

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Jonathan Michael Smith for the degree of Master of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies in Speech Communication, Speech Communication, and Political Science presented July 29, 2011.

Title: Building Character Through Metaphor and Ideology: A Rhetorical Examination of John F. Kennedy's Use of Metaphor to Combat the Religious Issue in 1960

Abstract Approved: _____
Robert S. Iltis

On September 12th 1960, just two months prior to one of the closest Presidential elections in American history, John F. Kennedy faced the Houston Ministerial Association and delivered a powerful speech on religion and Americanism. The “religious issue” of the 1960 campaign drew immense interest and trumped other issues pertinent to the campaign. The speech came on the heels of the dissemination of abundant anti-Catholic literature throughout the United States, as well as statements by two prominent religious groups attacking Kennedy’s candidacy directly. Kennedy’s speech helped to alter views of him as an outsider with alien beliefs, to a true American seeking to lead from a position based on Constitutional principles and traditional Americanism. This thesis analyzes the rhetorical strategies used by Kennedy to alter perceptions of his character. Employing an interdisciplinary approach that concerns rhetorical strategies in political discourse, this thesis utilizes Edwin Black’s conception of metaphor and ideology in conjunction with Kenneth Burke’s theory of substance. The analysis

shows that Kennedy's use of metaphor expressed a familial-based ideology that helped him to identify with audience members and overcome negative perceptions. The findings of this study suggest that the use of metaphor and ideology have powerful implications for building and expressing good character.

©Copyright by Jonathan Michael Smith

July 29, 2011

All Rights Reserved

Building Character Through Metaphor and Ideology: A Rhetorical Examination of
JFK's Use of Metaphor to Combat the Religious Issue in 1960

by
Jonathan Michael Smith

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies

Presented July 29, 2011
Commencement June 2012

Masters of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies thesis of Jonathan Michael Smith
presented on July 29, 2011.

APPROVED:

Major Professor representing Speech Communication

Director of Interdisciplinary Studies Program

Dean of the Graduate School

I understand that my thesis will become part of the permanent collection of Oregon State University libraries. My signature below authorizes release of my thesis to any reader upon request.

Jonathan Michael Smith, Author

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1 – Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 – Literature Review.....	8
Chapter 3 – Methodology.....	25
Metaphor and Persuasion.....	25
Ethos and Speaker Character.....	27
Metaphor and Its Relation to Ethos.....	32
Burke’s Theory of Substance.....	34
Burke’s Pentad.....	38
Black’s Theory of Ideology.....	40
Chapter 4 – Context.....	43
Chapter 5 – Analysis.....	68
Chapter 6 – Interpretations and Conclusions.....	94
Bibliography.....	114
Appendix.....	119
John F. Kennedy “Address to the Houston Ministerial Association”	119

Building Character Through Metaphor and Ideology: A Rhetorical Examination of JFK's Use of Metaphor to Combat the Religious Issue in 1960

Introduction

The 1960s have come to be recognized as a time of change and acceptance across a diverse landscape of cultural and historical issues. Long-standing barriers of traditional Americanism were breached and broken during this pivotal time. The 1960 election between John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon would produce a winner slated to lead America through the beginning of a historic transformation process. The drama created by the context prefaced what would become “one of the closest elections on record” (Carlson 1). Kennedy received 49.7 percent of the vote while Nixon received 49.6 percent (Warnick 183). Out of 68 million votes, Kennedy won by the slim margin of 113,000 votes (Carlson 1).

In the midst of the time period's cultural controversy, there was one issue in particular that overshadowed the rest: Religion. Barbra Warnick writes that many of the issues, including “civil rights, nuclear proliferation, and education, weighed heavily on the voters' minds” (183). However, as election day approached, every voter understood the significance of the religious issue, because “Kennedy was a Catholic and no Catholic had ever been elected President of the United States” (183). Kennedy was relentlessly scrutinized by Protestants and other groups unsure about the implications of his Catholic beliefs. The issue was so important that the manner in which Kennedy dealt with the issue undoubtedly contributed to his eventual

victory. Hugu Brogan states: "Historians debate the matter now, as journalists and political scientists did then; but it seems likeliest that his religion almost cost Kennedy his election" (47). The religious issue commanded respect because Kennedy's candidacy represented a bold and necessary challenge to one of the oldest, most powerful and least tolerable of American prejudices" (Brogan 47).

Kennedy's candidacy led to a resurgence in skepticism toward Catholic American political figures. Harold Barrett discusses that many Americans actively view Catholicism as a European institution. The European influence within Catholicism includes perceptions of "anti-democratic and anti-American" behavior, which transcends the "spiritual realm" and enters the "temporal and political" (Barrett 259). Kennedy's campaign initially made concerns regarding religious freedom an afterthought as many feared for the future of democracy under the leadership of a candidate who may or may not have ulterior allegiances.

Not since Al Smith's 1928 bid for the presidency had so much attention been given toward the religious beliefs of a major political figure. Michael O'Brien states: "John Kennedy's nomination rekindled anti-Catholic agitation" (473). The most pervasive fear among skeptics was Kennedy's potential allegiance to the Pope. Many felt that Kennedy would be under pressure to provide the Vatican with representation (O'Brien 474). O'Brien quotes the "National Council of Citizens for Religious Freedom" who claimed, "Kennedy's religion was 'one of the most significant issues' of the 1960 campaign because, no matter what the senator claimed, 'his church insists that he is duty-bound to submit to its direction'" (474).

The issue became trendy among news organizations and political analysts. While ultimately it would prove to be a non-factor in Kennedy's presidency, the religious issue was a dominant topic that overshadowed interest in some of the more contemporary topics of the time. Even Kennedy's opponent felt its presence and actively avoided it. As Hermann Stelzner states: "Both Kennedy and Nixon felt [the religious issue's] presence; both sought to avoid exacerbating it. Kennedy often said that the emphasis placed on his Catholicism prevented him from doing justice to far more compelling issues" (224).

Kennedy was forced to comment on his religion frequently but many of his responses seemed to fall on deaf ears. He consistently provided the same responses, which shaped his position without displaying his agitation. Steven Goldzwig and George Dionisopoulos note this point: "He knew he could not afford to be defensive, angry, impatient or silent, no matter how many times he heard the same insulting, foolish or discriminatory questions" (23). While his frustration was not publically evident, Kennedy was unhappy with the amount of pressure on him to constantly address the issue. He characterized the negative conception toward Catholic politicians by stating that Catholics were viewed as "pawns on the political chessboard, moved hither and yon" (Sorensen "Kennedy" 108). He was also adverse to the common conception that "the top spot had been permanently closed to all Catholics by the overwhelming defeat of Catholic Al Smith in 1928" (Sorensen "Kennedy" 109).

The Kennedy camp formulated many of its campaign strategies with consideration for the religious controversy: “Kennedy’s staff considered his Catholicism to be the biggest obstacle in his quest for the presidency, and concern for it dictated strategy for a great many campaign decisions” (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 21-22). Kennedy attempted to put the issue to rest on multiple occasions, but a successful breakthrough was not achieved until his invitation to speak in front of a group of Houston ministers. Kennedy’s “Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association” took place on September 12th at the Rice Hotel in Houston, Texas (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 27). Kennedy faced a crowd of 300 ministers and 300 spectators “in the pink-and-green-carpeted ball-room of the Rice Hotel” (White 260). In tune with the preparation process of many of Kennedy’s speaking performances, Kennedy and his team of speechwriters collectively composed the speech to the Houston ministers. Ted Sorensen, widely believed to be Kennedy’s chief speechwriter, said the speech was composed while the Kennedy camp traveled through Los Angeles and El Paso. The “chief source of material” Sorensen used was based on Kennedy’s previous extemporaneous statements regarding religion. Sorensen says that Kennedy wanted to explicitly identify himself with the constitutional definition of church-state relations: “The senator’s desire was to state his position so clearly and comprehensively that no reasonable man could doubt his adherence to the Constitution” (190). Sorensen called and read the speech to Jesuit theologian “Rev. John Courtney Murray, S.J., a leading and liberal exponent of the Catholic position on church and state” (Sorensen “Kennedy” 190),

James Wine, and former Commonweal editor John Cogley. The draft speech was universally approved (Massa 14). It is probably safe to say that those involved in the composition process could not have gauged the persuasive success or historically impact the speech would come to have. Less than 2 months later, on the heels of his almost universally praised performance before the ministers, Kennedy would be named the victor of the November 8th election and become the 35th president of the United States.

The speech has been widely regarded as the greatest speech on American religious acceptance and church-state separation in the history of American politics. Kennedy defined the current church-state relationship in a time of quickly changing and evolving social and cultural issues. Kennedy diverted attention away from his religious beliefs and demonstrated that religious discrimination was no different than intolerance toward race, gender, and class. Whereas prior to the speech, many felt that some semblance of skepticism was warranted. After the speech, those still opposed to a Catholic president were seen as bigots and extremists.

Kennedy's speech marked a moment of crisis aversion. The religious issue threatened to single-handedly mar Kennedy's attempt at the Presidency. Every crisis involves surprise, threat, and a short response time (Ulmer, Sellnow, Seeger 6). While resistance toward a Catholic was not shocking, the situation became a crisis when well known religious groups (Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State [P.O.A.U.]), and the National Conference of Citizens for Religious Freedom (the Peale group) released documents in the *New*

York Times blatantly expressing their opposition to Kennedy because of his religion. The documents threatened to influence voters and severely affect Kennedy's Presidential chances. Kennedy was compelled to respond and did so promptly with his speech to the Houston ministerial association.

Kennedy's speech was a form of crisis communication meant to minimize the damage to his image intended by the statements released by the P.O.A.U. and the Peale group. Kennedy used the speech as a form of crisis management to "remove some of the risk and uncertainty" (Fearn-Banks 9) enacted by the religious groups' statements. The speech responded to the accusations against Kennedy and allowed him to take control of negative impact brought by the issue.

In his speech, Kennedy confronted the crisis by testing the degree to which church and state separation really existed. He asserted that despite his religion, he was still an adequate and acceptable candidate for the presidency. Kennedy's speech and subsequent election as president defined the current church-state relationship, his election was "a reaffirmation and, as with the best reaffirmations, a freshening, and an enlarging and extending of the meaning of (the church-state) relationship" (Stelzner 233).

The cultural and historical significance of Kennedy's September 12th speech render it a rhetorical artifact worthy of study. The speech pitted Kennedy before a hostile and uninviting audience of individuals who were predominantly adverse to the idea of a Catholic president. Likely one of the most pressing challenges for

Kennedy was establishing credibility so that his audience would be open to consider the reasonable presentation of his views.

Literature Review

Given the significance of the speech, critics have written at length about Kennedy's success as a speaker, and the rhetorical implications of the occasion. Ultimately the speech had an important impact on religious freedom in the United States. Although there has been abundant critical comment about the speech, a review of that literature shows that there is still work to be done.

Critics agree that Kennedy's speech advanced an important, lasting position on the relationship between church and state in American politics, and that position had a profound and positive impact on the Kennedy campaign. Harold Barrett believes that the speech marked the moment in which Kennedy was able to establish himself, not as a Catholic American, but as a true American. This statement of identity made the speech an enormous success (Barrett 260). Other authors agree regarding the speech's success calling the speech "the finest moment of the campaign" (Brogan 47) and "among his best and finest moments in public" (Silvestri 121). Brogan extends that conclusion to its impact on American history: Kennedy "performed with dignity and courtesy, and his speech was perhaps the most effective statement of the case for religious freedom and equality ever made by an American politician" (47). Along a similar vein of reasoning, Lawrence H Fuchs comments on the change the speech had regarding church and state in the United States: "[N]o President has ever made as important a speech on church-state matters' as did Kennedy in Houston" (qtd. In Stelzner 223). Sorensen and Silvestri note that not only was the speech important with regard to church and state, but it

had a sense of finality to it that had not been previously achieved: “What he said at Houston...on the complete and rational separation of church and state—as applied to all religious groups—is an important part of the Kennedy legacy (“Kennedy Legacy” 67). Although the speech did not contain new arguments regarding the issue, it represented Kennedy’s “most concise and complete statement of his position” (Silvestri 121).

The reward associated with Kennedy’s speech did not go without the potential for detrimental failure. Barbra Warnick says of the speech: “The stakes were high” (184). The implications of Kennedy’s performance went far beyond just a successful or unsuccessful stop on the campaign trail. Silvestri notes that Kennedy’s decision to accept the invitation was a risky one. Nixon had turned down the ministers when the invitation was extended his way, and “Kennedy could have made an unrecoverable error and could have jeopardized his entire election” (Silvestri 119).

Excluding contemporary incessant critics and extreme skeptics, in large part, the speech provided the answer that many were waiting for. Kennedy was finally able to feel as if he had gained an upper hand in the issue. Not only was he able to respond successfully to his skeptics, but he used the opportunity to fight back and instill a sense of shame and anti-Americanism in those who still opposed a Catholic candidate.

What made this particular speech so significant? A series of rhetorical and theological essays have been written in an attempt to answer this question. A common theme among much of what has been written suggests that Kennedy's speech is historically important for two reasons. First, he used a variety of rhetorical strategies to remove doubt regarding the impact of his beliefs on the presidency; and second, he defined the nature of the current church-state relationship and helped to reshape religion's connection to Americanism.

The majority of arguments made about the speech consent that it was a persuasive success. Warnick has observed this point as well: "Critics and observers of the Houston speech concur about its rhetorical effectiveness" (184) Some authors focus solely on the speech's clear persuasive impact, while others analyze the speech in search of specific reasoning. Ted Sorensen, Kennedy's speechwriter and personal advisor, writes that the speech did not silence extreme skeptics or completely end the religious controversy; however, "it was widely and enthusiastically applauded, not only in the Rice Hotel Ballroom but all across Texas and the nation" ("Kennedy" 193). The speech symbolized a single document containing "the answers to all questions any reasonable man could ask" and helped to exploit individuals who unreasonably condemned Kennedy for his religious beliefs (Sorensen "Kennedy" 193). The speech made converts to Kennedy's candidacy and made a future "full-scale answer" to the religious question unnecessary. Sam Rayburn enthusiastically comments about the speech's success: "As we say in my part of Texas...he ate 'em blood raw" (qtd. In Sorensen "Kennedy"

192-193). James Golden calls Kennedy's speech at Houston, "Kennedy's most persuasive presidential campaign speech" (351). Kennedy had repeatedly discussed that "he was not 'the Catholic candidate for president,'" that church and state separation was clearly outlined in the constitution, and that there were many other more pressing issues that deserved his time and attention (Golden 351). Golden states: "Such allusions later constituted a major portion of the celebrated Houston address (351). Michael O'Brien calls the speech "one of Kennedy's most dramatic campaign appearances" (474) and notes that Kennedy's advisors were nervous about the occasion but underestimated his ability to successfully answer questions about his religion (O'Brien 475). Hugh Brogan writes that the speech was crucial to Kennedy's presidential victory and important to the "perpetual struggle to get traditional America to accept modernity" (48). Kennedy represented all non-Protestant citizens and "asserted his right" in an "eloquent, intelligent and convincing way" (Brogan 48). Brogan believes that the true persuasive victory was in Kennedy's ability to give "heart to Catholics, Jews, unbelievers and liberals," who previously felt that only a Protestant candidate could be successful (48).

What about the speech could have spurred such clear consent for the speech's success? Most prominently, authors have written of the eloquence of Kennedy's speaking style, the rhetorical strategies Kennedy used, and the speech's ability to transform the American conception of church-state relations.

Regardless of the occasion, eloquence is often instrumental to the persuasive success of a speech. Kennedy has often been recognized for his persuasion as a

speaker. Following his presidency he would come to be recognized historically for his talent and eloquence as a speaker. Kennedy is held in a place of “eminence among twentieth-century political orators. Today his speeches appear in numerous texts and resource books as models of persuasive discourse and vivid style” (Golden 348). Kennedy’s speech to the Houston ministers was a demonstration of why he gained such a historical reputation. Silvestri believes that Kennedy’s speech marked the pinnacle moment of Kennedy’s struggle with the religious issue calling it “the most eloquent statement he had delivered on the religion issue” (121). Henry agrees and quotes a series of authors regarding the eloquence of the Houston speech. He states: “Kennedy’s speech has been variously termed his ‘most persuasive campaign speech,’ the ‘centerpiece of the session,’ and ‘a firm, honest, eloquent, and probably even decisive address’” (Henry 163). Some have extended their opinion of the speech’s eloquence beyond just his ability to overcome the religious issue in the campaign. Kathleen Jamieson calls the speech “the most eloquent speech [Kennedy] made either as a candidate or President” (qtd. in Warnick 184). O’Brien states that the speech was the most “powerful and eloquent” of the 1960 campaign, and the persuasive effect was palpable: “When Kennedy began, the audience seemed sullen, almost hostile. But as he spoke, the ministers warmed up, and some applauded” (478). Both O’Brien and Sorensen feel the speech rests among the best of Kennedy’s life, calling it “one of the most important in his political career” (478), and “the best speech of his campaign and one of the most important in his life” (190) respectively.

Sorensen believes the only speech to outshine its “power and eloquence” was Kennedy’s Inaugural Address (190).

Comments regarding Kennedy’s eloquence give a fairly superficial picture of the nature and structure of his speaking style. An in-depth examination of Kennedy’s style renders enhanced perspective regarding the implications of the rhetorical tools used by Kennedy during the speech to the Houston ministers. At the time of the speech, Kennedy was still in the midst of what would be seen as a period of important progression toward the pinnacle of his effectiveness as a speaker. Kennedy was not always known as a phenomenal speaker, but he was consistently praised for his ability to rise to great occasions and deliver influential, well-received speeches. And as his success continued with each speech, his confidence increased (Sorensen “Kennedy Legacy” 163).

Kennedy’s initial speaking performances as an aspiring politician were less than impressive. Silvestri writes that Kennedy’s first speaking efforts were described as “unsophisticated,” and some said that he was “shy” and “unassuming” and “not an orator or speaker” (4). In 1945, after his war tenure, Kennedy, as a fresh face in the political sphere, was “the antithesis of the oratorical, hail-fellow-well-met Boston politician typical of the mid-nineteen-forties” (Silvestri 3). However, Kennedy was adaptive and a fairly quick learner. Soon after his rough start, Kennedy learned develop his skills. He experience success with audiences because of his “informality on the platform, and his ability to talk directly to them” (Silvestri 23). His style and personality were engaging and he was especially popular among

women (Silvestri 23-24). However, Kennedy was still making great strides as a speaker throughout the 1960s campaign and the beginning of his presidency. Powell writes that when Kennedy began his 1960 campaign, “his voice was taut and tense, his delivery rapid and rushed,” and he was unsure of how to present himself as a presidential candidate (59). But his style and comfort improved as his campaign progressed, “his oratory became less frenetic, and even spiced now and then with humor and a sense of kinship with his audiences” (Powell 67).

Many authors have addressed Kennedy’s delivery style and concur that it was unique and fairly unorthodox. Sorensen notes that Kennedy had a clean manner to his delivery: “He Spoke crisply, earnestly, with his chin thrust upward and forward” (“Kennedy” 180). His speed was significantly faster than other prominent politicians of the day. At times, audience members would not have time to respond or react to what Kennedy had said as he would move from topic to topic rapidly. He spoke at about “240 words per minute, approximately 100 words a minute faster than normal speaking rates” (Powell 60), which some found to be a hindrance, while others thought it to be an advantage (Powell 61). According to White, one of Kennedy’s struggles as a speaker was find how to appropriately incorporate the ease with which he addressed others in smaller, intimate speaking situations to influence his style among the masses: “Kennedy, who speaks from the platform in a high, resonant, almost melancholy tone of voice, is, in private, one of the more gifted conversationalists of politics, second only to Hubert Humphrey in the ease, simplicity and color with which he talks” (54).

Kennedy's speaking style was clearly influenced by Ted Sorensen and changed noticeably when Sorensen joined his staff (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 12). Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos believe the goal of any Kennedy speech was primarily "audience comprehension and comfort" (11). To demonstrate how Kennedy was able to accomplish this, they provide a detailed analysis of the fundamental elements of Kennedy's speaking style. They write that Kennedy speeches were stylistically structured in the following way: "(1) short speeches, short clauses and short words wherever possible; (2) a series of points or positions in numbered or logical sequence, wherever appropriate; and (3) the construction of sentences, phrases and paragraphs in such a manner as to simplify, clarify and emphasize" (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 11). He was known to use "alliteration," "parallel construction and contrasts," and his speeches lacked "generalities and sentimentalities" (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 11). His speeches were often marked by his abundant use of "historical analogies, literary references, and quotations," and were designed to convey the persona of a "well-read, eloquently literate man of reason, possessing the detached sagacity of the seasoned historian—basing his calculations on the 'facts' contained in the relevant historical lesson" (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 12). Golden agrees and notes that Kennedy was regarded as well read in terms of historical perspective, which helped him immensely when extemporaneous speaking situations presented themselves. Golden cites Benjamin Bradlee, Managing Editor of the *Washington Post* and one of Kennedy's most intimate friends, who observed: 'He studied and remembered great orators—from

Burke to Churchill—backward and forward” (Golden 350). The intellectual nature of Kennedy’s speeches was often supplemented with humor as to provide a relaxed sense of confidence: “intellectual tone and sense of humor...became hallmarks of the Kennedy persona” (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 11). Sorensen notes this point as well stating: “A combination of humor and candor reflected his deep sense of confidence” (“Kennedy Legacy” 163). Ultimately it became Kennedy’s respect for the power of “the word” and its ability to engage and influence audiences that drove the construction of his speeches. Sorensen would later state that he and Kennedy were unaware of the stylistic devices that critiques attributed to Kennedy’s style: “They were really the by-products of an audience-centered approach mandating that the ‘test of a text was not how it appeared to the eye but how it sounded to the ear” (qtd. In Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 11).

Kennedy’s approach and the style for which he’s been known are present in his speech to the Houston ministers. And while the eloquent and distinctively stylistic nature of the speech seems clear, the majority of authors who have deemed it as such do not provide much support for their reasoning. However, a handful of authors have analyzed the speech in order to determine what rhetorical strategies were active in the speech’s composition and presentation. Rhetorical critic Barbra Warnick, in her 1996 essay focusing on argumentative schemes, writes that Kennedy used a host of various argumentative schemes in his speech to accomplish a variety of premeditated tasks. Kennedy used division, inclusion, the rule of justice, and reciprocity (183), as a means to identify with listeners and “respond to his

opponents, suppress the principles that worked against him, replace these with a new set of overarching principles based on reciprocal treatment, (and) distance himself from the church hierarchy” (Warnick 185). Warnick believes the series of schemes used played on the audience’s concept of human nature regarding “thought, values and predispositions” (185). The connection created by Kennedy’s use of rhetorical tools caused the audience to persuade itself of Kennedy’s merit and reshaped the common view of Kennedy as a candidate (Warnick 185). Similar to Warnick, David Henry, in his 1988 essay, focuses on the rhetorical nature of the speech. However, to preface his argument, Henry provides a detailed account of important events that contributed to the context of the situation. Agreeing with James MacGregor Burns, Henry notes that a proper understanding of the speech requires consideration for the nature of the context and a “thorough reconstruction of the rhetorical situation” (154). Henry writes that without the consideration for the context, a true appreciation for the speech cannot be reached: “the issue ultimately became not his Catholicism, but the place of religious tolerance, fairness, and charity in American society” (169). Ultimately, Henry feels that Kennedy’s performance served to “illuminate his skill in converting a hostile atmosphere rife with potential liabilities to an asset for the remainder of the campaign” (Henry 163).

Both Henry and Warnick focus on the way that Kennedy’s speech redirects blame. Kennedy, they argue, focuses on religious freedom as a means to exploit the unfair discrimination levied against him. Prior to the speech, the majority of the issue’s focus concerned the implications of a Catholic president. Kennedy used the

speech to target the intolerance of those skeptical of his religion. Henry believes that Kennedy, who was often viewed as a victim of bigotry during the campaign, uses victimization as an opportunity to strike back against his attackers. Kennedy's speech addresses that the constitutional definition of church-state separation goes against the Protestant prejudice being levied against him. Henry argues that, on one hand, the speech fulfills the criteria for *apologia*: "Kennedy's performance at Houston may have been stimulated by a desire to purify the negative image produced by the attacks against him in the campaign" (154). While on the other hand, "it may be argued with equal force that Kennedy was on the offensive at Houston, that he used an ostensibly defensive communication setting to question the tolerance and integrity of his inquisitors" (Henry 154). Henry calls Kennedy's speech "a brilliant merging of accusatory and apologetic tactics" (154). Kennedy redefined the nature of the issue from one focused on "the Catholic church's dictatorial nature to one of religious tolerance and reasoned decision making" (Henry 154). Warnick agrees that the speech demonstrated the unfairness regarding the negative attention Kennedy was receiving for his religion. She states:

If Kennedy were constantly questioned on his views on church state separation, why was Nixon, a Quaker, not questioned on military policy? And, if all Americans were guaranteed religious freedom by the Constitution, why shouldn't Kennedy, as an American President, not be free to practice his own religion?" (Warnick 185)

Dean A. Kemper's 1968 doctoral dissertation reinforces Henry and Warnick's arguments. Kemper argues that Kennedy's speech, which applied "the guarantees of tolerance and freedom of the secular realm (the Constitution and Bill of Rights) to

his religion,” forced critics to stop their indictments (198). Kemper writes that those continuing to express their skepticism “would have to attack the long-established American tradition of religious freedom as well as the Roman Catholic Church” (198). Kennedy defended his religious preference by conveying that the jeopardy of his religious freedom applied to all Americans. In order to oppose Kennedy because of his religion, one would have to attack a position that he or she actively supported. Kemper states: “The Senator’s encounter with the Houston clergy amply demonstrated the wisdom of his position” (198).

Hermann G. Stelzner’s critique of the speech focuses on the nature and structure of the speech as a whole. Rather than focusing on specific rhetorical tools evident in the speech, Stelzner likens the style of the speech to a Protestant sermon (227). Stelzner argues that Kennedy’s form constituted a “rhetorical act that helped to shape and give meaning to future church-state relations” (224). Stelzner believes the speech to be powerful in Kennedy’s quest for the presidency. But more importantly, the speech marks the end of a historical evolution regarding the status of church-state relations. Negotiations between church and state “had been set in motion historically by the making of a new nation and partially worked out between 1620 and 1960, from the Puritans at Plymouth to the confrontation at Houston” (Stelzner 224). While it is not a perfect fit, Stelzner suggests that the structure and tone of the speech demonstrate Kennedy’s attempt to match the Protestant form. Warnick reinforces this interpretation of Stelzner’s essay writing that it “likened the speech to an election day sermon. Its sermonic form—articulation of doctrine

followed by application to immediate events and circumstances—would appeal to Kennedy’s immediate audience of preachers and ministers” (184). Stelzner believes that by structuring the speech as a Protestant sermon, Kennedy was able connect and identify with his immediate audience. Along a similar line of reasoning, Albert Mendez focuses on the unifying aspect of the speech. The speech marked a moment for which individuals representing all areas of religious preference could empathize. It created a sense of unity across the American religious community and Kennedy demonstrated the power and importance of individual religious preference. Mendez states: “(Kennedy) reminded the listeners that prejudice against one faith should be construed as prejudice against all” (37). Kennedy’s intent to unify is evidenced by his reference to American soldiers who are not labeled according to their religion, but have died on the battlefield simply as Americans. Kennedy makes an emotionally driven argument that plays on the “fair-minded” quest for freedom that many Americans identify with (Mendez 37).

Many historians and critics argue that Kennedy’s focus on the church-state relationship helped to reshape the commonly held conception of Americanism. Religion, along with many other cultural freedoms, has an impact on citizen’s conception of Americanism. In the judgment of the observers, Kennedy’s speech is important in part for the way that it transformed the conception of religion within Americanism. Harold Barrett, in his 1964 assessment of the speech, argues that Catholicism and Americanism are not mutually exclusive. Barrett argues that the speech was a plea for fair play, and calls Kennedy’s argumentative structure “a

symmetrical catalog of ideals results, and catalog at once logical and emotionally appealing in its balance and almost subliminally projecting equality and justice” (261). Kennedy responded to charges against him, and presented himself as a true American, worthy of equal treatment. Barrett asserts that Kennedy fought to persuade his audience of their responsibility to actively defend Americanism, and the religious freedom afforded by the constitution (Barrett 261). Commenting on Barrett’s conclusions, Warnick stresses his point that the speech was “a mechanism of image transformation”(185). Kennedy “drew himself inside the circle of American citizenship” by “emphasizing American ideology and values such as honesty, fair play, and loyalty (Warnick 185). Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos argue that Kennedy’s speech seeks to demonstrate how skepticism toward Kennedy’s religious beliefs is unconstitutional and goes against the “American tradition” (31). They write that Kennedy created a situation where he was barred by the audience from discussing the elections real issues “and he maintained he would not discuss his religious beliefs because, like most Americans, he considered them a private matter.” (Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos 29). Mark Massa’s 1997 theologically based essay focuses on the speech’s impact on Religious freedom in the United States. Massa discusses that some have recognized Kennedy’s presidential victory in light of the speech “as the moment when the twentieth century came ‘into its own’ in American public life: as the first president born after 1900” (3). Kennedy represented the “perfect icon for a generation that had left behind the ‘bogey’ of the nineteenth century-ethnic, racial, and religious prejudices among them” (Massa 3). Massa

believes that Kennedy's speech marked a key moment in the "coming of age" of American Catholicism. Kennedy demonstrated a "stark new vision of an exceedingly high and solid wall of separation between church and state" (Massa 4). Massa's argues that the "secularity" expressed by Kennedy's speech was monumental with regard to the church-state relationship. The speech made many individuals confront the falsehood of true church-state separation. The speech encouraged "near-total privatization of religious belief" and caused individuals representing a variety of religious preferences to consider the future of religious freedom and the speech's "remarkable atheistic implications for public life and discourse" (Massa 16).

Although there has been commentary about the speech, there is still room for analysis. For instance, Kennedy structures the speech with a series of metaphors, and very little has been said about the metaphoric nature of the speech. Only Warnick and Stelzner comment on the speech's metaphoric language. Warnick believes that Kennedy uses a series of nine "symbolic liaisons" in the speech to "increase the salience of tensions caused by religious bigotry" (191), while Stelzner likens the metaphors "I believe in an America" and "I believe in a president" in Kennedy's speech to the "Nicene Creed," and suggests that listeners familiar with the Creed "would find suggestive similarities in Kennedy's doctrine. Viewed this way, Kennedy's statements are congenial to and congruent with the larger value system of the immediate audience" (229). The observations posed by Warnick and Stelzner are brief and underdeveloped, and a comprehensive metaphoric analysis

would render a more fruitful understanding for the speech's use of metaphor, and its affect on Kennedy's persuasion.

Metaphor is not the only area of study that has gone neglected. Kennedy's ethos with regard to the speech has received little apparent critical attention. For instance, while Barrett focuses on how the argument bridged Catholicism and Americanism, his focus is on journalistic reactions to the speech and not on a detailed analysis of how the argument and the style constituted ethical appeal. Henry gives a detailed historical account of the speech and also focuses on the bridge between Catholicism and Americanism but does not target Kennedy's character. Some authors clearly suggest that Kennedy's ethos was instrumental in his success but do not discuss his ethos as proof or as a factor in his style. Warnick concludes that Kennedy sought to "place himself in the same category as his listeners" and "reshape the public's view of him" (185), but her essay is most prominently focused on specific rhetorical strategies used in the speech. Similarly, Stelzner's essay hints at ethical appeal as his interpretation likens the speech to a Protestant sermon meant to create identification. He observes that Kennedy employed this strategy in order to gain goodwill among his audience members. However, Stelzner, as with Warnick, fails to focus specifically on speaker character. Numerous authors have called the audience and atmosphere of the situation "hostile," including Sorensen: "A sense of tension and hostility hung in the air" (190), and *Time* magazine: "it was plainly hostile ground" (21). It seems negligent that emphasis would not be placed on Kennedy's struggle to establish ethos in the face of

a hostile audience. As Aristotle famously remarks: The “character” or ethos of a speaker “may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion (an individual) possesses” (Aristotle 25). Kennedy accepted the invitation and gave the speech before the Houston ministers because his character as a potential Catholic president was in question.

A review of the literature regarding Kennedy’s speech to the Houston ministers has demonstrated that, while much has been said, continued examination is warranted. This research explores the following question: “How did Kennedy use metaphor as a rhetorical strategy in order aid the construction of his ethos, and successfully persuade a hostile audience of his American allegiance?”

Methodology

The methodology for this thesis will facilitate a metaphoric analysis of Kennedy's "Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association." The framework for this methodology requires a review and discussion of a series of concepts: the persuasive nature of metaphor, the nature of ethos, metaphor as it relates to ethos or speaker character, Kenneth Burke's theory of familial substance and Edwin Black's theory of ideology.

Metaphor and Persuasion

The significance of metaphor is not in question. It is quite possibly the most common and important of all tropes. Aristotle famously writes that metaphor "gives style clearness, charm, and distinction as nothing else can: and it is not a thing whose use can be taught by one man [sic] to another" (1405a). Metaphor, for Aristotle, is a skill that is difficult to explain and convey; it is inherent in some, and absent in others. Often speakers who have mastered its use are seen as superior, influential orators. For instance, Martin Luther King Jr.'s "I Have A Dream," which is full of creatively fresh and vivid metaphors, is considered by many to be the greatest speech in American history. Definitions of metaphor vary, but share in seeing metaphor as a kind of perspective that shapes ideas through the comparison of one thing to another. For instance, Aristotle defines metaphor as "giving the thing a name that belongs to something else" (1457b). Kenneth Burke identifies metaphor as one of his "four master tropes," and defines metaphor in a similar manner to

Aristotle: “Metaphor is a device for seeing something in terms of something else. It brings out the thisness of that, or the thatness of this” (503). With regard to applicability, Burke states that metaphor is a means to gain “perspective” (Burke 503). I.A. Richards’ definition is conceptually unique when compared to Burke or Aristotle. He argues that metaphor is “a borrowing between and intercourse of thoughts, a transaction between contexts” (Richards 94).

Scholars also have varying, and sometimes competing, conceptions of metaphors influence. Aristotle asserts that the use of metaphor enhances style, is advantageous to speakers who employ them, and that “metaphorical terms only can be used with advantage”(Aristotle 1404b). Contemporary authors Lakoff and Johnson believe that rather than just a means to enhance language, metaphor constitutes the basis of all language and thought. The use of metaphor does not just constitute clever wordplay; rather, metaphor is intimately connected to language and “human thought processes are largely metaphorical” (Lakoff and Johnson 6). Almost universally, scholars agree that the use of metaphor has some degree of persuasive appeal. Rinalducci and Henley address this point: “Research has long suggested that metaphors can assist in persuasion...and figurative language has been well documented as a part of political rhetoric (1).” Political speakers recognize the persuasive element that metaphors offer and many utilize metaphors to achieve persuasive success.

Metaphor has often been thought of as a way to enhance style, and therefore improve the persuasiveness of the speaker. Reinsch writes that historically

rhetoricians have recognized style and word choice as “relevant to the achievements of [a speakers] goals. Figures of speech, or tropes, have been regarded as a major component of effective style” (Reinsch 142). Metaphor helps to give color and substance to language. Metaphoric language can create tangible pictures in the mind of the listener and provides improved perspective. A study by Lamar Reinsch found that significant differences in attitudinal change could be observed when metaphoric language was employed rather than literal (Reinsch 145). One of the most interesting qualities of metaphoric language is that there is mystery and uncertainty with regard to the nature of its persuasion. Osborn and Ehninger state: “Critics have long been aware of the persuasiveness of metaphor in rhetorical discourse, and intrigued by the mystery of the metaphoric experience” (Osborn, Ehninger 223). Read et. al. agree that metaphors are unique and can have a powerful effect when employed appropriately. They claim that metaphor may be the only form of language that can simultaneously express emotion, call to mind shared experiences, “provoke admiration in the listener for one’s cleverness, structure and organize information, provide a new perspective on a topic by making us see it in terms of something else, and do it all so concisely” (Read et. al. 146).

Ethos and Speaker Character

Over time, many authors have considered past conceptions of ethos and tried to develop new and unique conceptions. The amount of attention given to the subject has solidified its importance as a persuasive and rhetorical concept. Although it has been addressed and analyzed by many, scholars still spend a

substantial amount of time and effort examining its nature. McCroskey and Young discuss the historical importance of ethos:

Throughout most of the twenty-four hundred year history of the study of rhetoric, ethos has held a central position. Aristotle's view that ethos is the most potent means of persuasion has been supported by many contemporary rhetorical scholars. (24)

Aristotle has been used a measuring stick or template when comparing conceptions of speaker character. Plato, Cicero, and Quintilian "expressed views comparable to Aristotle's" however their conceptions, as with every other scholar who has attempted to provide a unique perspective, differs somewhat (McCroskey, Young 24).

Aristotle argues that along with logos and pathos, ethos is one of three "modes of persuasion" or "means of effecting persuasion" (1356a). Regarding ethos, Aristotle writes that this first type of proof, "depends on the personal character (or ethos) of the speaker" (1356a). Generally, ethos refers to the persuasive effect induced by the character of the speaker. The character of the speaker comprises many qualities. Credibility, goodness, trustworthiness, and perceived ethics are especially important components of ethos. Aristotle states:

Some writers assume in their treatises on rhetoric that the personal goodness revealed by the speaker contributes nothing to his power of persuasion; on the contrary, his character may almost be called the most effective means of persuasion he possesses." (1356a)

A speaker's perceived personal goodness or quality of character plays a pivotal role in their ability to persuade an audience. Speakers use the expression of their character as a means to build credibility and enhance persuasion. Aristotle observes

this point: “[T]here are three things which inspire confidence in the orator’s own character—the three, namely, that induce us to believe a thing apart from any proof of it: good sense, good moral character, and goodwill” (1378a).

Historically authors have addressed a series of common themes (which are usually derivatives from Aristotle in one way or another) when treating ethos. These themes include ethos and its connection to source credibility, ethos and its connection to trust, and ways in which ethos is established and maintained. If a speaker can be perceived to possess good character, their persuasion can improve substantially. Rinalducci and Henly state: “[H]ighly trustworthy and expert spokespersons induce a greater positive attitude toward the position they advocate than do communicators with less credibility” (1). Speakers who are able to effectively establish credibility elicit a “positive attitude toward the position they advocate” and are therefore more persuasive and successful. The attention given to ethos by scholars has often resulted in it becoming synonymous with the notion of perceived source credibility, and some authors have attempted to conceptualize its sub categories (McCroskey, Young 24). McCroskey and his associates identify five dimensions: “competence, character, sociability, extroversion, and composure” (McCroskey, Young 26). Elsewhere McCroskey and Teven argue that the five dimensions should be condensed into three sub categories: perceived caring, perceived competence, and perceived trustworthiness. Other scholars have mirrored Aristotle’s division of ethos into sub categories, such as “expertness, trustworthiness, and intention toward the receiver” (Hovland, Janis, and Kelley qtd.

In McCroskey, Young 25). While a variety of characterizations have been suggested for the nature of ethos, each author's contribution to the field of study holds some degree of similarity to the next. McCroskey and Young state: "Historically, then, the construct of ethos or source credibility has long been thought to involve a source's knowledge of the subject that he or she discusses, his or her veracity, and his or her attitude toward the well-being of the receiver" (25). A more in-depth examination into the nature of ethos shows that scholars have felt that it deserves much attention.

Scholars have observed that the nature of ethos is tied to the degree of trust that is evident in the speaker/audience relationship. Garver notes that when a speaker's ethos disappears, "so does trust" (190). An audience can follow along with a speech and acknowledge that they understand the information they are being presented with, but if a speaker's ethos is poor, trust and persuasion will suffer: "An audience can still assent, but there is nothing for it to trust without ethical argument" (Garver 190). Speakers actively construct their ethos in the eyes of the audience. Everything they communicate verbally and nonverbally can play into the perceptions of the audience members. As Hyde describes: "The practice of rhetoric constitutes an active construction of character; ethos takes form as a result of the orator's abilities to argue and to deliberate and thereby to inspire trust in an audience" (xvi). Speakers are constantly required to uphold the ethos an audience expects of them. One wrong decision might compromise the audience's perception of them and render them untrustworthy. When considering ethos in relation to

source credibility, Rinalducci and Henley share a similar conception: “Basically, source credibility rests on a belief that statements by credible sources can be trusted. Research generally has supported the position that source credibility is a very important element in the communication process” (1).

Scholars have noted that speakers are able to establish ethos in numerous ways when constructing arguments. Each speaker’s unique style will play into the way ethos is established. Garver notes this point when he says that it is a “speakers argumentative and deliberative ability that creates ethos as a by-product” (Garver 192). One angle for establishing ethos deals with the ability of a speaker to present reasonable, coherent arguments. As Garver argues, it is the current “act of deliberation that the audience trusts, not the speaker’s ethical reputation” (Garver 193).

Some theorists maintain that ethos is inherently tied to ones ability to persuade audiences of their reasonable nature. It is human nature to be more susceptible to the persuasion of those who seem to be good-natured. A speaker who eases the minds of audience members is generally more persuasive and easier to put faith in. Hyde reiterates this notion, and says that speakers productively established character by putting “hearers into the right frame of mind so that their emotional state during the oration and subsequent deliberations are advantageous to the speaker’s persuasive intent” (xvii).

Speakers can build character based on their creative capacity. Character is not only enhanced because the audience recognizes the argumentative ability of the speaker. Speakers are also viewed as having good character “because [their] concentration on argument is more inventive” (Garver 195). A speaker who takes account of his or her ethos may be driven to increase their creativity, because the “ethos of rhetoric makes use of our inventive and symbolic capacity” (Hyde xiii).

It is fairly evident, at this point, that there are a variety of ways in which an individual can construct and enhance their character as a speaker. One area that has lacked attention is the effect of tropes or stylistic devices on speaker character. As metaphor is possibly the most important of all stylistic devices, examination regarding its relation to ethos is warranted.

Metaphor and Its Relation to Ethos

Is there a connection between metaphor and ethos? It seems likely considering they can both play such an important role in the persuasiveness of a speaker. The choices speakers make with regard to language and discourse undoubtedly effect audience perceptions of their character to some degree. According to Aristotle, the use of metaphor is directly tied to intelligence, and it would seem that the ability to present language in a way that helps to visualize concepts would encourage the audience to develop a sense of goodwill toward a speaker. The use of metaphor eases the path to understanding and presents messages in a way that cannot be accomplished via literal language. However, few

authors have addressed a connection between metaphor and ethos, and among those who have, only a handful have confirmed that the use of metaphor can aid the construction of speaker character.

Among those who have studied a connection between metaphor and ethos, scholars have rendered unique but often similar interpretations. Aristotle hints at the metaphor-ethos connection in *The Poetics*. He believes that the use of metaphor can allow a speaker to avoid being too high or too low in their diction. A speaker who effectively uses metaphor will avoid sounding pretentious among commoners and avoid sounding primitive among the educated. He states: “the strange word, the metaphor, the ornamental equivalent, &c., will save the language from seeming mean and prosaic, while the ordinary words in it will secure the requisite clearness” (1358a). He reiterates this point in *The Rhetoric* when he says that “people are not much taken either by obvious arguments...nor by those which puzzle us when we hear them stated, but only by those which convey their information to us as soon as we hear them” (Aristotle 1410b). Metaphor can be used in a way that effectively presents information in a manner that is acceptable for everyone. It allows an orator to identify with his audience, and he is therefore viewed in good character. Other authors have been more explicit in their discussion of metaphor and ethos. In a study conducted by Read et. al. the “presence of metaphor led to significantly more positive ratings of both the passages and the speaker on a number of characteristics” (Read et. al. 125). The authors conclude that the use of metaphor “lead a speaker to be perceived as more interesting, persuasive, memorable, and

having a better command of language—certainly desirable characteristics for any speaker and consistent with suggestions by Aristotle and others” (Read et. al. 139). Similarly, a study conducted by Bowers and Osborn reveals that metaphor affects competence, trustworthiness and ingenuity. Based on the nature of the metaphor, the audience may make positive associations between language use and their impression of the speaker (Bowers, Osborn 154). N.L. Reinisch observes that audience members were impressed by an orator’s use of metaphor, leading to perceived authoritativeness of the source (“Figurative Language”). Pradeep Sopory and James Price Dillard suggest that there are two general ways in which metaphor can enhance perceived credibility. The first is in line with Aristotle’s assertion that mastery of metaphor is a sign of genius (Aristotle 255). The second asserts that “previously unknown similarities” may be revealed between the compared entities, and “this newfound appreciation of commonalities is a source of interest and pleasure to the comprehender. Impressed by the message source, the receiver returns a favorable judgment of communicator credibility” (Sopory, Dillard 385).

Burke’s Theory of Substance

Substance to Burke is a particular component or one of a “set of words” that is derived from the “Stance family” (21). The “Stance family” deals primarily with “place, or placement” and in Burke’s eyes, could be explored to the point of “build(ing) a whole philosophic universe” (21). Burke believes that of the components of the “Stance family,” substance deserves the most attention, for it is the “most prominent philosophic member” (21).

Burke conceptualizes the nature of substance as follows: “[A] person’s or a thing’s sub-stance would be something that stands beneath or supports the person or thing” (22). Burke conceives substance as the grouping of a series of simple ideas that belong in the same vein because they “go constantly together” (22). These simple ideas cannot “subsist by themselves” and therefore naturally become categorized under a label representing a larger, all encompassing simple idea. This larger idea is to be conceived as a type of substance (Burke 22). Burke sees substance as an abstract idea that is defined by its characteristics. It cannot be defined in a concrete objectionable manner; it is the support for ideas with similar qualities that are intrinsically linked (Burke 23).

Burke defines substance in terms of a contextual and familial definition. Regarding context, Burke notes that it can be clarified to some degree by seeing it in terms of what it is not. An examination of the context of a given substance requires consideration for its defining characteristics; however, consideration for what it clearly is not provides an improved and essential perspective (Burke 23). To define, explain, or discuss an idea requires “mark(ing) its boundaries” and defining something in a positional or locational manner (Burke 24, 26).

Burke’s familial definition of substance differs, but is intimately connected or “interwoven” with the contextual (Burke 26). This perspective focuses on the way that ideas connected by substance are interconnected by means of a specific origin. Burke states: “This is the ‘tribal’ or ‘familial’ sort, the definition of a substance in terms of ancestral cause” (26). Relations among concepts are hierarchical or grow

out of one another; wherein, on one end of the spectrum, ideas or concepts are closely bound to the origin, and on the other, only faint lines of connectedness attach an idea to a vein of substance (Burke 27-28).

Ultimately the two definitional perspectives are equally important to a true concept of the nature of substance:

[C]ontextual definition stresses *placement*, ancestral definition stresses derivation. But in any sustained discussion of motives, the two become interwoven, as with theologies which treat God both as 'casual ancestor' or mankind and as the ultimate ground or context of mankind." (Burke 28)

Substance in general is defined from a perspective that utilizes the familial and contextual.

Burke goes on to identify and define four specific categories of observable substance: Geometric, Directional, Dialectic and Familial. Each dimension of substance provides a means to categorize relational figurative language. Burke states, "The structural relations involved are observable realities" (57). Geometric substance is described in terms of "plastic connotations (that) can lead readily into strictly materialistic notions of determinism" (Burke 29). Geometric substance pertains to concepts where a beginning and end can be conceived of and the components leading from beginning to end are readily accessible. Directional substance concerns the "means" related to directional movement with regard to a given concept. Dialectical substance regards locating and giving specificity to a given concept. Dialectic substance regards the "Being and Not-Being" of a concept (Burke 34). The process of attributing characteristics to a concept or explaining what

characteristics do not apply, will help to give the concept a sense of centrality. The final dimension or category of substance is Familial. Of Burke's four substances, the methodology for this study will use Familial substance alone as an analytical tool.

Why focus on familial substance alone? Analysis reveals that essentially every concept presented by Kennedy has familial undertones; it is inherent in the theme of the speech. With regard to familial substance, Burke states: "In its purity, this concept stresses common ancestry in the strictly biological sense, as literal descent from maternal or paternal sources" (29). Familial substance regards systems of belief and shared worldviews; it is "usually 'spiritualized,' so that it includes merely social groups, comprising persons of the same nationality or beliefs" (Burke 29). The components that make up familial substance in a given discourse will facilitate a system with which a group of people can identify with in a "familial" sense: "[T]he members of a class derive their generic nature from the 'idea' of the class in which they are placed" (Burke 28). The group driven by familial substance will generally have a system of key elements to identify with. These elements help to bind the group and establish boundaries and meaning regarding what it means to be a part of the group. Burke states: "Most often...there is the notion of some founder shared in common, or some covenant or constitution or historical act from which the consubstantiality of the group is derived" (Burke 29).

Burke's Pentad

Burke prefaces his discussion of substance with a review of the elements of the pentad. He believes that substances can be observed through the examination and analysis of pentadic ratios. He writes that there are "certain formal interrelationships" among the five elements of the pentad that will prevail among the rest due to "their role as attributes of a common ground or substance" (Burke xix). The ratios of the pentad often work in tandem with substance and examination of the ratios helps to exploit the substance latent in the text. A review of the pentad and the nature of its ratios will help to clarify its connection to substance.

Burke's pentad, which provides situational perspective through the examination of five elements, is a tool for analyzing and discovering appropriate situational perspective. Burke writes that the "titular word" for this method is "dramatism," because "language and thought" are seen as "modes of action" which encourage one to consider "the matter of motives" (xxii). Dramatism is driven by the elements of the pentad, which are: the act, the scene, the agent, the agency, and the purpose (Burke xv). Burke explains the nature of these elements in the following way: the act- "names what took place, in thought or deed;" the scene- "the background of the act, the situation in which in occurred;" the agent- "what person or kind of person...performed the act;" the agency- "what means or instruments he (sic) used;" and the purpose, which considers why the act was done by the agent (Burke xv). These "five key terms of dramatism," answer the question: "What is involved, when we say what people are doing and why they are doing it?" (Burke

xv). In other words, analysis that deploys the components of the pentad allows one to discover or exploit the motive expressed by the text (Burke xv). However, situations are often depicted in ways that favor one or more of the elements; thus, Burke stresses that each situation has a dominant element, and prominent ratios between elements.

It is essential in Burkeian dramatism to discover the dominant element in a situation in order to determine the nature of the text and the motivation within it. Burke writes that one should locate the “‘essential’ term, the ‘causal ancestor’ of the lot,” once this is done, one can work deductively and “proceed in the reverse direction across the margins of overlap, ‘deducing’ the other terms from it as its logical descendants” (Burke xxii). In other words, the dominant term often acts as the root of the most important ratios in the situation.

Burke writes that the ratios drive the nature of the situation and often convey the rhetor’s motive through their action in the text. Often a text will have one or more prevalent relationships that will be important with regard to the nature of the situation. One should search for “purely internal relationships” which each of the terms share with one another to exploit “possibilities of transformation, their range of permutations and combinations” and draw conclusions about motivation (Burke xvi). Ratios in a text, thus act as “principles of determination” (Burke 15), or “principles of selectivity” as opposed to truly “causal relationships” (Burke 18). Burke is sure to note that determining motivation via the pentad is subjective and subject to differing and sometime competing analyses. He says that the elements of

the pentad are inherently rooted in philosophy rather than “to be solved in terms of empirical science” (Burke xxiii). Embracing subjectivity is essential to the art of criticism because the method helps to advance interpretations and facilitates conversations about artifacts.

Black's Theory of Ideology

Edwin Black's essay, “The Second Persona” deals with idea that critics cannot appropriately make moral judgments of discourses because discourses are seen as objects (Black 110). Black believes that discourse should not be viewed this way; doing so allows critics to escape assessing moral judgment, and texts from receiving them. The unique rhetorical nature of each author's work is neglected and undertreated. Black argues that we ought to “more proficiently explicate the saliently human dimensions of a discourse,” because every text, to some degree, contains “tokens of their authors” (Black 110). Each author's works are in some way or another, “directly or in a transmuted form, the external signs of internal states” (Black 110). Even authors intending to be impartial construct their discourses in a way that carries unique attributes of the specific writer: “Certain features of a linguistic act entail certain characteristics of the language user” (Black 110). Black argues that because of the mark left on a text by the author constructing it, each can be said to have an “implied author,” and since there is an implied author, there is consequently an implied auditor or “second persona” (111). He states: “[W]e are able...to observe the sort of audience that would be appropriate to it. We should have derived from the discourse a hypothetical construct that is the implied auditor”

(Black 112). But what is significant about the identification of an implied auditor?

Black says that by identifying the implied auditor, critics can make a judgment based not on the immediate audience, but on the one that seems to be intended or implied by the text. The true goal behind this perspective is to establish the “second persona” as a means to determine the ideology inherent in the text. Essentially, identification of the implied auditor provides a deeper perception for a text’s ideology.

Black views ideology as “the network of interconnected convictions that function in a man epistemically and that shapes his identity by determining how he views the world” (112). The ideology latent within a given discourse, will allow a critic to analyze the worldview presented by the discourse. With regard to the ideology-driven worldview presented, a critic can locate the type of auditor most suited for, or implied by, the discourse (Black 112). The discourse offers a system of concepts that the implied auditor can readily identify with as a means to structure and shape the belief system offered by the ideology. This system of concepts is presented in terms of “stylistic tokens.” With regard to the ideology present in a given discourse, Black states: “the most likely evidence available will be in the form of stylistic tokens” (Black 112). Each “stylistic token” in the text that is used to influence and drive the ideology is suitable for the auditor the text implies (Black 113). It is important to consider the discourse with regard to the “implied auditor” because it provides the most suitable perspective of the purpose of the ideology presented, and the critic can therefore attempt to be as objective as possible when

assessing moral judgment. Black states: “the critic can see in the auditor implied by a discourse a model of what the rhetor would have his real auditor become” (Black 113). Ultimately, the identification of the ideology latent in a text allows a critic to assess moral judgment.

It is ultimately the goal of this study to use the methodological concepts reviewed in this section to construct a specific framework that will be used to analyze Kennedy’s speech. Black’s theory of ideology will be used in conjunction with Burke’s theory of familial substance in order to identify, categorize, and analyze metaphors in Kennedy’s speech to the Houston ministers. This analysis will show that the metaphoric world created by Kennedy within the speech aided his identification with audience members, and led to positive ethical appeal.

Context

Whether or not it receives significant attention, the religious issue looms in many presidential elections. As a point of major attention, the religious issue has held a place of public attention in no less than seven American presidential campaigns (McClerren 1). 1856 Republican candidate John C. Fremont was said to have been a Catholic who had left the church. 1876 Democratic candidate Samuel J. Tilden was accused of sympathizing with the Catholic church, which the Republican party thought was part of a plan to overthrow their party and the “free school system” (McClerren 1). James G. Blaine’s 1884 attempt to win the nomination was marred by “rum, Romanism, and rebellion” (McClerren 1). Similar to Blaine, thoughts of “Romanism” derailed William McKinley’s bid in 1896 as he was thought to have affiliation to the “Roman political hierarchy” (McClerren 1). And finally, prior to the campaigns of Smith and Kennedy, skeptics created controversy during William Taft’s presidential attempt because “he was thought to have been overfriendly to the Roman Catholic Church” on a few separate occasions (McClerren 1-2). Even in the upcoming 2012 presidential election, where Mitt Romney—a Mormon—bids for the nomination, the religious question maintains significance. Kennedy’s election to the presidency in 1960 broke a significant streak of strictly Protestant presidents. It seems many U.S. citizens have historically identified with the wholesome nature and safety that is tied to a person who identifies as a Christian. It is symbolic of the “American way” as evidenced by the Christian references in the “Pledge of Allegiance” and the placement of “In God We Trust” on

U.S. currency. While the constitution clearly stresses church/state separation and unequivocal religious freedom, historically each major election containing a non-Protestant candidate has acted as a checkpoint for American attitudes toward non-Protestant political figures. The first major test of such a nature came in the form of New York Governor Al Smith's 1928 presidential campaign.

Smith was the only candidate ever nominated for President prior to Kennedy (Knebel 13), and dealt with the religious issue far differently. While Kennedy addressed the issue frequently and sought to turn the controversy in his favor, Smith only focused on it during two meaningful occasions. In a 1927 issue of *The Atlantic*, Smith debated the issue (Burns 21), and then ignored it until September 20, 1928 when he gave his "Address at Oklahoma City." In his address, Smith specifically addressed the religious issue and stressed the constitutional view of church-state relations (McClerren 1), while calling anti-Catholic skepticism "un-American propaganda" and the movement against him a "wicked attempt" (Smith 7). Ultimately Smith's choice to confront the issue on only a few select occasions proved detrimental to his chances. Skepticism toward his religion was probably even greater than Kennedy's experience in 1960. Knebel writes that Smith's discussion in *The Atlantic* seemed to satisfy the majority of Protestant clergymen (17); however, Barrett argues that Smith was classified out of serious contention because of his religion (259). Unlike Kennedy, Smith asserted that he was a "devout Catholic" and many connected his devotion to the Catholic requirements for "obedience to her doctrine and law" (Dioffenbach 38). Smith's display of strong identification with the

Catholic Church drew numerous responses from Protestant leaders prior to the 1928 election. During that time, Dr. Albert C. Dioffenbach, editor of *The Christian Register* in 1928, argued that Smith's religion would render him essentially a pawn of the church, and his election would cause monarchic theory to carry over into American politics (40). Dioffenbach called himself "devoted to religious liberty and political freedom" but felt that Smith is unfit for the presidency because "this country really is...a spiritual institution with a spiritual destiny" (43). Others agreed and reiterated the fear of Smith being a pawn of the pope. A.T. Robertson, professor of New Testament Interpretation, observed: "The Pope undoubtedly longs for the wealth and power of the United states to be in his hands. He will never give up that hope. He will leave no stone unturned to gain that end" (72). To some Protestants, the religious issue in 1928 was a matter of national security and a sign of moral direction. L.R. Scarborough, President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, and one with whom some identified as an "Anti-Catholic agitator," was compelled to leave his party's side after their nomination of Al Smith. He wrote that the nomination of a Catholic betrayed the trust he had in his party, and named the religious issue among he most important of 1928: "Issues far deeper than tariffs, taxes, international relations, industrial policies are involved. Great problems of morality, sobriety, law enforcement, the vitalities of the home, church, state, all are at stake" (69). The fear and uncertainty aroused by Protestant leaders and other anti-Catholic agitators eventually led to a decided victory for the Republican party and demonstrated the feasibility of a Catholic president during the time period.

Contemporary scholar Hugh Brogan notes that prior to the Kennedy campaign, the Protestants of the United States had last “asserted themselves effectively” with the defeat of Al Smith (46). Massa agrees and calls Smith the “‘wet’ democratic governor of New York” who lost in a landslide, and led many to believe that “a Catholic candidate for the presidency would lose more votes than could be gained by adherence to that faith” (5). Al Smith’s defeat had a lingering affect on perceptions toward non-Protestant candidates. While the resistance toward Kennedy proved to be less successful than the effort against Smith, the religious issue in each of the two elections had important similarities and differences. The similarities include: skepticism that the Catholic church did not believe in church-state separation, belief that the Catholic church did not believe in religious liberty, and the fear of Roman influence (McClerren 5). The main unique concern in 1928 regarded fear about the implications for the state of prohibition if Smith were elected; while in 1960, store was given to the potential for administering tax money to parochial schools, the state of birth control, and business taxes (McClerren 6).

The resistance Kennedy faced was less significant than what Smith faced in 1928 for two particular reasons. First, the strategy Kennedy used to confront and overcome the issue was far superior to the lackluster way that Smith dealt with the controversy. Second, attitudes toward religion were changing, just as attitudes toward race, gender and class changed during the late 50’s and early 60’s. Knebel noted this point in his *Look* magazine article prior to Kennedy’s nomination. He wrote that Americans have historically put candidates through the religious test, but

this notion seemed to be changing as voters at the time were "showing signs of discarding this notion" as many Catholics were being "pushed toward the top. Knebel also recognized that many observers were predicting the nomination of a Catholic at the 1960 convention (13). Even with the new sense of cultural acceptance on a number of levels, Kennedy's candidacy—and his well-publicized popularity—brought about a storm of controversy, and aroused efforts by numerous groups who sought to undermine his credibility. O'Brien writes that Kennedy's nomination "rekindled anti-Catholic agitation" (473). Anti-Catholic propaganda in the form of literature and public discourse spread through the country at an alarming pace. In fact, "over three hundred different anti-Catholic pamphlets, books, and tracts were circulated to an estimated readership of twenty to twenty-five million voters" (Warnick 183). The overwhelming body of material prompted the Fair Campaign Practices Committee to express "concern about the growing volume of rabidly anti-Catholic material" (Warnick 183). There was an apparent paranoia about Kennedy's Catholicism that was repeatedly demonstrated by public figures, and most prominently, Protestant church leaders. For instance, in response to the attention given to the religious issue prior to the election, Dr. Gaye McGlothen, Baptist pastor at the time, wrote that the issue was largely founded in the threat of clericalism or "the pursuit of power, especially political power, by a religious hierarchy, carried on by secular methods for the purpose of social domination" (140). McGlothen believed that a Catholic president would facilitate the clericalist movement sought by the Catholic Church. He propositioned:

Why, then, is religion an issue in this election? Basically it is because of the political and social or civic demands of the Roman hierarchy and its unyielding insistence through the years in the United States that the Roman Catholic Church be granted a favored position.” (142)

While many of the actions in the movement against Kennedy were expected to some degree, there were also extreme cases where individuals were known to spread blatant lies regarding the implications of a Catholic president as a scare tactic.

Mendez writes: “One Lutheran minister reportedly warned his congregation that Protestants would be hanged in the town square of Levittown if Kennedy were elected” (39).

Kennedy’s potential allegiance to the Pope was likely the most significant and well publicized concern during the election. The Catholic religion has historically been known to intimately link businesses of church and state, and questions were created regarding Kennedy’s American allegiance and the political direction of the U.S. if he were to be in command. Similar to beliefs during Smith’s campaign, many felt that Kennedy would be under pressure to provide the Vatican with representation (O’Brien 474). In response to Kennedy’s answers in the infamous *Look* interview with Fletcher Knebel, some Protestant leaders “attributed his answers to a plot directed from Rome to deceive the public, and urged that the ‘interests of the nation are safer in the hands of one who does not confess to a foreign, earthly power’” (Henry 155). The National Council of Citizens for Religious Freedom claimed that “Kennedy’s religion was ‘one of the most significant issues’ of the 1960 campaign because, no matter what the senator claimed, ‘his church insists that he is duty-bound to submit to its direction’” (O’Brien 474).

While members of both the Protestant and Catholic camps waged attacks often, there were also sympathizers to be found on each side. Many well-known Protestant figures sought to spread fear and skepticism, but some found that the situation presented an opportunity to exploit the unjust nature of the aversion Kennedy met. Dr. Hugh Wamble, Professor of Church History and Midwestern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1960, discussed at the time that religion had become an overblown issue in the election and that many people did not have the adequate information to make informed decisions. He believed the implications created “voters vulnerable to propaganda, from both sides...evoke[ing] irrational responses and foster[ing] prejudice” (104). Similarly, prominent Catholic figures addressed the issue publically as well. And while many were quick to label those publically opposed to Kennedy as bigots or extremists, some sympathized with the nature of the situation and felt that controversy was inevitable. Raymond William Gribbin, Catholic and Assistant Pastor of St. Matthew’s Church in 1960, was sympathetic of Protestant fears at the time and noted that it would be unjust “to label those who possess...fears [of a Catholic President] as bigots, and unreal “to consider the fears themselves as unfounded” (90). Gribbin argued that there was a general lack of knowledge and understanding of what it meant to be a Catholic political figure (91), because the allegiance required by a Catholic was “in the spiritual realm and not in the political realm” (91).

The attention given to the religious issue was pervasive throughout media outlets nationwide. Many periodicals weighed in and provided perspective for the

diversity of opinions present at the time. It was an issue that sparked the interest of a number of organizations and interested the majority of the nation. *Time* magazine observed: "Religion was a subject that, most everyone agreed, had to be talked out at some point in the campaign, and sincere men as well as bigots had brought it to the fore" ("Test of Religion" 22). Many outlets seemed tired of the issue and felt that it was constantly overblown and unnecessarily emphasized. *The Christian Century* stated that it was untimely to be quarreling over an issue that could "fatally divide America" when many more pressing issues called for unity (qtd. In "The Religious Issue" 22). The *Detroit News* found the continual interest in the issue to be tedious and felt that Kennedy had satisfactorily answered all questions which came his way (qtd. In "The Religious Issue" 22). The *Boston Herald* recognized the importance of the religious issue and chocked it up to being an intangible worthy of consideration. However, they believed that it should not become "all-important" in the political context (qtd. In "The Religious Issue" 22). Some outlets found the oppression against Kennedy—which bordered on bigotry—to be the most intriguing topic in the issue. In fact, many Protestants came out in support of Kennedy because they disapproved of the actions displayed by their fellow religious affiliates. *Newsweek* pointed out that Kennedy gained a great deal of support from Protestants who felt that the statement released by the Peale group was unwarranted and unethical ("That Religious" 38). *World Outlook* said that it was ambiguous whether or not it was actually bigotry to base one's vote off of a candidate's affiliations; however, it is certainly "bad politics and worse religion" (qtd. In "The Religious Issue" 22). Former

president Truman chastised Nixon for “stand(ing) at the front door proclaiming charity and tolerance, (while) his supporters are herding the forces of racial, religious and anti-union bigotry” (“That ‘Religious’” 37). A few sources contended that the religious issue was actually beginning to help Kennedy rather than hurt him because so many were disgusted by religious discrimination. *Time* noted this point writing that on the whole, politicians agreed the religious issue was working in Kennedy’s favor. However, they felt the Kennedy camp could only gain from the controversy “so long as a counterreaction did not set in out of suspicion that he was deliberately exploiting it” (“Test of Religion” 22). The *Detroit Free Press* stated that it seemed the Kennedy campaign felt discussing the religious issue was beneficial and they appeared to welcome the chance to comment on it (qtd. In “The Religious Issue” 22). Murray Kempton of the *New York Post* thought it foolish for the Kennedy campaign to try to stop talking about religion during the campaign as it had already done as much damage as it possibly could and was only helping Kennedy to keep it going (qtd. In “The Religious Issue” 22). The exploitation of the issue by the Kennedy camp bothered some outlets and they wrote that it was unfair of the Kennedy camp to attempt to turn the issue in their favor. The *Cincinnati Enquirer* and Roscoe Drummond of the *New York Herald-Tribune* said accusations from the Kennedy camp that Protestant skeptics were engaging in bigotry were a demonstration of bigotry in itself (qtd. In “The Religious Issue” 22). Not everyone felt that it was unethical to raise suspicions about Kennedy’s religion. James Reston of the *New York Times* thought that it was a good political move and smart for Texas republicans to

try to defeat Kennedy with the religious issue rather than waging other attacks against him (qtd. In "The Religious Issue" 22).

The controversy created by Kennedy's Catholicism was present throughout his candidacy and tenure as president. However, the speech to the Houston ministers marked a key moment in Kennedy's quest to overcome the issue because his performance was almost universally applauded and accepted. After the speech, the Kennedy camp felt the speech marked a moment of triumph over the issue. Little attention was spent on religion from that point on. *Time* magazine wrote at the time that the Kennedy camp "rated Kennedy's performance as highly successful" and that Kennedy's men "planned to send tapes of the show to TV stations throughout the South and Midwest" ("Test of Religion" 21). To really grasp the meaningfulness of Kennedy's success, it is important to consider the specific timeline and series of events that led to Kennedy's decision to accept the invitation. A series of circumstances pertaining to the religious issue during the campaign created a need for such a speech.

The Kennedy camp recognized that religion would be a challenge at an early date, and anticipated that there would be skepticism toward a Catholic president. They made a series of decisions intended to combat the uncertainty. Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos note this point: "Kennedy's staff considered his Catholicism to be the biggest obstacle in his quest for the presidency, and concern for it dictated strategy for a great many campaign decisions" (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 21-22). While there were many notable events and occasions leading up to the speech with the Houston

ministers, scholars have recognized key events and point to the speech in Houston as the pinnacle of the controversy. James MacGregor Burns writes that the religious issue “unfolded in three phases” (qtd. In Henry 154). The first was the *Look* magazine interview, the second “consisted in the events of April and May 1960, encompassing the Wisconsin and West Virginia primaries and an address to the American Society of Newspaper Editors” (qtd. In Henry 154), and the final was the speech at Houston which he called “dramatic and decisive” (qtd. In Henry 154). Warnick makes a similar observation but notes specifically Kennedy’s public statements on religion leading up to the speech in Houston. She writes that he made three major statements: “the first to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in April during the West Virginia primary, the second during his acceptance speech at the Democratic National convention, and the third at Houston in September” (Warnick 183).

As far back as 1956, the Kennedy camp released what became known as “the Bailey Memorandum,” which was written by Ted Sorensen and sought to dispel the “Al Smith Myth” that Smith was not elected because 1928 was a republican year, rather than because of his Catholic religious beliefs (Massa 6). In preparation for the 1960 election, the first real confrontation with the religious issue was a March 3, 1959 interview with Fletcher Knebel of *Look* magazine. Kemper calls this interview one of the “basic sources for the candidate’s own words” regarding the religious issue (Kemper 29). Knebel made observations regarding the issue and also interviewed Kennedy about the possibility and potential implications of a Catholic

candidate (Henry 154). Knebel discussed that church-state relations were open for “perplexing interpretations” and “litigation and disputes are endless in the field” (17). Knebel also noticed that there was a clear movement of acceptance being demonstrated by Catholic politicians prior to Kennedy’s candidacy. He observed:

Catholic Democrats in 1958 won the governorships of seven state, two as repeats; the party now has eight Catholic governors. Also, eight Catholic Democrats, four of them newcomers, won election to the U.S. Senate, to increase the number of Catholic Democrats in the Senate to 12. (14)

In the interview, Kennedy sought to convey that he believed in the absolute separation of religious belief and political agenda (Henry 155). Kennedy had addressed that he would be required to state his position on church and state, but he was adamant in making it known that “religion is personal, politics are public, and the twain need never meet and conflict” (Knebel 17). Kennedy developed a position regarding his Catholicism in his Knebel interview that he would largely reiterate in his speech to the Houston ministers roughly a year and a half later. Kennedy discussed that church-state separation is fundamental to traditional views of Americanism, and that the First Amendment is “an infinitely wise one” (Knebel 17). He stated that the president should not act as an ambassador to the Vatican, and that he was opposed to the government funding churches or their schools (Knebel 17).

Reactions to Kennedy’s statement ranged from enthusiastic praise to skepticism that his statements were part of a plot to deceive directed from Rome (Henry 155). Primarily, the *Look* interview was significant for two reasons; first, “it

helped establish Kennedy's independence from his church on matters of broad philosophy as well as specific issues;" and second, "it portended the rhetorical stance that would emerge as the campaign progressed" (Henry 155). The interview was also significant because responses to it presented reactions that reoccurred throughout Kennedy's campaign. Subsequent reactions to moments when Kennedy addressed religion would often either consist of praise for Kennedy's courage and his constitutional loyalty, or skepticism regarding the true nature of his intentions and his American allegiance.

Word of Kennedy's religion spread quickly. His popularity saw noticeable swings prior to his nomination that were undoubtedly attributed to his Catholicism. For instance, the polls showed that Kennedy held a 70 to 30 percent lead over Hubert Humphrey in West Virginia in December 1959; however, by the middle of April, Kennedy's lead had vanished and Humphrey held a comfortable 60 to 40 percent advantage. The West Virginia headquarters solely attributed the swing to Kennedy's Catholicism as West Virginia had a 95 percent non-Catholic electorate. The headquarters stated: "No one in West Virginia knew you were a Catholic in December. Now they know" (Henry 153). The decline in Kennedy's popularity was noticeable elsewhere as well, and the link to his Catholicism was often evidential. The Kennedy camp decided it would be strategically beneficial to engage the religious issue directly, and Kennedy would go on to discuss his religion on numerous occasions leading up to the election.

On April 21, 1960, Kennedy addressed the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C. In his address, Kennedy emphasized that he felt religion was receiving too much attention in the primaries and was often taking the place of more relevant issues (Henry 156). Kennedy asserted that he was “not trying to be the first Catholic President” but rather, he was trying to serve his nation as a President who happened to have been born Catholic (Henry 156). Kennedy’s address was partially an attack on the ethics of the press who incessantly chose to give the religious issue attention. As Henry states: “Kennedy carefully but surely shifted the grounds of debate from the question of his religion to one of press responsibility” (156).

On May 3, 1960, Kennedy met Humphrey in a televised debate, and he addressed the religious issue briefly. Kennedy reiterated his “commitment to the constitution” and the religious freedom it afforded (Henry 157). While religion did not constitute the major issue in the debate, Kennedy’s responses demonstrated his willingness to engage the issue often and provide concrete, consistent answers about his stance.

On May 10th, 1960, A “Look” magazine interview with Protestant leaders Dr. Eugene Carson Black and Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam demonstrated the fear and paranoia among certain Protestants regarding a potential Catholic president. The Protestant leaders expressed that a Catholic president would strengthen the political influence of the Roman Catholic Church (Blake and Oxnam 31). They stated that they felt “uneasy” and were concerned with the separation of church and state

and the conduct of foreign affairs (Blake and Oxnam 31-32). While they did not condone the categorization of non-Protestant political figures as “second-class citizens” they believed the American representation and symbolization of the presidency made it unfit for a Catholic (Blake and Oxnam 32). Ultimately they believed that the Catholic Church in the United States did not fully support the constitutional conception of church-state separation.

On September 8, 1960, the *New York Times* released statements by the group “Protestant and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State (P.O.A.U.)” (Henry 159). Included in this group were Bishop Oxnam and Reverend Dr. Blake, who had previously released statements to *Look*. The statement by the P.O.A.U questioned Kennedy’s allegiance to an organization that believes in the partial union of church and state. The P.O.A.U. asserted that a candidate who endorsed an organization with this view of the church/state relationship was inevitably unfit for the presidency (Henry 160). However, the P.O.A.U did assent that Kennedy had displayed the ability to respond favorably to some of their concerns.

Also on September 8, the *New York Times* released statements by the National Conference of Citizens for Religious Freedom, or the “Peale group” as they would come to be known (Henry 161). The Peale group was led by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale and Dr. Harold John Ockenga of Boston (Stelzner 225), who came to Washington to head a group of 150 Protestant ministers and laymen on “the political aspects of Roman Catholicism” (“Protestants In” 3). Dr. Peale’s endorsement and position as the group’s figurehead shocked many because for

years, both “from the pulpit, in his syndicated column and in his books” he had “championed a saccharine philosophy, far removed from bigotry” (“The Tablet” qtd. In “The Religious Issue” 21). Initially Dr. Peale openly came out in support of Richard Nixon, and then proceeded to show up at a meeting to rally against Kennedy (“Protestants In” 3), but his allegiance and willingness to lead the Citizens for Religious Freedom aligned him with “forces of prejudice” and “agents of hate,” which surprised Catholics and non-Catholics alike (“The Tablet” qtd. In “The Religious Issue” 21). The group’s statement insisted that Kennedy’s Catholicism was among the most important issues of the campaign because regardless of Kennedy’s persistent claim of absolute church state separation, “his church insists that he is duty bound to its direction” (“Protestants In” 3). In summary, the Peale document implied that “not only would (Kennedy) be under ‘extreme pressure,’ but that insofar as he is a good Catholic he would accede to these pressures” (“Protestants In” 4). Warnick writes that the Peale document sought to create uncertainty regarding Kennedy’s Catholicism and addressed past actions of the candidate that would suggest unpredictability. The document did not distinguish between “‘direction’ in matters of faith and morals and ‘direction’ in the management of public affairs,” thus implying that Kennedy, if elected, would be at the “Beck and call of the Vatican” (Warnick 186). Massa agrees with this interpretation, and believes the main idea behind the statement was that “however sincere Kennedy himself might be regarding his commitment to upholding the principles of the First Amendment, he could never be free of his church’s ‘determined efforts...to breach

the wall of separation of church and state” (Massa 11,12). The Peale document was highly controversial and was received unfavorably by a number of individuals, groups, and organizations. Sorensen writes that the Peale group “stirred a wave of anger and dismay from coast to coast. Many who had previously assumed that intolerance was confined to ‘backwoods Bible-thumpers’ were shocked by the (group’s) transparent unfairness” (Sorensen “Kennedy” 189). Kemper reiterates this sentiment and observes that “news of the Peale Group position paper hit like a bombshell” (Kemper 190).

Although the issue had been addressed on numerous occasions leading up to the election, Kennedy was not satisfied with the outcome. Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos note that Kennedy could not seem to bury the controversy and move on. They state: “He knew he could not afford to be defensive, angry, impatient or silent, no matter how many times he heard the same insulting, foolish or discriminatory questions” (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 23). The Kennedy camp was always searching for an appropriate and meaningful “‘forum in which to confront the [religious] issue.’ The opportunity was provided by an invitation from the Greater Houston Ministerial Association” (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 27). While the stage offered by the association was ideal, the audience and context was undesirable and unnerving. Stelzner writes that “Kennedy decided with ‘considerable reluctance’ to accept the invitation extended by the Houston Ministerial Association” (Stelzner 225). Nonetheless, the invitation was accepted, and Kennedy’s advisors decided that Kennedy ought to use the occasion as a platform to specifically address

the “allegations” of the Peale group (Warnick 186). The main concerns outlined by the Peale group were general and largely mirrored the most prominent concerns expressed by members of the public and other skeptics. In retrospect, Barrett highlights these concerns. For instance, some felt that the inevitable influence of the Pope would facilitate a turning point in American values and ideals. Barrett states:

Would not a President’s Catholicism, this strange and threatening dogma, enforced by blindly devoted practitioners of mysterious ritual, with headquarters in a foreign country, and followed unquestioningly by 40,000,000 Americans cause the debasement of Americanism?
(260)

Others felt that Kennedy’s election would mean a political figure that was nothing more than an extension of Rome who answered to the Pope. Barrett adds: “Would not the Pope, an alien representing alien ideas, dictate to the White House?” (260) Furthermore, because of the nature of Catholicism and the implications of a lifetime its religious system, one could not possibly control their own political actions or feelings without considering the will of the Pope. Barrett writes: Would not a Catholic as President unconsciously act against America? (260). These questions as well as others pertinent to the issue were the focus of Kennedy’s speech to the Houston ministers.

Kennedy’s speech did more than just respond to ill feelings of skeptics. It demonstrated his polished speaking skills and ability to face adversity head on and overcome it. Historically, the speech is notable for a variety of reasons. But most apparent is the fact that it was almost universally received as a success.

Contemporary scholars and media members at the time have written extensively

about reactions to the speech's persuasion, and Kennedy's ability to overcome the issue. For instance, following the speech, Ernest Lindley, in a September 26, 1960 article, wrote that Kennedy was in top form as a speaker and "at his best," he states: "At his meeting with the Protestant ministers in Houston," Kennedy was "carefully prepared and he read it well. In answering the questions which followed, he was even better" (Lindley 56). He went on to say:

I wondered why Kennedy was so much more effective in his session with the clergymen than in most of his political speeches, especially the short ones. It was partly, I suppose, because he knew the confrontation was extremely important and involved questions about which he felt deeply. (Lindley 56)

For some, Kennedy's speech served to put the oppression against him in perspective. An article in the *New Republic*, released just one week after Kennedy's speech to the Houston ministers, demonstrated the powerful nature of Kennedy's words and targeted the irrationality of skeptics, most notably, Dr. Peale. The article argued that the statement released by the Peale group was contradictory and riddled with falsehoods. It stated that the Peale group expressed their desire to perpetuate church-state separation; however, "there seems no disinclination on the part of Norman Vincent Peale...to speak out as he wishes on political subjects—including the Presidential campaign of 1960" ("Protestants In" 5). The article went on to discuss that seemingly the only way for Kennedy to "prove his bonafides" would be to give up his faith all together ("Protestants In" 5). James MacGregor Burns, in a November 1960 *Progressive* article, discussed that based on Kennedy's responses, the religious issue would subside substantially. He stated: "I am

confident, however, that by the time this article appears several weeks from now, the religious issue will no longer be a national issue" (21). He argued that Kennedy's speech to the Houston ministers was the pinnacle of Kennedy's struggle to put the issue to rest: "His address and his question-answering before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association were even more dramatic and decisive than the talk to the newspaper editors, although he said almost nothing new" (Burns 21). Burns identified six things to take away from the issue in the aftermath of the speech. The two most important are: one, "bigotry is politically self-defeating"; and two, criticism regarding Kennedy's religion probably resulted in Nixon losing support and Kennedy gaining it (Burns 21-22). While levels of enthusiasm varied, interviews with a series of notable individuals present at the speech reiterate the consensus of the speech's success. Among those with clear enthusiasm for Kennedy's performance, former Senator Ralph Yarborough said that Kennedy "won the issue" and "put it to rest," and that he "marveled" at Kennedy's "supreme intelligence" (Strober and Strober 44). Jack Valenti, special assistant to President Johnson, called it "about as brilliant a performance as I've ever witnessed," and stated: "If there was a turning point in that issue, it was there" (Strober and Strober 45). Those with less confidence in the impact of the speech include Eugene McCarthy, former senator and 1968 candidate in the presidential primaries, who thought the obligation for Kennedy to speak implied by the occasion was unnecessary, but that generally "people thought it was a positive influence on the election" (Strober and Strober 45). Similar to McCarthy, Tom Wicker, former associate editor and columnist for the *New*

York Times, felt that the religious issue wasn't "the key one" but thought that the Kennedy camp was able to eventually use the issue to their advantage. Wikcker concluded that the issue "helped Kennedy rather than hurt him" (Strober and Strober 46).

Contemporary scholars have also consented that the speech was well received. Debora Hart Strober and Gerald Strober write that the Houston speech marked "[t]he climactic moment in the debate over Kennedy's religious beliefs" because, "Kennedy was finally able to defuse the religious issue. This neutralization of the Protestant clergy proved to be the turning point of the campaign" (Strober and Strober 44). Warnick agrees and observes that the media's reaction as well as the events following the speech revealed that Kennedy had gotten his message across" (192). Media reaction to the speech showed that, for some of his audience, Kennedy succeeded in ending identification of him as solely 'the Catholic candidate' (Warnick 192). Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos have a similar interpretation. They write that the media's reaction was primarily positive and consisted of "highlighting the major elements of Kennedy's message and offering praise for the views expressed by the Democratic candidate" (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 33). Kennedy recognized the successful reception and appeared to receive a boost of confidence from the speech's success. Stelzner observes that "[a]fter his appearance in Houston, Kennedy himself 'seemed much surer of the course the campaign would take'" (227). Not only was Kennedy more confident, but the public seemed to adopt this confidence as well. This improved assurance in his candidacy led to improved public

approval. The forum and timeliness of the speech were likely pivotal to his chances in November. Strober and Strober argue that Kennedy defused the religious issue and neutralized the Protestant clergy, while the speech marked “the turning point of the campaign” (44). Many scholars have gone as far as to write that the speech played an instrumental role in Kennedy’s victory in the election less than two months later. Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos argue that the speech allowed Kennedy to “reframe the religious issue away from concerns over his Catholicism toward larger and more profound considerations of tolerance, and therefore may have had an effect on the final vote tally in November 1960” (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 33). Stelzner agrees and adds that Kennedy’s success in Houston not only improved his chances of winning the white house, but also provided “some listeners a certain measure of comfort and of shared ideation” (227).

The success of the speech caused the Peale group—who had “set the whole fuss going the week before” (“Test of Religion 21)—to praise Kennedy’s comments. Dr. Peale stepped down as the leader of the group and renounced his former position. From that point on, those outwardly against Kennedy because of his religion were viewed as considerably unfavorable. Stelzner notes this and observes “within a few days of his address the Reverend Mr. Peale resigned from the National Conference of Citizens for Religious Freedom. Further, except for extremist groups, the religious question was no longer a respectable public issue” (227). The Peal group released a statement “saying that the speech was ‘the most complete, unequivocal and reassuring statement which could be expected of any person in

[Kennedy's] position'" (Goldzwig, Dionisopoulos 33). Dr. Daniel A. Poling called the speech "magnificent" ("Test of Religion 21"). Reactions to the speech demonstrated that Kennedy was clearly able to respond to the Peale group and use the speech as a public platform to overcome the issue.

The extent of positive reactions to the speech are all the more remarkable because of the hostile nature of the audience. Kennedy faced a large audience of ministers who had concrete, predetermined views toward Catholic political figures. Many of the members had also become angered by questions regarding the ethical nature of their opposition to Kennedy. Stelzner illustrates this point: The audience consisted of "nearly 1,000 ministers" most of whom "were both politically and theological opposed to him" (Stelzner 226). Rev. George Reck called the meeting to order, and Rev. Herbert Meza introduced Kennedy. When calling the meeting to order, Rev. Reck felt compelled to remind audience members to treat Kennedy with respect. He encouraged "good order, proper respect for the nominee," and "good Christian behavior generally" (Kennedy 27). Some individuals present had made pointed demonstrations of their opposition to Kennedy; in fact, one individual "had made available in the lobby of the meeting place 'unspeakably malicious' anti-Catholic literature" (Barrett 261). The audience members were suspicious of Kennedy's presence, and the "emotional tone of the occasion" influenced the Chairman to warn audience members to conduct themselves respectfully and appropriately (Barrett 261). To insure that audience members were aware of the implications of their behavior, he also mentioned the national attention surrounding

the speech stating: "Our little mouse has grown into a lion of significance" (Kennedy 27). When questioned regarding the manner in which he addressed the crowd, Rev. Reck "responded briskly," stating: "'I was just afraid.' The co-chairmen also observed Kennedy's tensions. The candidate said little to them and 'was very, very nervous.' Listeners, too, seemed on edge" (Stelzner 226). The audience as a whole shared collective feelings of suspicion toward Kennedy's character (Henry 163). When Kennedy inquired about the mood in the room, his press chief Pierre Salinger responded, "[t]hey're tired of being called bigots" ("Test of Religion" 21). Because of the apparent opposition and ill will toward Kennedy by the audience, numerous individuals have specifically called the forum and audience within hostile. Rev. John W. Turnbull of *The Reporter* says of the atmosphere: "There was a strange feeling of tension, uncertainty, perhaps hostility in the air" (qtd. In Kemper 38). Goldzwig and Dionisopoulos say that Kennedy was nervous before the speech and sensed "tension and hostility in the room" (28). *Time* magazine writes "Jack Kennedy carefully chose his ground for his counterthrust on religion, and it was plainly hostile ground" ("Test of Religion" 21). White reiterates saying, "[h]e had addressed a sullen, almost hostile audience when he began" (White 262). O'Brien is impressed with Kennedy's demeanor but recognizes the nature of the atmosphere. He states: "Kennedy was polished, relaxed and polite; the ministers, on the other hand, appeared tense, apprehensive, and some even hostile" (O'Brien 475). Sorensen observes that when Kennedy stood at the pulpit, the ministers looked upon him with intense suspicion. He writes: "Glaring at him from the other side were the Protestant ministers of

Houston...A sense of tension and hostility hung in the air. The few minutes of waiting seemed endless (Sorensen 190). Stelzner reiterates this observation saying Kennedy faced “a sullen crowd of glaring ministers” and he could feel the tension in the room (226). Despite of the intense and unfavorable atmosphere, Kennedy performed brilliantly and did not once waiver or show signs of intimidation. The ministers carried their disapproving disposition into the question and answer session but Kennedy persevered there as well. Henry writes: “Kennedy was calm, in control, and poised,” even in the act of having to respond to questions and speak on an issue that had been plaguing him constantly, however: “The ministers asking questions...varied from openly hostile to suspecting naively that they were putting forth the issues for the first time” (164).

The hostile audience is especially important with regard to this study because it points to the need to understand his ethical appeal and the tools he used to attain it. Historical perceptions toward Catholic candidates, attitudes specific to Kennedy regarding religion, the events and factors leading to Kennedy’s Houston speech, and the public reception and critical reaction to the speech, all justify the need to study the connection between Kennedy’s ethical appeal and his rhetorical technique. This study, focusing on the relationship between style and credibility, deploys Black and Burke in hopes of accounting for that connection.

Analysis

This analysis explores the persuasive implications of the stylistic devices used by Kennedy in his speech. Kennedy used metaphor to drive an ideology that helped to persuade audience members of his American allegiance. The use of Burke's concept of "pentadic ratios" will show that the three most important ratios in the speech are the agent-purpose, the agent-scene, and the scene-purpose, with agent-scene and scene-purpose serving to reinforce and strengthen the agent-purpose ratio. Burke's concept of "familial substance" emerges in the speech where the agent-purpose ratio is observed. Analysis of this substance through Black's method for disclosing ideology shows the ideology behind the metaphors in Kennedy's speech..

In Kennedy's speech, the agent is the dominant and most important pentadic element. The way Kennedy refers to and positions himself points to this conclusion. In the speech, Kennedy says "I," "I'm," or "I'd" a total of forty-seven times. He also says "me" or "my" a total of twenty-five times. He makes direct references to himself seventy-two times throughout the speech. He makes collective references ("our" or "we"), meant to include himself and his audience only nine times. In contrast, he refers to the audience directly by saying "you," only four times. To put the prominence of Kennedy's self-references in perspective, the transcript taken from the recording of the speech shows only forty-five complete sentences.¹ Kennedy

¹ The transcript used was retrieved from Americanrhetoric.com, which states that the text is "Authenticity Certified" and "transcribed directly from audio." Elsewhere

refers to himself directly in thirty-four of the forty-five sentences, and a total of seventy-two times. In many sentences, he refers to himself two or more times.

Kennedy is clearly the agent. The text reveals that the speech is meant to be agent-centric. Further evidence for this judgment can be found in the very first line of the speech where Kennedy says “Reverend Meza, Reverend Reck, I’m grateful for your generous invitation to state my views.” By saying “I’m grateful” to state “my views,” Kennedy establishes himself as the subject and focal point of the occasion, and therefore, the agent.

The agent is involved in the pentadic ratios of the speech for the majority of its length, and most of the speech operates in the agent-purpose ratio. In the third paragraph Kennedy makes clear both his purpose and the agent-centric focus for the speech as he states his central thesis for the speech: “So it is apparently necessary for me to state once again—not what kind of church I believe in, for that should be important only to me—but what kind of America I believe in.” Ratios are established by locating a dominant element and then observing that element’s interaction with another element of the pentad (Burke xxii). When Kennedy states that it is “necessary for [him] to state once again...what kind of America [he] believe[s] in,” he as the agent is declaring his “purpose.” The purpose is shown from the perspective of the agent; therefore, the agent-purpose ratio operates in this instance. The majority of the remainder of the speech acts to support this agent-

on the site they state: “Be assured that where ‘Authenticity Certified’ appears in one of American Rhetoric’s text holdings, readers are guaranteed to find a text that is substantively and stylistically faithful to the speech as originally delivered.

purpose ratio. It should also be noted that while the purpose in the speech is for Kennedy to clarify the “kind of America” in which he believes, on a larger scale the purpose has further reaching implications. Kennedy has agreed to give the speech in the interest of his campaign and the purpose of any speech on the campaign trail is to improve a candidate’s chances of winning the Presidency.

Kennedy begins his support for the thesis by touching on the most important components of the “kind of America” in which he believes. He makes a series of declarations that shape his constitutional view of church-state relations. Collectively, the purpose of these declarations is to clarify Kennedy’s conception of Americanism as it relates to religion. As the agent, Kennedy speaks from a first person perspective and advances his purpose with each declaration. Each statement begins with “I believe” followed by a specific belief regarding religion and Americanism. These declarations include: “I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute”; “I believe in an America that is officially neither Catholic, Protestant nor Jewish”; “I believe in an America where religious intolerance will someday end, where all men and all churches are treated as equals.” In these instances, Kennedy, as the agent, and as the sentence subject, informs his audience of his specific conception of Americanism as it relates to religion. Each of these lines operates in the agent-purpose ratio because the sequence of agent-purpose declarations culminates in a declaration that, if accepted, dictates that Kennedy should be seen as equal.

Kennedy proceeds by branching from his discussion of Americanism to address his conception of the Presidency. This material operates under the agent-purpose ratio as well since it follows a logical progression that points to his purpose. As with his discussion of the “kind of America” in which he believes, Kennedy gives a first person perspective of the “kind of Presidency” in which he believes. Kennedy’s purpose is to shape his conception of the presidency as it relates to religion, and demonstrate that the conception he holds reflects that of the Constitution. The agent-purpose ratio can be observed because Kennedy, as the agent, advances his conception of the presidency with the purpose of strengthening his view of the “kind of America” he believes in. He states the following points about the Presidency: “This is the kind of America in which I believe. And it represents the kind of Presidency in which I believe”; “I would not look with favor upon a President working to subvert the first amendment’s guarantees of religious liberty”; “I want a Chief Executive whose public acts are responsible to all and obligated to none.” Kennedy’s discussion of the Presidency informs his audience that his philosophy as candidate is based on fundamental American values that they can expect from him if he is elected.

Kennedy moves from his discussion of Americanism and the Presidency to discuss the American tradition. Similar to his discussion of the presidency, this section of the speech reinforces his discussion of Americanism and supports his thesis. Kennedy’s treatment of tradition represents another example of the agent-purpose ratio because Kennedy uses tradition as another angle to convey his

conception of Americanism. Kennedy discusses tradition to ultimately convey that his view of church-state relations has been upheld historically. Thus, tradition helps to provide support and perspective for Kennedy's position. It is an instance of the agent discussing a topic to advance a purpose, and therefore it signifies an instance of the agent-purpose ratio. For instance, after his discussion of the forefathers fight "for the constitution, the Bill of Rights, [and] the Virginia Statue of Religious Freedom," Kennedy pleads, "I ask you tonight to follow in that tradition." As the agent, Kennedy places himself as the sentence subject and attempts to advance his purpose. By linking himself with traditional American conceptions, Kennedy further clarifies his conception of Americanism and does so in a way that ought to relate to audience members devoted to that tradition. The constitution, Bill of Rights, and the Virginia Statue of Religious Freedom represent iconic symbols of American freedom and equality. Kennedy reminds his audience that stigmatizing someone for their religion goes against longstanding American tradition and disregards some of the fundamental American principles that the forefathers fought to establish.

In the final few grouping of paragraphs in the speech, Kennedy discusses the nature of his stance based on what he is opposed to. Kennedy uses this area of the speech to clarify his perspective by negation. As a collective, the purpose of these negating statements is to once again further clarify Kennedy's conception of Americanism. The agent-purpose ratio is operating because Kennedy places himself as the subject of each sentence and presents a series of different negating claims to shape his position. Therefore, as the agent, he is advancing a purpose by means of

negation, and the agent-purpose ratio can be observed. He presents the following statements meant to define by negation: “But let me say, with respect to other countries, that I am wholly opposed to the State being used by any religious group”; “I am not the Catholic candidate for president. I am the democratic Party’s candidate for President who happens also to be a Catholic”; “I do not speak for my church on public matters; and my church does not speak for me”; “But if the time should ever come...when my office would require me to either violate my conscience or violate the national interest, then I would resign the office.” Kennedy concludes the speech by owning his position and conveying that his philosophy will lead to a President who leads from a constitutional perspective. He states: “I do not intend to apologize for these views to my critics of either Catholic or Protestant faith” and “[I]f...I should win this election, then I shall devote every effort of mind and spirit to fulfilling the oath of the Presidency.” These final statements operate in the agent-purpose ratio as well because they are an instance of the agent (Kennedy) once again, supplying the audience with statements meant to advance a purpose (to clarify his conception of Americanism and win the Presidency).

While the agent-purpose ratio is clearly the dominant ratio throughout the speech, a handful of other ratios hold significance and warrant examination. The agent-scene ratio and the scene-purpose ratio are the most prevalent ratios other than the agent-purpose. Not only are they important because of their prevalence, but also because they reinforce and contextualize the agent-purpose ratio.

The agent-scene ratio operates in discourse when the agent, as the dominant element acts in a scene, acts on a scene, or influences a scene. Examples of the agent-scene ratio in Kennedy's speech occur when he speaks from a first person perspective, or positions himself as the sentence subject, and presents a scene that is relevant to his position. The agent-scene ratio frequently occurs during moments where Kennedy speaks from a first person perspective about background and contextual information. He uses this perspective to provide scene-based contextual evidence to help shape his position. This interpretation is especially evident at the beginning of the speech. Kennedy recognizes that his purpose for the night is to discuss the religious issue, but he introduces his discussion of purpose by presenting the "scene" of the campaign from his perspective. It is a moment of the agent contextualizing the scene. The religious issue was one of many issues during the time of the campaign, but it had grown in popularity to the point where it trumped the other issues. Kennedy presents the scene in a way that insinuates that the "religious issue" should not be an issue at all. He states:

While the so-called religious issue is necessarily and properly the chief topic here tonight, I want to emphasize from the outset that I believe that we have far more critical issues in the 1960 campaign; the spread of Communist influence, until it now festers only 90 miles from the coast of Florida—the humiliating treatment of our President and Vice President by those who no longer respect our power—the hungry children I saw in families forced to give up their farms—an America with too many slums, with too few schools, and too late to the moon and outer space. These are the real issues which should decide the campaign. And they are not religious issues—for war and hunger and ignorance and despair know no religious barrier.

Kennedy uses the discussion of his position to contextualize and discount the nature of the religious issue. In the subsequent paragraph, he blames the religious issue for the reason “the real issues in this campaign have been obscured,” and states that it is “apparently necessary” for him to state “once again” his position regarding the issue. The agent-scene ratio is operating here because it is an instance of an agent (Kennedy) presenting, and acting on a scene (the landscape of issues pertinent to the campaign). Kennedy uses this presentation of scene to introduce his purpose. After stating his purpose, the agent-scene ratio is evident once again when Kennedy uses personal testimony to reinforce his stance. He says that the “kind of America” he believes in is the same kind that he “fought for in the South Pacific” and the kind his “brother died for in Europe.” As the agent, Kennedy presents numerous scenes, including the state of the religious issue, the state of the “real issues,” the battle in the South Pacific, and the battle that took the life of his brother in Europe. Kennedy presents these instances of agents acting on or in scenes to show that the religious controversy goes against constitutional principle. Each instance provides an example of an agent acting in a scene that defends constitutional principle. Other notable instances of the agent-scene ratio come when Kennedy encourages the condemnation of nations that do not believe in the same American constitutional freedoms and withhold their office based on religion. He says “I hope that you and I condemn with equal fervor those nations which deny their Presidency to Protestants, and those which deny in to Catholics.” As the agent, Kennedy is referring to another current scene that is relevant to, and helps to contextualize his

position. Kennedy also presents future hypothetical scenes and discusses what his actions would be in the event of those scenes. The agent-scene ratio is operating because he says “I” would do this, if this scene were to occur. For instance, he says that he would resign from the office if his religion were ever to cause him to “violate the national interest,” and that he would be satisfied if he were to lose based on the “real issues” because he could be confident that he did his best and was “fairly judged.” The most important implication of the agent-scene ratio operating throughout the speech is that these instances serve to advance Kennedy’s purpose (clarification of his conception of Americanism) and reinforce the agent-purpose ratio. Often throughout the speech, instances of the agent-scene ratio are closely entwined with instances of the agent-purpose ratio. Similarly, instances of scene-purpose ratio are closely interlinked with the agent-purpose ratio.

Instances of the scene-purpose ratio do not come from a first person perspective; rather, Kennedy uses stories and contextual information to advance his purpose and reinforce his thesis. For instance, Kennedy demonstrates that the religious issue this year has far reaching implications for future elections. The scene-purpose ratio is evident here because he presents a scene that has clear implications for his purpose. He states: “while this year it may be a Catholic against whom the finger of suspicion is pointed, in other years it has been—and may someday be again—a Jew, or a Quaker, or a Unitarian, or a Baptist.” The presentation of scene shows his audience the dangers of religious prejudice and illustrates his purpose (to conceptualize his view of Americanism). In a later

instance, he asserts that the “America for which our forefathers did die” and which “Bowie and Crocket” fought for and “Fuentes, and McCafferty, and Bailey, and Badillo and Carey” died for did not require a “religious test.” Kennedy then pleads that “the whole nation will be the loser” if “40 million Americans lost their chance of being President on the day they were baptized.” The presentation of historic events along with potential future events signify scenes that help to demonstrate Kennedy’s purpose by clarifying his ideal “kind of America” in the present. As with the instances of the agent-scene ratio in the speech, cases of the scene-purpose ratio are often intertwined with, and serve to reinforce, the agent-purpose ratio. Instances of the scene-purpose ratio are pieces of evidence that clarify Kennedy’s position, reinforce his thesis, and illustrate his purpose.

So what can be learned from the examination of these ratios? Burke writes that ratios and substance are intimately connected (xix). In Kennedy’s speech, the most prominent ratios often signify moments where the substance is most apparent. With regard to the ratios, substance can be thought of as the vein of similarity among ratios. As previously stated, substance provides a means to categorize relational figurative language (Burke 57). The common ground among the ratios in Kennedy’s speech is familial substance.

The examination of the agent-purpose ratio showed that Kennedy used discussions of Americanism, the Presidency, and American tradition to support his thesis and shape his position. These three areas of emphasis share a “familial” nature. As explained earlier, familial substance regards systems of belief and shared

worldviews; it is “usually ‘spiritualized,’ so that it includes merely social groups, comprising persons of the same nationality or beliefs” (Burke 29). Kennedy’s discussion of Americanism, the Presidency, and tradition, characterizes an attempt to relate the religious issue to key topics that correspond with what it means to be an American.

Americanism as a concept developed in the speech represents a complex system of beliefs to which most Americans would ascribe. It is a shared sense of unity that requires cohesive thought and action among group members. When speaking on Americanism in the speech, Kennedy describes his conception as the “kind of America” in which he believes. Each line refers to religion specifically, and he uses fundamental ideals that are essential to the commonly held conception of what it means to be American. Kennedy sets up his discussion in a way that encourages the audience to agree with his conception so as not to alienate themselves. For instance, Kennedy discusses absolute “separation of church and state,” opposition to public funding for church schools and the imposition of religious will on “the general populace,” acceptance of religious diversity, and the need for a proactive stance against religious intolerance. He sums up his discussion of Americanism by encouraging his audience to “promote...the American ideal of brotherhood.” Kennedy’s discussion of Americanism is clearly familial in nature. He encourages shared belief systems, advocates for unity, and speaks of Americanism spiritually by presenting it as the kind of America he “believes in.” Finally, he ends

by promoting “the American ideal of brotherhood,” and the concept of a “brotherhood” is inherently familial.

Following his discussion of Americanism, Kennedy takes a similar approach to his discussion of the Presidency. Kennedy’s discussion of the Presidency signifies one of the most important moments of familial substance in the speech because traditionally Presidents have been positioned as fatherly figures. For instance, George Washington has often been historically viewed as the father of our country (Richard Morris calls him the “Surrogate father to a revolutionary generation” (31)), and among the seven figures thought to be the “Founding Fathers” of the United States (John Adams, John Jay, James Madison, Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, George Washington, and Alexander Hamilton) (Morris 1), four of them were presidents (Washington, Adams, Jefferson, and Adams). As with his statements about Americanism, Kennedy describes his position based on the kind of President he “believes in”; or, the kind of “fatherly figure” he feels should be head of the country. He refers to common American values that are tied to the Presidency. Audience members choosing to disagree with his conception would risk alienating themselves from the American shared system of beliefs. For instance, he states that the kind of presidency in which he believes, means regarding it as “a great office” that is never the pawn of a religious group, or confined to members of one single religion. He goes on to say that the presidency recognizes absolute church-state separation, does not subvert first amendment guarantees, and is not conditioned by religion in any way. Kennedy’s discussion essentially represents his belief that a

President should support and actively work to enforce the guarantees of the first amendment. Kennedy's discussion of the Presidency is "familial" in nature because his conception positions the President like the head of a family. The audience should easily relate to the point because historically President's have been seen as iconic, fatherly individuals who represent what it means to be an American. In Kennedy's conception the idealized head of the national family is a leader who ideally reflects the family's values and works as an influential force to perpetuate those values.

Kennedy follows his description of the Presidency with a discussion of American tradition. Kennedy's discussion of tradition involves a series of historical stories and symbols including the forefather's sacrifice for religious freedom, the establishment of the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, and the historic battle at the Alamo where Americans fought side-by-side regardless of religious affiliation. When Kennedy discusses tradition, he requests that his audiences "follow in that tradition" and ascribe to the shared system of values that the tradition represents. He implores his audience to carry on the tradition and to continue to believe in the values and sense of Americanism that can be derived from tradition. Kennedy's section on tradition ties directly to Burke's conception of familial substance. As previously mentioned, Burke argues that in instances of familial substance, there is usually "the notion of some founder shared in common, or some covenant or constitution or historical act from which the consubstantiality of the group is derived" (Burke 29). Kennedy directly refers to the forefathers who fought to break free from the British rule because of religious

prejudice, and he refers to landmark historical moments that have shaped the America of the present day. The discussion of tradition is “familial” because Kennedy refers to “historical acts” that have created “consubstantiality” among Americans².

Kennedy’s discussion of Americanism, the Presidency, and tradition shows that moments in the speech operating in the agent-purpose ratio are clearly familial in nature. However, an equally important point of analysis is that the familial nature of these areas is developed via metaphor. Substance for Burke takes form because concepts are presented metaphorically and run along a vein of substance. The metaphors in the speech act as the pieces that construct a familial-based ideology. Metaphor allows Kennedy to express the familial substance in the speech and develop an ideology.

Black’s theory of stylistic tokens enables one to explore the languages in an artifact with the purpose of deriving an ideology. Black calls for examining “stylistic tokens” that represent a system of concepts and provide evidence for the intended ideology, and he sees potential especially in metaphors. The metaphoric “stylistic tokens” in Kennedy’s speech are the root of a hierarchical system of methodological concepts. Evidence for Kennedy’s thesis can most readily be seen where the agent-purpose ratio is operating. Where the agent-purpose ratio can be observed, the familial substance of the speech is most evident. These moments of substance are

² “Consubstantiality was referred to in the section on Burke’s substance in the methodology chapter. Burke expresses “Consubstantiality” in terms of familial unity created by shared ancestry (Burke 29, 102).

framed by specific metaphors. Observation of these metaphors helps to illuminate a specific ideology.

There are four major metaphors in the speech, and a series of supporting minor metaphors. The four major metaphors are the disease of competing beliefs metaphor, the spirit of America metaphor, the spirit of tradition metaphor and the metaphor of the losing nation. These metaphors act as stylistic tokens that reflect the ideological principle that freedom of religion is a value of the American family. The examination of each metaphor individually will provide evidence for this ideology.

It should initially be noted that two of the four major metaphors (the spirit of American, and the spirit of tradition) occur where the agent-purpose ratio and familial substance in the speech are most evident. For Burke, the examination of these key moments can often illuminate a motive (Burke xvi). These moments also provide the richest material for examining an overarching ideology. Therefore, these two metaphors will be regarded as the most important in the speech, with the “spirit of America” metaphor being regarded as the most important since it can be found in the speech’s thesis.

The first metaphor Kennedy presents is the disease of competing beliefs. Kennedy presents this metaphor near the beginning of the speech when he discusses the “real issues” in the speech and argues that the religious issue is not truly a “real issue.” He states: “We have far more critical issues in the 1960

campaign; the spread of Communist influence, until it now festers only 90 miles from the coast of Florida" (Kennedy). Kennedy treats communism as "disease-like" by describing it as festering off the coast. The term "fester" means "to cause increasing poisoning, irritation, or bitterness" or "to undergo or exist in a state of progressive deterioration" (Merriam-Webster). When one can observe a disease "festering" it usually means the disease is in late stages and is likely contagious. Kennedy treats Communism as a contagious disease that is in close proximity to the United States. The metaphor shows the potential for Communism's influence to increase. Moreover, the metaphor suggests that Communism's "festering" could "infect" our nation. While he refers to Communism specifically, this metaphor has further reaching implications. The thesis of the speech regards the "kind of America" he believes in. By stating this metaphor, Kennedy begins to shape his view of the values held by the "American family" by exploiting values that are not included. He stresses that if we lose focus on what is really important, we could be subject to the influence of a competing political system. The system of values held by the "American family" could be "infected" and eventually corrupted. Kennedy pleads that there should be attention given to the constant threat of un-American influence, rather than a value (religious freedom) that is essential to the American family and guaranteed by the Constitution.

Following this metaphor, Kennedy discusses a series of other issues that are important to the election. This discussion acts as an introduction for Kennedy to state his thesis, which also expresses the "the spirit of America" metaphor. Kennedy

states: "So it is apparently necessary for me to state once again—not what kind of church I believe in, for that should be important only to me—but what kind of America I believe in." It is important to note that when Kennedy uses of the "spirit of America" metaphor, or the subsequent metaphors dealing with spirit, he does not address his conception of "America," or "tradition" with regard to "spirit." However, as previously stated, Burke argues that when "familial substance" can be identified, "the concept of family is usually 'spiritualized'" (Burke 29). Kennedy presents these concepts in terms of his "belief," which spiritualizes them because a sense of spirit is insinuated by belief. Belief is "conviction of the truth of some statement or the reality of some being or phenomenon especially when based on examination of evidence" (Merriam-Webster). Faith in a particular religion is often characterized by belief. Kennedy's statements regarding his belief in a number of constitutional principles spiritualize the nature of them as concepts. The "spirit of America" metaphor is the most important in the speech. Kennedy honors its significance by spending a great deal of time and energy conceptualizing it. He presents it in the series of statements analyzed earlier regarding his statement of Americanism, and minor metaphors to help shape his conception. Each statement regarding Americanism refers to the kind of America Kennedy *believes in* with regard to religious freedom: "I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute"; "I believe in an America that is officially neither Catholic, Protestant nor Jewish"; "I believe in an America where religious intolerance will someday end, where all men and all churches are treated as equals" (Kennedy). Kennedy refutes

anti-religious prejudice by spiritualizing principles and law in terms of belief. These principles and laws, presented in terms of belief, form a secular catechism that, to be American, one believes. Through the belief metaphor the Constitution is treated in a biblical sense as the manual for true Americanism. Freedom of religion, as a Constitutional principle, gains power through belief by Americans in its legitimacy. Constitutional principles inspire belief, and these principles gain power through the nation's unified belief. Fundamentally, freedom of religion, as a principle, is already a components of values held by the "American family." By presenting these statements, Kennedy is reiterating values that unify the American family and reminding the audience of the importance of these values.

Kennedy also uses a series of four minor metaphors to build understanding for the nature of the "spirit of America": These metaphors are, the metaphor of the "religious body," the "finger of suspicion" metaphor, "the fabric of society" metaphor, and the metaphor of the "American ideal of brotherhood."

The "religious body" metaphor is meant to characterize the nature of religion as it relates to the value system of the "American family." Kennedy states: "I belief in an America...where no religious body seeks to impose its will" (Kennedy). Kennedy treats the "religious body" as a member of the American family. The use of the "religious body" metaphor humanizes the concept. It conveys that, in a society that values freedom, equality, and choice, one member of the family will not influence or dictate the direction of the whole. Characterizing a particular group as a single "body" insinuates that there are other "bodies" that make up the "American family."

In regard to religion, each religious denomination represents a “religious body.” There is the “Catholic body,” and a “Protestant body.” Kennedy’s use of “religious body” insinuates that all religions can be considered in terms of bodies. Beyond religion, Kennedy’s use of the term “body” opens the possibility to think of other groups as bodies as well. Kennedy could have said religious group or just religion. The use of the term “body” assumes that our nation as a family can be conceived of as containing groups or bodies of individuals. Kennedy uses the “religious body” metaphor to help characterize that the “kind of America” in which he believes regards equality among individuals and bodies of religious groups.

The “finger of suspicion” and the “fabric of society” metaphors are meant to demonstrate the implications of straying from the values held by the “American family.” Kennedy demonstrates that the skepticism toward him regarding his religion does not have a place in the “kind of America” he believes in. He states: “For while this year it may be a Catholic against whom the finger of suspicion is pointed, in other years it has been...a Jew, or a Quaker, or a Unitarian, or a Baptist” (Kennedy). The “finger of suspicion” metaphor creates specific imagery that illustrates discontinuity within the American family, or a rupture of the “spirit of America.” Finger pointing insinuates isolating a specific member of the group. However, there is no basis or grounded evidence to point the finger, it is a “finger of suspicion.” Kennedy uses the “finger of suspicion” show that the skepticism against him is unfounded and a violation of the secular catechism that creates unity among Americans. The “finger of suspicion” helps Kennedy to define the “kind of America”

in which he believes by negation. He uses the metaphor to describe an un-American action that has dangerous implications for all religious institutions.

The “fabric of society” metaphor continues the line of reasoning presented by the “finger of suspicion” metaphor. Kennedy uses the “fabric of society” metaphor to demonstrate the detrimental implications of suspicion among members of the “American family.” The notion of a “fabric of society” insinuates a vulnerable state that can be torn or unraveled. Kennedy uses this metaphor to demonstrate that harmony can be easily broken by the introduction of un-American action and ideals. He declares that while, “[t]oday, I may be the victim...tomorrow it may be you—until the whole fabric of our harmonious society is ripped apart at a time of great national peril” (Kennedy). Kennedy uses the “fabric of society” metaphor to show that, if this type of un-American action is to persist, it will not only affect Catholics, it will encourage skepticism in other unfounded areas until the discontinuity is so prevalent that it causes division among members of the “American family.” The “finger of suspicion” and “fabric of society” metaphors demonstrate the dangers of discontinuity among the values of the “American family.” Kennedy uses them to reinforce the legitimacy of the “kind of America” in which he believes.

The metaphor of the “American ideal of brotherhood” is a re-conceptualization of the “spirit of America” metaphor that Kennedy uses to further the sense of a unified “American family” that is central to his ideology. Kennedy states:

I believe in an America...where Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at both the lay and the pastoral levels, will refrain from those attitudes of disdain and division which have so often marred their works in the past, and promote instead the American ideal of brotherhood.

The term “brotherhood” engages the language of family. Brotherhoods have also been historically associated with fraternal societies or groups of people bound by specific beliefs, guidelines, and actions. Presenting American unity as an “ideal of brotherhood,” allows Kennedy to convey to his audience that the statements that make up the “kind of America” he believes in are components of the brotherhood, or “American family.” The “ideal” for Kennedy is composed of the Constitutional rights and freedoms that align with the “kind of America” he is presenting. The collective “values” of the “American family” make up the “ideal.” Religious freedom is a “value” and part of the “ideal,” whereas prejudice is unfounded, and ultimately, un-American.

As a collective, the four minor metaphors (the “religious body,” “the finger of suspicion,” “the fabric of society,” the “American ideal of brotherhood”) help to build understanding and shape Kennedy’s presentation of the “spirit of America” metaphor. These metaphors are crucial in demonstrating the depth and importance of Kennedy’s conception of the “spirit of America.”

Along with the four minor metaphors, Kennedy also uses the concept of the “kind of Presidency” in which he believes to conceptualize the type of America in which he believes. While the concept of the Presidency is meant literally, not metaphorically, it provides important support for Kennedy’s conception of

Americanism and helps to paint a picture of Kennedy as a potential president.

Kennedy demonstrates that the “kind of America” in which he believes will facilitate the “kind of Presidency” in which he believes. He states: “This is the kind of America in which I believe. And it represents the kind of Presidency in which I believe.” As with his discussion of the “kind of America” in which he believes, Kennedy uses a series of statements and metaphors to shape his position. Each statement refers to the outlook on religious freedom that an ideal President should hold. By presenting his vision in this way, he conveys to the audience that his philosophy would reflect those of the ideal President he presents. He states: “I believe in a President whose views on religion are his own private affair”; “I would not look with favor upon a President working to subvert the first amendment’s guarantees of religious liberty”; “I want a Chief Executive whose public acts are responsible to all and obligated to none...whose fulfillment of his Presidential office is not limited or conditioned by any religious oath, ritual, or obligation” (Kennedy). The connection drawn by Kennedy between the “spirit of America” and his conception of the Presidency positions him as an individual who will lead with regard to the ideals he presents.

Kennedy also uses metaphor to quickly conceptualize his view of the office of the Presidency. Kennedy characterizes the Presidency in terms of proper and improper conditions, and uses these conditions metaphorically to situate religious freedom as it relates to the Presidency. Kennedy implies that there are certain characteristics within the condition of the Presidency, whereas religious influence and lack of church-state separation are outside that condition. The condition of the

Presidency is an ontological metaphor. Ontological metaphors concern the creations of “artificial boundaries that make physical phenomena discrete” (Lakoff & Johnson 25). For instance, he states: “I believe in a President whose views on religion are his own private affair, neither imposed upon him by the nation, nor imposed by the nation upon him as a condition to holding that office.” Later he goes on to say that the “Presidential office is not limited or conditioned by any religious oath, ritual, or obligation.” Kennedy’s use of condition treats the Presidency as a container that is shaped by certain characteristics that are inside or outside of it. Kennedy uses the words “imposed” and “limited” to conceptualize what is within the “condition” of the Presidency and what is not.

In similar fashion, Kennedy presents the subversion of the first amendment metaphor. Kennedy’s use of subversion as a metaphor helps to conceptualize the condition of the Presidency. The act of subverting the first amendment’s guarantees is outside his conception of the condition of the Presidency. He states: “I would not look with favor upon a President working to subvert the first amendment’s guarantees of religious liberty.” In the sense that he uses it, the term subvert can be regarded as an orientational metaphor. Orientational metaphors regard the association of “spatial orientation” with concepts (Lakoff & Johnson 14). The metaphoric use of orientation assumes that good is associated with “up” whereas bad is associated with “down” (Lakoff & Johnson 16). Kennedy’s use of the word “subvert” assumes a downward connotation and therefore associates the subversion of the first amendment as being bad and outside the “condition” of the

Presidency. Kennedy uses the condition and subversion metaphors to further characterize that the “kind of President” he believes in is one who upholds liberties afforded by the Constitution and Bill of Rights. He intends these metaphors to be reflective of his American allegiance, and his conception of the values held by the “American family.” It should be noted that the familial substance in the speech allows Kennedy’s conception of the Presidency to take on some metaphorical significance. A sense of fatherhood or can be derived when Kennedy is considered as the head of the “American family.”

Kennedy moves from his treatment of the Presidency to present the “spirit of tradition” metaphor. There is a sense of “spirit” or “belief” in Kennedy’s discussion of tradition because Kennedy presents a series of “traditional” American stories and concepts and encourages his audiences to “follow in” or ascribe to the philosophy that the “American tradition” implies. As with his presentation of the “spirit of America” and the “spirit of the Presidency,” here, Kennedy also uses statements and metaphors to shape his stance. For instance, he refers to his experience as a soldier where “[n]o one suggested then that we might have a divided loyalty, that we did not believe in liberty, or that we belonged to a disloyal group that threatened...’the freedoms for which our forefathers died.’” Kennedy also presents the “spirit of liberty” metaphor in this statement. He says that while he fought with a unified body of soldiers, no one suggested that they did not “believe in liberty.” Kennedy uses this metaphor to show that traditionally there has been a collective belief in a shared sense of liberty among Americans. If traditionally that belief has existed, as a

Presidential candidate, why should his sense of liberty be questioned now because he is a Catholic? He insinuates that it is traditional for the “American family” to embrace a sense of unity and a shared system of values and beliefs. He goes on to reinforce his stance with a discussion of the forefathers dying for their will to “escape religious test oaths” and their struggle to establish the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom. Kennedy’s use of “escape” has metaphoric orientational and ontological significance. To “escape” assumes directional movement, and moving away from something and implies separation. Therefore, the American sense of the “spirit of liberty” does not contain “religious test oaths.” A “religious test oath” is a characteristic that lies outside of the concept of the “spirit of liberty.” To conclude his discussion, he presents a second metaphor: the “shrine at the Alamo.” While the Alamo shrine is a literal place, Kennedy’s use of it takes on metaphoric significance in terms of the spirit of tradition. The “shrine at the Alamo” represents deaths of a diverse number of Americans who fought and died together, including “Bowie and Crockett...Fuentes, and McCafferty, and Bailey, and Badillo, and Carey” (Kennedy). This battle is historically iconic and has been portrayed frequently in book and film. It is metaphorically significant because it is symbolic of unity and perseverance among soldiers who, though fighting for Texas at the time of the battle, fought for an American sense of liberty. Kennedy is sure to note that “no one knows whether they were Catholics or not. For there was no religious test there.” Kennedy’s presentation of the Alamo vividly shapes his ideology that “religious freedom is a value of the American family.” He uses it to

show that historically religious preference has not affected true American values and the country's successful progression.

The final metaphor in the speech is the metaphor of "the losing nation." This metaphor sums up the implications of Kennedy being snubbed of his presidential chances because of his Catholicism. Kennedy uses it to show that if his position is rejected, it will have detrimental consequences that reach far beyond his personal loss. The position presented by Kennedy, led by the "kind of America" he believes in, is almost solely fueled by the Constitutional rights and freedoms that are afforded to every American. His loss based on his religion would mean straying away from the foundation of values that have historically shaped the "American family." He states:

[I]f this election is decided on the basis that 40 million Americans lost their chance of being President on the day they were baptized, then it is the whole nation that will be the loser, in the eyes of Catholics and non-Catholics around the world, in the eyes of history, and in the eyes of our own people." (Kennedy)

Kennedy uses each of the major and minor metaphors in the speech as "stylistic tokens" to construct a metaphoric world and drive the overarching ideology "freedom of religion is a value of the "American family." These metaphors run along a vein of "familial substance" in the speech and the majority of them are found where the agent-purpose ratio can be most prominently observed. Kennedy's use of metaphor allowed him to present his perspective in an enhanced manner that would not have been possible with the use of literal language alone. I turn next to the persuasive implications of this strategy.

Interpretations and Conclusions

The familial substance in Kennedy's speech created a basis for Kennedy to construct a metaphoric world illustrated by the conceptualization of America as a family. The familial substance creates the metaphoric sense of family that the speech is driven by. While the terminology used by Kennedy related to "family" is limited, the clear vein of familial substance latent in the speech shapes the metaphors and concepts presented to fit the American family ideology. Ultimately, the metaphoric structure of Kennedy's speech represents a particularized construct of the nature of family in a political and national sense.

There were moments in the campaign where conceptualizing America as a family existed outside of Kennedy's speech. The most prevalent counter narrative advanced by Kennedy's skeptics concerned his allegiance to the Pope. The notion of the Pope as a distant ruler has familial implications. The etymology of the word Pope is "Papa" or "father" (Oxford English Dictionary). The familial substance in Kennedy's speech positions Kennedy's view of the Presidency as the head of the household or father of the country. When viewed this way, the familial substance acts to combat the counter narrative advanced by Kennedy's skeptics that the Pope would be a distant ruler or distant father of the country.

The counter narrative advanced by skeptics originated from the history of Papal dictatorship. Concern of Papal allegiance brought forth a fear of potential reversion to pre-reformation Christianity. The Protestant reformation signified a

moment of discontinued allegiance to the Pope and recognition of the Bible as the authority for Protestant principles. Prior to reformation, Christian people universally acknowledged Catholicism to be the one true religion. The word Catholic means “universal.” The acknowledgement of this one true religion meant allegiance to the head of the Catholic Church: the Pope. Reformation began when some nations began to disregard the authority of the Pope and discontinued their acknowledgment of him as the head of the Christian church and facilitator of divine will. The root of this lack of recognition grew from protests against some doctrines of the church (Cobbett 2). Reformers “believed that the old organized Church had betrayed the Christian faith by departing from the norms found in the Bible and by setting the authority of its own bishops above that of the bible. Canon law had taken the place of the gospel” (Todd 13). English Protestantism refuted the Catholic Church’s claim of infallibility claiming that it had “erred in the past, and may well continue to do likewise in the future” (George & George 318). Protestants argued against the claim of infallibility of popes and Roman Catholic councils because no church could be expected to dictate the will of God and be free of all error (George & George 318). The discontinuing of Papal allegiance was symbolic of the new “reformed” Protestant doctrine that adhered to Biblical principles.

Kennedy’s skeptics believed that his Catholic beliefs would lead to a potential reversion back to the Pope as the ultimate leader and political dictator. Thus, Kennedy would not be a leader at all; he would be a pawn of the Pope’s will. Anti-Kennedy literature at the time argued that it had been, and was still, the will of the

Pope to “get the wealth and power of the United States to be in his hands” (Robertson 72). Kennedy’s election would mark a moment of Rome’s attempt to seize control of the United States (Robertson 72). Other Anti-Kennedy literature stressed that even though religious freedom is an inalienable right, no person could “divorce his (sic) religion from political decisions” (Wamble 101). Kennedy’s oppressors constantly stressed that he could not politically separate himself from his religion, and this lack of separation would lead to the dictating the will of the United States from Rome.

The familial substance in the speech conceptualizes the “kind of America” in which Kennedy believes in a way that directly combats the notion of the Pope as a distant father. Kennedy combats the counter narrative advanced by skeptics by presenting the President as a facilitator of Constitutional will and a leader or father of the country. Reflection on the familial substance in the speech and its implications clarifies Kennedy’s effective use of the “American family” ideology to combat the counter narrative he faced.

Burke’s conception of substance assumes that it “stands beneath or supports” the concept presented (Burke 22). The substance at the root of each metaphor supports Kennedy’s metaphoric world. Burke also describes that concepts will be linked based on their substance. They “go constantly together” and cannot “subsist by themselves”; therefore, they should be categorized in terms of a type of substance (Burke 22). The use of metaphor by Kennedy to create an overarching ideology suggests that the concepts he presents are meant to have relational

significance. Each metaphoric concept builds and feeds off the others to create a structured web of concepts that construct Kennedy's ideology. This web of metaphoric concepts is supported by familial substance.

The metaphoric concepts in Kennedy's speech convey unity and a cohesive system of beliefs, characteristics of an ideal America and Presidency, significance of traditional and historical moments, and the implications of discontinuity. These concepts are all aligned with the way Burke characterizes familial substance. Burke argues that familial substance regards "common ancestry" from "maternal or paternal sources," shared systems of belief and worldviews, unity of "persons of the same nationality or beliefs," recognition of unity by group members, "the notion of some founder shared in common, or some covenant or constitution," and recognition of tradition or a "historical act from which the consubstantiality of the group is derived" (Burke 29). Each of Burke's characterizations can be found in the way that Kennedy shapes his position and conveys the "kind of America" in which he believes. The sense of unity and familial structure based on history, belief, and action expressed by Burke is apparent in Kennedy's expression, and the metaphoric concepts that shape his position. In fact, each of the four major metaphors has some semblance of Burkean familial substance within them.

Kennedy recognizes unity and shared systems of belief and worldviews (Burke 29) when he defines the beliefs and values of an ideal America. He uses stipulation and negation with the "disease of competing beliefs" metaphor and the "spirit of America" metaphor to conceptualize what the Constitution would dictate

as the ideal American worldview. He further “familializes” the “spirit of America” metaphor with the two minor metaphors: the religious body and the “American ideal of brotherhood.” Kennedy’s reference to a “religious body” reflects familial substance, as does his expression the “American ideal of brotherhood.” Both metaphors advance Kennedy’s “American family” ideology. Kennedy also recognizes a type of “covenant or constitution” (Burke 29) by shaping his position with regard to constitutional principles and his acknowledgement of the forefathers’ fight for the Constitution, Bill of Rights, and Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom. Kennedy recognizes the “common ancestry” and “historical act” (Burke 29) from which group unity was created by referring to when the “forefathers fought for the Constitution,” and American heroes died at the Alamo to shape the spirit of tradition metaphor. Burke’s notion of familial substance stresses unity and the characteristics that define the “consubstantiality of the group” (29). Kennedy stresses the dangers of discontinuity and its implications when he discusses the potential unraveling of the “fabric of our harmonious society” and the metaphor of the losing nation. There are clear connections between Burke’s sense of familial substance and the ideology expressed in Kennedy’s speech. These connections present Kennedy’s metaphoric concepts in a familial sense, and reflect the ideology of the “American family.”

Presenting a nation in terms of a family assumes a world of connotations for the person presenting it and the mindset of the person willing to accept it. Black examines a similar set of implications in his essay “The Second Persona,” where he observes the “communism as cancer” metaphor. Black wonders what can be

determined about both the person presenting the metaphor and the mindset of those susceptible to receiving it³. Just as comparing a socio-political system to disease has a series of implications, presenting a country in terms of a family creates a specific set of connections and implications.

Americans understands the connection between family and nation, and the characteristics that shape the conception of a national family. Scholars have recognized the connection between nation and family. Mark Lakoff argues that a nation can be viewed in terms of a family because one can recognize and apply the link between a “strict-father,” with “family-based morality,” to politics. The metaphor unfolds in a manner where “the nation is seen as a family, the government as a parent, and the citizens as children” (195). Fernand Hallyd uses Lakoff’s interpretation of the “Nation-as-Family” to argue that worlds of connections can be derived from the ideology presented by such metaphors. He says that metaphors such as the “Nation-as-Family” act as “powerful carriers and shifters of political, theoretical, and therapeutic meanings and practices on the surface-level discourses” (205). The use of the “Nation-as-Family” metaphor and the recognition of its legitimacy demonstrates the importance of family as a relational concept to characterize nation. Nations can take on particular perceptions based on their

³ Black discusses that cancer is a fearful disease and argues that the connection created by the ‘communism as cancer’ metaphor insinuates that the audience accepting it is paranoid. Kennedy conceptualizes cancer in similar fashion when he discusses the “spread of communist influence” that “now festers only 90 miles from the coast of Florida.” Kennedy uses this “disease of competing beliefs” metaphor as one of the building blocks for his “American family” ideology.

characteristics and philosophy. Family philosophies are created based on the characteristics that define each family. Traditionally, the concept of “family” insinuates blood relations, shared economic standing, collective cultural and traditional beliefs, cohesive religious and political beliefs, shared living quarters, and a system of values. The Oxford English Dictionary defines family in a few notable ways. It states that family should be conceived of as “[t]he group of persons consisting of the parents and their children, whether actually living together or not; in wider sense, the unity formed by those who are nearly connected by blood or affinity.” It goes on to also define family in two other ways that hold significant relevance to the “American family” metaphor. It states: “In a wider sense” family should be defined as “[a] race; a people or group of peoples assumed to be descended from a common stock” as well as “[a] brotherhood or group of individuals or nation bound together by political or religious ties. The diverse use of the concept of a family has been depicted frequently in American culture via literature, film, advertising, and many other cultural artifacts. Idealized conceptions of family generally convey some sense of morality. Lakoff writes that the comparison of family and nation “turns family-based morality into political morality,” where the degree of conservatism in political positions held by the nation is viewed in terms of familial-based morality (195). A number of connections are created between the concept of nation, and the morality expressed by a sense of family.

The notion of “family” also insinuates dramatic relations among members that can lead to changes in the family dynamic. Family members lose and gain trust in one another. Families break up, and get back together. Family members leave the family and sometimes return. Family members die and new family members are born. Families are often bound by the love that the members have for one another, but that love can be lost. The dramatic nature of a family will often lead to degrees of relational health and functionality. Some families are deemed by observers to be “the perfect family” while others are deemed completely dysfunctional.

Kennedy’s presentation of America as a family brings with it many of the commonly held conceptions of “family.” Kennedy’s use of family helped him to unify himself with audience members and graphically shape his conception. Just as with the “communism as cancer” metaphor, viewing a nation in terms of a family brings forth many associations.

It is important to note one caveat in the connection between “family” and “nation.” While the metaphors used present a conception of Americanism that mirrors key components of traditional American families, there is one glaring difference. Kennedy presents these metaphors to drive the ideology that “freedom of religion is a value of the American family.” For traditional American families, cohesive religious beliefs, as well as other beliefs, are often a crucial component of family unity and philosophy. Beyond religion, the prevalence of freedom and choice afforded by the Constitution and conveyed by Kennedy goes against the way of

many traditional American families. Families often limit freedom and choice in the interest of unity and child rearing.

The Constitution dictates that the “American family” must stray from the way of the “traditional family” because religious freedom and equality are fundamental American values. Kennedy must essentially convey to his audience that the “kind of America” he believes in represents a family that values freedom and choice. With regard to the American family, the audience must reshape their notion of “family.” This transition is difficult because, even though the Constitution stresses religious freedom, the United States has a large population of Protestants and the Protestant religion has helped to shaped Americanism. Kennedy’s speech acts as a re-conceptualization of the notion of “family.” Audience members must buy into this new conception in order to reshape their view of Kennedy as a potential president. Religious freedom represents a value that is not associated with the “traditional family” but is essential to Constitutional Americanism, and therefore to the “American family” presented by Kennedy. Kennedy is able to use the “American family” ideology effectively despite the difference between “America as a family” and the “traditional American family.”

The immediate audience Kennedy faced was hostile. They were a group of Protestant ministers who held religious beliefs that differed from his. While it is always important to consider the immediate audience and its effect on the occasion, the context of the situation suggests that Kennedy intended to speak beyond them. With regard to factors outside the text, fundamentally this was a campaign speech

meant to help Kennedy win the presidency. However, he probably did not gain a significant number of votes from immediate audience members. In the grand scheme of things, the potential impact for Kennedy's ability to sway members in his immediate audience was very small. For the purposes of gaining votes, it was the act of broadcasting the speech on television and radio that would have made an impact. The context suggests that Kennedy recognized this opportunity and meant to speak beyond his immediate audience.

Additional evidence for Kennedy's desire to speak beyond his audience can be found in the speech itself. Kennedy acknowledged or addressed his direct audience very little. As the context chapter demonstrated, the circumstances of the speech were far different than the average Presidential campaign speech. However, Kennedy does not treat them as such in his speech. In fact, in one of only two references to his direct audience, Kennedy compliments the integrity of the audience by assuming that their concerns regarding his religion are more ethical than many scholars and media members had assumed. When discussing how attention to his religion has diverted attention away from other campaign issues, Kennedy states: "the real issues in this campaign have been obscured—perhaps deliberately, in some quarters less responsible than this" (Kennedy). The only other time Kennedy addresses his direct audience is in the first two lines of the speech. He states: Reverend Meza, Reverend Reck, I'm grateful for your generous invitation to state my views. While the so-called religious issue is necessarily and properly the chief topic here tonight..." (Kennedy). Beyond these examples, Kennedy only uses

the word “you” four times in the entire speech. A case could be made in each of those instances that Kennedy is speaking to the entirety of the American public, and not just his direct audience. For the purposes of this interpretation, it is important to consider Kennedy’s rhetorical strategies in terms of the nation as a whole, rather than just the immediate audience.

The nature of Kennedy’s national audience proved well suited to accept the “American family” ideology. Black wonders what could be said about the person presenting an ideology, and the mindset of the audience accepting it. For Kennedy, it is clear that he was after unification and identification. The idealized family is a tight-knit group. The etymology of family concerns members of a household (Oxford English Dictionary). They are often bound by blood, love and trust. Kennedy uses the implications of family to unify himself with audience members. The ideal audience’s acceptance of the “American family” ideology shows a desire for the unification Kennedy intended. Many Americans value a sense of unified country. Evidence for the desire for unity can be found in the reciting of the “Pledge of Allegiance” in the American school system or the singing of the “Star Spangled Banner” at American events. Many Americans are clearly “proud to be Americans” and find this pride in the unified values within “Americanism.” A sense of unified Americanism has been historically depicted in a familial way. As discussed earlier, we recognize George Washington as “the father of our country” and identify the founding fathers as the pioneers of Americanism.

Fear was created around Kennedy's candidacy because there was a concern of anti-American political influence. People wanted reassurance that Kennedy, as a leader, or "father" of the country, would maintain the same unified system of values. There was a sense of political paranoia, the same sense that Black recognizes in the "communism as cancer" metaphor. Kennedy uses the family ideology because the connections it created provided an effective way to quell the paranoia and reestablish himself as a "true" member of the "American family." Freedom of religion is a constitutional right. Kennedy conveys that his religion would not cause the infiltration of competing political influence; but rather, it was an example of "Constitutional Americanism" at work.

The use of the "American family" ideology helped Kennedy to create unity and identification between himself and audience members. Kennedy creates a metaphoric world within a vein of familial substance that allows him to shape key components of his ideology. Each metaphor acts as a building block to construct his ideology. Gary Woodward discusses the connection between ideology and identification in his book *The Idea of Identification*. He writes that ideology can create identification where "clusters of terms or symbols are 'all derived from the same generating principle, hence all embodying it'" (Woodward 31). Woodward also describes identification as created when an ideology has a "superstructural association" leading to the relations of concepts generically (Woodward 31). Kennedy's ideology is structured by the four major metaphors in his speech. Each metaphor acts to strengthen Kennedy's identification with audience members. The

identification created positively affects Kennedy's persuasion because it allows him to build character.

For the audience to shift their perception toward Kennedy, their view of his character had to be altered. Issues of character spawned the religious issue. People questioned whether Kennedy would be a pawn of the Pope. Would Rome dictate the direction of the White House? Would Kennedy's religion affect his political allegiance? How could Kennedy act as an American president without considering the will of the Pope? These questions focus on choice. People were skeptical of the choices Kennedy would make because of his religion. By presenting the "American family" ideology as one dictated by the Constitution, Kennedy eliminates questions of choice. He presents the "kind of America" he believes in as one of Constitutional allegiance, and therefore, there would be no choice regarding his actions as President with regard to the Constitution. His actions would follow "true" Constitutional Americanism.

The root of Kennedy's use of ideology to build character lies in his use of metaphor. Metaphor provides the foundation for Kennedy's ideology; and therefore, the stepping-stones along the path that create a change in character perception. Kennedy creates a metaphoric world with specific metaphoric concepts that audience members can readily engage and identify with. The identification enables Kennedy to build character and alter the unfavorable image created by skeptics. Burke notes that identification can lead to favorable character perception. Burke suggests that it is identification or, the ability to persuade someone by talking their

“language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, *identifying* your way with his” that leads to the appropriate demonstration of character and earning the “audience’s good will” (Burke “Rhetoric of” 55-56).

The metaphoric concepts presented and Kennedy’s discussion of the Presidency represents key components to conceptualize a “nation” in terms of a “family.” Each metaphor presents a concept that is consistent with the audience’s conception of “family” in the ideal sense. Kennedy’s conception of an idealized sense of family is one that unites to protect itself from outside threats. His “disease of competing beliefs” metaphor encourages unity of political philosophy and unified effort toward that goal. Systems of belief that do not fit a family’s philosophy can infect, corrupt, or kill a family’s dynamic or structure. Kennedy stresses that by questioning the merit of members within the American family, we are neglecting the “spread of Communist influence, until it now festers only 90 miles from the coast of Florida.” Kennedy further stresses the point when he refers to his battle against external threats in the South Pacific and his brother’s death in Europe. These wars represent energy spent fighting as unified Americans where “no one suggested...that we might have a divided loyalty, [or] that we did not believe in liberty” (Kennedy). Audience members can identify with the possibly outside threats in a familial sense and relate the importance of unity and shared values to their own conception of family.

The identification rendered by the disease of competing beliefs metaphor presents Kennedy as just another member of the “American family” who would

work to stop the infiltration of competing political beliefs. This metaphor is especially important because many people felt that Kennedy's religion would result in Catholic political influence. Kennedy positions himself as a member of the "American family" who is opposed to communist influence, and therefore, any political beliefs that might infect the American family's system of beliefs and values. In light of the disease of competing beliefs metaphor, the audience is encouraged to view Kennedy as an individual whose character would not allow for the influence of competing systems of belief. Kennedy demonstrates that his character is one that puts country before religion.

Kennedy demonstrates an idealized sense of family respects its values with the spirit of America metaphor. Kennedy uses this metaphor to show that his conception of the system of values tied to true Americanism is dictated by the Constitution. While he refers to religious freedom specifically, his discussion creates a much larger picture because he presents religion from a position of Constitutional Americanism. Kennedy provides a number of examples throughout the speech to shape his conception of the values held by the American family. He shows that his conception of America and the Presidency is shaped by Constitutional principles. He refers to valued American artifacts and monuments including the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Virginia, Statute of Religions Freedom, and the Alamo Shrine. Each of these instances of American history acts as a touchstone for the values expressed by the spirit of America metaphor. Audience members can identify with this metaphor in a familial sense because each family has specific characteristics that act

as touchstones for the system of values that make up the family dynamic. The spirit of America metaphor allows Kennedy to show audience members that his conception of the system of values held by the American family is based on the Constitution and represents a sense of “true” Americanism that is unaffected by his religion. In fact, Kennedy conveys that his candidacy is a representation of the rights afforded by the Constitution and an example of “true” Americanism at work. To supplement his expression that his candidacy represents true Americanism, he presents his notion of the Presidency.

Kennedy uses his discussion of the Presidency to demonstrate that an idealized sense of family respects its head of household. Kennedy’s discussion of the Presidency has implications beyond the stipulations about religion he presents. He reflects a position of leadership based on values that are guaranteed by the Constitution. Although he discusses religious freedom specifically, he insinuates that his leadership would be based on the Constitution in all facets. He states that he would not look favorably upon a President who would subvert “the first amendment’s guarantees of religious liberty” or “Article VI of the Constitution.” Using the Bill of Rights and the Constitution as examples for his position suggests adherence to the entire system of values that those documents represent. Kennedy presents himself as a leader who will lead according to a system of true American values. In terms of the American family, Kennedy’s discussion of the Presidency takes on metaphorical significance. Kennedy positions himself as the head of the family, or father of the country, who will perpetuate the Constitutional values that

represent true Americanism. He conveys that, as head of the American family, he will hold, and perpetuate, true American values. His discussion of the “kind of America” and “kind of Presidency” he believes in creates a picture of the values and actions that can be expected from him as a leader, or “head” of the “American family.” Audience members—who are members of families themselves—can conceive of a notion of ideal values and an ideal leader who would perpetuate those values in their own families. Kennedy positions himself as an individual whose character represents the “ideal” as dictated by the Constitution.

Kennedy expresses that an idealized sense of family reveres its tradition with the “spirit of tradition” metaphor. Kennedy’s conception of tradition is shaped by Kennedy’s belief in the merit of traditional Americanism. He discusses historical moments and wars that have shaped American values including the forefathers’ fight and death for freedom, WWII, the Alamo, as well as classic American heroes such as Davy Crockett. Kennedy’s brief discussion of tradition reminds the audience of a number of important moments in American history and the implications they carry with them for the present day world. In terms of the “American family,” Kennedy’s discussion of tradition represents events and ideals that have shaped the “American family” into what it is today. Every family has some semblance of tradition, whether or not the immediate family chooses to identify with, or carry on that tradition. Audience members can identify with the sense of tradition presented and apply it to the way tradition has shaped their own family. Traditional families

ascribe to many of the ideals and values that have been passed down from generation to generation.

The spirit of tradition metaphor helps Kennedy to demonstrate that his vision of the ideal is driven by Constitutional Americanism and grounded in tradition. Audience members can readily identify with Kennedy's illustrations of tradition because they are well-known, important historical moments. Audience members can also identify with a sense of tradition in terms of "America as a family" because tradition is a component of the concept of "family." Kennedy's conception demonstrates that he values tradition and believes that it should be instrumental in the direction of the country. Kennedy uses the audience's identification with a "sense of tradition" to convey that his character as a potential leader will recognize and value tradition.

Kennedy articulates that an idealized sense of family works to maintain unity with the metaphor of "the losing nation." Kennedy argues that the oppression against him represents dangerous discontinuity among conceptions of Americanism that, if continued, will have detrimental consequence. Kennedy conveys that the oppression against him is unconstitutional, and that disregarding Constitutional rights and privileges will have an effect beyond his inability to win the Presidency. Kennedy presents a number of examples of national discord that he believes will lead to disharmony and potential downfall or national loss. For instance, he refers to the disagreement over the attention that each campaign issue deserves. While some believe the religious issue to be the most important issue, others, himself included,

find it to be a non-issue and a distraction. He refers to “the finger of suspicion,” which suggests discontinuity and skepticism among members who should be united by Constitutional Americanism. He refers to the labeling of him as the “Catholic candidate for President,” which singles him out as someone who is not a true American candidate. Kennedy uses these examples to stress that discontinuity is dangerous and could lead to “the whole fabric of our harmonious society [being] ripped apart at a time of great national peril.” Audience members can identify with the “losing nation” metaphor in terms of family because lack of unity among family members can upset the dynamic. Disagreement, skepticism, finger pointing, and singling out can lead to discontinuity, separation and eventual disbanding.

The “losing nation” metaphor demonstrates the merit of Kennedy’s character. Audience members can identify with the way that problems in a family can upset the dynamic. Kennedy discusses that the oppression against him strays from “Constitutional Americanism.” He states that the “eyes of history” will see the prejudice against him as a great loss because it represents a demonstration of unconstitutional Americanism. He conveys that his character as an American is one that represents “true Constitutional Americanism” whereas the character of those who oppress him goes against the traditional, and Constitutional, American way. The “kind of America” in which Kennedy believes represents true Constitutional Americanism. By implication, those who do not believe in the “kind of America” that he does possess character that is fundamentally un-American.

Kennedy's ability to "familialize" his conception of Americanism via metaphor helps him to transform his image. By presenting himself as just another member of the American family, Kennedy changes his image from one of an outsider possessing a detrimental system of beliefs, to a true American with true American values and aspirations. He also positions himself as a leader with a Constitutional philosophy. The Constitution is essentially the manual for true Americanism. Audience members choosing to maintain their prejudice against Kennedy subject themselves to blasphemy against true Americanism.

Ultimately use of metaphor to build character is enabled in the speech by the identification made possible by presenting the nation in terms of a family. Kennedy uses his ideology to create a sense of unity and inclusion. His speech works to reduce uncertainty and positions him as a member and potential leader of the American family. He conveys that he possesses the same vision of ideal, Constitutional, Americanism despite his religious beliefs. The near-universal acclaim regarding the speech's success suggests that Kennedy effectively constructed the speech to show that his religious belief was a demonstration of a key value of the American family, rather than a threat.

Bibliography

- Aristotle. *The Rhetoric and the Poetics of Aristotle*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1984. Print.
- Barrett, Harold. "John F. Kennedy Before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association." *Central States Speech Journal* 15 (1964): 259-266. Print.
- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *The Quarterly Journal Of Speech* 61.2 (1970): 89-99. Print.
- Blake, Dr. Eugene Carson and Oxnam, Bishop G. Bromley. "A Protestant View of a Catholic President." *Look* 10 May 1960: 31-34. Print.
- Bowers, John Waite and Michael M. Osborn. "Attitudinal Effects of Selected Types of Concluding Metaphors in Persuasive Speeches" *Speech Monographs* 33.2 (1966): 147-155. Print.
- Brogan, Hugh. *Kennedy*. New York: Longman, 1996. Print.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969. Print.
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969. Print.
- Burns, James MacGregor. "The Religious Issue." *Progressive* November 1960: 21-22. Print.
- Carlson, Peter. "Another Race To the Finish." *Washingtonpost.com*. *The Washington Post*, 17th Nov. 2000. Web. 13th Mar. 2010.
- Cobbett, William. *A History of The Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland*. New York: Benziger Brothers, 1827. Print.
- Dioffenbach, Albert C. "Church and State." *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 35-43. Print.
- Fearn-Banks, Kathleen. *Crisis Communications: A Casebook Approach*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers, 2007. Print.
- Garver, Eugene. *Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1994. Print.

- George, Charles H. and Katherine George. *The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961. Print.
- Goldzwig, Steven R. and George N. Dionisopoulos. *In A Perilous Hour: The Public Address of John F. Kennedy*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 1995. Print.
- Golden, James L. "John F. Kennedy and the 'Ghosts.'" *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 52 (1966): 348-358. Print.
- Gribbin, Raymond William. "The Catholic Candidate." *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 90-94. Print.
- Hallyn, Fernand. *Metaphor and Analogy in the Sciences*. Google Books. Google. Web. 13 July 2011.
- Henry, David. "Senator John F. Kennedy Encounters the Religious Question: 'I am Not the Catholic Candidate for President.'" *Oratorical Encounters*. Ed Halford Ross Ryan. New York: Greenwood, 1988. 223-235. Print.
- Hyde, Michael. *The Ethos of Rhetoric*. South Carolina: The South Carolina Press, 2004. Print.
- Kemper, Deane Alwyn. "John F. Kennedy before the Greater Houston Ministerial Association, September 12, 1960: The Religious Issue," Ph.D. dissertation. Michigan State University, 1969, p. 30, 39-40. Print.
- Kennedy, John F. "Address At Houston, Texas." *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 26-34. Print.
- Knebel, Fletcher. "Democratic Forecast: A Catholic in 1960" *Look* March 3, 1959: 13-17. Print.
- Lakoff, George. "Metaphor, morality, and Politics, Or, Why Conservatives Have Left Liberals In the Dust." *Social Research* 62.2 (1995). 177-213. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 13 July 2011.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980. Print.
- Lindley, Ernest K. "As Kennedy Goes." *Newsweek* 26 September 1960: 56. Print.

- Massa, Mark S. "A Catholic for President?: John F. Kennedy and the 'Secular' Theology of the Houston Speech 1960." *Journal of Church & State* 39.2 (1997): 307-328. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 9 March 2011.
- McClerren, Beryl F. "Introduction." *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 1-6. Print.
- McCroskey, James C. and Thomas J. Young. "Ethos and Credibility: The Construct and Its Measurement After Three Decades." *Central States Speech Journal* 32 (1981): 24-34. *Scholar.Google.com*. Web. 10th, March 2010.
- McGlothen, Gaye L. "The Religious Issue 1960." *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 139-158. Print.
- Mendez, Albert J. *John F. Kennedy: Catholic and Humanist*. Buffalo: Prometheus Books, 1978. Print.
- Merriam-Webster Dictionary*. Merriam-Webster, n.d. Web. 13 July, 2011
- Morris, Richard. *Seven Who Shaped Our Destiny*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1973. Print.
- O'Brien, Michael. *John F. Kennedy: A Biography*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2005. Print.
- Osborn, Michael M. and Douglas Ehninger. "The Metaphor in Public Address" *Speech Monographs* 29 (1962): 223-234. Print.
- Oxford English Dictionary Online*. Oxford English Dictionary, n.d. Web 14 July 2011.
- Powell, James G. "Reactions to John F. Kennedy's Delivery Skills During the 1960 Campaign" *Western Speech* 32.1 (1968): 59-68. Print.
- "Protestants in Politics." *New Republic* September 19, 1960: 3-4. Print.
- Read, Stephen, Ian Cesa, David Jones, and Nancy Colins. "When Is the Federal Budget Like a Baby? Metaphor in Political Rhetoric." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 5.3 (1990): 125-149. *Academic Search Premier*. Web. 10th, March 2010.
- Reinsch, N. Lamar. "An Investigation of the Effects of the Metaphor and Simile in Persuasive Discourse." *Speech Monographs* 38.2 (1971): 142-145. Print.
- Reinsch, N. Lamar. "Figurative language and Source Credibility: A Preliminary

- Investigation and Reconceptualization." *Human Communication Research* 1.1 (2006): 75-80. *Scholar.Google.Com*. Web. 10th, March 2010.
- Richards, I.A.. *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1964. Print.
- Rinalducci, Ned and Tracy B. Henley. "The Effects of Figurative Language on the Perceived Credibility of Political Candidates. *International Journal of Communication*. Jan-June (2007): 1-11. *Scholar.Google.com*. Web. 10th March 2010.
- Robertson. A.T. "The Romish Perils" *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 7-25. Print.
- Scarborough, L.R. "Some Issues Involved In The National Election" *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 69-71. Print.
- Silvestri, Vito N. *Becoming JFK: A Profile in Communicaiton*. Westport: Praeger Publishers, 2000. Print.
- Smith, Alfred E. "Address at Oklahoma City" *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 7-25. Print.
- Sopory, Pradeep and James Price Dillard. "The Persuasive Effects of Metaphor: A Meta-Analysis." *Human Communication Research* 28.3 (2002): 382-419. Print.
- Sorensen, Theodore C. *Kennedy*. New York: Harper & Row, 1965. Print.
- Sorensen, Theodore H. *The Kennedy Legacy*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1969. Print.
- Stelzner, Hermann G. "John F. Kennedy at Houston, Texas September 12, 1960. *Rhetoric and Communication: Studies in the University of Illinois Tradition*. Ed. Jane Blankenship and Hermann G. Stelzner. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1976. 223-235. Print.
- Strober, Deborah Hart and Gerald S. Strober. "The Kennedy Presidency: An Oral History of the Era" Washington D.C.: Brassey's, Inc, 2003. Print.
- "Test of Religion." *Time* 26 September 1960: 21-22. Print.

- "That 'Religious Issue': Hot and Getting Hotter." *Newsweek* September 19, 1960: 37-38. Print.
- "The Religious Issue." *New York Times* 14 September 1960: 42. Print.
- Teven, J.J., & McCroskey, J.C. "The relationship of perceived teacher caring with student learning and teacher evaluation." *Communication Education*. 46: 1997, 26-35. Web. 10th, March 2010.
- Todd, John M. *Reformation*. Garden City: Doubleday, 1971. Print.
- Ulmer, Robert R., Timothy L. Sellnow, and Matthew W. Seeger. *Effective Crisis Communication: Moving From Crisis to Opportunity*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 2007. Print.
- Wamble, Hugh."The Religious Issue in Politics." *The Presidential Campaigns of 1928 and 1960: The Religious Issue*. Ed. Beryl F. McClerren. Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 196?. 99-104. Print.
- Warnick, Barbara. "Argument Schemes and the Construction of Social Reality: John F. Kennedy's Address to the Houston Ministerial Association." *Communication Quarterly* 44.2 (1996): 183- 196. Print.
- White, Theodore H. *The Making of the President, 1960*. New York: Atheneum Publishers, 1961. Print.

Appendix

John F. Kennedy

Address to the Greater Houston Ministerial Association

delivered 12 September 1960 at the Rice Hotel in Houston, TX

Reverend Meza, Reverend Reck, I'm grateful for your generous invitation to state my views.

While the so-called religious issue is necessarily and properly the chief topic here tonight, I want to emphasize from the outset that I believe that we have far more critical issues in the 1960 campaign; the spread of Communist influence, until it now festers only 90 miles from the coast of Florida -- the humiliating treatment of our President and Vice President by those who no longer respect our power -- the hungry children I saw in West Virginia, the old people who cannot pay their doctors bills, the families forced to give up their farms -- an America with too many slums, with too few schools, and too late to the moon and outer space. These are the real issues which should decide this campaign. And they are not religious issues -- for war and hunger and ignorance and despair know no religious barrier.

But because I am a Catholic, and no Catholic has ever been elected President, the real issues in this campaign have been obscured -- perhaps deliberately, in some quarters less responsible than this. So it is apparently necessary for me to state once again -- not what kind of church I believe in, for that should be important only to me

-- but what kind of America I believe in.

I believe in an America where the separation of church and state is absolute; where no Catholic prelate would tell the President -- should he be Catholic -- how to act, and no Protestant minister would tell his parishioners for whom to vote; where no church or church school is granted any public funds or political preference, and where no man is denied public office merely because his religion differs from the President who might appoint him, or the people who might elect him.

I believe in an America that is officially neither Catholic, Protestant nor Jewish; where no public official either requests or accept instructions on public policy from the Pope, the National Council of Churches or any other ecclesiastical source; where no religious body seeks to impose its will directly or indirectly upon the general populace or the public acts of its officials, and where religious liberty is so indivisible that an act against one church is treated as an act against all.

For while this year it may be a Catholic against whom the finger of suspicion is pointed, in other years it has been -- and may someday be again -- a Jew, or a Quaker, or a Unitarian, or a Baptist. It was Virginia's harassment of Baptist preachers, for example, that led to Jefferson's statute of religious freedom. Today, I may be the victim, but tomorrow it may be you -- until the whole fabric of our harmonious society is ripped apart at a time of great national peril.

Finally, I believe in an America where religious intolerance will someday end, where

all men and all churches are treated as equals, where every man has the same right to attend or not to attend the church of his choice, where there is no Catholic vote, no anti-Catholic vote, no bloc voting of any kind, and where Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, at both the lay and the pastoral levels, will refrain from those attitudes of disdain and division which have so often marred their works in the past, and promote instead the American ideal of brotherhood.

That is the kind of America in which I believe. And it represents the kind of Presidency in which I believe, a great office that must be neither humbled by making it the instrument of any religious group nor tarnished by arbitrarily withholding it -- its occupancy from the members of any one religious group. I believe in a President whose views on religion are his own private affair, neither imposed upon him by the nation, nor imposed by the nation upon him¹ as a condition to holding that office.

I would not look with favor upon a President working to subvert the first amendment's guarantees of religious liberty; nor would our system of checks and balances permit him to do so. And neither do I look with favor upon those who would work to subvert Article VI of the Constitution by requiring a religious test, even by indirection. For if they disagree with that safeguard, they should be openly working to repeal it.

I want a Chief Executive whose public acts are responsible to all and obligated to none, who can attend any ceremony, service, or dinner his office may appropriately require of him to fulfill; and whose fulfillment of his Presidential office is not limited

or conditioned by any religious oath, ritual, or obligation.

This is the kind of America I believe in -- and this is the kind of America I fought for in the South Pacific, and the kind my brother died for in Europe. No one suggested then that we might have a divided loyalty, that we did not believe in liberty, or that we belonged to a disloyal group that threatened -- I quote -- "the freedoms for which our forefathers died."

And in fact this is the kind of America for which our forefathers did die when they fled here to escape religious test oaths that denied office to members of less favored churches -- when they fought for the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, the Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom -- and when they fought at the shrine I visited today, the Alamo. For side by side with Bowie and Crockett died Fuentes, and McCafferty, and Bailey, and Badillo, and Carey -- but no one knows whether they were Catholics or not. For there was no religious test there.

I ask you tonight to follow in that tradition -- to judge me on the basis of 14 years in the Congress, on my declared stands against an Ambassador to the Vatican, against unconstitutional aid to parochial schools, and against any boycott of the public schools -- which I attended myself. And instead of doing this, do not judge me on the basis of these pamphlets and publications we all have seen that carefully select quotations out of context from the statements of Catholic church leaders, usually in other countries, frequently in other centuries, and rarely relevant to any situation here. And always omitting, of course, the statement of the American Bishops in 1948

which strongly endorsed Church-State separation, and which more nearly reflects the views of almost every American Catholic.

I do not consider these other quotations binding upon my public acts. Why should you?

But let me say, with respect to other countries, that I am wholly opposed to the State being used by any religious group, Catholic or Protestant, to compel, prohibit, or prosecute the free exercise of any other religion. And that goes for any persecution, at any time, by anyone, in any country. And I hope that you and I condemn with equal fervor those nations which deny their Presidency to Protestants, and those which deny it to Catholics. And rather than cite the misdeeds of those who differ, I would also cite the record of the Catholic Church in such nations as France and Ireland, and the independence of such statesmen as De Gaulle and Adenauer.

But let me stress again that these are my views.

For contrary to common newspaper usage, I am not the Catholic candidate for President.

I am the Democratic Party's candidate for President who happens also to be a Catholic.

I do not speak for my church on public matters; and the church does not speak for me. Whatever issue may come before me as President, if I should be elected, on birth

control, divorce, censorship, gambling or any other subject, I will make my decision in accordance with these views -- in accordance with what my conscience tells me to be in the national interest, and without regard to outside religious pressure or dictates. And no power or threat of punishment could cause me to decide otherwise.

But if the time should ever come -- and I do not concede any conflict to be remotely possible -- when my office would require me to either violate my conscience or violate the national interest, then I would resign the office; and I hope any conscientious public servant would do likewise.

But I do not intend to apologize for these views to my critics of either Catholic or Protestant faith; nor do I intend to disavow either my views or my church in order to win this election.

If I should lose on the real issues, I shall return to my seat in the Senate, satisfied that I'd tried my best and was fairly judged.

But if this election is decided on the basis that 40 million Americans lost their chance of being President on the day they were baptized, then it is the whole nation that will be the loser, in the eyes of Catholics and non-Catholics around the world, in the eyes of history, and in the eyes of our own people.

But if, on the other hand, I should win this election, then I shall devote every effort of mind and spirit to fulfilling the oath of the Presidency -- practically identical, I might add, with the oath I have taken for 14 years in the Congress. For without

reservation, I can, "solemnly swear that I will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will to the best of my ability preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution -- so help me God.