12-1-1978

An Analysis of Selected Speeches of A. C. Townley, 1915-1921

Alice C. Poehls

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES OF A. C. TOWNLEY, 1915-1921

by
Alice C. Poehls

Bachelor of Science, University of North Dakota, 1974

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Master of Arts

Grand Forks, North Dakota

December
1978

This Thesis submitted by Alice C. Poehls in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Raymond Fischer
(Chairman)

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title An Analysis of Selected Speeches of A. C. Townley, 1915-1921

Department Speech

Degree Master of Arts

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my thesis work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this thesis or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my thesis.

Signature Alice C. Poehls

Date November 21, 1978

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the rhetoric of Arthur C. Townley who, in 1915, founded the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota. The study included the history of the organization and activities of the Nonpartisan League from 1915 to 1921, a biography of Townley, a discussion of the Aristotelian canon invention, and an analysis of the logical, emotional, and ethical proof utilized by Townley in selected 1917 speeches.

Townley had a great deal of natural oratorical skill and benefited also from some education, imitation of other speakers, and experience. His agrarian background greatly influenced his public speaking and political philosophy. An analysis of Townley's oratory revealed that the three modes of proof are clearly discernible. Townley demonstrated an ability to utilize logical proof in the arrangement, choice of premises, argumentation, and refutation. His greatest inventive asset was the emotional proof apparent in the arrangement, audience adaptation, language, and use of humor. Because he spoke to primarily sympathetic agrarian audiences, Townley was able to emphasize the emotional proof more than the logical proof. Townley used ethical proof sparingly but did attempt to enhance his credibility by demonstrating intelligence, high moral character, and good will. Townley's oratorical skill helped him organize one of the strongest farm coalitions in North Dakota's history.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY

Although Arthur C. Townley,[1] one of North Dakota's most colorful politicians and effective orators, was never elected to an office, for a time he virtually controlled both the state legislature and the governor's office. A bankrupt farmer in 1915 with an unusual talent for organization and persuasion, Townley founded the Nonpartisan League,[2] an agrarian political party formed primarily to alleviate the grain marketing problems of the state's farmers. Townley's organization benefited from years of agitation among farmers and several political organizations which had attained relative success in North Dakota and other midwestern states. After a cleverly organized membership drive, the League boasted 40,000 state members in 1916[3] and 200,000 members in thirteen states by 1919.[4]

---

[1]Townley's middle name is listed in most sources as Charles. Only the Minnesota State Historical Society has his middle name listed as Channing.

[2]Hereafter the Nonpartisan League may be referred to as the League.

[3]Robert H. Bahmer, "The Economic and Political Background of the Nonpartisan League" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1941), p. 441.

[4]Herbert E. Gaston, The Nonpartisan League (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920), p. 1.

The success of the Nonpartisan League between 1915 and 1921 is generally attributed to Townley, even by political foes. Townley's administrative mistakes, however, may have caused the League to fail after this brief six-year period of success. Townley recognized that the farmers were justified in their complaints of unfair price-fixing, inconsistent grain grading, and exorbitant freight rates. He also realized that other farm organizations had failed because they attempted political action through a third party. The fact that Townley's League worked through the existing party system and captured the Republican Party enabled it by 1918 to control both the legislature and the governor's office.

Campaigning throughout North Dakota and Minnesota from 1915 to 1921, Townley delivered fiery, controversial speeches to huge audiences. Herbert Gaston, a political contemporary, noted that in no agrarian state would a huge crowd fail to appear to witness Townley's caustic attacks on the business interests;[1] in just one week during the 1920 campaign 68,000 people attended rallies at which Townley spoke.[2] Contemporaries and historians have recorded that Townley's oratory was deliberate and often profane; he controlled his audiences not with polished oratory, but with the language of the farmer.

---

[1]Ibid., p. 247.

[2]Paul John Dovre, "A Study of Nonpartisan League Persuasion, 1915-1920" (Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1963), p. 72.

Townley's Biography

Arthur Townley was born on December 30, 1880, in Browns Valley, Minnesota. Shortly before the birth of their first child, his parents, Esther Genevieve Cross and Fitch Townley,[1] moved from Tyrone, New York, to Browns Valley. When Townley was fourteen, his family moved to a farm near Parkers Prairie and Writestone Station where descendants still live.[2] In Parkers Prairie a young grade school teacher turned Townley's interests to books rather than sports.[3] At Alexandria High School in 1900 Townley completed a course of study which emphasized English grammar and composition, Latin grammar, and literature, including studies of Caesar and Cicero. His grades appear average.[4] For three years after high school, Townley taught in Hewitt and Browns Valley in Minnesota.

Gaston's description of Townley's life includes mention of his high school interest in forensics and debate. Gaston also describes an elderly friend who encouraged Townley's speech activities and discussed with him the philosophies of authors such as Herbert Spencer and Ralph Waldo Emerson.[5]

---

[1]Minnesota, State Population Census Schedules Traverse County Census, 1885: Population, vol. 536 (St. Paul, Minnesota: State Archives and Records Service, 1600 Mississippi Ave., 1966).

[2]Written interview with Mrs. Ruthie Hennagir, Bertha, Minnesota, 10 August 1978.

[3]Interview with Mrs. Ruth Townley by William Watts Folwell, 12 March 1925, Folwell Papers, Minnesota State Historical Society, St. Paul, Minnesota.

[4]Alexandria, Minnesota, Alexandria High School Records (1900).

[5]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 47.

There is little evidence in the incomplete documentation of Townley's life, however, that he had much training or experience in public speaking during his school years. He explained his abilities as a natural gift and claimed that his first public address was not until 1905 or 1906. Townley himself indicated he had no schooling in oratory.[1]

After leaving western Minnesota in 1905, Arthur Townley never again settled in a location or worked at an occupation for more than a few years at a time. He began a series of enterprises none of which could be termed successful except perhaps his League efforts from 1915 to 1921. From Browns Valley he moved to Beach, North Dakota, where he was joined by his brother, Covert. After a year he left North Dakota for Colorado where he attempted a large scale wheat farming operation.[2]

In 1907 Townley returned to Beach with a wife, Margaret Rose Teenan.[3] Little is written about Rosie except that she and Townley had one daughter, Bonita. During his League years, Mrs. Townley and Bonita were "sent away to relatives."[4] In 1925 they moved to Hollywood, California, where Bonita pursued an acting career.[5] Mrs. Townley died in 1944; Bonita, a year later.

---

[1]Interview with Arthur C. Townley by Lucile Kane and Russell Fridley, 11 December 1956, Minnesota State Historical Society, St. Paul, Minnesota.

[2]Robert L. Morlan, Political Prairie Fire (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955), p. 23.

[3]Interview with Mrs. Ruth Townley by Folwell.

[4]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 45.

[5]Interview with Mrs. Ruth Townley by Folwell.

After failing with wheat farming in Colorado, Townley and his brother decided to undertake a bonanza flax operation in western North Dakota where Townley felt the soil and climate were favorable.[1] They leased land from the Northern Pacific Railroad and gained liberal credit from supply houses such as International Harvester.[2] Townley and his creditors hoped to benefit from promotion in the Beach area. A local paper reported that by 1912 the operation consisted of 7,000 acres capable of producing 100,000 bushels of flax.[3] That fall, however, an early snowfall and low market prices forced Townley into bankruptcy. Later, Townley and his political cohorts blamed his failure on price fixing in the eastern markets.[4] By 1912, the "Flax King of the Northwest" was $80,000 in debt.[5]

Antagonized by his farm failure and unemployment, Townley was hired in 1913 by North Dakota's Socialist Party, a unit well organized in the state from 1908 to 1914. An organizer for the party, Townley traveled about the state in a Ford to distribute Socialist literature. He found the farmers supportive of the moderate program for state-owned mills, state-financed hail insurance, and rural credit; however, they were unwilling to sign the famed red card. Although Townley effectively gathered pledges, the Socialist

---

[1]Charles Russell, The Story of the Nonpartisan League (New York: Harper and Brothers Publisher, 1920), p. 191.

[2]Bahmer, "Economic and Political Background," p. 432.

[3]Ibid.

[4]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 192.

[5]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 23.

Executive Committee became disenchanted with his approach because he often did not encourage the farmers to become members of the party but merely asked for their support of the program. Townley broke from the party in January 1915.[1]

Immediately following his employment with the Socialist Party, Townley founded the Nonpartisan League and became its unelected president and chairman of the Executive Committee. Until his resignation in 1922, Townley's personality and leadership dominated the League. He has been called "one of the great[est] natural leaders of protest movements . . . this country has ever produced."[2] When his League association was over, however, Townley was once again without employment. A man who had risen to national prominence, he was destined to obscurity and failure. The brief period of success during Townley's life may be attributed to his unique and powerful skills exemplified so well during his League affiliation.

Descriptions of Townley's voice and speaking style during the League years could apply to tapes which Townley made thirty years later. He had a slightly nasal, not unpleasant, voice, and he often punctuated his speech with staccatoed deliberateness. In his public addresses he spoke slowly and used a conversational style much like that he used in private conversation. One contemporary described his voice as " . . . expressive, strong, and

---

[1]Bahmer, "Economic and Political Background," p. 437.

[2]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, preface.

resonant."[1] The same man called him " . . . one of the great native orators of America."[2]

Audience control was perhaps Townley's greatest asset. He used humor which was often cynical, sarcastic, or profane. A farm wife describing his discussing politics with her husband at the kitchen table said that he was "homey and somewhat uncouth."[3] Townley seemed to "understand the psychology of the popular audience;"[4] he always elicited cheering, clapping, and stomping from them.[5] William Lemke, former North Dakota Congressman, generously praised Townley as " . . . one of the great men of the nation. [He had] met few men who [were Townley's] equal on the platform and as an organizer."[6]

His ability did not serve Townley as well when he was no longer affiliated with the League. During the remainder of his life he was promoter or propagandist. He engaged in a variety of ventures which required him to use his persuasive ability. In the Twenties, Townley attempted to found a producer's alliance which did not materialize; he also promoted oil ventures

---

[1]Ibid., p. 32.

[2]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 32.

[3]Interview with Mrs. T. E. O'Toole, Crystal, North Dakota, 15 March 1978.

[4]Andrew A. Bruce, Non-Partisan League (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921), p. 62.

[5]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 46.

[6]Ibid., p. 368.

in Robinson and Ray, North Dakota. He then began a series of congressional campaigns. In 1930 during North Dakota's third district race, he traveled with a preacher with whom he debated prohibition.[1]

By 1932 Townley was back in Minnesota where he ran and lost as a congressional candidate on the farm labor ticket. Two years later he lost badly in a contest with farm labor Governor Floyd Olson; he received fewer votes than the other three candidates. Returning to North Dakota, he campaigned without success in elections in 1936, 1944, and 1956. In the early Fifties he also stumped the state speaking on political issues such as Korea, and then he became a militant anti-Communist.[2]

Townley's 1958 campaign for the U.S. Senate was probably an attempt to acquire radio time with which to denounce "Communist Soviet" influences. As a result of a speech in which he linked the Farmers Union with the Communist party, he was sued along with co-defendant WDAY television in Fargo. This was his last political escapade, for he was killed in a traffic accident in 1959. Shortly before his death he was asked what he did for a living. He said, "I rustle around and do one thing and another, mostly political stuff; and make some money."[3]

Many of Townley's speeches during his final years were recorded on small disc records which he distributed on his speaking tours. Some of these

---

[1]Ted Kolderie, "A. C. Townley Can Say He Helped Shape North Dakota Politics," Minneapolis Tribune, 8 February 1959, p. 10.

[2]Dovre, "Nonpartisan League Persuasion," p. 4.

[3]Kolderie, "A. C. Townley Can Say He Helped," p. 10.

discs, recording machines, a few books, and his clothing were among his few belongings. He lived in a small trailer which he moved from time to time to farm yards of friends. Ironically, Townley died on the same day as Senator William Langer, who had been his fierce enemy after Langer broke with the League in 1919. He is buried in Writestone cemetery near Bertha, Minnesota, in an unmarked grave near the family headstone.

Economic and Political Background of the Nonpartisan League

The Nonpartisan League began in a year of prosperity for the people of North Dakota. Unsatisfactory market conditions rather than economic hardships, which usually accompany political radicalism in agrarian states,[1] were the impetus for revolt. The 1915 crop, the largest ever grown in the state, was a staggering 151,000,000 bushels of wheat.[2] The fact that extremely low crop yields in 1916 and 1917 brought disaster to the state's wheat-based economy was not a factor in the initial organizational efforts. Long dissatisfied with marketing conditions, farmers distrusted the markets. The distance between the farmer and the Minneapolis-St. Paul grain exchange aggravated the problem. The following account indicates the farmer's frustration:

> The farmer lost when he borrowed money at exorbitant rates, when he sold his wheat on fictitious grades fixed against him by a power over which he had no control, when he was docked for impurities that did not

---

[1]Bahmer, "Economic and Political Background," p. 5.

[2]Bruce Nelson, Land of the Dacotahs (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1946), p. 300.

> exist, when his wheat was hawked about the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce by parasitical or phantom handlers to be hocused and doctored, when it was hauled at extravagant rates, [and] . . . when it was charged for switching that was never done. . . .[1]

Grain marketing records substantiate most of these accusations. For years North Dakota had been struggling for state-operated terminal elevators. Although hundreds of "farmers' elevators" existed in North Dakota, most were simply camouflaged line elevators or grain exchange elevators controlled by large business interests.[2] Grain grading irregularities were the most common and the most obvious infractions. For example, in a report of a Bankers' Association survey it shows that in one year a state elevator received 99,711 bushels of Number 1 Northern wheat and shipped out 190,288 bushels of the same grade. It received 141,455 of Number 2 Northern and shipped 467,764 bushels.[3] When the State Department of Grading tested all of the scales used at public elevators after the 1917 legislature, 60 percent were false or defective. With striking regularity, wheat prices dropped when farmers were harvesting and rose after the wheat was bought by the dealers.[4]

During the early part of the twentieth century the Agricultural College leaders involved with the agrarian problems supported terminal elevator efforts. Studies by Dr. Edwin F. Ladd, professor of chemistry at the

---

[1]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 93.

[2]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 21.

[3]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 613.

[4]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 37.

Agricultural College and food commissioner of North Dakota, accompanied by statements by Dr. John A. Worst, president of the school, became material for the League. The most often quoted statistic showed that one wheat crop was actually worth 55 million dollars more than the farmers had received.[1]

In the decade prior to Nonpartisan League politics, several strongly organized political movements surfaced in the Midwest. The most successful in North Dakota were the Socialist Party and the Society of Equity. The Socialist Party with its program of state-ownership was responsible for much of the platform and many of the organizational methods subsequently used by the League.[2] Among several Socialist speakers and organizers who utilized their experiences in the League were Townley, Charles Edward Russell, Arthur LeSueur, and A. C. Bowen. Perhaps the most significant contribution of the Socialist Party was the program of state-ownership which gained acceptance under the auspices of existing parties when promoted by the League. The fact that the enigma of socialism was never totally removed from the League proved detrimental.

The Society of Equity successfully promoted co-operative buying and selling among the farmers. By 1912 the Equity was leading the campaign for the erection of a state-owned terminal elevator. That year the constitution was amended by referendum to authorize the construction of elevators owned by rth Dakota in Minnesota or Wisconsin. The 1913 legislature levied a tax

---

[1]Ibid., p. 29.

[2]Dovre, "Nonpartisan League Persuasion," p. 29.

for the elevators, and in 1914 another amendment permitted location of the elevators in North Dakota.[1]

The commencement of this project depended on a report of recommendations to be given by the State Board of Control at the 1915 legislative session in Bismarck. The Equity Society, therefore, scheduled its state convention concommitant with the session considering the bill. Both Townley and Bowen were in Bismarck to witness the reaction of farmers when the elevator proposal was rejected. Following the February convention, several Equity speakers toured the state denouncing the grain "overlord" and the "kept press."[2] Thus, as one historian explained, the Equity counseled revolt while the League organized the protest movement.[3]

Two Equity men ultimately influential to the League were George S. Loftus and William Lemke. Loftus, general manager of the Equity Exchange, was a fiery speaker. Enthusiastically accepted by rural audiences as he set class against class, Loftus was a master at manipulating his audience. Many League speakers, including Townley, appear to have modeled their style after that of Loftus. Many considered Lemke, an Equity Exchange lawyer who directed campaigns and the political machinery, to be the political genius of

---

[1]Theodore Saloutos, "The Rise of the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota, 1917-1919," Agricultural History 20 (January 1946): 44.

[2]Bahmer, "Economic and Political Background," p. 4.

[3]Ibid., p. 429.

the League. Perhaps Lemke was the first to use the term "Big Biz" so popular with League speakers.[1]

The Nonpartisan League offered very little which was original to the politics of North Dakota. After years of farm discontent, the Equity Society and the Socialist Party created a radical fervor. The Socialists suggested most of the platform; both organizations offered leadership to the League. However, the organizational direction of A. C. Townley led to an amazingly powerful League by the elections of 1916.

The Issues

In February of 1915, Arthur Townley and A. E. Bowen traveled to Deering, North Dakota, to discuss a new non-partisan political organization with prominent Equity leader Fred B. Wood. The Farmers' Nonpartisan Political League was officially founded when Howard Wood and Townley wrote a brief platform. Shortly after the platform evolved, Wood and Townley initiated the membership drive which would secretly recruit thousands of dues-paying farmers. The League, from the start, was not a third party but an organization which campaigned to place its candidates on the existing ticket.

The first platform was brief and simplistic in nature:

State ownership of terminal elevators, flour mills, packing houses, and cold storage plants
State inspection of grain and grain dockage
Exemption of farm improvements from taxation

---

[1]Bruce, Non-Partisan League, p. 67.

State hail insurance on the acreage tax basis
Rural credit banks operated at cost[1]

Historian Paul Fossum has divided the platform into ameliorative measures which would give immediate relief to farmers and long-range plans for state-ownership. Those planks which could give immediate relief included state grain inspection guidelines and exemption of farm improvements from taxation.[2]

The League's first priority was to acquire legislative control in order to bring about the proposed state-controlled industry. However, legally enacting the platform required alterations in the state constitution. The amendments of 1912 and 1914 made only the proposed state-owned elevator possible; but it could not be built until some method was found to evade the constitutional limitation of debt.[3]

To accomplish legislative control, Townley designed a highly democratic election system. He achieved grassroots involvement on February 22, 1916, when 2,000 precincts met in North Dakota to chose League candidates. The League avoided all candidates who sought office, and neither Townley nor any League officials accepted nomination lest their motives to help the farmer be doubted. Delegates chosen at the precinct meetings attended district

---

[1]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 26.

[2]Paul R. Fossum, The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1925), p. 96.

[3]Lewis F. Crawford, History of North Dakota, 3 vols. (Chicago and New York: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1931), 1:425.

conventions in March to nominate candidates for both houses of the legislature and delegates to the state convention held in Fargo on March 29 and 30.

The candidates chosen by the convention included Pembina County farmer Lynn J. Frazier for governor; Thomas Hall, secretary of state; William Langer, attorney general; Carl R. Kositzky, auditor; and Neil C. MacDonald, state superintendent of public instruction. Ironically, Hall, Langer, and Kositzky had been office seekers and later abandoned the League.[1] Other farmer candidates were P. M. Casey, the only Democrat, for treasurer; S. A. Olsness, commissioner of insurance; Albert Stenmo, lieutenant governor; John N. Hagan, agriculture commissioner; and M. P. Johnson, Charles Bleick, and Sam Aandahl, railroad commissioners. These names were placed on the June 28 primary ballot after the required petitions were filed. The League zealously accumulated more than 20,000 signatures for Frazier.[2]

The League tasted victory in its first political enterprise: capturing the Republican ballot virtually meant victory in North Dakota. Even though torrential rains made rural polls nearly inaccessible, the farmers rallied to nominate all candidates except Casey, the Democrat. In November, the League captured every state office except that of the treasurer. Prior to the election, the crucial Supreme Court race seemed to be the most uncertain; however, the League was easily able to elect three Justices who endorsed the

---

[1] Elwyn B. Robinson, History of North Dakota (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), p. 335.

[2] Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 118.

League program. By electing Governor Frazier and eighty-one members of the House, the League succeeded in controlling every branch of government except the Senate.

Frazier was wisely chosen as the League candidate for governor. A classmate of William Lemke at the University of North Dakota, Frazier had returned to his farm in Hoople where he remained until his unsolicited nomination. Frazier instilled confidence because he appeared a sincere and simple farmer, he was a life-long Republican, he was without Socialist connections, and he spoke in a plain, straightforward manner. The "farmer candidate" won by a four-to-one margin, the largest majority ever given to a North Dakota governor.[1]

Having accomplished its first priority, the new League administration arrived in Bismarck in January 1917 to enact its proposals. At nightly caucuses held in the Northwest Hotel, leased for the session, the inexperienced legislators were briefed in the areas of parliamentary procedure and the drafting of bills. League leaders such as Townley, Wood, Bowen, and Lemke directed the sessions which infuriated the opposition who charged that Townley had become the new "boss" of North Dakota politics.[2] Another League problem was holdover senators who had control of the upper House. This was aggravated when Lt. Governor Anton Kraabel[3] appointed holdover senators to

---

[1]Ibid., p. 87.

[2]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 97.

[3]Albert Stenmo dropped out of the race to be replaced by Kraabel.

major committees leaving the League with majorities in only six of the forty committees.

The issue most explosive and consequential during the 1917 legislative session was House Bill 44, designed to legalize state-owned utilities and appropriate funds for them. Drafted by the legislature, it was a modified constitution which, if passed, would provide the following:

> . . . the election of state and county officers every four years instead of two years . . . the short ballot permitting the election of the governor and one or two other executive officers, the rest to be appointed by the legislature; the meeting of the legislature every two years so that there would be no holdover Senators . . . to make possible extensive loans to farmers at reasonable interest rates; an increase in the bonded debt limit of the State to $500,000 to permit the construction of state-owned projects. . . .[1]

Even though it received the approval of such farm organizations as the Tri-State Grain Growers and the Society of Equity,[2] the Bill was indefinitely postponed in the Senate after House approval. The effect of this was crucial to League progress. Not only were the introduction and struggle for the passage of the Bill an important factor in the coalescence of League opposition,[3] but the loss in the Senate limited major League accomplishment during the 1917 session.

---

[1]Saloutos, "The Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 56.

[2]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 150.

[3]Edward C. Blackorby, "Political Factional Strife in North Dakota From 1920 to 1932" (M.S. thesis, University of North Dakota, 1938), p. 9.

Without the passage of House Bill 44, the League enacted some reforms offering immediate relief to the farmers although long-range state-controlled industrial projects were postponed until 1919. These reforms included the establishment of the office of state inspector of grains, weights, and measures; partial tax exemption for farm improvements; and the prevention of discrimination by railroads supplying services to elevators. Aid to rural education was tripled as evening schools for adults were established, and the compulsory school age was raised to seventeen. Finally, the League showed interest in state labor problems; for example, it established a nine-hour work day for women. In all, 254 laws were passed by the 1917 legislature.[1]

To be successfully implemented, the League program required a stronger legislative hold. The sudden death of U.S. Senator H. T. Helgesen in 1917 and subsequent election of League candidate John M. Baer[2] offered an encouraging national victory. All but two of the state officers were re-endorsed at the League convention. The convention also drafted seven initiated measures which, when combined with three previously approved, totaled ten measures to be voted upon in November. In the primary of 1918, every state and congressional League candidate was endorsed.

In November passage of all the League-initiated measures authorized the state to engage in industries, lifted the limit of state debt, allowed for the levying of an acreage tax for hail insurance and permitted the legislature to

---

[1]Saloutos, "The Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 58.

[2]Baer was known for his cartoons in the Nonpartisan Leader.

exempt certain classes of personal property from taxation. In addition, the measures declared that only with a decision of four of five Supreme Court Justices could a legislative act be declared unconstitutional, and that two-thirds vote of each house could declare an act an emergency measure which would be enacted ten days after the close of the session rather than July 11, the date previously designated. The initiative and referendum procedures were simplified as was the procedure for amending the state constitution.[1]

The 1919 session was the briefest ever held by a North Dakota legislature and the only one that adjourned short of the sixty days which are allowed by the constitution.[2] The session passed several bills allowing for the enactment of the industrial program and a statute creating the Industrial Commission composed of the governor, the secretary of agriculture, and the attorney general. The function of the Commission was to govern all state-owned financial and commercial industries.

Laws established a state-owned industrial program and created the Bank of North Dakota with capital of two million dollars. The Bank was to finance League industries by extending credit to them as well as to farmers. The Bank received all public funds, which it then redeposited in smaller banks. Until 1920, when initiated measures required an independent audit of the Bank, it was examined only by the bank examiner, an appointee of the governor. This

---

[1]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 85.

[2]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 25.

led to mismanagement and favoritism when the Bank made redeposits.[1] The fact that 1920 initiated measures also removed the requirements for deposit of public funds caused thirty-nine of fifty-three county treasurers to demand return of deposits.[2] Although differences of opinion about bank policy were apparent, historian Morlan concludes the Bank provided a number of useful services to private banks, lowered farm credit rates, and financed state industries.[3]

The State Mill and Elevator was made possible through a bill which declared the purpose of the state " . . . to engage in the business and manufacturing and marketing of farm products and to establish a warehouse, elevator, and flour-mill system."[4] A state bond issue of five million dollars was provided as capital. Because Grand Forks businessmen offered to furnish a site and buy a million dollars worth of bonds, the Mill was constructed in Grand Forks.[5] The League began construction in 1920 and completed the State Mill and Elevator in February 1923. The credit for initiating a project long desired by North Dakota farmers must be given to the League even though the State Mill and Elevator was not completed during the period of League-controlled government.

---

[1]Blackorby, "Political Factional Strife," p. 40.

[2]Ibid., p. 32.

[3]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 334.

[4]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 261.

[5]Robinson, History of North Dakota, p. 344.

Several legislative bills passed by the League were considered innovative although they were not always successful. One such law was the Home Building Association, which allowed citizens to build homes with a down payment of 20 percent and payment of the remainder over a period of ten to twenty years. Morlan called this venture "a fiasco."[1] On the other hand, the amendment of the compulsory state hail insurance program was a success. A flat tax of three cents an acre was levied on all tillable land in the state to provide a working fund for the program. Other noteworthy legislation established state income and inheritance tax, the Workman's Compensation Bureau and Fund, and new state railroad regulations which reduced rates and regulated service.

The 1919 legislative session marked the peak of League power; by 1921 the Independent Voters Association, a powerful opposition group, led a campaign which was successful at recalling a governor for the first time in American history. Although Frazier and the other two members of the Industrial Commission were removed from office, the initiated measures designed to halt the industrial program failed to pass. The League lost control of the House in 1920 and in the 1922 elections lost control of the Senate as well as the House. Ironically, the recalled Governor Frazier was elected United States Senator in 1922.

League Organization

Arthur Townley's genius lay in carefully organizing several phases of the Nonpartisan League: the intensive membership drive, the thorough

---

[1]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 334.

propaganda campaign, and the internal leadership hierarchy of which he was the autocratic president. Historian Crawford recognized that the only way for farmers of this period to " . . . obtain a reform or a concession from local or national government was to present demands backed up by organizations impressive in name, numerical in membership."[1] Townley was evidently aware of this fact as he undertook the improvement of farm conditions.

The membership drive initiated by Howard Wood and Townley in February 1915 introduced the method adopted for the entire effort. Wood furnished introductions to his neighbors and then Townley took over and did the talking. He would antagonize prospective members by reciting farm grievances with which they were familiar and then thrust a copy of the platform for them to sign. Later, using the same method, a "Booster," an early community convert, would accompany the organizer and introduce him to the farmers with whom he was acquainted.

Early membership dues were $2.50, then $6.00, then $9.00, and finally in 1917 they were fixed at $16.00 for a two-year period.[2] An arrangement had been made with Pearson's magazine so that paid members would receive copies of it until the League was able to begin the publication of the Nonpartisan Leader. Organizers accepted postdated checks which were cashed in the fall after the farmers sold their crops. They offered membership only to farmers. Russell discusses the desperation of farmers who would

---

[1] Crawford, History of North Dakota, p. 417.

[2] Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 47.

pledge money to an unknown man at a time when money was scarce.[1] Yet, Dovre explains that "few incentives to loyalty to an organization could equal a substantial membership fee."[2] "We'll Stick" became the rally cry of 18,000 farmers who had paid dues by September 1915.[3]

The canvas for membership was done in near secrecy, an extremely important arrangement lest the opposition be alerted and begin to discourage membership through the press. Not only were the organizers pledged to secrecy and the farmers warned to keep quiet, but Townley also said the headquarters were moved from town to town in the state every thirty days so that " . . . there was no place they could find us."[4] Townley explained why the farmers kept quiet about the organization:

> Publicity was omitted completely, organizers wouldn't tell what they were doing to anyone but the farmer. If they had to tell somebody what they were doing, oh, they were selling books. And they told the farmers when they organized them not to tell anybody. And he didn't because he thought he had been took. He didn't want anyone to know he had been took.[5]

From the start, the League hired organizers who were young, enthusiastic men recruited from farms or from the Socialist Party. Townley or experienced organizers trained them thoroughly in salesmanship and

---

[1]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 201.

[2]Bahmer, "Economic and Political Background," p. 444.

[3]J. W. Brinton, Wheat and Politics (Minneapolis: Rand Tower, 1931), p. 33.

[4]Interview with Townley by Kane and Fridley, p. 11.

[5]Ibid., p. 10.

persuasion, and they usually earned a commission of one-quarter of the membership fee. Canvassing the state in Model T Fords, organizers tried to impress upon the farmers the importance of solidarity. They used Townley's method of psychology to reach prospective Leaguers:

> . . . find out the damn fools [sic] hobby and talk it. If he likes religion, talk Jesus Christ; if he is against the government, damn the democrats; if he is afraid of whiskey, preach prohibition; if he wants to talk hogs, talk hogs--talk anything he'll listen to, but talk, talk, until you get his . . . John Hancock to a check for six dollars.[1]

However, the trained organizers adhered as closely as possible to the fundamental goals of attaining better marketing conditions and a stronger farm voice in the state government.

While the rolls of membership grew, Townley and his aids developed an extensive propaganda network which included continued individual solicitation as well as public speaking tours and publications. The League invested the collected dues in the organization scheme; in 1916 it spent $50,000 on cars and $40,000 on campaign literature.[2] By November of that year, the League had ninety-one automobiles.[3] it even acquired a train, the "Victory Special" which carried Lynn Frazier over the entire state to speak at rallies.

Historian Saloutos estimated that the League conducted five to six hundred meetings during the winter of 1915-1916.[4] Many of the men were

---

[1]Dovre, "Nonpartisan League Persuasion," p. 67.

[2]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 87.

[3]Bahmer, "Economic and Political Background," p. 453.

[4]Saloutos, "The Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 51.

inexperienced public speakers who had begun as League organizers; however, many of them were experienced speakers such as Townley, Bowen, and Walter Thomas Mills. Dovre surveyed several who had attended many League rallies and found Townley was considered the most effective speaker.[1] In his discussion of League persuasion, Dovre explained that oratory was a crucial method of persuasion because " . . . the [speaking] platform was the League's principal mode of reaching the non-member element of the electorate."[2]

The League had an extensive scope of publications. The major source of printed League propaganda was the Nonpartisan Leader, which appeared from September 1915 through July 1923, a period during which there appeared nine similar state newspapers. With the format of a farm journal, the Leader presented caustic attacks on "Big Biz," sharp editorials by Townley and other talented writers such as Charles Edward Russell, and clever political cartoons by John Baer. In addition, the League had controlling interest in the Fargo Courier News and the Grand Forks American. The Northwest Publisher's Service, which was maintained by the League, controlled nearly one hundred North Dakota and Minnesota weekly newspapers and provided the papers with editorials and syndicated material supportive of the League leaders and policy.

After its first year, the League faced strongly organized opposition. According to one of its publications, the Independent Voters Association could

---

[1]Dovre, "Nonpartisan League Persuasion," p. 51.

[2]Ibid., p. 131.

have defeated the League at the polls in 1918 had it not been for member apathy at the polls;[1] however, the organization steadily improved its voting record. J. D. Bacon, publisher of the Grand Forks Herald, was also one of the most persistent attackers of League policy. Not only did his paper lambast League leaders but Bacon was active in the organization of several anti-Townley groups and the publication of much literature of the same nature. Other opposition newspapers included the Fargo Courier News, which later became a League paper, the Bismarck Tribune, and the Norwegian language Normanden, published in Grand Forks.

The final aspect of Townley's organizational plan was the leadership hierarchy within the internal structure of the League. Townley defined League leadership as a collective operation which he merely mobilized.[2] From the start, however, President Townley was indisputably the maker of all major decisions. His enemies commonly called him a "czar," an "autocrat," and a "dictator," terms which often did apply. Townley repeatedly said that he was a confirmed choice as president because each member knew he was president at the time he signed the platform card; therefore, each signature gave Townley a vote of confidence. Townley was aware of his administrative weaknesses and always surrounded himself with experts. Lawyer Lemke, his key political advisor, drafted most of the League legislation. Arthur LeSueur, another

---

[1]Theodore G. Nelson [Anti-Townley Pamphlet, title obscured, 1917], Nelson Papers, North Dakota State Historical Society, Bismarck, North Dakota.

[2]Interview with Townley by Kane and Fridley, p. 26.

attorney and former Socialist leader, was a major financial advisor. The unusually powerful Industrial Commission was chaired by the Governor, whom some considered merely Townley's puppet.[1]

The League did not remain a North Dakotan movement but boasted membership in thirteen states as it became the National Nonpartisan League. In 1917 Townley moved the headquarters from Fargo to St. Paul. This seems ironic and perhaps unwise because alienation between Minneapolis-St. Paul markets and the farmers had originally been a cause of the farmers' distrust of the markets. During its years of strength, the League received support from such national leaders as Congresswoman Jeanette Rankin of Montana and Senator Robert LaFollette of Wisconsin. In addition to Senator Frazier, Senators Langer and Nye were originally elected with League endorsement.[2]

There has been a great deal of speculation about the failure of the Nonpartisan League. Excessive taxation initiated to pay for the industrial program and the farmer's lack of money for dues after five years of poor crops are often given as reasons for farm disenchantment. Mismanagement of some programs such as the Bank of North Dakota and the Home Builders Association, as well as the lack of democratic rule within the League, have also been suggested as reasons for the League's demise. Charges of disloyalty during the war and the taint of Socialism caused much suspicion of the League in the rural communities. However, it must be conceded that the League

---

[1]Bruce, Non-Partisan League, p. 108.

[2]Nelson, Land of the Dacotahs, p. 283.

accomplished much of what it originally proposed; perhaps as a political revolt, it had simply run its course. This is the reason which Townley preferred; he gave this answer when asked to account for the decline of the League in the early 1920's:

> Well, the Nonpartisan League was organized, as I understood it, for a specific purpose, we had a program, a plan of action, some laws, legislation. All that program was enacted into law, and the laws were referred to the voters following the second two-year legislative term, and the voters okayed the laws. And as I saw it that was about all there was to it. There was no legislative objective after that, no goal, as there had been, as I saw it.[1]

---

[1]Interview with Townley by Kane and Fridley, p. 6.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Invention

The five modes of classical rhetoric utilized in speech criticism are invention, disposition, style, memory, and delivery. Most classical rhetoricians consider invention the most important for it provides the "content for discourse."[1] Invention, described by Cicero as "the investigation, analysis, and grasp of the subject matter,"[2] is the discovery of all the extrinsic means of persuasion including the thought, learning, experience, and research brought to the situation by the speaker.

Aristotle concluded the three means of effecting persuasion were through the ability to "reason logically, to understand human character, . . . and to understand the emotions."[3] Most rhetoricians consider these three--ethos, pathos, and logos--the modes of proof utilized during the inventive process. Although Aristotle's Rhetoric devotes much discussion to the emotional and

---

[1]Raymond Louis Fischer, "The Rhetorical Principles of Robert Green Ingersoll" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968), p. 14.

[2]Charles Sears Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1959), p. 43.

[3]Aristotle, Rhetoric and Poetics, trans. W. Rhys Roberts (New York: The Modern Library, 1954), p. 24.

ethical appeals, clearly he considered the logical argumentation with solid evidence and reasoning to be the most vital to persuasion.

In order to reason, the speaker must exercise judgment not only by discovering all the available facts but also by ascertaining which information will be the most persuasive with regard to the subject, the audience, and the situation. Only through rigid knowledge and selection of material will the speaker be able to amplify his strong arguments. Cicero included discovery and arrangement of material during the conception process, for only by carefully putting facts in order will the speaker "make most of the stronger points without seeming to slur the weaker."[1] Although there is a variety of arrangement forms, most rhetoricians consider " . . . proposition and proof essential, exordium and peroration as usual."[2]

After the premises have been set forth by the speaker, he must prove them by logical means using evidence and reasoning. Having inferred a relationship between facts, the speaker must demonstrate to his audience the reasoning process and subsequent conclusions. This reasoning may be based on generalizations from examples, comparisons, causal relationships, or deduction from general statements. Evidence is generally thought of as the

---

[1]Marcus Tullius Cicero. Cicero, trans. H. M. Hubbell (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 52.

[2]Ibid., p. 34.

factual material which will "affirm the existence of the fact or proposition."[1] Evidence may include testimony, statistics, or illustrations.

Pathetic proof appeals to the emotions of the audience and puts them into "the right frame of mind"[2] to accept the speaker's premises as truths. The logical proof convinces the listener, but the emotional proof moves an audience to action. A skilled speaker recognizes possible reactions and then creates the emotional states which will induce the desired action. Aristotle realized that "our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile."[3]

Emotional proof, which never suffices alone but as a companion to reason, involves several factors. The proper arrangement of material is vital for an effective persuasive oratory; usually emotional material is preferred in the introduction and conclusion. Language is also a highly emotive tool. Another factor basic to persuasion is the speaker's understanding of the audience. Kenneth Burke, a modern critic, explains the need for speaker-audience identification, the realization that "in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas [and] attitudes."[4] Thus, not only is knowledge of the audience's characteristics important in persuasion, but the

---

[1]Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, and Waldo W. Braden, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1970), p. 399.

[2]Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 90.

[3]Ibid., p. 25.

[4]Kenneth Burke, A Rhetoric of Motives (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950), p. 21.

speaker must understand his own motives, personality, and intelligence in order to complete the identification process. The speaker uses language and arrangement of material in conjunction with self-audience awareness to create appropriate pathetic proof.

Ethical proof depends on the character of the speaker. Aristotle wrote that " . . . persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible."[1] Although audiences have a tendency to trust men whom they believe to be honest, Aristotle explained that ethical proof is gained not by how the speakers' character is viewed before the speech but by the credibility achieved during the speech. By classical standards, the three sources of credibility are good sense, high character, and good will.

The Selected Speeches

In 1917 North Dakota's citizens were bitterly divided along League and anti-League lines. Townley deliberately antagonized the class war within the state because he hoped to achieve farm solidarity by depicting the farmer as the victim struggling against a generalized personal enemy, "Big Biz." The Leaguers believed they were being exploited by the nonagrarian faction in the state; but to most townspeople, "the League was a monstrous thing, an organization thriving on class hatred and seeking revolutionary changes."[2]

---

[1]Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 24.

[2]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 113.

Historian Bruce Nelson recollects the class hatred still evident in 1920 as Townley campaigned in an airplane:

> Even children of six or seven, despite the awe and admiration they felt for these daring aviators, spat fiercely on the wings of the plane when they learned that it carried A. C. Townley. . . . I can verify this, for I was one of those children.[1]

In 1917 political strife was amplified by the imminent possibility of American involvement in a world war. According to Gaston, "The sentiment of North Dakota and practically all the states west of the Mississippi was decidedly pacifistic."[2] Agrarian problems in a relatively young state were of more concern to a majority of North Dakotan voters, who signified their anti-militaristic attitude by giving their 1916 electoral votes to Woodrow Wilson. Before the war, the League had taken an anti-militaristic stand, a factor which later supplied the opposition with substance for their charges of League disloyalty. Russell considered the League's attitude toward the war a mistake, and his comments were typical of those who supported American entry:

> [The League] did not know the importance or the significance of the Great War. . . . The sheer existence in this world of the principle for which they contended, the principle of democratic control was at stake in that war. . . .[3]

North Dakota historian Robinson believes that the disloyalty charges waged by the state's conservatives against the League gave North Dakota an

---

[1]Nelson, Land of the Dacotahs, p. 296.

[2]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 173.

[3]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 234.

entirely unjustified reputation as a disloyal state.[1] The League strongly advocated conscription of wealth for financing the war, emphasized the need for a statement of peace terms, and strongly supported patriotic efforts within the state. The League-controlled state supplied the military with 18,595 men, 2.12 percent above the national average.[2] The League also collected Red Cross funds at meetings even though the money was refused by Red Cross officials because of the League's reputation for disloyalty.[3] The Leader consistently urged farmers to fulfill the government's requests for high wheat production[4] and the state of North Dakota oversubscribed Liberty Bond quotas.[5] George Creel, chairman of the National Committee on Public Information defended North Dakota as a patriotic state by reciting the facts.

> Three successive crop failures, and yet the farmers of that state oversubscribed the first Liberty Loan 140 per cent. . . . With only one regiment at the outset, North Dakota promptly recruited a second. . . . In the last Red Cross drive North Dakota's allotment was $200,000, and it subscribed $575,000. . . . In 1918 North Dakota increased its wheat acreage over 630,000 acres at the request of the government.[6]

Between June 5 and June 16, 1917, League speakers, including Townley, Frazier, and Bowen, undertook an extremely controversial state speaking tour

---

[1]Robinson, History of North Dakota, p. 353.

[2]Saloutos, "Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 61.

[3]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 189.

[4]Morlan, Political Prairie Fire, p. 141.

[5]Saloutos, "Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 61.

[6]Russell, The Nonpartisan League, p. 243.

which took them to ten cities including Devils Lake, Minot, Grand Forks, Jamestown, Fargo, and Dickinson. Although the campaign was considered part of the membership drive, the main speech topic during the tour was the American war policy. The Leader claimed a total attendance of 25,000 to 30,000[1] and a total of 20,000 signatures to the declaration of principles which was distributed at the meetings.[2] The resolutions adopted asked for a declaration of terms of peace, removal of business monopolies, government control of the nation's food supply, and conscription of wealth to finance the war effort.

Although the June meetings were peaceful, they caused violent outcry in the newspapers. The Grand Forks Herald published a political cartoon depicting Townley being hanged for treason. With indignation, the Leader reproduced the cartoon and along with it a copy of Townley's Jamestown speech under banner headlines crying, "Is This Treason?"[3] When the Forum suggested the opposition greet Townley in Fargo on the last day of the tour to demonstrate their "patriotism," Lemke countered in a letter to League delegates:

> Following the lead of the Grand Forks Herald, the Fargo Forum in last Saturday's issue ran an editorial . . . advocating bodily harm to your President. . . . In order to convince the rough necks in this city that the farmers stand back of their President . . . we will ask

---

[1]Nonpartisan Leader, 21 June 1917, p. 5.

[2]Nonpartisan Leader, 14 June 1917, p. 7.

[3]Ibid.

you to kindly get busy and see that a large delegation from your county attend this grand mass meeting.[1]

The potential of physical violence, however, was not realized in North Dakota. The June tour stirred opposition and offered them more verbal evidence of "disloyalty," but violence against the League was never a major problem in North Dakota because the League was as powerful as the opposition. In Minnesota, where there were only 12,000 members in 1917,[2] the League met with a great deal of difficulty. Under legislative auspices, a group called the Public Safety Commission prevented farmers from holding meetings and often arrested organizers or drove them out of the neighborhood. In 1918, forty of a scheduled 250 meetings were abandoned because of threats of violence or legal action.[3] In 1919, Townley and an organizer, Joseph Gilbert, were convicted in Jackson County, Minnesota, of charges of discouraging enlistment. The case was appealed, but Townley eventually served a short jail term.

Organization was less successful in states other than North Dakota because elsewhere there were fewer "economic problems . . . higher levels of diversification, prosperity, and non-agricultural activity."[4] The League, therefore, hoped to form a strong alliance between labor and agriculture in

---

[1]William Lemke to League Delegates, 11 June 1917, William Lemke Papers, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota.

[2]Saloutos, "Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 58.

[3]Gaston, Nonpartisan League, p. 232.

[4]Dovre, "Nonpartisan League Persuasion," p. 258.

order to encourage national growth of the party. Townley estimated the farmers controlled 35 percent of the national electorate and labor controlled 27 percent; combined there could be tremendous political power.[1] The farm-labor coalition made progress in 1917 and 1918. Not only did Minnesota and North Dakota State Federations support the League, but in November 1917, Townley was invited to address the American Federation of Labor in Buffalo, New York.

The activities of the League in 1917 were the most dramatic because they demonstrate the League's foremost ambitions: to organize North Dakota farmers to control their state; to remove big business control of farm production and national defense; and to become a national organization by expanding to other states and seeking a coalition with labor. Most major speeches delivered by League orators throughout the six-year movement included general discussion of these topics; however, in 1917 the immediacy of the concerns dictated a more concentrated effort and the use of the speech platform was expanded. Legislative control had not yet been achieved in North Dakota and fledgling state organizations needed a boost from dynamic orators like Townley.

Three speeches delivered by Arthur Townley were chosen for this study from among several speeches extant from this time period. They were chosen because of the historical significance, the completeness of the texts, and the representative nature. The speeches, all of which were delivered in 1917, include one delivered in Jamestown, North Dakota, during the June tour; one

---

[1]Saloutos, "Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 60.

delivered in Litchfield, Minnesota; and finally, Townley's address to the American Federation of Labor delivered in Buffalo, New York.[1]

---

[1]Each of the speeches was recorded by League stenographer Norbert O'Leary; Townley always used a stenographer after the first three speeches of his June tour were misrepresented in opposition newspapers.

CHAPTER III

LOGICAL PROOF

The inventive process in Arthur Townley's speeches analyzed for this discussion demonstrates a consistency discernible in his methods of logical, emotional, and ethical proof. Although discussed separately, these areas are intrinsically linked within the whole of the speech and are arbitrarily divided for effective analysis. Classical rhetoricians consider logical proof the intellectual substance of oratory. However, they emphasize the importance of the speaker's judgment in choosing between essential and nonessential materials of proof in order to constantly utilize significant argumentation. Townley apparently had a keen sense of proportion and propriety in discriminating between the materials available to him and in analyzing the problems to be solved.

Arrangement

Although some rhetoricians consider disposition a canon distinct from invention, it is necessary to examine the arrangement of the speech in order to analyze thoroughly the logical process. As Cicero explained invention, the orator must consider "what to say, in what order, and in what manner."[1]

---

[1] Cicero, Cicero, p. 339.

Townley used the logical method of arrangement common to speeches of advocacy. He began each speech with discussion of the problem and then proposed a solution. In his Jamestown speech during the June 1917 tour, he discussed first the problem of business war profits and then suggested an alternative, government control.[1] This pattern also appears in the outline of the Townley address to Labor; however, he emphasized definition of the problem:[2]

Logical Outline

I. Introduction
   A. Reference to preceding speech
   B. This is a message from the farmers
      1. American liberties are at stake
      2. Farm and Labor must stick together against business
      3. The coalition will ensure the will of the majority

II. It is necessary for farmers and Labor to unite to secure democracy
   A. The wealth of the nation is unevenly distributed
      1. Conditions in North Dakota are bad
         a. There were two successive crop failures
         b. Farmers are plagued by mortgages and bankruptcy
      2. National farm conditions are also bad
   B. Farmers are not receiving enough from crops
      1. $27 million raised each year but only $9 million goes to the farmer
      2. Pork prices are low wholesale and high retail
      3. Wheat prices are low wholesale and high retail
   C. Organization is needed to ensure fair division of farm surplus
      1. AFL got wise thirty years ago
      2. North Dakota needs to solve wheat marketing problems
         a. The "handlers" illustration reveals the problem
         b. Dr. Ladd reports a $55 million farm loss

---

[1]See appendixes B and C for logical outline and text of Jamestown address.

[2]See appendix D for text of address to the American Federation of Labor.

D. Milling interests are exploiters
   1. Feed D wheat in North Dakota is an example
   2. The AFL has a problem in Minnesota
      a. The AFL passed a resolution
      b. The fixed price failed to help Labor
      c. Millers claim patriotism
         (1) North Dakota oversubscribed
         (2) Minneapolis does not subscribe as much

III. Conclusion: A call for unity

Not only is the arrangement of the subject matter important, but the order and structure within that arrangement are crucial to the effectiveness of the oratory. Aristotle emphasized that statement of the case and proof are indispensable but that an introduction and a conclusion are also desirable. Every speech should have a beginning, a middle, and an end with a clear statement of thesis after an emotional introduction. Townley used a short, well-defined introduction and conclusion which will be discussed in Chapter IV.

Townley's logical analysis of the problem is evident in his thesis statement and proof. The thesis statements in the addresses at Litchfield and Buffalo were very similar and easily discerned. He generally stated a need for farm and farm-labor involvement to insure the democratic concept of majority rule and to get the nation working right again. His address in Jamestown, a direct and specific attack on business, offered a more specific thesis: "They [middlemen] are using the war as a pretext for raising the price of everything."[1]

---

[1]See appendix C, p. 97.

The Premises

A speaker's general premises depend upon his own convictions, but he may consider the values of the audience and adjust his general premises. Rhetorician Herbert Simons explains that all persuasion begins from shared premises which the speaker may manipulate. The persuader "may capitalize on unexamined premises, without necessarily making them explicit, . . . appeal to unquestioned authorities, . . . or imply stereotypes."[1] By using these "verbal shortcuts," a speaker may defend his case less scrupulously, especially with an unintelligent, uncritical, or sympathetic audience.

In formulating his basic premises, Townley invariably chose to intensify the perceived differences between his audience, usually made up of farmers, and the antagonist, generally referred to as "Big Biz." To create a good guy-bad guy dualism, Townley polarized the viewpoints of each side. The Leader cartoons depicted the farmers as strong, hard-working, humble, intelligent workers and the businessmen as cigar-chewing overweight, crafty bankers and lawyers. Townley encouraged the same images in his addresses. As Dovre pointed out in his analysis of League persuasion, "all elements of opposition to Townley were treated as co-conspirators against the farmer . . . [this] provided clearcut explanations of complex problems."[2] Townley consistently failed to explain the complexities of his system but concentrated

---

[1]Herbert W. Simons, Persuasion: Understanding, Practice, and Analysis (Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1976), p. 204.

[2]Dovre, "Nonpartisan League Persuasion," p. 146.

on what Simons calls the "if-only" beliefs of his audiences, their desire to hear only about what was good.[1]

Townley's objectives in these three 1917 speeches were closely related to his basic premises. He hoped to encourage League growth on local and national levels by squelching the accusations of disloyalty and reiterating the farm grievances against the large business trusts. Townley based his reasoning on four premises:

1. Democracy is based on majority rule.
2. It is the duty of farmers and labor to demonstrate the will of the majority.
3. The majority should possess a representative share of the nation's wealth.
4. All Americans should sacrifice what they can for liberty.

It appears that these premises are consistent with each other and were acceptable to Townley's agrarian audiences. However, Townley's difficulty arose when he proposed solutions based on these premises.

Because Townley's discussion of the farm situation was biased and his suggestions for improvements of the farm conditions were not developed in detail, his analysis appears to be somewhat inadequate. If his logical capacities are judged in light of the Dewey formula for reflective thinking, Townley's analysis seems overgeneralized and incomplete. The five steps of the Dewey

---

[1]Simons, Persuasion, p. 219.

formula are recognition of the problem, the causes and effects of the problem, the possible solutions, elaboration of possible solutions, and explanation for the chosen solution.[1] Townley placed most of his emphasis on the first two steps. The problem, quite apparent to his audiences, was inappropriate distribution of wealth, specifically, farm poverty. The causes were exploitation by the businessmen who handled the produce, uncontrolled business monopolies, and unorganized farm majorities ostracized by the business interests when attempts to organize were made.

Townley's solutions to these problems included the support of the League's program of state-ownership to aid the farmers, conscription of the wealth to support the war, and dissipation of disloyalty charges which discouraged membership. It appears antithetical that Townley so strongly supported state-ownership while proclaiming the democratic principles of majority rule and free enterprise. Although his speech to the Litchfield farmers explained the necessity for poor farmers to shop by mail in order to find the best bargains, Townley seemed then to disclaim free enterprise in his solution by advocating the socialistic ventures of state-ownership. However, it is doubtful that Townley envisioned nation-wide state-ownership as he attempted to form a national Nonpartisan League. After the success in North Dakota, Townley seemed not to have a detailed long-range political or economic plan for the League.

---

[1] A. Craig Baird, Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950), p. 42.

Townley's proposed solutions became more indefinite as he moved out of North Dakota into areas of nonagrarian interests. His Jamestown speech contained a direct attack on the wealthy businesses profiteering by the war and openly advocated government conscription of wealth. The Litchfield address, nearly two hours in length, consisted primarily of illustrations of unevenly distributed wealth with only inexact references to organization and one reference, in the last paragraph, to conscription. However, Townley's most general statements for solution appeared in a letter to Samuel Gompers, president of the American Federation of Labor and in his address in Buffalo, New York. In the letter he suggested a joint Nonpartisan League-American Federation of Labor Board which would propose nonbinding suggestions to "multiply their power for their mutual good against the forces of special privilege."[1] The speech to the Labor organization contained merely a call for unity that the Federation would stand by the League in their "battle to protect . . . families against those who [were] robbing [them]."[2]

Argumentation

Townley arrived at his oratorical conclusions by using a deductive line of reasoning based primarily on inferences drawn from personal experience, illustrative examples, and statistics. This method was especially effective because his audiences, generally sympathetic or neutral, were compelled by

---

[1]A. C. Townley to Samuel Gompers, 13 April 1917, LeSueur Papers, Minnesota State Historical Society, St. Paul, Minnesota.

[2]See appendix D, p. 110.

illustrations and examples. Townley varied his reasoning patterns but seemed to be quite successful with figurative analogies and syllogistic deductions. His causal arguments seem less sound because he overgeneralized from the evidence. In nearly all of his speeches, Townley failed to utilize as much evidence as was available to him; apparently he preferred emotional appeals.

Although Townley used evidence sparingly, he appeared to have a keen awareness of the importance of discrimination in applying evidence to topic, situation, and audience. His proposals for farm labor unity were very general in his New York address, but his use of evidence to define the problems of farmers and laborers was abundant. In Jamestown, North Dakota, where farm grievances were self apparent, only one set of statistics was included; the speech otherwise lacked substantial evidence. The Minnesota address and the New York address each contained four instances of statistical proof as well as several examples and illustrations. Townley's evidence, although conservatively used, is quite reasonable in terms of reliability, relevance, and representativeness.

The most frequently cited statistics were the results of studies conducted by Dr. Ladd, a competent scientist at North Dakota's Agricultural School in Fargo. In the Labor address, Townley referred to Dr. Ladd's experimental comparison of Feed D wheat and Number One Northern; the scientist produced comparable quality flour from wheat grades which sold for divergent prices. Perhaps Townley most frequently used Dr. Ladd's statistic that the grain handlers annually denied the farmers $55 million. He used this figure in the

Minnesota and New York speeches and dramatized it by dividing the sum among North Dakota farmers, who he said should each add twelve hundred dollars to their yearly income. This statistical evidence gained credibility because of Dr. Ladd's reputation. The material was relevant to the state-ownership policy which Townley advocated. However, Townley sensationalized the $55 million figure and once again overgeneralized conclusions from his statistics.

The reliability and representative nature of other agricultural statistics used by Townley are difficult to verify. In his Labor address, Townley made an unsubstantiated claim that the average American farm income was only $318.22 a year--a shocking, impressive figure. Similarily he stated that farm products earned $27 million in the United States each year but that the farmer received only one-third of that amount. More specifically, Townley quoted the prices of farm equipment and produce:

> We got $4.00 last year for the wheat that makes a barrel of flour and that barrel sells to the consumer for $14.00 to $19.00. . . . We have to pay $250.00 for a binder that we used to get for $115.00. . . .[1]

These discrepancies, stated Townley, explained why 2 percent of the population controlled 60 percent of the wealth.

To prove that big business was profiteering from the war, Townley compared net profits of large corporations before and during the war years. Townley used incriminating figures in his Jamestown and Litchfield addresses and also published them in several editions of the Leader. According to a

---

[1]See appendix D, p. 106.

1917 edition of LaFollette's Magazine, a progressive publication which also carried a list of the net profits, the Congressional Record was the original source of the information.[1] Townley, not satisfied merely to state this evidence, dramatized the recital of numbers with sarcasm and invective:

> Now the DuPont Powder Company. I suppose you know what they use powder for, and what the powder company makes powder for. You may think the powder company makes powder to explode and shoot. They don't. Here is what they make it for: Before the war $4,500,000 profits in a year; after the war, in the same length of time, 1916, $82,000,000 of profit.[2]

Townley abundantly used such examples in preference to statistical evidence. Often he used vague examples casually interjected as fact. For instance, on two separate occasions in the Litchfield address, he cited countries which did not have freedom of the press but failed to show relationship to his argument:

> In old Russia they didn't have the right of free speech. I think in Japan, and some other countries, they haven't the right of free speech. They didn't always have in England, and France. . . .[3]

On other occasions, his examples adeptly clarified his point such as in the Litchfield speech when he rebuked his farm audience for failing to set their own price for their produce and then humorously offered examples of other industries that did set prices:

---

[1]"Net Profits of American Industrial Corporations," LaFollette's Magazine, August 1917, p. 11.

[2]See appendix C, p. 98.

[3]A. C. Townley, Address delivered at Litchfield, Minnesota, 9 October 1917, Nonpartisan League Papers, University of North Dakota, Grand Forks, North Dakota (St. Paul, Minnesota: Dakota Microfilm Services, Inc., 1969). (Hereafter referred to as Townley, Address at Litchfield.)

> Do you know how the fellow that makes these boots handles his business? . . . he adds a profit for himself . . . and so it is with your hat, and your coat, and mittens, and tobacco, and whiskey; and everything . . . why this homely stenographer here, when I asked him to come with me and take down everything I say . . . he says, "How much am I going to get for this work?"[1]

Townley enjoyed extending examples into lengthy illustrations with characters and humor. In order to prove to his Minnesota audience that various League organizing efforts had been successful, he narrated the story of a business boycott in New Rockford, North Dakota. According to Townley, when George Loftus came to speak, the businessmen locked all the assembly halls and forbade a farm meeting. The League, however, met on private land and planned a boycott of all community businesses. After several weeks, the businessmen were willing to rent halls and pay League speakers if that would entice the farmers to return their business. The businessmen's attitudes toward the farmers improved, stated Townley, "but only after the farmers educated them."[2] With this illustration, Townley introduced the controversial concept of business boycott without the necessity of a direct suggestion.

From his collection of illustrations, Townley frequently repeated his favorites, such as the story of the grain "handlers." With hyperbolized detail, Townley explained the step-by-step procedure of raising potatoes from cutting them to picking them in the fields. The final step was to "load them on a wagon again, and haul them to town, and load them in a box car--and

---

[1]Ibid., p. 33.

[2]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 27.

then somebody else [began] to handle the potatoes!"[1] According to Townley, the handlers made more money from one bushel than the farmer made raising ten, a fact discovered by Governor Frazier on a trip to New York. There the Governor saw the potatoes he sold for 83 cents bringing $5.50 per bushel on the Eastern market. He concluded that "raising" potatoes was not nearly as profitable as "handling" potatoes.[2]

Townley chose this illustration wisely. The story was entertaining and it evoked laughter from his audience, yet it demonstrated sympathy for their hard work. Rather than attempt a complex economic justification of state-owned warehouses, Townley chose to achieve corroboration from his audience by emphasizing the situation rather than the solution. The fact that Townley failed to explain how state-owned warehouses would be funded or implemented was not relevant to his audience once he had enhanced the desirability of the project with a highly emotive illustration. Using Governor Frazier as the victim of the exploitation advanced his popularity through identification.

Townley used a variety of inferential methods to draw conclusions from his evidence. His figurative analogies were deficient as were his illustrations; they were logically insufficient yet effective with a sympathetic audience willing to waive solid reasoning. In a lengthy address to the Producers and and Consumers Conference in St. Paul[3] and in his speech to the Litchfield

---

[1] Ibid., p. 10.

[2] Ibid., p. 11.

[3] "The War Profits," Nonpartisan Leader, 4 October 1917, p. 9.

farmers, Townley included an analogy comparing agriculture to a poker game. Townley adopted vocabulary from this analogy to other speeches: the business trusts he termed "gamblers in the necessities of Life."[1] A brief portion of the analogy suggests the logical imprecision and persuasive appeal:

> Now we go on playing poker here. And Magnus is perfectly willing to have me fix the Rules of the game; and we start to play. I play with him a while; and pretty soon I say to him, Magnus, I have got a ruling from the Attorney General--a letter . . . and he says that the last legislature passed a law, from now on Magnus, you get 5 cards and I get 7.
>
> (Laughter.)
>
> Now Magnus is perfectly willing to have it go that way, because he is used as a farmer, to have some one else fix the rules. . . . So I get another letter from the Attorney General . . . and in this letter he says that there has been a new interpretation of this law. It has been before the Supreme Court. And the Supreme Court says that I not only have the right to have seven cards to your five; but I do all the dealing and I look at your cards before I give them to you.
>
> (Applause and laughter.)
>
> Now you may think that is overdrawn--I have a right to see his hand, and he doesn't see mine. But it is not. Go to a hardware store, and buy a shovel--or a monkey wrench. You will find on that wrench two marks. One mark, 75¢ is the price that you pay. And then over that, there is a dash, and then some chinese above that, that you can't understand.
>
> (Laughter.)
>
> The 75¢ is your hand; the chinese is his. He sees your hand; you don't see his. He don't dare to show you his. If he did you would send to Sears Roebuck for that wrench. . . .[2]

Townley based this analogy on the similarity between relationships in a poker game and in a farm community. The analogy depended on the implication that all businessmen were dishonest or unethical--another example of Townley's biased and dualistic reasoning. Townley implied that farming was a chance

---

[1]See appendix C, p. 99.

[2]Townley, Address at Litchfield, pp. 37-38.

venture similar to a card game, but the chances of winning became even more remote when the opponent or middleman "stacked the deck." The middleman looked at the farmer's hand before he decided how to fix the grain prices. Finally, the odds of the game were against the farmer who battled environment and the business system while "betting it all" from season to season.

In this analogy, Townley's underlying generalities were biased and inaccurate. His sympathetic audiences were quick to agree to his allegations of impropriety on the part of all businessmen and to verify complete dependence of the farmer on the industrial giants. Townley did not sufficiently explain that farm prosperity also depended on environmental factors in North Dakota and other wheat-growing states, on land conditions, and, finally, on supply and demand.

Townley used many short analogies. He vindictively compared the corporate trusts sapping the life blood of the country to "vultures upon the industrial life of the nation." During the same speech he said the cost of living was rising faster than "the elevator men can raise wheat in the elevator." Finally, in an analogy with more substantial logical appeal, Townley explained why conscription of wealth would be a wise economic maneuver:

> But if I can pay today, I am duty bound to, and as a businessman and a man of common sense I will pay today. And if a nation when entering war can pay today, they ought to pay today, so that the boys can start a new life when they get back again.[1]

---

[1]See appendix C, p. 102.

Of the three speeches analyzed, the speech to the Jamestown audience seems to have been the most carefully prepared and thoughtfully reasoned. The speech contains a series of syllogisms which produced a much stronger logical framework than is evident in speeches which merely link illustrations or figurative analogies. Townley proved his first proposition, that large corporations were profiteering by the war, with a series of statistics. His second proposition was that the United States government should assume responsibility for business enterprises during the war. Townley used premises based on the patriotic beliefs of his audience to prove this idea. These are the paraphrased syllogisms:

If our boys at war will be fed, the government will distribute the crop.
Our boys at war will be fed.
Therefore, the government will distribute the crop.

If the government control of business has worked in Europe, it will work in the United States.
Government control of business has worked in Europe.
It will work in the United States.

If our boys must be supported in war, then supplies must be bought.
Our boys must be supported.
Therefore supplies must be bought.

If money is available immediately to buy supplies, our boys will have no bills when they return home.
Money is available immediately.
Therefore our boys will have no bills.

Either borrowed money, or existing money will help our boys.
Borrowed supply money will not help our boys.
Existing supply money will help our boys.

Townley reasoned that because government control of business interests was successful in Europe, it could insure Americans that their overseas

soldiers were supplied with food and clothing. Furthermore, he reasoned that money for supplies must come from the existing corporate profit surplus so that the soldiers, upon return, would not be burdened with a national debt. Townley concluded that conscription of life and wealth were necessary to ensure liberty. America could not replace a soldier's lost life nor could America replace spent wealth.

Townley's syllogisms appear to be valid because the conclusions logically follow his premises. However, the premises were often false. He inaccurately presented government crop distribution as the only efficient means of supplying servicemen overseas. Secondly, Townley assumed that the audience approved of European business control, but the major premise was too vague and unsubstantial to merit that assumption. Finally, in suggesting conscription Townley failed to present the ramifications of depleting the nation's money reserves, and he did not make an explanation of how conscription would directly help improve the farm conditions. If the government were to fix prices of all products, the surplus would necessarily disappear again creating a question of how the war should be financed.

Townley's arguments, although persuasive, lacked logical depth and precision because of his failure to correctly point out causal relations. He used a priori reasoning or reasoning from cause to effect. Townley wrongly concluded that an active Nonpartisan League electorate, upon achieving majority rule, would necessarily legislate wisely and judiciously. In addition, he wrongly assumed that government control of elevators, transportation, and

distribution would assure farm prosperity. Most seriously, he wrongly concluded that a nation existing with state-ownership and major government controls could remain a democratic nation. Townley successfully established relationship between such things as farm income and state control, but he overemphasized and oversimplified the causes of farm economic difficulties.

Refutation

Townley exercised a very direct approach to refute all opposition accusations of League disloyalty. The inherently emotional nature of opposition attacks maximized Townley's refutive ability. Had the opposition press questioned the logical weaknesses of Townley's programs rather than attempting to discredit the character of the League and its president, Townley would probably have avoided the refutation or would have been unable to use it effectively. The clearest example of Townley's refutation occurred at the beginning of his speech in Litchfield, Minnesota. The press implied the Public Safety Commission would not allow the farmers to meet because of unpatriotic intentions.[1] Townley capitalized on this political media error:

> This is a free country. Now by a free country I don't mean freedom to me to do an injustice to you. By a free country I don't mean a country where one man can steal another man's horse.
>
> (Laughter.)
>
> Or where one man may shoot a neighbor without having to answer for it. Nor where a man may disobey the laws of the nation. Nor where a man may do something to the disadvantage of his country in time of war. That is not what I mean by a free country. By a free country I

---

[1] "Ain't Farmers Legal?" Nonpartisan Leader, 18 October 1917, p. 4.

> mean a country where we have a right to do what the majority of our citizens agree we have a right to do. And one of the things that we have a right to do is freely to assemble, and when assembled exercise the right of free speech. . . .
>
> But I have discovered during the last week or ten days that there are some people--and some of them are in this audience--that believe in the right of free speech, only when THEY do the talking.
>
> (Applause and laughter.)
>
> Now, I got the impression from the newspaper reports the last few days, that there were a large number of people in the City of Litchfield, that didn't believe in the right of free speech--including the mayor and the sheriff. But I want to congratulate you upon the fact that the newspapers have been handling the affairs of the City of Litchfield just about the same as they have the affairs of the Nonpartisan League. We have both been fooled.[1]

Townley also was charged with opposition to programs to fund the war; he directly refuted these charges also:

> The Grand Forks Herald and Bismarck Tribune have been telling that I oppose the sale of bonds. I don't. If we can't find another and more efficient way to finance the war, then we will have to finance it by the sale of bonds.[2]

Townley's direct rebuttal was masterful. He emphasized the basic premise that democratic privileges must not be denied. By using these arguments as part of his introduction, he precluded vocal antagonism during the meeting by justifying all discussion and reminding the audience of their right to assemble. It would have been politically suicidal for the opposition to attempt to deny this large, self-righteous audience their right to hear Arthur Townley speak.

Townley demonstrated skill in choosing essential materials of logical proof. He used proportion and propriety when discriminating between the

---

[1]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 3.

[2]See appendix C, p. 301.

materials available to him and when analyzing the problems to be solved. Townley arranged his speeches in a logical order with a distinct beginning, middle, and end. His premises were based on the unquestioned democratic values of his listeners. Townley argued from a deductive line of reasoning using primarily illustrations and statistical evidence. Although he used a series of syllogisms in the Jamestown address, Townley seemed to prefer analogies. His refutation of disloyalty charges was direct and usually based on the assumption that democratic privilege must not be denied. Although Townley seemed to prefer emotional proof, his speeches are adequately developed logically.

CHAPTER IV

EMOTIONAL PROOF

Most rhetoricians consider emotional proof the expediter of action. Logical proof convinces an audience of the intellectual substance, but emotional proof puts the listener "into the right frame of mind" to react.[1] Aristotle explained that:

> . . . judgments when [listeners] are pleased and friendly are not the same as when [they] are pained and hostile. It is towards producing these effects . . . [that] writers on rhetoric direct the whole of their efforts.[2]

Emotional proof is intrinsically linked with logical proof; neither of them exists as a single entity. Materials of emotional proof create in the audience an awareness or need for action.

Although an effective speaker should utilize good judgment in developing his materials of proof, an unethical speaker may manipulate an audience by using inappropriate or disproportionate emotional proof; in order to induce action, he may overemphasize emotive materials and neglect the substantial logical material. However, Thonssen, Baird, and Braden emphasize the

---

[1]Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 90.

[2]Ibid., p. 25.

necessity of emotional proof in oratory regardless of the possible improprieties:

> [Persuasive improprieties] illustrate the need for honest, high-principled reliance upon [emotional proof] as a means of making truth the more palatable and, accordingly, the more decisive in the social process.[1]

The previous chapter demonstrated that Townley utilized logical proof but exercised a penchant for emotional appeal. In most of his addresses, Townley occasionally maximized emotional development to a disproportionate extent. However, because his logical development is sufficient and his motivation appears ethically justifiable,[2] Townley's use of emotional proof appears not only to be within the bounds of propriety but also to have been exercised with skill. He arranged his speeches carefully with an emotional introduction and a climactic ending and adapted his materials to each audience with remarkable ability. Finally, Townley's effective use of emotional proof is apparent in both his diction and use of humor.

Arrangement

Utilizing the natural order of conventional address, Townley arranged his material in a distinct pattern with beginning, middle, and end. In his introductions, Townley usually attracted the attention and interest of his audience, explained his purpose with a relatively well-defined thesis, and attempted to establish credibility with his audience. His conclusions were

---

[1] Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, p. 422.

[2] See Chapter V.

amplified emotional appeals which lacked a summary but which always had a definite note of finality.

Although the introduction of Townley's Jamestown address was direct and relatively short, it was adequate because the audience was with the speaker and the situation. Townley began with striking questions: "What do you pay for a gang plow now? What are you going to pay for twine this summer?"[1] He followed these questions with an indictment of "a horde of gamblers . . . making millions upon millions out of [their] products."[2] Townley's thesis statement immediately following these remarks stated that the war was a pretext for business to raise prices. Not only did Townley generate interest with this introduction, but he established a common bond with the audience and assumed the role of defender.

In his lengthy address to the Litchfield audience, Townley created a proportionately longer introduction in which he appealed to the audience for their confidence in his patriotic motives. After his personal remarks, he defended the audience's right of free speech and complimented them on their persistence in claiming that right. Townley precluded the danger of sounding insincere by using humor: "If you only knew how to interpret the daily press, you could get the truth out of it. The best way to do it is to read it upside down."[3] Because

---

[1]See appendix C, p. 97.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 3.

this was an audience more neutral than the partisan group in Jamestown, Townley was wise not to assume that they saw him in a favorable light.

Townley changed his style of introduction once again for his address to the American Federation of Labor in New York. He used a less conversational style than usual, and he calculated these remarks more carefully than those delivered in his home territory. Realizing that the cross section of American citizens in the audience were relatively uninformed about him and the League, Townley strove to establish first his credibility and then to cultivate common interests. He began with exaggerated personal remarks to create confidence:

> I want to carry to you a message from the farmers. . . . I represent directly some hundreds of thousands of farmers, and indirectly, I think I can speak for many millions of farmers in these United States.[1]

Then, using a fear appeal, Townley attempted to create a common bond by establishing a mutual enemy:

> Liberties that your forefathers and mine fought for and won are in jeopardy. . . . It is very important that you, the workers in the cities, and we in the country should understand each other; it is very important no third person, for selfish purposes, shall be permitted to lead you to believe that we are opposed to you and to lead us to believe that you are opposed to us.[2]

Finally, Townley appealed to the audience's sense of duty with a preface of patronizing remarks:

> If you will permit me, I will tell you what we understand to be our rights and our duties as American citizens. . . . When a majority

---

[1] See appendix D, p. 104.

[2] Ibid.

> of the citizens . . . have spoken, when they have passed a law or have placed men in office to make laws, it is our duty . . . to obey.[1]

Indirectly, Townley expressed his thesis statement in these lines; he hoped that a coalition majority of farmers and laborers would create a more just government.

Because he did not use notes from which to deliver his speeches, Townley's conclusions were often tediously filled with digression rather than summary. The long Litchfield address contained a lengthy conclusion of this nature. However, he was capable of climactic emotional conclusions demonstrated in the Jamestown address. To reinforce the major argument, that government should conscript wealth, he rephrased his arguments in dignified and dramatic language. First, he appealed once again to patriotic motives and motives of self-sacrifice which he combined with a fear appeal for the safety of the soldiers:

> You send your millions of boys across the water. . . . When the war is over, this government gives back to them such of their lives as is left; . . . gives back to the mothers and the fathers of these young men of their lives what is left--one arm gone; two arms gone . . . gives them back to you perhaps blinded for life . . . gives back to you what is left of their lives . . . and gives back no more.[2]

Townley's audience was stimulated with the patriotic righteousness of this emotional exhortation. Townley appealed to their power motives with prophetic determination:

> So we demand here and now and all the time, and we will continue to demand from this platform; from this roadside; from the housetop.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] See appendix C, p. 103.

> . . . We will demand that this nation or the rulers of this nation . . . must make this arrangement, that when we give our lives, all that we have, this nation will take first of your profits and then of the property you have got . . . and after the war is over we will give back, as you give back our lives, as much as is left and no more.[1]

Adaptation

After convincing the audience with logical proof, the speaker must persuade "him through proper motivating materials."[2] A speaker must "expound upon [his] views with forethought of the emotional makeup of the audience, with full recognition of the possible reactions of the group."[3] Before he can motivate, the speaker must analyze his audience with regard to their interests, intelligence, prejudices, and needs. Townley demonstrated an ability to adapt to his audience by adjusting his tone, his arrangement, and his evidential materials to the particular group. In developing his emotional appeals, Townley considered the drives and motives of his audience in terms of their emotional needs.

A. H. Maslow said the human needs are organized into a hierarchy.[4] A smoothly running society makes its citizens "feel safe enough from . . . tyranny" to satisfy their safety needs.[5] The need for safety may become a

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Baird, Argumentation, p. 214.

[3]Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, p. 429.

[4]A. H. Maslow, "A Theory of Human Motivation," Psychological Review 50 (May 1943): 375.

[5]Ibid., p. 376.

mobilizer "only in emergencies [such as] war."[1] Love and belonging needs are desire for self-respect and the esteem of others, for independence and freedom, and for reputation or prestige. According to Maslow, an individual will seek to fulfill the needs as long as certain conditions prevail:

> There are certain conditions which are immediate prerequisites for the basic need satisfactions. Danger to these is reacted to almost as if it were a direct danger to the basic needs themselves. Such conditions are freedom to speak, freedom to do what one wishes so long as no harm is done to others. . . . Thwarting in these freedoms will be reacted to with a threat or emergency response; . . . these conditions are defended because without them the basic satisfactions are quite impossible. . . .[2]

Historian Theodore Saloutos said that "in the art of mass psychology [the League speakers] were unsurpassed."[3] Townley, perhaps the most effective of the League speakers, demonstrated a superior understanding of the particular needs which motivated his audiences.

Townley motivated his audiences primarily through the activation of their safety needs, love needs, and needs for prestige. More than any of these, Townley accentuated the conditions of freedom of speech and freedom to gather which, when threatened, jeopardized the basic needs. Townley used patriotism, fear, and social power as emotional appeals in most of his addresses.

The use of fear appeals was natural because the United States was at war, and Townley's topics in 1917 were usually directly related to war. Townley

---

[1]Ibid.

[2]Ibid., p. 383.

[3]Saloutos, "Rise of the Nonpartisan League," p. 50.

repeatedly dramatized attempts of groups such as the Public Safety Commission to halt Nonpartisan League meetings. In order to create what Maslow called "an emergency response,"[1] Townley created a fear that the United States could lose the war: "This country can never succeed in war until it governs the business of transporting your products."[2] He created fear for the well being of the young soldiers under the existing government policies:

> I am not talking this way to discourage you in financing this war, but to impress on you the necessity of financing it in a tremendous measure or keep your boys at home, because they should not go there without money only to starve.[3]

He created fear that the democratic system was threatened by industrial trusts: "In a time like this . . . all the liberties that your forefathers and mine fought for and won are in jeopardy."[4]

Occasionally, Townley included emotional material which was in extremely poor taste and of questionable value. One of the most blatant examples of this was an analogy in his Minnesota address which compared the United States business interests profiteering to grave robbing on the European battlefields. This example demonstrates the exaggerated theatrical style of which Townley was capable:

> While your boys are across the water, fighting for liberty and democracy, over there in the night sometimes there travel among the bodies of the dead, some very low-down degraded creatures in human

---

[1]Maslow, 'Human Motivation," p. 383.

[2]See appendix C, p. 98.

[3]Ibid.

[4]See appendix D, p. 104.

> form. They follow all war. They go among the dead bodies of the soldiers, robbing the little things upon their bodies--money, treasures, clothing, and the little trinkets that might have been sent from home. Nothing that I could imagine, up to a little while ago, is as bad as robbing the dead body of a soldier boy. But bad as that is, it does not hurt the dead soldier much if someone takes his money and his clothing, because he does not need them any more: he has gone to his reward. And the clothing and the money may help the poor devil that came along and took it. But while that is going on over there, here in this country are a group of citizens who have talked so much about themselves that we regard them almost as patriots, who go about among US, fat, well kept, well groomed, who with their million ramifications throughout this nation, rob and plunder the mothers and brothers and sisters of those boys who have gone across to fight for liberty and democracy.[1]

Townley utilized patriotism as an effective means of motivation and a demonstration of loyalty to control opposition allegations. He began his speeches to the American Federation of Labor and the Litchfield group with similar exhortations of the duties of the American citizen and clearly defined the rights of assembly and speech. In all of his speeches, he emphasized the League support of the war effort. The Jamestown address contained these remarks:

> This nation of farmers are [sic] so patriotic that even the government today may be in the hands and the absolute control of the steel trust. . . . We are going to do our best by producing all [the wheat] we can.[2]

The remarks to the American Federation of Labor concerning the support for the war effort were even more dramatic:

> Since the war began you will find the farmers' wives and daughters . . . working in the field. . . . Schools [are] closed and the mothers, brothers and sisters of those boys that have gone to war

---

[1] Townley Address at Litchfield, pp. 53-54.

[2] See appendix C, p. 100.

> [are] out in the field picking the corn, digging up the potatoes, gathering in the food to feed the world and its armies of liberty.[1]

Townley utilized the fear and patriotism appeals in his speeches to the American Federation of Labor in New York and to his audience in Jamestown, North Dakota. Because these were more progressive audiences than the one he had faced in Litchfield, he attempted to convince the Minnesota audiences of the importance of the League and its platform before he discussed the war issues. Therefore, the Litchfield address contained primarily appeals to power; in fact, Townley cleverly avoided appeals to fear and patriotism until his lengthy speech was nearly completed. In all three addresses, Townley obviously hoped to encourage strong farm or farm-labor organization by using appeals to power.

Townley expounded upon the League intentions to go into the handling business once legislative power was achieved, and he referred often to the political progress that had been made. He reminded the Litchfield audience that North Dakota Leaguers "elected everybody from dog-catcher to Governor."[2] Extending his poker analogy, Townley talked of the future capture of the holdover Senate seats:

> The cards are stacked, and it is only a question of a few weeks, or a few months, [before] the North Dakota farmers will elect representatives of the people in place of those holdover senators who represent the grain trust and the beef trust.[3]

---

[1]See appendix D, p. 105.

[2]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 14.

[3]Ibid., p. 15.

His illustration about the business boycott in New Rockford also demonstrated to the farmers their potential strength as a coalition.

Townley often used subtle power appeals to motivate needs for confidence, prestige, and importance. In the Jamestown address the reiteration of the statement, "we respectfully suggest and we demand" was effective as an instigator. Townley used the remark several times throughout this speech and used the word "demand" four times in his conclusion calling for conscription of wealth. Similarly, the conclusion of Townley's address to Labor appealed to the potential power of a farm-labor coalition.

> If you will stand shoulder to shoulder with us in our battle to protect our families against those who are robbing us, we will stand shoulder to shoulder with you and I pledge you further that if the 500,000 organized workers in the city of New York . . . and the organized workers over these United States will recognize the farmer in his struggle . . . we will aid you in your struggle by recognizing the brand of goods made in your union shops until the day arrives when no man, either upon the farm or in the city, shall not be organized.[1]

Language

Townley's referential language, like his logical proof, was often vague, generalized, and biased. The emotive quality of his language, however, was extremely valuable for its suggestive and colorful characteristics contributing to Townley's ability to draw large, responsive audiences. Most noticeable of Townley's emotive language devices were his good guy-bad guy labels, his use of alliteration, and his questions directed to his audience.

---

[1]See appendix D, p. 110.

Townley's name-calling seemed to be an emphatic devise enjoyed by his League-oriented listeners. He depicted the enemy of the agrarian people in vague, negatively connotive terms such as "gamblers in food products and the necessaries of life," "trusts," "middlemen," and "handlers." The League supporters were generally referred to as "workers of the fields," or simply "farmers." In his Jamestown conscription speech, Townley was confident of the strong anti-business antagonism of the group; therefore, he utilized such invectives as "rotten rich," "blatant demagogues," "vultures," and "parasites" to describe the enemy.[1] In his New York address, however, Townley was prudent enough to tone down his suggestive descriptions to bland generalities such as the "third person," "these gentlemen," and "those who are making it very difficult for us to live."[2]

Townley utilized repetition of key general nouns or pronouns throughout an address. In the Jamestown address, in which Townley relied on patriotic appeals and motivated fear for the safety of loved ones, he referred to "the boys" or "young men" at war no less than fifteen times in a relatively short speech and mentioned the "gamblers" in the necessities of life at least seven times.[3] Similarly, in the Labor address, primarily an appeal for power in farm-labor unity, he emphasized the common bond of the field and factory laborers. "Worker" was repeated throughout the address as was the pronoun

---

[1]See appendix C, p. 97.

[2]See appendix D, p. 104.

[3]See appendix C, p. 97.

"we." The following quotation demonstrates his use of vague references to the antagonist and his repetition of the unity key words:

> And so it is necessary that we come in contact with each other, because there are at work in this nation tremendous forces whose very life depends upon keeping you workers in the cities fighting the workers on the farm. . . .[1]

Townley ornamented his speeches with illustrations, analogies, and metaphorical labels such as "the vultures" and "the parasite." Alliteration appeared in the more carefully prepared speeches such as the Jamestown address. Townley lamented the farmers' hard work which served only to "make more multi-millionaires." He asked that the farmers not be condemned for wanting "a price for their product that [would] . . . protect them from [the] plunder." Finally, he spoke of the cost of "the shot and shell and food and clothing that [they] ship across the sea."[2]

With the exception of his speeches to unfamiliar groups such as the American Federation of Labor, Townley's addresses were punctuated by remarks or questions directed to the audience or to individuals in the audience. At Litchfield, Townley conversed repeatedly with Magnus Johnson, the Meeker County, Minnesota Legislative Representative who chaired the meeting. Shortly before the Jamestown address, the opposition press charged Townley with treasonous war statements. Townley capitalized on the accusations by stirring his audience to his defense. Twice in the short speech he asked his audience their opinion of his remarks:

---

[1]See appendix D, p. 104.

[2]See appendix C, p. 100.

"Is this treason?"
Voices--"No. No. I should say not."
"Demanding a measure that will enable us to succeed in the war can not be treason, can it?"
A Voice--"It is patriotism!"
Another Voice--"That is what it is!"
"Is this not a patriotic meeting?"
A Voice--"Yes, Sir!"
"Isn't this our first duty."[1]

One of Townley's most effective emotional devises was his use of humor. In speeches such as the Jamestown and New York addresses, his humor was sarcastic and often subtle in nature. However, in a casual, lengthy address such as that in Litchfield, the humor was usually opposition-oriented, and it was not uncommon for him to openly ridicule a political figure or a vociferous opponent in the audience.

At Litchfield, Townley advised the citizens to achieve the best results with the local opposition press by reading it upside down.[2] He talked about the "flabby and fat" businessmen[3] who needed to be put to work so they could have trim bodies like those of the farmers. Perhaps his most humorous but merciless attack on an individual came as he read and ridiculed parts of an anti-League letter which had been printed in the Litchfield newspaper. The author, a man named John Coyle, sat in the audience while Townley rebuked and taunted him. This was Townley's answer to Coyle's contention that the League was "disloyal to the core:"

---

[1]Ibid., p. 98.

[2]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 1.

[3]Ibid., p. 16.

> Now the core of the League is the membership of the League. It is right in among his own neighbors there. That is the core . . . and John is close enough to it to know how disloyal the core is.[1]

Townley proceeded to read Coyle's anti-League remarks and counter them with barbed replys which elicited laughter from the crowd.

Townley's sarcasm in his speech to Labor was much more reserved than his humor to familiar audiences, but it was perhaps more strikingly bitter in tone. His resentment of farm conditions was clear as he wryly described the farm expenditures:

> The average income of the average farm family in the United States is $318.22 a year; now I mean by that that the average farm family after they have paid for their machinery, paid the interest, paid the threshing bill, paid all those expenses of producing the crop that they must pay, they have $318.22, out of which they may buy clothing, groceries, educate their children, buy automobiles, take a trip to Florida and furnish themselves with whiskey and tobacco.[2]

Conversely, in his address to the Jamestown audience, Townley sarcastically attacked the businessmen's freedom from financial oppression:

> We have some suspicion also that even before the war the owners of the beef trust had been fairly well able to clothe and feed their families. . . . Don't hear very much holler about starvation on their part.[3]

Townley relied on emotional appeals to motivate his audiences to support the League, its programs, and its candidates. He demonstrated competence in arranging his speeches for maximal effect and adapted his language and humor to a variety of listeners. Townley's speeches were not only provocative and

---

[1]Ibid., p. 41.

[2]See appendix D, p. 105.

[3]See appendix C, p. 97.

controversial, but they were also entertaining, largely because of his liberal use of emotional appeals.

CHAPTER V

ETHICAL PROOF

The third mode of proof which a speaker must use in the inventive process is ethical proof. Aristotle said that the three means of effecting persuasion were to reason logically, to understand emotions, and to understand human character.[1] Thonssen, Baird, and Braden point out "that the force of the speaker's personality or character is instrumental in facilitating the acceptance of belief."[2] A speaker must convince an audience with logical appeals, motivate them with emotional appeals, and inspire their trust in his character with ethical appeals.

Aristotle believed that the speaker himself is the principle means of persuasion. Baldwin, paraphrasing Aristotle, stated that all of rhetoric is necessarily ethical because "everything consecutively imparted or communicated . . . is subjective."[3] Listeners have a tendency to believe credible sources or sources which transmit impressions of intelligence and moral quality. Aristotle defined ethical proof in the Rhetoric:

---

[1]Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 24.

[2]Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, p. 445.

[3]Baldwin, Ancient Rhetoric, p. 12.

> [Ethos] depends on the personal character of the speaker; . . . persuasion is achieved by the speaker's personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him credible. We believe good men more fully and readily than others. . . . A man's character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses.[1]

The three things which inspire confidence in an orator's character as he speaks are intelligence, high moral character, and good will toward the audience. Aristotle believed that ethos should be achieved by what the speaker says, "not by what people think of his character before he begins to speak."[2]

Invention is a complex process which integrates logical proof, emotional proof, and ethical proof to effect persuasion. It is difficult to separate ethical appeal from emotional or logical appeal because they are often consubstantial. Material which "establishes the moral character of the speaker and imposes strictures upon that of the opponent"[3] is demonstrating probity while it also puts the audience in an emotional state susceptible to belief. Similarly, strong logical argumentation suggests intelligence and in so doing establishes speaker credibility.

Chapters III and IV discussed Arthur Townley's use of logical and emotional appeals: he developed his arguments adequately and demonstrated a remarkable ability for adapting his materials to a particular audience. Townley also appeared to possess an ability to create confidence in himself by establishing his intelligence, high moral character, and good will toward

---

[1]Aristotle, Rhetoric, p. 25.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, p. 453.

the audience. This chapter will discuss Townley's method of completing the inventive process with materials of ethical proof.

Intelligence

Thonssen, Baird, and Braden profess that a speaker must exhibit sagacity by demonstrating intellectual integrity and wisdom. They suggest that he may do this by (1) using common sense; (2) acting with tact and moderation; (3) displaying good taste; (4) revealing a broad familiarity with the interests of the day; and (5) showing by the way he handles speech materials that he is possessed of intellectual integrity and wisdom.[1] Townley established his intelligence through several of these means.

Primarily, Townley displayed intelligence with common sense. His tone and substance suggested that he was speaking candidly and directly to his agrarian audiences without attempting to burden them with sophisticated terminology or complicated argumentation. His reasoning, demonstrated previously, was often in the form of analogies or illustrations developed from common sensical ideas. One clear example of Townley's use of common sense was his Litchfield explanation of the foolhardiness of local merchants who would not lower their prices to keep the farm money in the community rather than in the hands of distant catalog houses. "We are strong," said Townley, "for this idea of keeping our money at home."[2] Also in this speech, he expounded upon

---

[1] Ibid., p. 459.

[2] Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 19.

the fact that farmers usually bought at retail and sold at wholesale, a practice that simply did not show good sense on the part of the farmers. Townley explained:

> The most important part of any business, is what you get for what you do. The most important part of the farmer's business is what he gets for what he produces. The most important part of the farmer's business, has to do with the rules and the laws that affects [sic] the prices of the stuff that you have to sell.[1]

Another method Townley used to impress his audience with his intelligence was his adeptness in handling speech materials. Standing before any audience, relaxed and without notes, Townley suggested to his listeners capability and control. Townley apparently had no nervous manifestations or distracting habits. His speeches were well organized and abundant in emotional appeal and logical detail. Finally, his quick-witted handling of hecklers and his dialogue with the audience enhanced his credibility. Townley recalled one example of his quick wit:

> I was about half through when [he] said in a loud voice, "Mr. Townley, didn't you tell me . . . last winter up in the caucus room in Bismarck to go home and lie like a horse thief?" I said, "Yes, and you've been doing it haven't you?" And when the crowd got through laughing, I said, "[He] always does what I tell him to."[2]

Because most of the newspaper accounts of the reception to Townley's speeches were extremely biased and his political contemporaries were polarized in their viewpoints concerning Townley, it is difficult to ascertain how audiences judged Townley's intelligence with regard to the other criteria. It would appear

---

[1]Ibid., p. 31.

[2]Interview with Townley by Kane and Fridley, p. 15.

that Townley did not always use tact, moderation, and good taste for he sometimes used name-calling, suggested undignified analogies, and appeared retaliatory and bitter. In his Litchfield speech he called the terminal elevators "houses of prostitution"[1] and the business interests "lying son-of-a-guns."[2] Although analogies such as the one comparing corporations to those who rob the bodies of dead soldiers seem theatrical and in poor taste, they may have been acceptable to the audiences. Townley also failed to reveal a broad familiarity with other political issues of the day; but this, too, was probably overlooked by the partisan audiences who expected to hear the topics of business interest, conscription, and League organization.

Character

Thonssen, Baird, and Braden state that a speaker focuses attention upon the probity of his character if he (1) associates himself or the message with the virtuous; (2) bestows, with propriety, praise upon himself or his cause; (3) links the opponent with what is not virtuous; (4) minimizes or removes unfavorable impressions of himself or his cause previously established by his opponent; (5) relies upon authority derived from his personal experience; and (6) creates the impression of being sincere.[3] Townley utilizes most of these methods in his speeches in order to establish credibility.

---

[1]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 9.

[2]Ibid., p. 36.

[3]Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, p. 458.

Most conspicuously, Townley identified himself and his cause with what was virtuous: specifically patriotism, hard work, and democracy. In his Litchfield address he said that farmers were busy in the patriotic work of producing a large crop. Unlike the flag-waving businessman, the farmer "works 16 hours a day [and] he don't [sic] feel very much like waving the flag and shouting."[1] In all three addresses, Townley reported on the farmers' commitment to the war effort through crop production, war bonds, or liberty loans. He also stressed the hard work of every family whether in support of the war effort or simply out of necessity.

> And when you can't get enough out of the soil, and out of your own hides, and out of your wives, then you begin upon the lives of the little children, that God Almight expects you to take better care of than you are doing. They don't have the educational advantages that the children of those who "handle" potatoes and wheat get.[2]

Ethical proof based on the work virtue was the primary method which Townley used in his address to the American Federation of Labor. It was crucial that he establish in the minds of the Easterners a favorable impression of the Midwestern farmer as a hard-working, self-sacrificing individual. He accomplished this with descriptions of the arduous potato-growing process, the family work force, and the small income and careful budget of a farm family.

Townley openly praised the North Dakota farmers for their patriotic self-sacrifice and election success, but he was usually indirect and temperate when

---

[1]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 49.

[2]Ibid., p. 24.

praising himself. Townley attempted to build his credibility at the beginning of the New York speech by referring to the large numbers of farmers whom he represented, but that was the only direct reference to himself in that speech. In his Litchfield and Jamestown addresses, however, Townley mentioned the verbal chastisement he had received from the opposition press and intemperately implied that he was acting courageously to continue his campaign against the trusts. With martyrized drama, Townley referred to the Grand Forks Herald's cartoon which depicted his hanging for treason:

> We will continue to demand from this platform; from this roadside; . . . from the city; from the country; if need be from the federal penitentiary, or even from the gallows. . . . I can make any sacrifice and I am not afraid.[1]

Townley explicitly linked his opponents with non-virtuous enterprises such as destruction of the democratic process, unethical business practice, and disloyalty. First of all, he amplified reports that the Public Safety Commission attempted to halt League meetings. According to Townley, any man who would deny American people the right of assembly and free speech was simply "not a good citizen."[2] Secondly, Townley repeatedly implied that all businessmen were unscrupulous in their exploitation of farmers and were probably prolonging the war in order to make larger profits. He described the corporate leaders as money-hungry scavengers who would "wrap the flag about

---

[1]See appendix C, p. 103.

[2]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 7.

their bodies"[1] in false patriotism while they failed to truly sacrifice. With a masterful play on words, Townley suggested that true sacrifice from business could stop the war:

> I would [draft] first the big strong fat advocates of war; because they will stop more bullets than these thin little fellows here; and I believe in it further because if they had to go when the young man goes, we would not go quite so often.[2]

With blatant denial and ridicule, Townley minimized or removed the unfavorable impressions which the anti-League press created. To the Grand Forks Herald which charged him with treason, he replied that he was "a traitor to the steel trust" which was profiteering from the war. Perhaps his favorite technique of refuting the disloyalty accusations was to interject throughout his addresses sarcastic remarks such as this one:

> Now this isn't the most seditious part of our speech. But it is pretty seditious. Getting rather DISLOYAL right now.[3]

Later in the same address, Townley interjected for the fourth time:

> This is the real [sic] seditious part of my talk. This is the disloyal part. I am disloyal to the four billion dollar a year gentlemen. But I don't believe I am disloyal to my country and my fellow citizens, when I raise my voice against the robbery of my fellow citizens. Is a man less criminal because he keeps a flag waving to all men as he goes down the street?[4]

---

[1]See appendix D, p. 109.

[2]See appendix C, p. 101.

[3]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 11.

[4]Ibid., p. 51.

These remarks helped Townley discredit the opposition attacks against himself, identify with patriotic virtue, call attention to his efforts to assist his fellow farmers, and imply that the corporate interests were falsely patriotic.

Townley seemed to leave an impression of sincerity with his audiences even though his sarcastic and condemnatory style often suggested political retaliation rather than constructive oratory. He did not seek office and had no prospects for monetary gains through his League involvement. There is little evidence that Townley ever profited from his League efforts; in 1917 the Leader reported that he received only $200 a month from the League, had less than $400 in the bank, and did not own a home, automobile, or insurance policy.[1] Townley convinced the audience of his sincerity by his rigorous campaigning on their behalf and constant defense of them during his speeches.

Good Will

According to Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, the speaker creates good will in his listeners if he understands them and presents himself as a friend of what they consider good. This can be achieved if the speaker (1) captures the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience; (2) identifies himself properly with the hearers and their problems; (3) proceeds in a straightforward manner; (4) offers necessary rebukes with tact and consideration; (5) offsets any personal reasons he may have for giving the speech; and

---

[1] "Nail Lies About the League," Nonpartisan Leader, 1 November 1917, p. 10.

(6) reveals without exhibitionism his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth.[1] Townley achieved good will with his audiences by doing several of these things.

In his speech to the American Federation of Labor, Townley needed to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise because both he and his cause were unknown to the audience. Without fawning, he expressed conciliatory remarks to demonstrate his earnestness and respect. "I want to tell you something about the condition of the farmer," he said and later prefaced statements with similar remarks such as "I want you to notice," "I call your attention," and "If you will permit me, I will tell you." Townley moderately complimented the Federation by stating that he was pleased to be speaking to them and then praised them for having organized with these remarks:

> We farmers in these United States have been very much asleep, while you and your president for thirty years or more have been struggling to perfect an organization to protect yourself industrially.[2]

Townley identified with his agrarian listeners by referring to himself as a farmer; most of his North Dakota and Minnesota audiences were aware of his Beach, North Dakota, flax enterprise. In his Litchfield address, Townley humorously reminded his listeners that he was originally from their state having been "fed on parched corn and jack rabbits for the first three years."[3] In addition, he stressed his respect for firm bodies developed on the farm and

---

[1]Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, Speech Criticism, p. 459.

[2]See appendix D, p. 106.

[3]Townley, Address at Litchfield, p. 8.

claimed to be a hard worker himself. At one point in this address he invited the audience to "come up here and take a look at these hides."[1] Finally, he reminisced about his childhood when he had to go to the cellar on cold nights "with blankets and an oil lamp, and maybe sit there half the night to keep [the potatoes] from freezing."[2]

If his audiences were not convinced of his intentions when he appeared in their communities, Townley removed their suspicions with his speeches. All of his oratory used the first person plural to encompass the particular group. "We" in North Dakota meant "we farmers" and "we" in New York meant "we laborers." He explained his reasons for wanting the Minnesota farmers to organize so that his motives were clearly understood:

> Now you may wonder why, if we had such a good thing up there we would bother to come down here in Minnesota. Well I will tell you how we came to come down here. The same fellows that make 55 million a year on our wheat, make a little out of yours. . . . After we had gotten ourselves thoroly [sic] organized, we could very readily see that that bunch of pirates that was getting fat off of us, was getting fat off of you too. . . .[3]

Finally, it is doubtful that Arthur Townley revealed without exhibitionism his personal qualities as a messenger of the truth. His audiences appreciated the problems of farming and were probably filled with the same resentment and invective that Townley voiced. To a great extent, Townley's exhibitionism enhanced his appeal; his exaggerated patriotism and barbed attacks on "Big Biz"

---

[1]Ibid., p. 22.

[2]Ibid., p. 10.

[3]Ibid., p. 16.

were not only entertaining for his listeners but also cathartic. Townley verbalized the frustration and bitterness felt by the farmers.

Townley used ethical appeals to inspire his listener's confidence in his character. He demonstrated his intelligence by using common sense and displaying adeptness in handling speech materials. Townley focused attention upon the probity of his character by associating himself with virtuous democratic ideas, moderately praising his audience, linking his opponent with non-virtuous enterprises, minimizing unfavorable impressions of himself, and leaving an impression of sincerity. Finally, Townley created good will in his listeners by using appropriate praise, identifying with his listeners, and making clear his intentions.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

This thesis has investigated the rhetoric of Arthur Townley in terms of the Aristotelian canon invention. A study of Townley's life and his involvement with the Nonpartisan League revealed that much of his oratorical skill was natural but that Townley benefited from some education, imitation of other speakers, and experience. The three modes of logical, emotional, and ethical proof which Aristotle designated are clearly discernible in the speeches of Townley.

Arthur Townley was reared in an agrarian environment which influenced him greatly. His parents, Esther and Fitch Townley, moved to Minnesota in 1881 and established a farm near Bertha and Parkers Prairie. Townley's course of study at Alexandria, Minnesota, High School was comprehensive in the areas of composition, literature, and grammar; and he developed an interest in debate and forensics. However, Townley denied whatever high school speaking experience he had and claimed to have had no training or experience in speaking until he began his career as an agrarian speaker in 1905 or 1906.

After teaching for three years in Minnesota, Townley and his brother undertook a large flax operation in Beach, North Dakota. Aided by liberal credit from supply houses such as International Harvester, the Townley

brothers created a large operation which was destroyed in 1912 by an early snowfall and low market prices. Bankrupt, Townley blamed his failure on price-fixing in the grain markets; his resentment toward the grain establishment was evident in most of his Nonpartisan League addresses.

From 1913 to 1915 Townley developed persuasive skill and cultivated an understanding of farm problems while he worked as an organizer for the Socialist Party of North Dakota. Much of the original Nonpartisan League platform of state-ownership had been advocated previously by the Socialist Party. The Equity Society also influenced the League platform, and Equity Speaker George Loftus demonstrated a fiery speech style later imitated by Townley.

Townley gained a great deal of oratorical confidence and persuasive skill from solicitation of individual membership during his affiliation with the Socialist Party and later in organizing the Nonpartisan League. He became aware of farm grievances and developed skill adapting his arguments to the specific needs of his listeners. Townley's public speaking was conversational and dynamic, characterized by sarcasm, local illustrations, and invective for "Big Biz." Although he was a propagandist and a "promoter" his entire life, Townley's oratorical talents were successful only during his League years.

In the 1917 Nonpartisan League addresses analyzed for this investigation, Townley demonstrated an ability to utilize logical proof. He had a keen sense of proportion and propriety in discriminating between materials available to him and in analyzing the problems to be solved. Townley's arrangement, choice

of premises, argumentation, and refutation were all effectively developed in his addresses.

Townley arranged each speech with a distinct statement of thesis followed by logical proof. His speeches usually began with a discussion of the problem and ended with suggested solutions; typically, the Jamestown address began with an argument against business profiteering during the war and ended with a briefly stated alternative, government control of business. Townley usually maximized his emphasis on the problem, but he minimized the details of proposed solutions. In addition, Townley's addresses had clearly discernible introductions and conclusions.

When developing his premises, Townley carefully analyzed his listeners and then intensified the stereotypes and the perceived differences between the farm audiences and the business interests. In addition, he capitalized on using authorities and ideas unquestioned by his audience to invent patriotic and democratic premises. Judged in light of the Dewey formula for reflective thinking, Townley's analysis appears to have been overgeneralized and incomplete. He emphasized the problem of farm poverty and simplistically designated the cause as business exploitation of farmers. The implementation of his proposed solutions of state-ownership was never explained in detail.

Townley used deductive reasoning based primarily on illustrations and statistics which were compelling to his sympathetic agrarian audiences. He used evidence sparingly but clearly demonstrated an ability to alter the amount of evidence with regard to the particular situation, audience, or topic. In

Jamestown, North Dakota, where farm grievances were apparent, Townley waived evidence; however, in his Minnesota and New York addresses he utilized much more evidence. Many of his statistics originated at the State Agricultural College as a result of the work of Dr. Ladd. During the 1917 war-related addresses, Townley also utilized a set of Congressional Record statistics which demonstrated business profits from the war. Townley also included casual personal examples with which the farmer could identify.

Characteristic of most of Townley's speeches were lengthy exaggerated illustrations and figurative analogies often lacking in logic but nevertheless very effective with sympathetic audiences. In several speeches Townley's hyperbolized illustration of the difference between "raising" potatoes and "handling" potatoes induced laughter and identification among his listeners as did the analogy based on the similarity between relationships in a poker game and in a farm community. Although most of his speeches contained analogies and illustrations rather than syllogistic deductions, Townley's address at Jamestown contained a series of syllogisms creating a much stronger logical framework.

Townley exercised a direct approach to refute the inherently emotional attacks on him or the League. Because neither the logic of Townley's programs nor the feasibility of his proposed state goals were questioned, Townley was able to utilize emotional refutation. He defended the League and himself by referring to the democratic rights of free speech and free assembly and subsequently precluded vocal antagonism during his addresses.

Perhaps Townley's greatest inventive asset was the emotional proof apparent in his arrangement, audience adaptation, diction, and use of humor. He arranged his speeches in a distinct pattern with beginning, middle, and end. Proportionate to the length of the address, his emotive introductions defined his thesis, established his credibility, and created interest. In introductions, he utilized a variety of attention-getting devices including striking questions, appeals to patriotic motives, and appeals to common interests. Some of Townley's conclusions were long and tedious, but in other speeches he demonstrated capability for climactic emotional appeals in the conclusion.

Townley displayed an understanding of the needs which motivated his audiences and appealed to their safety needs, love needs, and prestige needs. He used patriotism, fear, and social power as emotional appeals in most of his addresses. Patriotic and fear appeals used in combination were especially apparent in the 1917 addresses concerning the financing of World War I. The appeals to social power were very effective when Townley sought League membership and a farm-labor coalition.

Townley utilized suggestive and colorful emotive language with an abundance of name-calling and with questions directed to his listeners. The invectives utilized to describe the business interests were usually extremely negative when he was confident of business antagonism in the audience, but he prudently used more conservative language in addressing an unfamiliar group. He repeated suggestive nouns, such as "gamblers" and "vultures," throughout his speeches to cultivate anti-business sentiment. Most of his addresses

included questions directed to the audience and some alliteration. Sarcastic humor was abundant in Townley's oratory.

Although Townley utilized ethical appeals sparingly, he did attempt to enhance his credibility in all of his addresses. He adhered to the Aristotelian divisions and sought to inspire confidence in his character by demonstrating intelligence, high moral character, and good will. Townley demonstrated intelligence by using common sense and by handling speech materials adeptly. He enhanced his character by identifying with virtuous democratic principles and linking his opposition with non-virtuous anti-democratic actions and unethical business practice. He minimized unfavorable impressions of himself by using denial and ridicule, and he reinforced his sincerity by vigorously defending the interests of his listeners. Finally, Townley created good will by moderately praising his audiences, identifying with his agrarian listeners, and explaining directly his intentions.

The fact that Townley was an effective public speaker was evident in his ability to draw large audiences and keep them entertained for several hours. His persuasive effectiveness was apparent in the number of farmers he convinced to join the Nonpartisan League and vote for League candidates. His conversational style, common-sense logic, colorful illustrations and analogies, and bitter sarcasm addressed to the business interests were the characteristics of his address which appealed to his agrarian listeners. Townley conformed to the inventive rules suggested by Aristotle to create well-arranged oratory adequately logical and abundant with emotional appeals. Townley chose to

forego some logical and ethical appeals to emphasize the emotional appeals which consistently demonstrated sympathy for the farm grievances of his agrarian listeners.

Suggestions for Further Research

This study indicated several areas for further research in the rhetoric of Arthur Townley and other agrarian orators. Townley's speaking career spanned a half century during which time he was one of the Midwest's most popular and effective speakers. However, after his League days were over, Townley was never again a powerful political speaker capable of drawing large audiences and controlling legislative decisions. Further study of his speaking might reveal whether Townley's style lost its effectiveness with the advent of radio or whether the immediacy of subsequent farm situations precluded the need for oratorical style such as Townley's.

Secondly, further study is recommended in the area of farm oratory. Recent agrarian speakers have failed to produce solid farm coalition; perhaps because of the media, public speaking may no longer be an effective means of persuasion in the rural sector. A comparison between early twentieth century oratory such as Townley's and current oratory would enable the student of rhetoric to understand better the political temperament and intelligence of the farm populace. Perhaps another speaker as effective as Townley could be produced by the agrarian sector if this understanding were achieved.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LOGICAL OUTLINE OF LITCHFIELD ADDRESS

I. Introduction
   A. The Press has tried to stop this speech which they call disloyal.
   B. This is a free country, everyone has the right of free speech.

II. The affairs of the country are not as well arranged as they should be.
   A. Wealth is not evenly distributed.
      1. There are too many monopolies.
      2. Democracy is the will of the majority.
      3. Farmers must become politically involved to sustain the will of the majority.
   B. In North Dakota a Nonpartisan League has been organized.
      1. Elevators and state-owned projects are needed because of farm exploitation.
         a. "Raising" potatoes is more difficult than "handling."
         b. Dr. Ladd says the farmer loses 55 million dollars each year on his farm products.
         c. The flour trusts oppose state-owned efforts.
      2. The farmers got together.
         a. 40,000 were organized.
         b. The election was successful.
   C. A national organization is needed.
      1. Businessmen are unfair to the farmers.
         a. They require them to shop in town but offer no discounts.
         b. Farmers cannot afford to shop in town.
         c. Businessmen make profit selling retail to farmers.
      2. Farmers are poor businessmen.
         a. They buy at retail and sell at wholesale.
            (1) They cannot survive without outside support.
            (2) Entire families must labor in the fields.
         b. Boycotting has worked in the past.
            (1) Loftus was to speak in New Rockford, North Dakota.
            (2) This has given the farmers hope.
         c. Farmers must set their prices like wise businessmen.
      3. The relationships in a poker game are much like those in a farm community (lengthy analogy).

D. The War has become a large scale poker game.
   1. War profits are large for corporations.
   2. Farmers have been very patriotic.
      a. Farmers fought at Lexington.
      b. Farm and labor work for patriotism.
      c. Nonpartisan League has done more than any organization for the war cause.

III. Conclusion
   A. The opposition tried to halt Townley in Lake City, Minnesota.
   B. The League needs to become a national group.
   C. Conscription of life and money is the fair way to supply the war effort.
   D. Leaguers will buy war bonds.
   E. The nation will be set in order when the war is paid for.

APPENDIX B

LOGICAL OUTLINE OF JAMESTOWN ADDRESS

I. Introduction--Rhetorical questions

II. The war is a pretext for rising prices.
  A. Business is reaping financial reward because of the war.
    1. Many businesses show greater earnings.
      a. Swift and Co. has profited from the war.
      b. Cuban-Sugar Co. has profited from the war.
      c. Armour and Company has profited from the war.
      d. DuPont Powder Company has profited from the war.
    2. Trusts have the power to fix prices.
      a. $2.50 for wheat will not help farm proverty if farm expenses continue to rise.
      b. Trusts are gambling in food products and necessities.
  B. The government should take the responsibility of business during the war.
    1. The government should help the farmer distribute his crop.
      a. They must make sure the soldiers are fed.
      b. Farmers cannot bother raising crops with no market.
    2. European countries have taken over their businesses.
    3. Conscription is necessary for funding the war.
      a. The soldiers need costly supplies.
      b. Borrowed money leaves a nation in debt.
        (1) The boys should not have to return to debt.
        (2) Indefinite length of the war could mean indefinite debt.
      c. The government has already consented to conscription of youth.
      d. Wealth of trusts should be used.
        (1) 200 billion dollars is presently available.
        (2) This money was earned by labor of the nation.
        (3) Trust profits made from the war should go back to the war effort.
        (4) What is left will be returned after the war.

III. Conclusion
  A. We must have no debt after the war.
  B. We will all sacrifice what we must during the war.

APPENDIX C

ARTHUR TOWNLEY'S JAMESTOWN ADDRESS
DELIVERED JUNE 9, 1917

What do you pay for a gang plow now? What are you going to pay for twine this summer? The price of producing a living is going up, up, faster than the elevator men can raise wheat in the elevator.

Well, we understand. I don't need to discuss with you very long the causes for the rise in the cost of living. We are paying too much for our living, not because the farmers are getting rich, not because the workers in the factories are getting too much for producing your clothing and your shoes, but because a horde of unnecessary middlemen, a horde of gamblers in the product of your farms and the product of your factory are making millions upon millions out of your products. (Applause.)

They are using the war as a pretext for raising the price of everything you have to use. They have absolute control of the price fixing machinery both coming and going.

I am going to read you some figures now to show you that in time of war the gamblers in the necessaries of life, the price-fixers of plows, of binders, of flour, of clothing, of tobacco and whisky and everything else, are making profits undreamed of and impossible before the war--something you never read in the Grand Forks Herald.

These are the reports of different corporations on their incomes for income tax purposes. These reports were made by these corporations over their sworn statements to the government of these United States.

Now you know the steel trust before the war was doing pretty well, and the sugar trust before the war had been able to pay expenses. We have some suspicion also that even before the war the owners of the beef trust had been fairly well able to clothe and feed their families out of the profits they made. We don't hear very much hollier about starvation on their part. I even suspect that they could buy an automobile most any time before the war--but since the war they have been doing very, very much better.

I will start in here anywhere. In 1913 Swift & Co. made a net profit of nine million dollars. In 1916, after the war got going in pretty good shape, Swift & Co. made the nice little comfortable income of twenty million dollars.

Cuban-American Sugar Co. was almost broke before the war. They only made a profit of $356,000 in 1913, but thanks to the kaiser and his associates,

in 1916 they were able to push that up a bit so that in that year their profits were $8,235,000. That is doing pretty fairly well for inexperienced business men.

Armour and company. Now what do Armour and company do? Anybody--

Man in the audience: "Buy grain."

Buy grain. Buy most everything, don't they?

Yes--fruit, butter, eggs, pork--everything. Before the war, in 1913 their profits were $6,800,000, by their own sworn statement. But since the war they have been able to make $20,100,000 of net profits in the year. Pretty fairly well they have been doing lately, and they hope to do better.

Now the Dupont Powder Co. I suppose you know what they use powder for, and what the powder company makes powder for. You may think the powder company makes powder to explode and shoot. They don't. Here is what they make it for:

Before the war $5,500,000 of profits in a year; after the war, in the same length of time, 1916, $82,000,000 of profit.

Now that is going pretty fairly good isn't it, in times of war?

Now you boys that buy machinery, twine, hayrakes, boot-jacks, knives, anything that has steel in it, I am going to show you what our best friend, the United States Steel Corporation, has been able to do for themselves and to you, since the war started. In 1913 all they could dig out of your hides was $81,000,000 of profit above all expenses. I presume the reason they could not make any more was because you were not very much excited at that time. There would have been too much hollering; a revolution might have been started, they have been able so well to manage their business and your business that they have made $271,500,000 in 1916. That is some accomplishment.

Now do you begin to understand the high cost of living? You have been told it was necessary because of the war. The facts are that it is necessary because during war times they use the war as an excuse to raise the prices on everything you buy. (Applause.)

Oh this power! This power of the industrial monarchs of this nation--this power to fix the prices of everything you have to sell and of everything you have to buy! The governor said your political power was tremendous. Well, the next thing to it is the power of the trust to fix prices.

There is no relief as long as you permit this condition to continue--absolutely no relief; and tho you might get $2.50 a bushel for your wheat, they still will take it away from you in the prices of gasoline, and plows, and shoes, and bacon, and overalls and everything else; and when the farmers down here in Fargo, in convention assembled, demand that the government fix a price of $2.50 a bushel for wheat. our friend Judge Young says the farmers are patriotic at the rate of $2.50 a bushel. He does not say anything about the steel trust fixing the prices for their products, but he condemns the farmers for wanting a price for their product that will in some measure protect them from this plunder.

I want to say to you that this nation can never succeed in war unless this your government instead of serving the interests of the United States Steel Corporation and the sugar trust and the beef trust, this country can never

succeed in war until it governs the business of transporting your products and wipes off the face of the earth the gamblers in food products and the necessaries of life. (Applause.)

It is absolute insanity for us to lead ourselves or anybody else to believe that this nation can succeed in war when hundreds of thousands of parasites, the gamblers in the necessities of life, use the war only for the purpose of extracting exorbitant profits. We are working, not to beat the enemy, but to make more multimillionaires. That is what we are working for!

Now here is the seditious and treasonable and unpatriotic part of my discussion. We respectfully suggest, and then we demand, that this nation, instead of serving the interests of the gentlemen it must be serving now, or it would not permit those gigantic corporations to rob you of so many millions a year--I am afraid this government must be serving them, because I can't figure out from these reports how they are serving us--and so, we respectfully suggest and we demand that as a war measure, this United States government shall do the one thing first of all that is necessary, and take over, before they send one single boy to Europe, take over the railroads and the distribution of food into their hands--(Prolonged hand-clapping and cheers)--take over the railroads and the distribution of foods and kick the gamblers into the sea or send them to war--(Laughter and applause)--so that when you gentlemen, you tillers of the soil, shall produce an immense crop, you will be sure that crop will arrive at the camp where your boy is fighting for his country without your having to pay for it at that end four times what you received for it at this end. (Applause.)

For unless you do away with the gambler in food and the necessities of life you will produce your wheat and get two dollars a bushel for it and then you will bond the nation and pay across the water $5 or $6 a bushel for your own wheat for your own boy!

That is the line-up now. It is wrong. It is national suicide. It is national suicide in times of peace; it is multiplied national suicide in times of war, and we are not so crazy as to believe we can succeed unless this government shall do what every European government already has done--take over, absolutely take over, the business and kick out the gamblers in clothing and food and machinery and munitions and armor plate and everything else that they are using now to make seven times as much money as they made before the war--and God knows they made plenty then! (Applause.)

Is this treason?

Voices--"No." "No." "I should say not!"

Demanding a measure that will enable us to succeed in the war can not be treason, can it?

A Voice--"It is patriotism!"

Another Voice--"That is what it is!"

IS THIS NOT A PATRIOTIC MEETING?

A Voice--"Yes, sir!"

Isn't this our first duty? Why should you labor to raise a big crop until you have attended to the distribution of that crop?

If you lived a thousand miles from market and there was no way to get your crop to market, would you produce a crop? And if you live a thousand miles from market, and there is no way to see that the crop gets to the people that you want to get it, what is the use of raising it?

Well, they have charged us with treason, but I want to say to you that this nation of farmers are so patriotic that even the government today may be in the hands and the absolute control of the steel trust and the sugar trust and the machine trust, even tho it is, we are going to do our best by producing all we can. (Applause.) All as it is, if we can't do better, we will do that.

And so, whenever you see anybody out here in your districts volunteering it will be all right if they are volunteering for war service but whenever you see anybody volunteering to serve you politically, you suggest that they prove their sincerity by volunteering to go to war first; because the one great danger to this movement is in falling a prey to the volunteer politician.

Well, you understand we are for conscription whenever we need men for any public purpose.

These boys that go across the water cannot win unless you send after them, powder, shot, shells, bedding, clothing, bandages, nurses, doctors, ministers, priests, corn, ham and bacon. These boys can never win unless you send with them and continue to send every month and every day and every hour, tons and tons of munitions and provisions.

And that costs money; costs money; costs thousands upon thousands; it costs millions, millions; it will cost billions of dollars to defend this war; and win this victory. Billions of dollars!

The five billion already appropriated and provision made to be raised by this nation amounts for this country about a million and a half dollars. I am not talking this way to discourage you in financing this war, but to impress on you the necessity of financing it in a tremendous measure or keep your boys at home, because they should not go there without money only to starve.

Now the question we have is how best to raise the money that is needed to fight our battles and win this war. I want you to listen now, carefully, very carefully.

If this nation borrows twenty billion dollars during this war, if it goes in debt twenty billion dollars, that debt is going to have to be paid after the war. All debts are paid by the people that work, that produce. It means that your boys that go across the water to fight these battles, when they come back home will have to labor years and years and years to pay off the debt; labor to pay for every pound of shot and shell and food and clothing that you ship across the sea --and interest upon the debt.

And if the war lasts long the burden will be so heavy that maybe they never can pay even all the interest on this war debt. This is not a pleasant prospect for men that are to go across the water fighting for the honor of this country.

And if there is another way and in our judgment a better one--better because it will more securely protect the lives of these boys, better because it will get the money quicker, and spells more of the justice to every man and woman in the country, and will sooner end the war; I say if in our opinion there

is another and we think a better way because of those reasons, we certainly in this country have a right to propose that other way, and that we are going to do this afternoon.

The Grand Forks Herald and Bismarck Tribune have been telling that I oppose the sale of bonds. I don't. If we can't find another and more efficient way to finance the war, then we will have to finance it by the sale of bonds.

Representatives, not of your government, but representatives of big business, are in the audience always looking for something I might say that they could use against me. I have been pictured hanging to a telegraph pole here already in the state of North Dakota. They have pictured me hanging to a telegraph pole, a traitor to my country.

But you should not be alarmed, because the newspaper that published that picture is in the services not of the government, but the steel trust. I am a traitor to the steel trust.

Last Tuesday about 10,000,000 young men--I see them in the crowd here, and here, and here--about 10,000,000 young men went to the registration booths and there pledged their lives in the defense of their country's honor, went to the registration booths and there said in effect: "I will serve my country in any capacity that she may demand. I pledge you here my life. Take it and use it as you will. It is all I have. My life is everything to me. It is everything to my father, and my mother, and my sister, and my brother, and my children, or my sweetheart. It is all I have; it is all they have. In this world crisis you, my country, take this. all I have, and as much of it as you need for the defense of our homes and our country."

This is what these young men said in effect: "This is all that I can do."

This is the acme of patriotism. No blatant demagogue approaches within a million miles of the sacrifice these men made last Tuesday when they went to the registration booths. And it is right that they should have done it. I believe in the conscription of life in time of war, because it is not right that the burden should be shouldered upon those few who have the courage in their blood to go and fight.

I believe so thoroly in conscription of life in time of war, that I believe the age limit should be raised to take in all those that advocate war but do not go.

(Applause and cheers.)

(A voice--"Good boy!")

I would take in first the big strong fat advocates of war; because they will stop more bullets than these thin little fellows here; and I believe in it further because if they had to go when the young man goes, we would not go quite so often.

But at any rate I am for conscription of life. In time of national crisis and necessity it is the only measure, and the only way to raise an army. To try to raise an army by the volunteer system is insanity.

Only by conscription can you get the best for war and only by conscription can you get the best to serve you in office, in state or nation.

If we can not pay the war debt as we go along, then we will have to pay it when we get back. There is no doubt about that. If I can't pay today for what

I need to take home, then I have to go pay for it when I get back. But if I can pay today, I am in duty bound to, and as a business man and a man of common sense I will pay today. And if a nation when entering to war, can pay today, they ought to pay today, so that the boys can start a new life when they get back again.

There is a way to pay today. This nation is worth some 200 billions of dollars, and the fathers and the mothers and grandfathers and the grandmothers, of these ten million of young men that are going to war, they produced that 200 billion dollars worth of wealth. They produced it. And they have piled it in heaps so large and magnificent that they themselves dare not approach the wealth they have produced. They would stand in awe of the mighty institutions that their industry has reared.

And I propose that first of all we apply some of the proceeds of the labor of the years gone by to the payment of this war debt, and pay it as we go.

The steel trust here today made 281 million of dollars in 1916, 281 million of dollars of profit when three years ago they made less than 100 million. Made that profit, ladies and gentlemen, by charging your friends the allies across the water an exorbitant price for munitions of war. Not only that, but by charging you for plow shares and binders and threshing machines an exorbitant war price --rob you at the same time!

They used this war as an excuse to pull into the coffers of the already rotten rich 10 million where before they could only rob you of one million. In the heat and haste and confusion of war, they multiply their millions many times at your expense. You now sending your boys across the water must pay the steel trust added ever-increasing millions of profit to keep your boy from being destroyed after he gets over there.

That is the way it appears to be going now--and we have a DIFFERENT way.

The steel trust here makes two or three hundred MILLION dollars of profit. The sugar trust makes profits; the harvester trust makes profits, the railroad trust makes profits; the lumber trust makes profits; the shoe trust; the whisky trust; the grain trust; the beef trust--every trust makes an enormous war profit.

Today and tomorrow and every day they are sapping--these vultures upon the industrial life of this nation--are sapping the life blood not only of your allies, but of YOU, a thousand times more than ever! When you need that blood most, they sap it most. Now in this world crisis, they pile up during the war more THAN IT WOULD TAKE TO PAY THE EXPENSE OF WAR; and I say to you that the first thing this government should do is to take the profits they are making today to pay the expense of war.

(Loud cheers and great applause.)

Is this treason?

(Many cries from the audience of "No!" "No!")

Anarchy?

(Cries of No! No! No!)

More than that, if by the duration of this war, those war profits are not enough to pay the cost of the war; if by their management we are so far led into war--and we WILL GO AS FAR AS IS NECESSARY to defend this nation--if we must go so far as to exhaust those profits, and need MORE money, there is still another reservoir; and that is THE MILLIONS THAT THEY PILED UP BEFORE THE WAR. We will take that, too! (Great applause.)

And when the war is over we will not be in debt, and when those boys come back they may start life then new, not to live for decades in the mire of national bondage.

You send your millions of boys across the water. They go and go freely, and give freely of their lives to defend their nation; and when the war is over let us see what happens: They come back--all come back?--ah, no!

When the war is over, this government gives back to them such of their lives as is left; gives back to these boys their body minus an arm; gives back to the mothers and the fathers of these young men of their lives what is left--one arm gone; two arms gone; three limbs; ALL their limbs perhaps; gives them back to you perhaps blinded for life, or deaf, or blinded and deaf for life! Gives back to you what is left of their lives--back to their sweethearts; back to their brothers, sisters, mothers and fathers, back to the little children that have been crying for them all these years. The government gives back to all their relatives as much as is left of their lives, AND GIVES BACK NO MORE! They come back--oh, not always even the body, not always even the blinded and the insane father or brother--but come back perhaps a hundred thousand, perhaps a million, perhaps two million dreary messages--dreary messages that your father or your brother, or lover, or son, was dead many months ago!

Only the dreary message will come back to millions; this your government gives back to you of your lives, what is left. This and no more.

So we demand here and now and all the time, and we will continue to demand from this platform; from this roadside; from the housetop; from the city; from the country, if need be from the federal penitentiary, or even from the gallows--for if you are to make that sacrifice, I can make any sacrifice, and I am not afraid--we will demand that this nation or the rulers of this nation, fearing now not so much for us and our country, as for yourselves, you rulers of this nation using this war now to multiply your millions of profits; we demand of you, afraid of the autocracy of Germany, afraid of the European autocracies, if you fear that autocracy may come across the waters and rob you of the power to rob us; if you are afraid and you want us to go to war and give our lives, we say to you that you must, you must, send proof to us that you are sincere. You must make this arrangement, that when we give our lives, all that we have, this nation will take first of your profits and then of the property you have got, if the profit is not enough; and after the war is over we will give back, as you give back of our lives, as much as is left, and no more.

SOURCE: Nonpartisan Leader, 14 June 1917, pp. 5, 6, and 15.

APPENDIX D

ARTHUR TOWNLEY'S ADDRESS TO THE AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR DELIVERED IN BUFFALO, NEW YORK, NOVEMBER 16, 1917

I want to repeat just one thing that the gentleman who preceded me has said, and that is that the farmers of this country, especially of the Northwest, misunderstand the organized workers. They class the organized workers too largely as I. W. W's. and anarchists, and I want to submit that the farmers are not altogether to blame for that impression, because they have a great deal of help in arriving at that conclusion.

For a few minutes this morning I want to carry to you a message from the farmers, the workers in the fields of the Northwest. I represent directly some hundreds of thousands of farmers, and indirectly, I think I can speak for many millions of farmers in these United States. In a time like this when all the liberties that your forefathers and mine fought for and won are in jeopardy, when no man can tell just what the future may hold for us, it is very important that you, the workers in the cities, and we in the country should understand each other; it is very important that no third person, for selfish purposes, shall be permitted to lead you to believe that we are opposed to you and to lead us to believe that you are opposed to us.

And so it is necessary that we come in contact with each other, because there are at work in this nation tremendous forces whose very life depends upon keeping you workers in the cities fighting the workers on the farm. If you will permit me, I will tell you what we understand to be our rights and our duties as American citizens. In this country, a democracy, the farmers understand that the laws of the land are not made by any one man or group of men to rule us all our lifetime; we understand that the laws of this land are the will of the majority of the citizens, and we understand as our duty as American citizens that when a majority of the citizens of this country have spoken, when they have passed a law or have placed men in office to make laws, it is our duty as American citizens to obey those laws and to obey the men when the majority authorize to make them.

We admit that sometimes the law may not suit us; sometimes, usually never do the men in power suit all the people of the nation, but we believe that our first duty is to fulfill our first pledge, and that pledge in this country is that we obey, not the law of a king, a kaiser, or a czar, but that we obey the decision of a majority of our fellow citizens.

I want to tell you something about the condition of the farmer, especially of the West. I am sensible of the fact that the organized workers feel that the farmer is in some measure a capitalist; that the farmer in a large measure is robbing the workers in the city. I want to tell you that in the state of North Dakota because of two bad crops in succession it is going to take us up there ten years to make up what we have lost in the last two years. Our mortgages are continually increasing, the number of farms that are farmed by tenants are continually increasing. I can take you to vast stretches of territory in the Northwest and in the Southwest where the farmers are so thoroughly bankrupt that it is a physical impossibility for them to pay an eight dollar membership fee a year. There are whole groups of counties where they can not pay a membership fee because they never see any money.

This may be surprising to some of you, but it is nevertheless a fact. The average income of the average farm family in the United States is $318.22 a year; now I mean by that that the average farm family, after they have paid for their machinery, paid the interest, paid the threshing bill, paid all those expenses of producing the crop that they must pay, they have $318.22 out of which they may buy clothing, groceries, educate their children, buy automobiles, take a trip to Florida and furnish themselves with whiskey and tobacco. I wouldn't have you understand, however, that that $318.22 is used to pay for the milk and the butter and the potatoes and things raised on the farm. That is what they have left for the work of the family with which to buy those things that they can not produce upon the farm.

Since the war began you will find the farmers' wives and daughters and their children working in the field. I have spent many days in the last few weeks driving over the country and I find their schools closed and the mothers, brothers and sisters of those boys that have gone to war out in the field picking the corn, digging up the potatoes, gathering in the food to feed the world and its armies of liberty.

We are not satisfied with these conditions; we are not getting along very well; we want better conditions and we think we deserve them, because we believe that with the improved farm machinery we have to use we are producing many times more than it takes to support our families. Years ago we didn't have the machinery that we have now; then when we came to thresh the wheat we did it with a flail. We argue that at that time the farmers of this country were able to live, they got all they wanted to eat, clothing and shelter enough, and they did not work much longer than they work now; they didn't produce one-fiftieth part of what they produce now. The average North Dakota farmer in an average year will raise wheat enough to feed his family for fifty years, but two weeks after he raises his wheat he hasn't any more than any one else. We average in this country $27,000,000,000 worth of farm products per year, and of that amount it is estimated that farmers get $9,000,000,000 for producing them.

It is getting to be quite a problem for us to find out where these other $18,000,000,000 go to. When we begin to inquire why it is that we only get eight, ten or twelve cents a pound for pork out of the thirty-five or forty-five

cents that the consumer pays, the packers tell us that the reason we only get eight or ten cents is because the fellows who work in the packing plants are making so much money, that they can't do anything with them, and if they don't give it to them they will go on strike. When we inquire why it is that we got $4.00 last year for the wheat that makes a barrel of flour and that barrel sells to the consumer for $14.00 to $19.00 a barrel, the millers tell us it is because the mill workers are organized and they take all the money. And when they raised the freight rates on stuff we ship out and we complained about the raise, the railroads published the story in all of the papers that the railroad workers were on strike and they had to raise the rates to get money enough to pay them. When we want to know why it is that we have to pay $250.00 for a binder that we used to get for $115.00, the International Harvester company tells us that the fellows who make binders are living in high society and feeding poodle dogs and that they have to have the money. That's about the way the story goes.

I want to say that I am very glad this morning for the opportunity of meeting face to face, representatives of that group of workers in the United States who are getting our money. For a long time we have wanted to talk this matter over with you. Now, there are some of the farmers who actually believe you are getting the money, but there are a lot of them who are suspicious about it, and I want to take back the word of your own mouths to tell the farmers what you said about it. I want to know whether you delegates and those you represent, Mr. President, have got that money or not.

President Gompers (interposing): I will tell you on the quiet after awhile.

Mr. Townley (continuing): The boss doesn't want to confess to his part of it, but I want to say to you that you don't need to be a bit afraid to confess if you have been getting the money. As a matter of fact we hope you have got it, because if you have it we believe we can settle the problem fairly easy, and if some other fellows have it who we have a sneaking notion have got it we are going to have some trouble settling the problem.

The surplus of the farm belongs to the worker in the city and the surplus of the worker in the city belongs to the farmer. The farmers of this country are tremendously interested in the surplus you produce, and if you are as much interested as the farmers are it is only a matter of a few years until we can make a tremendous bargain here that will be very much to the benefit of all of us. We are going to make a trade, we are going to make a deal, and the farmers that produce in the fields of the United States and the workers that produce in the cities in the United States will get together and they will bring about better conditions, not only for the workers in the field and city, but for all the deserving people in all the land.

We farmers in these United States have been very much asleep, while you and your president for 30 years or more have been struggling to perfect an organization to protect yourselves industrially, but we are awakening because we are compelled to awake.

In the state of North Dakota we don't mine very much gold; we don't do much of anything except to raise wheat. North Dakota raises more wheat than any other state in the United States; a hundred million bushels of wheat is the

average wheat crop for the state. I want you to notice that in North Dakota the farmers raise the wheat, and that is all we have to do with it. After we raise it we turn it over to the Minneapolis milling interests to handle it for us. There is a great difference between raising and handling anything. Let me illustrate.

We elected a farmer-governor in North Dakota last year and he loaded his potatoes on a box car for 83 cents a bushel. During the winter he came to New York to talk about the high cost of living and he found potatoes selling for $5.50 a bushel. He came back with a glowing report to us on how to make money in the potato business, and he told us what we wanted to do was to go into the business of handling the potatoes and let somebody else raise them. Let me make that plainer to you still. When a farmer raises potatoes all he does is plow the ground, drag it and disc it, cut up the potatoes in seed, drop the potatoes in the furrow, cover them up, then cultivate and hoe them and fight the weeds and potato bugs; a little later on he pulls them out, loads the pile in a wagon, puts them in a pit or cellar, and then a little later on puts them on a box car and then somebody else begins to handle them. All he has been doing up to that time is to raise them. The other fellow makes more money handling one bushel than the farmer makes raising ten.

What is true of potatoes is true of wheat, and particularly of the wheat in North Dakota. Three years ago Professor Worst, of the Agricultural college, told us that if we would establish elevators and flour mills in North Dakota and handle our own wheat, sell the flour, bran and shorts and get what the people paid for it--if we would grind up our wheat into flour, bran and shorts, feed the bran and shorts to cattle and sell the flour to you at the price you are paying we would make $55,000,000 more out of our wheat crop. That would be about $1,200 for every farmer in North Dakota, and that is the surplus that gets away from us. We don't propose, however, to charge you as much for the flour if we ever get to the place where we can sell it as the other fellow charges you now. So we went about it to build in the state of North Dakota a farmers' organization for the purpose of establishing flour mills and elevators and handling our own wheat. We propose to do that through the operation of state-owned flour mills and elevators because our experience and investigation showed us that they would "cut the mustard," and we haven't been able to do it in any other way. We have been trying to establish them by co-operative stock sale operations, but for some reason or other the flour trust invariably puts our mills out of business.

We looked around to see what had been accomplished in the way of publicly owned institutions and on the west coast in the county where Seattle is located we found there a publicly owned warehouse and wharf, and we found them saving the farmers a tremendous amount of money. The privately owned wharfs and elevators were charging 50 cents a ton for wharfage and were paying labor 32 cents an hour. After the county put in a publicly owned elevator and wharf the publicly owned institution paid labor 50 cents an hour and charged 20 cents a ton for wharfage and paid expenses. It was not a policy of this publicly owned institution or the people there to charge the consumer all they had been paying before, but the purpose was to divide "fifty-fifty."

And so we set about building an organization; we got 40,000 farmers in the state of North Dakota into one organization. Democrats, Republicans, Socialists, Bull-Moosers and everything else, and at the first election the farmers and their friends in the state of North Dakota elected everything from governor down to dog-catcher; and I want to say to you in passing that we had the full co-operation of organized labor in the state of North Dakota and still have it. The farmers and organized workers out there stand shoulder to shoulder for the control of the state of North Dakota for the benefit of the workers in the cities and on the farms. The same thing is taking place in Minnesota, South Dakota and in Montana, where we are pretty fully organized.

Last year we raised a very poor grade of wheat; the elevator men and flour trust called it "feed D" wheat; they called it chicken feed. We have an experimental mill at the college in North Dakota where Professor Ladd has been grinding up this wheat to see whether it would make flour or not. He has ground up 75 samples of this poor grade of wheat and he finds that 60 pounds of this grade will make as much as 60 pounds of No. 1 Northern, except about two or three pounds. When we were selling that wheat the milling trust paid us about 60 cents a bushel. The price of flour was based upon No. 1 Northern at $1.75 or $1.80 a bushel plus a good round profit, and those who had to admit that they made flour out of this poor grade wheat said the flour wasn't any good, but we caught them at that, too. The professor not only grinds wheat into flour, but he bakes the flour into bread, and he tests it by every physical and chemical process known. Through scores of tests he showed that this made just as good bread as the flour made out of No. 1 Northern. After the millers had gobbled up all our poor wheat at 75 to 80 cents a bushel they came out with an advertisement to the consumers in which they themselves said that the flour made out of this poor "feed D" wheat made better bread. By that one transaction alone the milling trust made over $20,000,000 last year. They took that out of our pockets, they didn't give it to you, and they haven't given it back to us.

I notice another matter since I have arrived in this town, and I want to read you a resolution to show you what our friends in the city of Minneapolis are doing.

Here Mr. Townley read the following resolution adopted by the Minnesota State Federation of Labor.

WHEREAS, The Washburn-Crosby Consolidated and Pillsbury Flour Milling companies, three of the largest concerns in the milling industry, on Thursday, November 1, refused the request of the government of the United States to reinstate members of the Flour and Cereal Mill Workers Union No. 15469, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor who had been discharged by these companies for affiliating with the Union; be it

RESOLVED, That the American Federation of Labor request the Government of the United States to take over and operate the flour milling industry of the United States at the earliest possible moment in order that the milling autocracy which for years has exploited both the workers of the city and the country, may be terminated, and the business of manufacturing flour conducted for the benefit of all the people.

I call your attention to that resolution to show you the necessity on your part of protecting yourselves and fellow-workers from these same men who belong to an organization s[illegible]ght that you can't drive a spike into it any place you begin, men who are m[illegible]ng millions and millions of dollars.

Let me show you further the attitude of this organization. About two months ago our government in its program to lower prices to you workers in the cities so that you might be able to buy bread at a reasonable price fixed the price of our wheat at $2.20 a bushel in the basket, fixed it arbitrarily and we have been getting $2.20 minus what it costs to produce it. At that time we understood that the millers were to get 25 cents a barrel profit for manufacturing flour out of the wheat we were selling for less than $2.00 a bushel, and that the bakers were going to get ten, but since that date these milling concerns have been making more than $1.00 a barrel profit. At a profit of 25 cents a barrel running half the time these millers could pay more than 10 per cent dividends. But they took it arbitrarily, and then when your fellow workers undertook to organize to protect themselves and their families they discharged them, even when the government of these United States asked them to reinstate these men.

These millers, to hear them tell it, are very strong for liberty and democracy. They lose no opportunity when they are not busy getting that dollar a barrel or locking out workers who try to organize, to wrap the flag about their bodies and call themselves patriots. They lead the parade in spite of anything the farmers can do, and if you have been told that the farmer was not keeping step in the loy[illegible]ty parade in the state of Minnesota I want to tell you that it is because these millers are at the head of the parade and the farmers don't like to follow them. They are a little bit suspicious of liberty and democracy that has to come through the leadership of these gentlemen. They are not suspicious of the liberty and democracy that will come through the sacrifice and the work of the American people of these United States, but they don't know just where they are when these gentlemen here talk of liberty and democracy for all the world while they deny it to the fathers and mothers, the brothers and sisters of the boys who have gone across the water to fight for liberty and democracy.

In spite of the fact that the farmer does not keep step always in a parade headed in this way, I want to assure you that the farmers of the Northwest, especially of the state of North Dakota, in their loyalty to the people of this country and this nation are second to none. In our state, in spite of two bad crop years, the farmers over-subscribed the Liberty Loan more than was over-subscribed anywhere else in the United States. The farmers of the state of North Dakota--and it must have been the farmers, because nobody else lives there, the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce doesn't live in North Dakota--the farmers over-subscribed 73 per cent. In the city of New York, the next best, they over-subscribed it 72 per cent, and in the city of Minneapolis where these gentlemen live they only over-subscribed it 34 per cent.

We are here primarily for the purpose of bringing about unity of the workers in the field and the workers in the city. We are looking over the plains to you as an ally in our battle against those who are making it very difficult for us to live, and we invite your co-operation with us politically and industrially

to bring about better conditions and unify the forces of this country for the good of the country in time of peace and for the success of the country in time of war. If you will stand shoulder to shoulder with us in our battle to protect our families against those who are robbing us, we will stand shoulder to shoulder with you, and I pledge you further that if the 500,000 organized workers in the city of New York, the million and a quarter of organized workers in the State of New York and the organized workers over these United States will recognize the farmer in his struggle and aid him in his struggle, we will aid you in your struggle by recognizing the brand of goods made in your union shops until the day arrives when no man, either upon the farm or in the city, shall not be organized. I thank you.

SOURCE: Nonpartisan Leader, 10 December 1917, pp. 6, 7, and 17.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Aristotle. Rhetoric and Poetics. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. New York: The Modern Library, 1954.

Baird, A. Craig. Argumentation, Discussion, and Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1950.

Baldwin, Charles Sears. Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic. Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1959.

Brinton, J. W. Wheat and Politics. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Rand Tower, 1931.

Bruce, Andrew A. Non-Partisan League. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1921.

Burke, Kenneth. A Rhetoric of Motives. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius. Cicero. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Crawford, Lewis F. History of North Dakota. 3 vols. Chicago: The American Historical Society, Inc., 1931.

Folwell, William Watts. A History of Minnesota, 4 vols. St. Paul: The Minnesota Historical Society, 1969.

Fossum, Paul R. The Agrarian Movement in North Dakota. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1925.

Gaston, Herbert E. The Nonpartisan League. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Howe, 1920.

Goldberg, Ray. The Nonpartisan League in North Dakota, A Case Study of Political Action in America. Fargo: Midwest Printing and Lithographing Company, 1948.

McGovern, George, ed. Agricultural Thought in the Twentieth Century. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1967.

Morlan, Robert L. Political Prairie Fire. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1955.

Nelson, Bruce. Land of the Dacotahs. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1946.

Nye, Russel B. Midwestern Progressive Politics: A Historical Study of Its Origins and Development 1870-1950. East Lansing: Michigan State College Press, 1951.

Peterson, H. C., and Fite, Gilbert C. Opponents of War. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1957.

Robinson, Elwyn B. History of North Dakota. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Russell, Charles Edward. The Story of the Nonpartisan League. New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1920.

Saloutos, Theodore, and Hicks, John D. Agricultural Discontent in the Middle West 1900-1939. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1951.

Simons, Herbert W. Persuasion: Understanding, Practice, and Analysis. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1976.

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

Tweton, D. Jerome, and Jelliff, Theodore B. North Dakota: A Heritage of A People. Fargo: North Dakota Institute for Regional Studies, 1976.

Wilkins, Robert P., and Wilkins, Wynona Huchette. North Dakota. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1977; Nashville: American Association for State and Local History, 1977.

Periodicals

Currie, Barton W. "A Great Upheaval." Country Gentleman, April-May, 1917.

Davenport, Frederick M. "The Farmers Revolution in North Dakota." New Outlook, October 11, 1916, pp. 325-27.

Gillette, John M. "The North Dakota Harvest of the Nonpartisan League." The Survey, March 1, 1919, pp. 753-60.

Maslow, A. H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." Psychological Review 50 (May 1943): 370-96.

McKaig, Ray. "The Nonpartisan Champion." Public, May 17, 1917, pp. 518-20.

"Net Profits of American Industrial Corporations." LaFollette's Magazine, August 1917, p. 11.

Pickett, John E. "A Prairie Fire." Country Gentleman, May-June 1918.

Remele, Larry. "Political Charisma in North Dakota." The Onlooker, December 26, 1976, pp. 5-7.

Saloutos, Theodore. "The Rise of the Nonpartisan League in North Dakota 1917-1919." Agricultural History 20 (January 1946): 43-61.

Newspapers

Litchfield News Ledger, 10 October 1917.

Minneapolis Tribune, 24 March 1957; 8 February 1959.

Minot Daily, 9 November 1959.

Nonpartisan Leader, 14 June 1917; 21 June 1917; 4 October 1917; 18 October 1917; 1 November 1917; 10 December 1917; 16 December 1917; 15 June 1918.

Unpublisned Papers

Bahmer, Robert H. "Economic and Political Background of the Nonpartisan League." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1941.

Blackorby, E. C. "Political Factional Strife in North Dakota." M.S. thesis, University of North Dakota, 1938.

Brake, Robert John. "A Rhetorical Criticism of Selected World War One Speeches of Arthur C. Townley." M.A. thesis, State University of South Dakota, 1916.

Brewer, Philip Edwin. "The Nonpartisan League in North Dakota." M.A. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1933.

Christian, Richard. "Personal Reflections on the Non-Partisan League." Undergraduate history paper, Minot State College, 1975.

Dovre, Paul John. "A Study of Nonpartisan League Persuasion, 1915-1920." Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University, 1963.

Fischer, Raymond Louis. "The Rhetorical Principles of Robert Green Ingersoll." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1968.

Gardner, Greg H. "Invention in the 'One World' Addresses of Wendell Lewis Willkie." Ph.D. dissertation, Bowling Green State University, 1972.

Hofland, Carl J. "The Nonpartisan League in South Dakota." M.A. thesis, University of South Dakota, 1940.

Manuscript Collections

Bismarck, North Dakota. North Dakota State Historical Society. Thorwald Mostad Papers.

Bismarck, North Dakota. North Dakota State Historical Society. Theodore Nelson Papers.

Grand Forks, North Dakota. University of North Dakota. William Lemke Papers.

Grand Forks, North Dakota. University of North Dakota. Nonpartisan League Papers. St. Paul, Minnesota: Dakota Microfilm Services, Inc., 1969.

St. Paul, Minnesota. Minnesota State Historical Society. Vincent Alpheus Day Papers.

St. Paul, Minnesota. Minnesota State Historical Society. William Watts Folwell Papers.

St. Paul, Minnesota. Minnesota State Historical Society. Joseph Gilbert Papers.

St. Paul, Minnesota. Minnesota State Historical Society. Arthur LeSueur Papers.

St. Paul, Minnesota. Minnesota State Historical Society. Otto Monroe Thomason Papers.

Interviews

Davies, Ronald N. North Dakota State Historical Society, Bismarck, North Dakota. Recorded interview with Robert L. Carlson, 7 November 1974.

Hennagir, Ruthie. Bertha, Minnesota. Written interview, 10 August 1978.

Martison, Henry. North Dakota State Historical Society, Bismarck, North Dakota. Recorded interview with Robert L. Carlson, 7 October 1974.

O'Toole, Mrs. T. E. Crystal, North Dakota. Interview, 15 March 1978.

Townley, Arthur C. Minnesota State Historical Society, St. Paul, Minnesota. Interview by Lucile Kane and Russell Fridley, 11 December 1956.

Public Documents

Alexandria, Minnesota. Alexandria High School Records (1900).

Minnesota. State Population Census Schedules. Traverse County Census, 1885: Population, vol. 536. St. Paul, Minnesota: State Archives and Records Service, 1600 Mississippi Ave., 1966.