the peripatetic orator practiced years after Ogilvie was dead.

Of course Ogilvie was as much a product of his age as he was a maker of it. Raw America, with little time for the more subtle literary arts, and supremely interested in politics, saw "eloquence" as the means to a limited aestheticism and to practical politics at the same time. What literary abilities the nation did possess more often found outlet in eloquence than in poetry or the essay.[61] The magazinists talked of the rules of oratory, and the most famous "English composition" text-book of the day, Blair's[62] *Lectures on Rhetoric,* concerned itself to a very great extent with the rules of spoken address.

In the first quarter of the nineteenth century America had great themes for forensic effort, but despite universal interest and the text-books there was little training in how to present these themes. Ogilvie filled a need; in what manner and degree he filled it we have seen. Every major American city, the new frontier, and several groups of impressionable students had observed him in action. A few discerning friends[63] saw him as "that wonderful example of the solemn comical"; unfortunately for our forensic history, too many saw him as the solemn wonderful. These latter gazed upon the white-togaed orator of rolling sentences and magniloquent gestures with respectful admiration.

[61] George F. Whicher, "Early Essayists," *Cambridge History of American Literature* (New York 1933), I, pp. 233-244.

[62] A compatriot of Ogilvie.

[63] William C. Preston, U. S. senator and president of the South Carolina College, in a letter of 1852 (New York Public Library Manuscript Collections) to his old friend Washington Irving, uses this expression in regard to Ogilvie. It is curiously similar to Irving's elsewhere (cf. *New-York Review, op. cit.,* pp. [117-118]), though both admired certain of the orator's abilities.

LOWELL THOMAS

LIONEL CROCKER
Denison University

ONLY a clairvoyant could have predicted that Lowell Thomas was to become famous in a medium that did not even exist when he was a boy at the turn of the century. Yet, if anyone was ever prepared for his life work, Lowell Thomas was. He was born in Darke County, Ohio, moved to Colorado, where he went to high school at Cripple Creek, went to the University of Denver, where he studied with Pearl Shale Kingsley and took an active part in the organization of chapters of Tau Kappa Alpha in the Rocky Mountain states. Then he went to Indiana and attended Valparaiso University. His speech as a boy was carefully supervised by his father, a scholarly physician, who could not abide slovenly speech. Unlike Kaltenborn, who was reared in Wisconsin, educated at Harvard, and who has many of the acquired characteristics of the Harvard dialect, Lowell Thomas has a composite American speech. His first job was as a reporter. Journalism and public speaking have much in common; both deal with the timely and both dramatize their material. After a year or so he turned to teaching but never lost his interest in news reporting.

He earned his living for two years teaching public speaking at Kent College of Law in Chicago. He taught students how to address juries and how to make pleas to the judge as well as teaching them in the fundamentals of public speaking. His next position was at Princeton University where again he taught public speaking. His experience in the field of speech reinforces the

thought which he expressed in the following statement on the importance of training in public speaking:

> As I look back on it now, if given a chance to do it all over again, and if obliged to choose between four years in college and two years of straight public speaking, I would take the latter, because under the proper direction, it could include most of what one gets from a four year Liberal Arts course, and then some. I can think of nothing that is more likely to add cubits to your stature than well-rounded training in public speaking, combined with plenty of practical experience.[1]

While teaching public speaking at Princeton University he also earned money by reporting. Franklin D. Lane, then Secretary of the Interior, invited him to go to Europe to prepare material to enlist American sympathy for the allied cause. The money was put up by a group of American business men. Out of this trip to Europe grew his lecture, "With Lawrence in Arabia." Like many radio commentators, Lowell Thomas came to the microphone by the way of the lecture platform. Dale Carnegie helped him to prepare his first lectures. In the foreword to his book on Lawrence, Lowell Thomas refers to Dale Carnegie as "To my colleague, Mr. Dale Carnagey [sic], the American novelist."[2] Dale Carnegie returned the compliment by inviting Lowell Thomas to write the foreword to his book *How to Win Friends and Influence People.* In the course of his fifteen page preface, Lowell Thomas declares that "The ability to speak is a short cut to distinction. It puts a man in the limelight, raises him head and shoulders above the crowd. And the man who can speak acceptably is usually given credit for an ability out of all proportion to what he really possesses."

When he returned to the United States, he lectured at The Century Theater on his adventures in Arabia. He toured the United States successfully. Percy Burton, the London impresario, formerly associated with Sir Henry Irving and Sir Johnston Forbes-Robertson, engaged him for a speaking tour of Great Britain. Night after night Lowell Thomas packed Covent Garden and the huge Albert Hall. Altogether he delivered his lecture on Lawrence over 4,000 times and made over a million dollars. His book by the same title was an outgrowth of the lecture. (Altogether Lowell Thomas has written more than twenty books.)

When *The Literary Digest* was looking for a commentator to replace Floyd Gibbons, it engaged Lowell Thomas after considering hundreds of other persons. After a few years with *The Literary Digest* he went with the Sun Oil Company. He states that his run on the radio is longer than that of any other program of any nature.

To understand Lowell Thomas it is helpful to know of his genuine interest in people and their goings and comings. Recently Sir Hubert Wilkins told me that when he first started out to lecture, Lowell Thomas invited him to his home to work on his forthcoming address, an address that was to be illustrated with moving pictures. All of the equipment in Lowell Thomas's private studio at his country home was put at Sir Hubert's disposal. The operator of the moving picture machine was given instructions to help edit his film and help in any and every other possible way. When the lecture was ready Lowell Thomas called in a few friends and they gave suggestions on improving the presentation. Sir Hubert said, "To Lowell I owe a great deal." The friendliness in Lowell Thomas's voice is not an assumed friendliness. Pat Kelley, the chief of the announcing staff

[1] A personal letter. I am indebted to Lowell Thomas for letters explaining his methods and aims, and also for two volumes of his broadcasts, September and October, 1939.

[2] Professor Victor A. Ketcham of Ohio State University told me that it was he who advised Mr. Carnagey to change the spelling of his name.

of the NBC, has said that although there are many voices much better than Lowell Thomas's, few have this gift of modulation, cadence, and meaningful intonation.

C. H. Spurgeon said that he owed more to variety than to profundity. Likewise, Lowell Thomas depends for interestingness upon variety. His news usually falls into three main divisions: the international, the national, and the purely local. Within these three large groupings there are many smaller classes of material. Each broadcast will vary in the number of incidents treated but the average will fall between twelve and sixteen. By contrast, we see that such commentators as Kaltenborn and Swing and Dorothy Thompson are handicapped in the matter of variety. By covering more than national news, Lowell Thomas does not have the imposed handicap of Fulton Lewis, Jr., who covers news only of Washington, D.C.

He usually opens his broadcast with the most important story of the hour, whether this be national or the international. His lead is strong. He uniformly closes his broadcasts on a humorous or whimsical note. He takes some ludicrous incident in the day's news and relates it so that he comes to the end of his time with a smile. He turns over the microphone to Hugh James with a chuckle in his voice. The tenor of his remarks is caught by Hugh James and the commercial is handled in a pleasing and inoffensive manner. In his broadcast of September 4, 1939, he said, "In the nine years that I have been doing this daily broadcast I have tried to make it a rule to end with an item of good news or of nonsense."

Throughout his broadcasts there is an air of good nature. He tries to inject humor into his relating of the news. He depends much on his ability to have fun with words. He is fond of puns, sarcasm and ridicule. Here is a specimen of his irony that evokes a smile: "The French Government has sent a communication to the League of Nations. Fancy that! It carries the accusation that Germany has committed an act of aggression against Poland. Fancy that! And what will the League be doing about it?" The following incident not only shows his ability to use subtle humor but the story is written with an eye to climax.

Fritz Kuhn, Führer of the Deutsch-American Bund, had another setback in court today. His attorneys applied for a reduction of his fifty thousand dollar bail. Some of the Nazis in New York held a meeting the other day to raise the fifty thousand. The amount subscribed was just a hundred and eighty-nine bucks. So Kuhn's lawyers complained to the New York Supreme Court that the bail is excessive and prohibitive. The answer was that in the opinion of the court the bail should be increased rather than reduced.

The American Führer's lawyers seem to have been rather out of luck. The judge presiding was Justice Aaron J. Levy.

Lowell Thomas's interest in adventure is likewise shown in his choice of material. Yet there is little if any crime news related. He frequently introduces explorers on his programs. Felix Von Luckner, Osa Johnson, Sir Hubert Wilkins have all been on his broadcasts. Frequently he identifies himself with some bit of news appearing on the other side of the globe by saying "When I was in. . . ." As I write this he is in Conway, New Hampshire, skiing. The audience is able to enjoy vicariously his love of the out-of-doors. These adventures, such as the one at the coronation of George VII, give an authenticity to his broadcasts that can not be secured in any other way.

So much for his material and its organization. What of his style? Busy men like Lowell Thomas do not write their own scripts. They have highly paid writers. Lowell Thomas has two: one writes two programs a week and the other three.

These writers have captured his style, yet frequently in the script one can see Lowell Thomas's green ink crossing out a word here and adding one there. Some examples will show his ability to create images and his skill in employing emotion-provoking words. One of his writers had described the evacuation of London: "Mothers don't stand weeping and sobbing farewell when their *kids* are just going away for an outing." Lowell Thomas deleted *kids* and inserted *little folks.* A writer had said, *like the closing of a vise,* which Lowell Thomas changed to *like the grip of a vise. Looking* out of the bedroom window is changed to *gazing.*

His style has been called the "gee whiz" style. From newspaper experience he is well versed in baseball slang. Such phrases as "sore soup bone," a "bum arm," "fence busters," "fusilade of slugging," and "snaky curve" roll off his tongue during the baseball season. Other phrases of the vernacular which are commonly used are "grapevine account," "kettle of Communist fish," "climbing on the bandwagon," "peace jitters," "throw the Nazis out of the window," "crack reporter," "chimes in," "had it in for," and "tickled pink."

If he uses a word which he feels all of his audience may not understand he interpolates a more common term. He might say, "obsolescent, out-of-date." His leaning to the common terms of experience does not mean that he will not use such terms as "asseverate" and "excoriation."

He likewise uses foreign words to give color to news stories of foreign places. Here are two examples: "The *Clement* was sunk in South Atlantic by the raider, with no loss of life apparently, and her rescued crew was taken to Rio. There they were held *incommunicado* for awhile, not allowed to tell their story, and there was only vague rumor about the supposed raider." Again, "Many a *hoch,* many a foamy glass of beer, was drunk to the news of peace that was false."

He uses words whose sound convey their meaning. In a description of the latest weapons of war we find such words as *uproar, explosive, noisy, bang-up, blasted, bursting,* and *thundering.*

He uses the objective technique. Rather than telling his audience, he shows them. Here are two examples: "Windows of automobiles had to be rolled down to keep them from being shattered by the detonations." And "All the actual war news today could be written on your cuff."

His style is that of oral discourse. Frequently he uses the phrase or the broken sentence rather than the complete sentence: "The British, for their part, sent a squadron of the Royal Air Force to have a look-see over Berlin and Potsdam. *Only a reconnaissance flight, no bombs dropped, not a shot fired. Reconnaissance plus propaganda.*"

The treatment of one episode may serve to illustrate how a story is handled and will serve to summarize what has been said.

At Orange, New Jersey,	*Act one* Definite place
a mystery was solved to-	mystery (note repetition)
day, a mystery of ten	
silent young men and	ten silent young men (repeated four times)
their Hindu servants. The	
town has a well-known	
mansion, the old Van	mansion
Dyke home. After being	Van Dyke mansion (repeated three times)
unoccupied for some time,	Hindu servants unoccupied
the Van Dyke home re-	
cently acquired some ten-	
ants that excited the curi-	excited curiosity
osity of the town. Ten	
young men, who kept se-	secluded
cluded among themselves,	associated with no one
associated with no one,	
spoke to no one. They	spoke to no one
were attended by swarthy	swarthy Hindu servants

Hindu servants, who wore turbans and were as reticent as their masters.

who wore turbans
reticent

Today, one of the ten young men drove off in his car, and presently got into a smash-up. He was injured, taken to a hospital, and there he told the story. The ten mysterious young men are Soviet Russian technicians, sent over here to study American ways of making radio tubes. They took over the Van Dyke mansion and, not wanting any publicity, kept to themselves—with their Hindu servants.

Act two
ten young men
smash-up
action
ten mysterious young men
Act Three
Soviet Russian
Van Dyke mansion
not wanting any publicity
kept to themselves with their Hindu servants

It is unnecessary to comment in detail on the technique employed here. It is obvious to teachers of public speaking. However, in the margin I have noted the mechanics of organization. There are three distinct parts, like the acts of a play. There is the use of repetition to create the air of mystery: *Van Dyke mansion, ten silent young men, secluded, ten mysterious young men, kept to themselves, reticent.* There are picture words that help the auditor to visualize the drama: *swarthy Hindu servants who wore turbans.*

All of Lowell Thomas's incidents are told with this consummate touch. It is a key to his success on the air. One has only to listen to a local announcer handle the same incident to appreciate what professional writing and speaking can do to a news story.

Lowell Thomas feels that his long run on the air is due to the fact that he merely reports the news. His broadcast is like that of the front page of the newspaper rather than like the editorial page. He is the reporter rather than the columnist. As he says, he does not attempt to shove his "own half-baked conclusions down anyone's throat."

In short, his success is not accidental. He came to his task well equipped by experience and temperament. He had not only taught public speaking but had practiced it successfully before thousands of people before going into the studio. He had not only served as a cub reporter but he had published books of distinction. His broadcasts consciously follow a pattern which is simple yet effective enough to reach an estimated audience of 10,000,000 every night and to help swell his annual income to more than $200,000. Here is a man who is an exception to Bernard Shaw's witticism that those who can do and those who can't teach. Lowell Thomas has done both and he admits that his teaching is largely responsible for his success.

PUBLIC ADDRESS TO PROVOKE THOUGHT

WILLIAM M. TIMMONS
Ohio State University

A FEW years ago Professor Utterback voiced a point of view to which many of us have adhered for some time: "The modes of public discussion through which a nation effects collective decision . . . are determined by the nature of the governmental process at the time, and this in turn depends upon the comparative stability of equilibrium between those conflicting interest groups whose activities underlie political phenomena."[1] Professor Utterback argued that many of the traditional types of speaking are inconsistent with the nature of society to-

[1] William E. Utterback, "Patterns of Public Discussion in School and in Life," *Q.J.S.*, XXIV (1938), p. 588.