description, which was mentioned in one textbook, but which was not used in the course of the debate. The reason for this omission could be that the method is used in developing a very particular type of argument and there was simply no such argument presented. Or the explanation could be that it is not a very useful method of support in legislative debate.

There was one method of support, assertion, which was used in the debate but was completely disregarded by the textbooks which were reviewed.[1] Assertion was the most important method of support in terms of the number of times it was used and the percentage of supported assertions it helped to develope. This might indicate a need to study the actual use of assertion in practical situations with a view toward re-evaluating our concept of its place in rhetorical theory.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

In this discussion of the implications of the preceding results it should be remembered that any conclusions from such a limited study must be tentative and can

---

[1]This method was defined and discussed more fully in Chapter V, p. 86.

be generalized only through further research into legislative debates.

The first conclusion is that supportive materials do play a major part in legislative speaking. Evidently speakers do feel a need to develop their arguments with various types of support. From this study it could also be inferred that legislative debates which follow a committee hearing rely on that hearing for supportive material. It seems that when such evidence is available from the hearing the expert testimony and factual specific instances which it provides are used by speakers as data from which to draw their conclusions. It appears that committee members who subsequently speak in the legislature use more logical proof drawn from the hearings, as well as a greater variety of methods of support, than do non-members. Non-members also seem prone to rely on assertion as a method of support more than committee members. Perhpas those who don't have the evidence at hand don't look for it.

Another conclusion from the study is that the practice of presenting most of the support materials early in the debate is followed in legislative debate. This parallels the practice in the constructive speeches of educational and competitive debate. Perhaps in legislative debate there is practical advantage in presenting most of the evidence early so that later speakers may handle refutation or develop new ideas.

It was found that factual material, coupled with assertion and restatement, was of most use in the legislative discussion. In a legislative forum where national problems are being discussed, it is reassuring to discover that factual materials form the basis of argument rather than hypothetical material, reasoning from figurative comparisons, or opinion of non-experts.

The negative speakers, who used a wider variety of methods of support, had all prepared their speeches well in advance of the day they were given. Of the affirmative speakers, those who gave short, extemporaneous speeches, were the ones who used only two or three different methods of support. Thus, there appears to be a correlation between both length of speech and preparation time and the variety of support materials which are used. The possible implication here is that it is less likely that speakers who speak on the spur of the moment will incorporate the varied techniques of public address which a thoroughly prepared speaker will

It was also found that the side supporting the prevailing mores and beliefs (in this case the affirmative) used assertion in support of nearly all of their arguments. This may imply that their position is more evident to the audience and that various existing facts and opinions can be mentioned without the need to provide evidence of their existence.

One of the most interesting implications of the study is the possibility that in legislative debate the use of greater volume and variety of support materials leads to victory when the vote is taken. This conclusion needs much more substantiation, but certainly deserves further study.

A final finding concerns the text book discussions of methods of support. It was found that assertion, the most frequently used method of support, was entirely disregarded by speech texts. This leads to the implication that current textual discussions of public address theory need to be re-evaluated. If public address theory is to be based on methods found to be of effective use in the public arena, then the use of assertion as developmental material cannot be overlooked.

Perhaps, also, some methods currently discussed by textbooks are more useful in certain situations than they are in others. Description appears to be of little use in legislative debate. Textbook discussions of methods of support might be more useful if they specified situations when each method was of most use or least likely to be of value.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It must be remembered that the conclusions drawn from this analysis are applicable only to the senate debate studied. On the basis of this analysis alone it

would be impossible to draw any accurate generalizations concerning the use of methods of support in senate debates or in any other type of debates. For broader generalizations in this area, an analysis of many more debates would be necessary. It is for this reason that further study of the methods of support is recommended. Other senate debates should be analyzed and experimental studies done in order to further verify or modify the conclusions reached by this study.

It would be of value to study a large number of congressional debates in an attempt to determine how methods of support were used. It would be interesting to know if there is a correlation between the quantity of support materials used by each side and the resulting vote. A knowledge of how support materials were distributed among the first speakers and the later speakers would also be of interest. The study of more debates could either confirm or refute the conclusions of this study concerning the types of support materials which are used most frequently. In all probability the types of support materials which are used vary with the type of proposition being debated. Even so, it might be possible, with a larger sample of debates, to determine which methods appear to be of most practical use.

This writer would recommend studies to see if the number of different methods of support used by a speaker

varies with the amount of background or preparation a speaker has. It would also be valuable to know if the use of a wide variety of supports has any relationship to the persuasiveness of the speeches.

As has been stated before, the studies concerning methods of support are just beginning to provide insight into the implications of their various uses in public speaking situations. The writer realizes that this study has been merely an effort to describe the actual use of methods of support in one particular senate debate. It is hoped that it may prove useful in providing information on this particular debate, and that it may stimulate further research in related areas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Baird, A. Craig. General Speech. New York: McGraw-Hill Company, Inc., 1949.

Blankenship, Jane. Public Speaking: A Rhetorical Perspective. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Bowers, Claude G. Beveridge and the Progressive Era. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1932.

Brigance, William Norwood. Speech. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1952.

Bryant, Donald C. and Wallace, Karl R. Fundaments of Public Speaking. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1960.

Buehler, E. C. and Linkugel, William A. Speech: A First Course. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1962.

Capp, Glenn R. How to Communicate Orally. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1961.

Darling, Arthur B. The Public Papers of Francis Newlands. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1932.

Dickens, Milton. Speech: Dynamic Communication. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1963.

The Doctrine and Covenants. Salt Lake City: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, 1961.

Foraker, Joseph Benson. Notes on a Busy Life. Cincinnati: Steward and Kidd Company, 1916.

Gray, Giles Wilkeson and Braden, Waldo W. Public Speaking. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1963.

Hale, Annie Riley. Bull Moose Trails. New York: Published by the author, 1912.

Ivins, Stanley S. The Moses Thatcher Case. Salt Lake City, Modern Microfilm Co., n.d.

Johnson, Allen and Malone, Dumas, (eds.) Dictionary of American Biography. 4th ed. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958, I-III.

Marquis, Albert Nelson, ed. Who's Who in America. Chicago: A. N. Marquis & Co., 1899, VI, VIII.

McBurney, James H. and Wrage, Ernest. The Art of Good Speech. New York: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1955.

McCrimmon, James M. Writing with a Purpose. 3rd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963.

Mills, Glenn E. Reason in Controversy. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1964.

Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. Chicago: Scott Foresman and Company, 1962.

Mudd, Charles S. and Sillars, Malcolm O. Speech: Content and Communication. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962.

Peet, V. S. $13,000 Reward. Salt Lake City: 1905.

Roberts, Brigham H. A Comprehensive History of the Church. Salt Lake City: Church Deseret News Press, 1930, VI.

Ross, Thomas Richard. Jonathan Prentise Dolliver. Iowa City: State Historical Society of Iowa, 1958.

Smith, Joseph Fielding. Essentials in Church History. 19th ed. Salt Lake City: The Deseret Books Company, 1964.

Smoot, Abraham O. "Early Experiences of Abraham O. Smoot," Faith Promoting Series. Salt Lake City: Juvenile Instructor Office, 1882.

St. Onge, Keith R. Creative Speech. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1964.

Weaver, Andrew T., Borchers, Gladys L. and Smith, Donald K. The Teaching of Speech. New York: Prentice Hall, 1952.

White, Eugene E. Practical Public Speaking. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.

Whitmer, O. F. "Apostle Reed Smoot," Lives of Our Leaders. Salt Lake City: Deseret News Publishing Co., 1901.

Wright, Herbert F. Reprint of Article on Philander C. Knox from the American Secretaries of State and Their Diplomacy. Alfred Knopf, Inc., 1929.

Articles and Periodicals

Anderson, Nels. "Pontifex Babbitt," The American Mercury, VIX (October, 1926), 177-182.

"The Arguments Against Senator Smoot," The Outlook, (December 22, 1906), p. 950.

Cathcart, R. R. "Experimental Study of the Relative Effectiveness of Four Methods of Presenting Evidence," Speech Monographs, XXII (1955), 227-233.

"The Case of Senator Smoot," The Outlook. (March 2, 1907), p. 484.

Cardon, A. F. "The Reed Smoot Diaries," The Utah Alumnus (September-October, 1962), p. 7-9.

"The Claims of the Candidates," North American Review (May, 1908), p. 641-681.

Cullom, Shelby. "The Reed Smoot Decision," North American Review (March 15, 1907), p. 572-576.

Dresser, William. "The Effects of 'Satisfactory' and 'Unsatisfactory' Evidence in a Speech of Advocacy," Speech Monographs, XXX (August, 1963), 302-306.

Eden, Antony. "Toward Peace in Indochina," Harpers (August, 1966), p. 36.

Garner, James Wilford. "The Case of Senator Smoot and the Mormon Church," North American Review (January 4, 1907), p. 46-58.

Gilkinson, Howard, Paulson, Stanley, and Sikkink, Donald. "The Effects of Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XL (1954), 183-192.

Golden L. L. "Philanthropic Endeavors," Saturday Review (December 10, 1966), p. 96.

"Human and Divine Law," The Democrat and Chronical (Rochester), January 25, 1905.

The Inquirer (Philadelphia, February 21, 1907.)

"Kearns Don't Want Smoot," The Deseret News, January 9, 1903.

"Men We Are Watching," The Independent, LXII (February, 1907), 491-494.

Merrill, Milton R. "Reed Smoot, Utah Politician," Utah State Agriculture College, Monograph Series, I (April, 1953).

"Ministers Oppose Smoot," Deseret News, November 24, 1902.

"More Protests Against Smoot," Deseret News, February 28, 1903.

"Mormon Church on Trial in Smoot Hearings," The Eagle (Brooklyn), March 13, 1904.

"Mormonism on the Rack," The American Monthly Review of Reviews, (April, 1904), p. 398-400.

The New York Times, March, 1905.

"President of Ministerial Association Talks," Deseret News, February 27, 1903.

"Probes Mormon Faith," The Washington Post, March 3, 1904.

"The Reed Smoot Case," The Washington Evening Star, March 2, 1904.

"Roosevelt Opposes Election of Apostle," The Salt Lake Tribune, January 9, 1903.

The Salt Lake Tribune, May 15, 1902.

"Senator Smoot Testifies," The New York Sun, January 25, 1905.

Schroeder, A. T. "The Case of Senator Smoot," Reprinted from The Truth Seeker, 1905.

Sikkink, Donald. "An Experimental Study of the Effects on Listeners of Anti-Climax Order and Authority in an Argumentative Speech," Southern Speech Journal, XXII (1956), 73-78.

"Smoot and the Senate," The Ledger (Philadelphia), June 3, 1906.

"Smoot Charged with Polygamy," Deseret News, February 26, 1903.

"Smoot Denies Leilich's Charge," Deseret News, February 27, 1903.

"Smoot Not A Citizen," Goodwins Weekley, November 22, 1902.

Smoot, Reed. "The Passing of Polygamy," North American Review, (January, 1908), p. 117-123.

"Theodore Roosevelt Refutes Anti-Mormon Falsehoods," Reprinted from Colliers, April 15, 1911.

Wells, Merle W. "Fred T. Dubois," Idaho Yesterdays, (Summer, 1960), p. 24-31.

Unpublished Material

Anderson, D. C. "The Effect of Various Uses of Authoritative Testimony in Persuasive Speaking," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Ohio State University, 1958.

Badger, Carl A. Unpublished Correspondence, 1904-1906.

Badger, Carl A. Scrapbooks of news clippings, 1902-1907.

Bettinghaus, Erwin Paul, Jr. "The Relative Effect of the Use of Testimony in a Persuasive Speech Upon the Attitudes of Listeners," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Bradley, 1953.

Boren, Robert R. "An Analysis of the Speaking In the Utah Constitutional Convention, 1895." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1965.

_____. "An Analysis of the Methods of Refutation Used in Championship Debates," Unpublished Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1964.

Clarke, John L. "Constitutional Doctrines of Justice George Sutherland." Unpublished Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1932.

Cardon, A. F. "A Trial of the Mormon Church. Typescript paper.

Kennedy, John F. Speech before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association, Rice Hotel, Houston, September, 1960.

Lowe, Jay E. "Fred Dubois, Foe of the Mormons." Unpublished Master's thesis, Brigham Young University, 1960.

Merrill, Milton Reese. "Reed Smoot, Apostle in Politics." Columbia University, Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, 1950.

Miller, H. Allen. "A Comparison of the Forms of Support Used in Contemporary American Protest Pulpit Addresses with the Forms of Support Used in Other Contemporary American Public Address: A Content Analysis." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1962.

Paschal, Joel Francis. "Man Against the State: The Ordeal of George Sutherland," Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Utah, June 1948.

Poll, Richard Douglass. "The Mormon Question, 1850-1865: A Study in Politics and Public Opinion." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1948.

_____. "The Twin Relic: A Study of Mormon Polygamy and the Campaign by the Government of the United States for its Abolition, 1852-1890." Unpublished Master's thesis, Texas Christian University, 1939.

Reasoner, Calvin. "Church and State," December 15, 1896.

Robinson, Vernon George. "The Public Career of Reed Smoot, 1903-1933," Unpublished Master's thesis, University of California, 1937.

Smith, Maude E. "Reed Smoot, Senator from Utah," Unpublished Master's thesis, Columbia University, 1934.

Thayne, Melvin Erickson. "Smoot of Utah." Unpublished Master's thesis, Stanford University, 1950.

Wells, Merle W. "The Idaho Anti-Mormon Movement, 1872-1908." Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1950.

Public Documents

U. S. Congressional Record. Vol XXXIII-XLI.

U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Privileges and Elections, hearings, In the Matter of Protests Against the Right of the Honorable Reed Smoot to Hold His Seat, 59th Congress, 1st Session, 1905-1906, I-IV.

U. S. Statutes at Large, XXIX, 876 (1896).

Utah, Senate Journal, 5th Session, 1903, p. 69.