AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES OF G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

Paul Housler

1957

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES OF G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

BY

PAUL HOUSLER

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

1957

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is deeply appreciative of the guidance, assistance, and encouragement given by Dr. Gordon L. Thomas, Dr. David Ralph, and Dr. Kenneth Hance. The writer also wishes to express his thanks to Governor Williams and the members of his staff, who were helpful in supplying information and speech manuscripts.

AN ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES OF G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

BY

PAUL HOUSLER

An Abstract of a Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

Department of Speech
Michigan State University

1957

Approved Gordon L. Thomas
Major Professor

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to describe, analyze, and interpret the speaking of G. Mennen Williams, primarily through the analysis of five of his speeches, in an effort to contribute to an understanding of the nature of his speaking.

The writer feels that G. Mennen Williams is worthy of study because he has an unprecedented record of five terms as Democratic governor of Michigan, a state that has normally been considered Republican. In addition, he has been mentioned as a candidate for national offices, including those of United States senator, vice-president, and president of the United States.

An analysis of Williams through his speechmaking was undertaken because it has been stated that Williams relies on public speaking to help him win elections. Such an analysis has not previously been made, and it is hoped that these preliminary efforts will prove to be a worthwhile pilot project.

The main sources of information used in this study were periodicals, newspapers, and interviews with the subject and with those associated with him. The material has been organized into the following chapters: Chapter I is the introductory chapter; Chapter II deals with the political and economic history of Michigan, providing a background against

which to consider Williams; Chapter III is concerned with Williams' background and training; Chapter IV attempts to give a picture of Williams as a speaker; Chapter V contains the analyses of the selected speeches; and Chapter VI presents a summary and draws conclusions.

The speeches for analysis were selected with respect to the dates on which they were delivered during Williams' career as governor, the subject matter of the speeches, the audiences who attended the speeches, and the places where the speeches were delivered. The technique for analyzing the speeches was adapted from the tenets of speech criticism handed down to us by the critics of antiquity and includes a description, analysis, and interpretation of the speeches with regard to the following topics: (1) ideas, (2) organization, (3) evidence and reasoning, (4) psychological and emotional appeals, and (5) style.

Following is a summary of the conclusions in each of the five areas: Ideas. The ideas expressed in the speeches analyzed seem to correspond to those of the New Deal philosophy, a basic concept of which includes using government as an active agent operating for the benefit of individuals in society. In each of the five speeches some evidence was found to support the conclusion that Williams believes in this concept. Organization. In each of the speeches analyzed Williams employed a definite introduction, body, and conclusion. In the bodies of the speeches he seemed to favor what may be termed a logical organization--that is, the grouping together of the ideas which are a part of the reasoning

process. Evidence and reasoning. Williams used a considerable body of evidence, employing statistics in all of the speeches analyzed except one. In addition to this use of evidence, Williams used quotations from authority, favoring citations from Patrick Henry, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Williams used this evidence of fact and opinion as a basis for several types of deductive and inductive reasoning. In four of the speeches Williams seemed to use deductive reasoning to a greater extent than inductive. Psychological and emotional appeals. In the five speeches analyzed, Williams used psychological and emotional appeals sparingly. One consistent psychological appeal employed was the use of personal pronouns, a device which seemed likely to emphasize the good will of the speaker. There were appeals made to the listener's sense of patriotism, duty, love, and co-operation. Style. Williams used parallel construction in each of the five speeches, while other stylistic devices--such as alliteration, analogy, rhetorical questions, and figures of speech--were used less consistently. One stylistic device which Williams employed with frequency was the use of personal pronouns.

The writer's opinion is that Williams' speeches contain considerable evidence of fact and opinion. They are well-organized and logical. They may not be stylistically imaginative; but, though they are generally not marked by wide use of psychological and emotional appeals, they enable Williams to present himself favorably to the listener. It is the writer's opinion that the listener accepts first the

speaker, then the ideas. What the Democrats in Michigan needed in 1948 was a leader who could visualize changes which had taken place within the state and who could capitalize upon them. Williams seemed able to impress the voters of the state with his qualifications, and certainly an important means of creating this impression was his speech-making.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of problem. One may examine many facets of an individual in an attempt to discover the sources of his leadership. It is difficult to isolate these sources because they are often interrelated, but throughout history speechmaking has been an integral part of the make-up of many individuals and an important source of their leadership. The purpose of this study is to describe, analyze, and interpret G. Mennen Williams, governor of Michigan, as a speaker--primarily through the analysis of five speeches--in an attempt to contribute to an understanding of the nature of his speaking.

Limitations imposed. The number of speeches analyzed will be limited to five. A complete study of the speaking of Williams would, of course, involve the examination of all the speeches that he has delivered in his career. This would be an impossible task, however desirable it might be. Within limits of time and space available, the writer decided to select five speeches which he felt would be representative of the speaking of Williams in terms of the subject matter on which he speaks, the audiences to whom he speaks, and the places and dates of delivery. The selection of five speeches is even more justifiable in view of the

fact that many, if not most, of Williams' speeches are the result of a joint effort on the part of many people closely connected with the governor. Some speeches, however, are almost entirely the work of Williams alone. It is from these speeches that the ones analyzed in this thesis have been selected; what is set forth in the following study is essentially a case study of a selected group of Williams' speeches.

This study will not attempt to make explicit, detailed value judgments for two reasons. First, the task of doing the research and detailed analysis necessary to justify such explicit judgments would require more time than the writer has available. Second, in order to judge in true perspective the speechmaking of any individual, it seems to the writer that time should mellow his accomplishments.

Justification. G. Mennen Williams is worthy of study because he has an unprecedented record of five terms as Democratic governor of Michigan, a state that has normally been considered Republican. In addition, he has been mentioned as a candidate for national offices, including those of United States senator, vice-president, and president.[1]

---

[1]Newspapers carried accounts of Williams' possible candidacy for presidency prior to the 1956 nominating conventions. The Courier Buffalo Express, November 18, 1955, stated: "The tall forty-four year old shaving cream heir who frequently has been mentioned as a possible Democratic presidential nominee said he has been aware of the speculation and has given the matter thought." The Detroit Free Press, November 29, 1955, summarized the situation in this way: "Some believe that the Michigan governor is not shoot-

Why, then, an analysis of Williams through his speeches? It has been stated that Williams relies on public speaking in helping him to win elections. He has delivered a large number of speeches on a variety of topics, and an analysis of his speeches has not previously been undertaken; thus, it is hoped that these preliminary efforts will prove to be a worthwhile pilot project.

Materials and sources. The main sources of information used in this study were periodicals, newspapers, and interviews with the subject and with those associated with him. The only biographical material that the writer could find concerning Williams was in news magazines, Current Biography, occasional newspaper accounts, and a brief biography released by Williams' office. The lack of biographical material proved to be a difficult barrier in preparing the chapters on "Williams, the Man" and "Williams, the Speaker". It is suggested that this may be a fruitful area for a later study.

Plan of organization. The material has been organized into the following chapters: Chapter II deals with the political and economic history of Michigan, providing a background against which to consider Williams; Chapter III is concerned with Williams' background and training; Chapter IV attempts to give a picture of Williams as a speaker; Chapter V contains the analyses of the five selected speech-

---

ing for the 1956 nomination for president but he hopes to emerge in four years as the party's liberal spokesman and benefit from reaction four years later."

es[2]; and Chapter VI presents a summary and draws conclusions.

[2]Copies of the speeches selected for analysis will be found in the appendix.

CHAPTER II

BACKGROUND

The purpose of this chapter is to trace briefly some of the significant aspects of the political and economic history of Michigan and to describe the gubernatorial elections in which Williams has participated. Such information will help place the accomplishments of Governor Williams as a speaker in their proper perspective.

Political and Economic History of Michigan

From 1854 until 1932 Michigan was almost solidly Republican, electing only two Democrats--Governor Winans in 1890 and Governor Ferris in 1912 and 1914. This almost solid Republican rule accounts for the fact that Michigan is considered a "Republican state".

A post-Civil War boom in mining, manufacturing, and lumbering was the harbinger of a new economy in Michigan, which was to make a marked change in the political structure of the state. Michigan's proximity to iron ore, adjacent to cheap water transportation, was destined to produce an industrial economy. Between 1890 and 1920 manufacturing increased enormously, and the trend from a predominatly extractive economy to one of manufacturing began. This industrial economy caused a shifting of population from rural to urban

areas and brought about a steady influx of workers to urban areas from other states and from Europe. Detroit, for example, had nearly a million inhabitants by 1920, five times as many as in 1890. The population of Flint increased ninefold during that same thirty-year period. In 1890 only thirty-five per cent of the inhabitants of Michigan lived in towns or cities of 2500 or more. However, by 1920 sixty-one per cent of the people lived in towns or cities of 2500 or more, while thirty-nine per cent lived in villages or on farms. As will be explained later in this chapter, this shift of population to urban areas was an important basic factor in the rejuvenation of the Democratic party, under whose banner G. Mennen Williams was to become a five-time governor.

At the top of the manufacturing hierarchy, as far as the state and the nation were concerned, was the manufacture of automobiles. The introduction of this industry to the state scene marked the end of an era and the beginning of a new era which was to exert marked changes, not only in the economy of the state but in the political structure of the state as well. These changes became evident during the world-wide depression of the 1930's. The depression brought about significant shifting in the political thinking of the people of the United States. Because of its highly specialized industrial nature, Michigan suffered sooner and more severely than most of the other states. It was the automobile industry in Michigan that had led the swing to prosperity--due, in part, to a great demand for cars by those who had made money during the first World War. Likewise,

it was the automobile industry which now caused widespread unemployment, because of decreased production. Only two million units were produced in 1933, as compared with five million units in 1929.[3]

Politically, the depression was largely responsible for the 1932 national landslide for the Democrats. The factors which influenced people to vote for Franklin D. Roosevelt in the 1932 election likewise influenced them to vote for many other Democrats throughout the nation. In Michigan, the Democratic candidate for governor, William A. Comstock, was elected by an overwhelming margin. He received 15,072 more votes than did Roosevelt in Michigan and 190,000 more than his Republican opponent, Wilbur M. Brucker. For the first time since the Civil War, the Democrats elected a majority of representatives in the state legislature.[4]

The New Deal philosophy[5] of the Roosevelt administration was reflected in Michigan by the action taken by Governor

---

[3]F. Clever Bald, Michigan in Four Centuries, (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954,) p. 188.

[4]Ibid., p. 406.

[5]In his book American Politics and the Party System, (New York: McGraw Hill Company, Inc., 1949), pp. 320-31, Hugh A. Bone, Professor of American Government and Politics at the University of Washington, states: "The role of the federal government [in the New Deal] became to regulate private economic forces, engage in economic planning especially for social security, plan several economic enterprises under public ownership, and extend public services to private individuals and groups...Within four years after the inauguration of Roosevelt, a federal public works and job security program, a federal-state system of old age pensions, unemployment compensation, and various health and welfare serv-

Comstock to solve problems brought on by the depression. He was one of the first governors in the United States to declare a bank holiday, due to the fear-inspired rush by the people to withdraw their savings. In line with general New Deal practices, Comstock instituted a program of soil conservation and reforestation in the state. It was during Governor Comstock's term of office that the three per cent sales tax was started in Michigan and the Old Age Assistance Act was passed.[6]

Concurrent with these developments, another important influence upon the political situation in Michigan appeared during the administration of the New Deal: the growth of labor unions, which became important political forces, particularly in Michigan. Unions were not unknown in Michigan before the 1930's, for there had been considerable labor unionization even before the Civil War. It was not until 1936, however, that the automobile workers in Michigan unionized under the American Federation of Labor banner, which in 1938 became the Congress of Industrial Organization.[7]

---

[5]ices were established. Credit was extended to homeowners, farmers, and business. Investors and consumers were given a larger degree of protection and the underprivileged were helped by public power projects. An underlying concept of the New Deal, as enunciated by [leaders of the New Deal] in its earlier days, was that the people had been made less secure because they were 'regimented into the service of the privileged few'. By curbing these few, the Rooseveltian philosophy held, greater freedom, liberty, and security for the average man would result".

[6]F. Clever Bald, op. cit., pp. 408-16.

[7]Ibid., p. 424

By 1936 the automobile workers' union had become a potent political force in Michigan. The Political Action Committee of the C.I.O. was formed in 1938 to support the political party which initiated legislation favorable to the union movement. Since the inception of the P.A.C., the union has consistently supported the Democratic party in Michigan. Likewise, since 1948 it has backed G. Mennen Williams in his election campaigns. The support of the labor vote, especially that of the C.I.O. members, has had an important bearing on the elections from 1950 through 1956.

Throughout the depression years, Michigan residents, as well as workers from the other states, continued to stream into the cities of southeastern Michigan. Wayne, Oakland, and Macomb counties were particularly high in the number of new residents who migrated to places within their borders. Many of these people came from the Democratic South; the heavily populated area of Wayne County has been, since the depression, overwhelmingly Democratic, while the more sparsely settled rural areas of the state support the Republican Party.[8]

Michigan's experience since the beginning of the depression demonstrates that Democratic appeal is greatest in the areas with dense population.

---

[8]Joseph G. LaPalombara, Guide to Michigan Politics, (Prepared for the Citizenship Clearing House, affiliated with the Law Center of New York Union, Washington Square, New York, 3, New York), p. 7.

Urban voting trends are essentially Democratic trends.[9] One can see that industrialization and a population increase have combined to produce a considerable Democratic shift. This is well-illustrated by the abrupt changes in seat distribution in the state legislature in 1933-1934. In 1931-1932 there were thirty-one Republicans and one Democrat in the State Senate and ninety-eight Republicans and two Democrats in the House of Representatives. In 1933-1934 there were fifteen Republican state senators and seventeen Democratic state senators, while in the House of Representatives there were forty-five Republicans and fifty-five Democrats. This turning point seems to have been permanent, for, while the Republicans, except for the 1933-1934 session, continue to dominate in both houses of the legislature, there has been only one brief return to the lop-sided majorities that prevailed in the earlier part of the century.[10]

It is significant to note that in all of the state's political regions, Republican and Democrat, a large independent vote exists which patently has influenced the course of political trends. At least a quarter of the state's voters are not committed to any one party.[11]

---

[9]Samuel J. Eldersveld and James K. Pollock, Michigan Politics in Transition, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942), p. 45.

[10]Joseph G. LaPalombara, op. cit., p. 16.

[11]Samuel J. Eldersveld and James K. Pollock, op. cit., p. 65.

Therefore, the candidate, whatever his political party, who can make the most favorable impression on this segment of the voters has a good chance of being elected to office.

To give a clearer view of the political picture in Michigan, it should be known that the state is divided into four political regions.[12] They are:

1. The six strong Democratic counties: Wayne, Bay, Delta, Presque Isle, Macomb, and Monroe, all of which have been the most inflexibly Democratic in recent years. Here, then, is the core of the Democratic strength. These six counties, five in the Lower Peninsula and three of these adjacent to each other in the Southeastern section of the state, have forty-four per cent of the population of the state.

2. The nineteen shifting Democratic counties--that is, counties which have recently gone Democratic more often than Republican: An analysis of these nineteen counties reveals that the most populous sections of the state had the pronounced Democratic shifts. These counties include twenty-two of the forty-three cities with a population of more than ten thousand; likewise, these counties include eighty-five per cent of the urban population of Michigan, which itself is more than sixty-five per cent urban.

3. The fourteen safe Republican counties: Quite the opposite of Democratic counties, these fourteen counties

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 20-41.

are fairly uniform as far as their geographical, economic, and populational nature is concerned. Except Luce County, in the Upper Peninsula, all are scattered in the Lower Peninsula but are situated mainly in the northern part. As could be expected, they are predominantly rural, as a group--more than eighty per cent so, despite the fact that Kalamazoo County has more than fifty per cent of its population in the city of Kalamazoo. These counties have only about eight per cent of the state's population, and their predominantly rural character presents a consistent group picture.

4. The twelve doubtful counties: These counties, unpredictable as to their voting preference, are located generally in the rural north. Six of them are in the Upper Peninsula, four being classified as "forest" counties and two as "mineral". Four of the Lower Peninsula counties are forest, one (Berrien) is farm-urban, and one (Jackson) is urban. There are no farm counties included in this category. The sparsely settled character of this group of counties is apparent from the fact that in 1940 it included no more than five per cent of the population of the state. In these twelve doubtful counties a high percentage of independent or "non-organization" vote exists.[13]

In order to bring us up to the point of Williams' entry into the political scene, a brief review of the state gubernatorial elections from the time of the depression

---

[13] Ibid., p. 41.

until 1948 will be given. It has already been noted that William A. Comstock, a Democrat, won the election of 1932, when the Democrats swept the state administrative offices. In the 1934 election the Republicans were victorious with their candidate, Frank D. Fitzgerald. Then in the 1936 election the Democrats elected Frank Murphy as governor. Frank Fitzgerald was returned to the governor's office by the Republicans in 1938. After serving two months of his two-year term he died, and Lieutenant Governor Luren D. Dickinson served out the rest of the term. In 1940, Murray D. Van Wagoner, a Democrat, was elected governor. This review of the elections serves to indicate the political change that had taken place in Michigan since the depression: the two-party character of the state government began to emerge and the voters of the state were willing to vote for the party which showed itself capable of administering to their best interests.

In the 1942 election, Harry F. Kelly, the Republican Secretary of State, defeated Governor Van Wagoner. Kelly was re-elected in 1944, the first incumbent in fourteen years to succeed himself in the governor's office.[14] All the executive offices in the state government were won by Republicans in 1944, and the party had a strong majority in the legislature. Two problems which faced the Michigan legislature during Kelly's first term were reapportionment and corruption. The first was the result of the movement to-

---

[14] F. Clever Bald, op.cit., p. 451.

ward the cities, increasing the population of the counties in the southeastern part of the state and decreasing it elsewhere. Under pressure of Governor Kelly, in 1943 the House reapportioned the seats, improving considerably the previous unfair apportionment, unchanged since 1925. The Upper Peninsula lost two seats, and certain counties in the Lower Peninsula lost ten. Of the twelve seats, six were given to Wayne County and six were distributed among Oakland, Genesee, Ingham, Macomb, and Washtenaw counties.[15] Since these counties are largely Democratic, the Democrats were given a better chance for additional representation in the state House of Representatives.

The problem of corruption in the legislature was attacked by a grand jury and the courts. In 1943 there was talk in Lansing that lobbyists were purchasing the votes of legislators. Attorney General Herbert J. Rushton petitioned the Ingham County Circuit Court for an inquiry into the charges of bribery. Judge Leland W. Carr was named grand juror to make the investigation, and Kim Sigler was appointed special prosecutor. The dramatic, crusading Sigler obtained the conviction of twenty defendants in 1944.[16]

Sigler, this colorful prosecutor of the legislators and businessmen who had been indicted by the grand juror, became very popular with the citizens of Michigan. In

---

[15] Ibid., p. 449.

[16] Ibid., p. 450.

1946 he sought and won the Republican nomination for governor. Formerly a Democrat himself, he defeated Van Wagoner by 350,000 votes. Encouraged by this overwhelming margin of victory, Sigler laid before the legislature a number of recommendations for improving the government of the state. The legislature did enact part of his program; but, even though the governor called the legislators into special sessions, most of the recommendations were rejected. Governor Sigler's wrangles with the legislature split his party, and his extensive travels during his term made many persons believe that he was neglecting the business of the state.[17]

At this point, with the state Republican party split over Governor Sigler, G. Mennen Williams decided he would like to run for governor of Michigan. The announcement "was received with a sensational state-wide wave of apathy."[18]

Williams' Political Campaigns

G. Mennen Williams resigned a post in the Liquor Control Commission to campaign for the governorship. He traveled the state extensively during the ensuing campaign. Saturday Evening Post reported;

> The flamboyant cowboy from Nebraska . . . proved to be Williams' best vote-getter. Kim Sigler . . . had spent his two years as Republican governor in what was apparently a determined effort to lose votes and alienate his political supporters . . . Sigler had

---

[17] Ibid., p. 452

[18] R. Thruelsen, "When Michigan Woke Up He Was Governor", Saturday Evening Post, Vol. 221, No. 33, (February 12, 1949), p. 26.

> displayed an astounding disregard for political amenities . . . . By November, 1948, the governor had little in either his legislative or executive record to which he could point with pride, while his opponents had plenty they could view with alarm.[19]

This analysis seems to be verified, at least in part, by the results of the 1948 election. Dewey, the Republican nominee for the presidency, carried Michigan; the state's Republican senator, Homer Ferguson, beat his Democratic rival. Both branches of the state legislature retained substantial Republican majorities. Several Republican state officials were re-elected to the administrative board, the governor's unofficial cabinet. Yet Williams, the unknown political figure, won the election over Sigler by 150,000 votes.

Williams' 1948 campaign was based upon a New Deal platform, with a few local modifications.[20] The nine points he emphasized were:

1. He recommended that the state take an active role in providing housing.
2. He advocated the increase of state unemployment compensation.
3. He favored repeal of the Bonine-Tripp Act, which labor union leaders called the "Little Taft-Hartley Act".
4. He recommended improvements in the educational system.
5. He suggested improvements in the civil rights program.
6. He favored an expansion of the highway system.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 113.

[20] Ibid., p. 114

7. He recommended the establishment of a Veterans' Service Program.

8. He favored the establishment of a farm marketing program.

9. He made the promise of a more efficient administration.

Time describes Williams' strength in Michigan in 1948 as being built on a sort of right triangle. The base was the powerful C.I.O. and Walter Reuther's U.A.W. in and around Detroit. The vertical side extending far up-state was the Michigan Democratic Club, founded by Williams and his good friend and law partner, Hicks Griffith. The hypotenuse was the candidate himself. Each member of the triangular coalition was essentially dependent on the other.[21]

The geographical character of the Williams' vote coalition in 1948 was unique and in large part dictated the nature of the gubernatorial campaign of 1950. Williams had won only seventeen of the eighty-three counties in 1948, but his pluralities in these counties were enough to offset Republican strength in the remaining sixty-six. The seventeen counties were spread throughout the state and included ten of the fifteen Upper Peninsula counties, three west-central counties (Muskegon, Manistee, and Kent), and four counties (Bay, Genesee, Macomb, and Wayne) in the southeastern section of the state. In Wayne County alone Williams had a plurality of 237,027 votes, of which 205,394 came from

---

[21] Time, Vol. LII, November 15, 1948, p. 27.

the city of Detroit.[22]

In the 1950 campaign for governor, the Republicans nominated Harry F. Kelly, who had been governor from 1942 to 1946, as their candidate; the Democrats re-nominated Williams. The campaign was Michigan's major political spectacle of the year. Since this was an "off-year" election, it was presumably a Republican year, and it was generally expected that most state-wide Democratic candidates would be unsuccessful. Such a concession was not made in the race for governor, which was strictly a personal political battle, Kelly vs. Williams. The ensuing campaign was intense, bitter, and exhausting, with both political machines blanketing the state with publications. Political organizational efforts were at their peaks, and the itineraries of both candidates were extensive, carrying them into all parts of the state. Interest in the election was heightened because two political traditions were at stake. First, not since 1849 had Michigan voters returned a former governor to the capitol after a two-term retirement; and, second, the last time that a Democrat had been able to succeed himself in an "off-year" was in 1914.[23]

Not until November 27 were the final results of the election announced: Williams, 935,152; Kelly, 933,998. The closeness of the original count had occasioned a re-count, at

---

[22]Samuel J. Eldersveld and Albert A. Applegate, Michigan Recounts for Governor, 1950-1952, (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954), p. 2.

[23]Ibid., pp. 1-2.

the end of which Kelly conceded the victory to Williams.

In 1952 Governor Williams again was unopposed for nomination for re-election by the Democrats. The Republicans, however, waged a vigorous three-way battle among Secretary of State Fred M. Alger, Jr., retired State Police Commissioner Donald S. Leonard, and Lieutenant-Governor William C. Vandenberg. In the primary Alger won a plurality victory over his opponents, and in the ensuing campaign both he and Williams "traveled throughout the state extensively...and explored a wide variety of campaign tactics, arguments, and media."[24] Williams retained his urban and Upper Peninsula support, carrying thirteen of the eighty-three counties, as he did in 1950; his Wayne County plurality was 110,000 larger than in 1950.[25] Although a recount was again necessary, Williams became Michigan's first consecutive three-term Democratic governor.

In 1954 the gubernatorial election followed the same general pattern as in the previous three elections. Williams, as strong as ever in the Upper Peninsula and in Wayne County, defeated Donald S. Leonard, Republican nominee. The Democrats, in addition to winning the governor's office, captured all of the key state offices and elected a significant number of representatives to the state legislature, although the Republicans retained their majority. In 1956 Williams again was elected governor over his Republican opponent, Albert

---

[24] Ibid., p. 121.

[25] Ibid., p. 122.

Cobo, Mayor of Detroit.

It may be possible to account in part for Williams' election to unprecedented third, fourth, and fifth terms by revealing that there may have been deep undercurrents of discontent within the ranks of the Republican party in Michigan. This disorganization has historical precedent, for the Republicans have showed themselves to be predisposed to split at several instances in the past. A notable example occurred when Theodore Roosevelt split from the Republican party in 1912 and formed the Progressive Party, winning a plurality of the popular vote in Michigan as well as the electoral vote of the state. In addition, it has been noted that the New Deal may have caused a general shift in the political thinking of the voters of the United States. Thus, it may be conjectured that there were factions in both the Republican and Democratic parties which supported to some degree the principles of the New Deal; likewise, there were factions in both parties which did not wish to change party policies. These factions, within the Republican party, were brought into sharp focus in the presidential election of 1952, when one segment of Michigan Republicans supported the presidential nomination of Robert A. Taft while the other segment supported the nomination of General Eisenhower. Since Eisenhower won the nomination, seeds of dis-union may have been sowed. Among the older Republicans, a number of men, including Harlow Curtice, president of General Motors, were for Eisenhower. There was also in 1952 a very vociferous Old Guard,

which included Homer Ferguson, Michigan's senator, which backed the presidential candidacy of Robert Taft. The effects of the split in the Republican ranks is difficult to assess; however, it seems to have resulted in the loss of support of erstwhile active Republicans.[26]

Thus, we can see that after eighty years of almost solid Republican rule, the Democrats began in 1932 to emerge as a power in Michigan. The reasons for the rise in strength of the Democrats are varied and interrelated, but may be summarized as follows: (1) Because of the rise in industry in Michigan, urban populations increased; these urban areas became predominantly Democratic, partly as a result of the stand of the labor unions which grew up with industry. (2) The Republican party became weaker in Michigan, perhaps due to a split in its ranks. (3) The fact that the Republicans waged bitter primary battles for gubernatorial nominations may have created a segment of discontented and apathetic Republicans.

From 1932 on, the Democrats have become progressively stronger in Michigan, to such a degree that by 1956 they had not only significantly increased the proportion of Democratic state legislators, but five times they had run successfully their candidate, G. Mennen Williams, who, in 1954 and 1956, carried the complete state Democratic ticket with him. Some

---

[26]For further information about dissension within Republican ranks, see Duncan Norton-Taylor's Article, "What's Wrong with Michigan?", Fortune Magazine, January 1955, p. 142.

of the impetus given to the resurgence of the Democratic party in Michigan may be due to the leadership of G. Mennen Williams. Let us next take a look at Williams, the man.

CHAPTER III

WILLIAMS, THE MAN

In analysing a speech, the critic must necessarily be familiar with the speaker's family background, with his education, with people who had influence on the speaker, with his career, and with his personality. In view of the fact that no one has yet written a biography of G. Mennen Williams, it is difficult and beyond the scope of this study to accumulate in detail all the desired information. However, the salient features of Williams' background are herewith given. Most of the information has come from periodicals, newspapers, personal correspondence, and personal interviews.

Family Background

Gerhardt Mennen Williams was born in Grosse Pointe, Michigan, a fashionably exclusive city near Detroit, on February 23, 1911. He is the son of Henry P. Williams, now deceased, and Alma Mennen Williams. His father came from old American pre-Revolutionary stock. His mother is the daughter of Gerhardt Mennen, who came from Germany.[27]

One of the most paradoxical facts concerning Williams'

---

[27] Anna Rothe (ed.), Current Biography (Newark: H. W. Wilson Co., 1949), p. 636.

background is that he was born into a wealthy, Republican family and later became a leader of the Michigan Democrats. His father had built up a comfortable income in the pickle business and in Detroit real estate. His mother is a Mennen, sharing with her brother control of the Mennen Company, manufacturers of soaps and toiletries, worth an estimated twelve million dollars.[28] The family was socially very prominent. Life reports that Williams was "born into a family which had made its mark long before the V-8 engine was conceived, and which stood socially a cut above the car makers."[29] It can be seen, then, that "though he was no crown prince of economic royalty, as he has sometimes been pictured, [Williams] knew his way around the fashionable circles of Detroit's automobile dynasty, and, in college, he surely never needed to worry where his next pair of gray flannels were coming from."[30]

Williams' family was Republican, so much so that when he announced his intention in 1948 to campaign for Democratic governor of Michigan, Life reported: "Mrs. Williams is a devout Republican who could not bring herself to finance what she thought was a big foolishness on Soapy's [31]

---

[28] Time, Vol. LX, No. 2, September 15, 1952, p. 27.

[29] Robert Wallace, "'Soapy' Williams", Life, Vol. 26, No. 10, March 7, 1949, p. 111.

[30] R. Thruelsen, op. cit., p. 27.

[31] According to Life, March 7, 1949, p. 112, at a tender age and for plain reasons young Williams picked up his nickname, "Soapy", which has stuck with him. His two younger brothers, "Lathers" and "Suds", shook off their titles with age.

part."[32] Williams himself later said for publication, "I was brought up in the Republican tradition and know all about that."[33]

From this family background of wealth and affiliation with big business, Williams was to make, in 1954, a political speech containing the following statements which seem to be a fair indication of his political philosphy:

> It's an ill wind that blows nobody good--and the nation's experience with Republican leadership has accomplished one good thing. It has demonstrated that the interests of farmers, workers, and businessmen are basically the same. The Republican recession has hurt all three without distinction or discrimination.
>
> The only group that hasn't been seriously affected as yet by the Republican recession is the big business group. And that is the reason why the Republican party leaders have taken such a tolerant view of unemployment, farm distress, and small business failures. They won't get excited about economic troubles until the profits of big business begin to feel the serious effects from the loss of purchasing power. That time hasn't come yet.
>
> But unless the national economic policies are changed, big business will eventually suffer along with everyone else, as it did in the depression of the 30's.[34]

Although the family influence on Williams's political philosophy may have been negative, such information as has been recorded indicates that early in his life he possessed certain personality characteristics which contributed to

---

[32]Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 117

[33]Ibid., p. 111.

[34]Unpublished speech delivered at Alpena, Michigan, October 18, 1954.

his later political accomplishments. The following anecdotes, recalled by G. Mennen Williams' brother, Henry Williams, now a Republican District Committeeman and a rancher in Glen Wood Springs, Colorado, indicate two such characteristics--his leadership qualities and his determination. Henry recalls:

> He's just the kind of guy who had to lead. Soapy was president of the choir at St. Paul's in Detroit. He used to kick me out all the time. I made the kids laugh and Soapy would run me out. Luckily I had pull: Father was a vestryman and he would get me back in.[35]

Henry was perhaps the first victim of Soapy's grim determination; he recalls that:

> Soapy was a muscle-man when we were kids. Soapy used to get all of those muscle courses and all the gadgets. He used to use me to practice his wrestling holds. He would prop the book up in front of him and then get a horrible armlock on me. I would wriggle out of it and Soapy would check the book again and mutter, "I'm sure that is the right hold, Hank. Let's try again".[36]

The aforementioned anecdotes give insight into Williams' personality as a youth. We shall see in the section of this chapter labeled "Personality" that these characteristics of leadership and determination have been retained throughout Williams' adult life.

Other aspects of Williams' family life are difficult to assay. For example, it is impossible to determine the influence of Williams' mother and father because no revealing information has been written about them. It is known, how-

---

[35] Time, Vol. LX, No. 2, September 15, 1952, p. 27.

[36] Ibid., p. 27.

ever, that Mrs. Williams had her own positive notions about bringing up her three sons, Mennen, Henry, and Richard. "We used to wear our hair in those Dutch bobs," Hank recalls, "and we used to have to wear those Buster Brown collars. But the kids in school in the seats behind us would write all over them, and when Mother saw what they wrote we didn't wear them any more."[37]

Education

An evaluation of Williams' education gives us a clearer picture of the man. Throughout his formal education at Detroit University School, Salisbury (Connecticut) School, Princeton University, and the University of Michigan, Williams showed himself to be intelligent, tenacious, and industrious. In addition, he displayed qualities of leadership; and reports indicate that he was a well-rounded individual.

Williams received a very thorough education, and he took full advantage of his educational opportunities. According to Time, "At Salisbury he gravely determined to get good grades. To the regular curriculum he added a special course in Greek."[38] One of his teachers, Edmund Samuel Carr, in a letter to the writer stated: "In each of these five years [at Salisbury,] he [Williams] was the top scholar in his form and usually (it may have been always, I do not happen to remember this surely) the top scholar of the entire school. But I do know that in his last year, his average

---

[37] Ibid., p. 27.

[38] Ibid., P. 27

was about 95, which still stands as the record top in Salisbury's fifty-five years of existence, as an average for a whole year."[39] Time further reported a recollection of Mr. Carr's: "Most schoolboys, when they excel, are just precocious. But with [Williams] it was a little different. He was very thorough. He just thought things through."[40]

As further evidence of Williams' intelligence and industry, in 1929, when he enrolled in the School of Public and International Affairs at Princeton University, "he deliberately shut himself off without a roommate so he would not have to waste study time in senseless gabbling."[41] This application to study was profitable, for he received a Phi Beta Kappa key before graduation from Princeton in 1933. Life carried an interesting account of this matter: "Most of his classmates thought of him only as an affable, sleepy young man, but when the Phi Beta Kappa list was posted, there stood Soapy's name."[42] But it can also be seen that Williams was not a "book-worm", for he put aside his studies long enough to earn varsity letters as a member of the Princeton Crew and as a football player. He also participated in baseball, basketball, skiing, and wrestling.

It was during his college days that some of Williams' political ideas began to take shape. While still at Prince-

---

[39]Edmund Samuel Carr, personal letter, July 10,1956

[40]Time, Vol. LX, No. 2, September 15, 1952, p. 27

[41]Ibid., p. 27

[42]Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 112.

ton, Williams made up his mind that he would like to enter politics. One summer he wrote a friend, Stan Beckus, "If God and man are willing, I am going to play some part in government."[43]

Williams' entered law school at the University of Michigan in 1933 and graduated with a Doctor of Jurisprudence degree in 1936.[44] During the college years, Williams' leadership qualities, mentioned by his brother Henry as a characteristic of Williams' youth, are evidenced. While at Princeton, he headed two important organizations: he was president of the Student Senate and president of the Young Republican Club, the latter position to serve subsequently as a source of embarrassment to him. At the University of Michigan he worked on the University Law Review and became a member of the Order of Coif.[45]

It was also during these college years that Williams' political philosophy apparently became clear in his mind. While at the University of Michigan he engaged, as it is customary for students, in informal discussions with his classmates. The University of Michigan students, like the people of the entire United States, were in a turmoil over the New Deal--a topic which furnished fuel for their heated debates. At this time Williams considered himself a

---

[43] Time, Vol. LX, No. 2, September 15, 1952, p. 27

[44] The top ten per cent of the students of a graduating law class are given a Doctor of Jurisprudence degree.

[45] Anna Rothe, (ed.) op. cit., p. 636.

liberal Republican, but a fellow law student convinced him that there could be no such thing as a liberal Republican and so "Soapy flipped resoundingly into the New Deal camp, much to the distress of his family."[46]

Persons Who Influenced Williams

During his law school years, Williams met two persons who undoubtedly exerted considerable influence on his future career.

One of these persons was Frank Murphy. It was rumored that when Williams successfully ran for governor in 1948 he did so as the result of Murphy's suggestion and under Murphy's tutelage. The truth of this rumor is impossible to substantiate at this time, but Life reported that "he[Williams] was a friend and protege of Frank Murphy."[47] Also, it is well-known that Williams and Murphy worked closely together, as will be seen, from the time of their meeting until Murphy's appointment to the Supreme Court. One of the questions asked by this writer, in conferring with persons close to the governor, was, "What people have had influence upon Williams?" Invariably the first person mentioned was Frank Murphy.

Thus, it should prove profitable to examine briefly Frank Murphy's beliefs and his career. Murphy was a part of the New Deal "brain trust". He was a poor boy who made

---

[46] Time, Vol. LX, No. 2, September 15, 1952, p. 27.

[47] Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 112.

good in the American tradition. He was a self-avowed public servant who said, "I should like to belong to that small company of public servants and others who are content to do some of the homely and modest tasks of perfecting integrity in government and making government more efficient and orderly".[48] Murphy began his career of public service in 1924, when he was elected to a judgeship in Detroit, handling criminal cases. In 1930 he became mayor of the city of Detroit, and in 1932 he was appointed Governor General of the Philippine Islands. In 1936 these experiences culminated in his election as governor of Michigan. In 1938 he was defeated for the governorship, and in that same year he was appointed United States Attorney General by Roosevelt. Murphy inspired the Department of Justice to more activity than ever before, ferreting out crime and successfully prosecuting the members of the Prendergast political machine in Missouri.[49]

It was in 1936, while Murphy was governor of Michigan, that young Democrat Williams, just out of law school, and Murphy met. Williams, at that time an attorney with the Social Security Board in Washington, was brought back to Michigan by the governor as Assistant Attorney General of the state. When Murphy was defeated in the next gubernatorial election, Williams followed him to Washington as the Attorney General's assistant and personal aide.

---

[48]Anna Rothe, (ed.) op. cit., p. 611.

[49]F. Clever Bald, op. cit., p. 432.

It can be seen that Murphy was influential in providing Williams with the opportunity for employment. It would seem safe to conclude that much more was assimilated from this important contact than merely job opportunities.[50]

Williams said in a eulogy of Murphy after his death: "Personally, I am losing a warm friend who at every turn in the road gave me a helping hand and who took every occasion to instill in me a devotion to the cause of the common man."[51]

The other person whom Williams met who was to have an influence on his future career was Nancy Quirk, "the tall, attractive daughter of Daniel L. Quirk, a banker, industrialist and yeoman Republican of Ypsilanti [Michigan]."[52] Nancy, attending the University of Michigan and working at the Detroit Children's Aid "was delighted to find in Soapy another refugee from Republicanism."[53] G. Mennen Williams and Nancy Quirk were married in 1937.

That his wife has had a significant influence on Williams' career can be seen from the fact that, during his first campaign for the governorship of Michigan, Nancy traveled with him and talked to groups of people in her husband's behalf. Time reported that "Soapy called square

---

[50] In a personal interview on July 8, 1956, Williams stated to this writer that Murphy had been very helpful to him and that he has adopted Murphy's philosophy of service as his guide in his administrative duties as governor.

[51] Detroit Free Press, July 20, 1949.

[52] R. Thruelsen, op. cit., p. 27.

[53] "Clean-up for Soapy", Time, Vol. LII, No. 20, November 15, 1948, p. 28.

dances at every cross-road and he and Nancy out-polkaed the Polish-Americans in Hamtramck."[54] It is worthy of note that today, after having been elected and re-elected to the governor's chair five times, Williams is accompanied by his wife on most important trips and speech occasions.

Career

In order to get as complete a picture as possible of Williams, an account will be given of his military experience and his employment up to the time he became governor.

When Frank Murphy was appointed to the Supreme Court on February 6, 1940, Williams remained in the Justice Department as Special Assistant to the Attorney General. He was assigned to aid in the Federal Grand Jury Investigation of the Michigan Liquor Control Commission. Afterward, he worked in the enforcement division of the Office of Price Administration.

In 1942 Williams entered Military service and was commissioned a Lieutenant Junior Grade in the United States Naval Reserve, serving as Air Combat Intelligence Officer on the carriers Bunker Hill, Essex, Hornet, and Yorktown. He had two and one-half years' service in the Pacific and was discharged in 1946 as a Lieutenant Commander, after earning the Legion of Merit award, ten battle stars, and three presidential citations.

Following his discharge from service, Williams returned to Michigan as Deputy Director of the Office of Price

---

[54] Ibid., p. 28.

Administration. In 1947 he entered private law practice in the firm of Griffith, Williams, and Griffith, and the same year he was appointed by Governor Kim Sigler as the Democratic member of the State Liquor Control Commission. Williams resigned from the Liquor Control Commission and ran for governor in 1948, winning over his opponent, Kim Sigler, by 150,000 votes. Williams was re-elected in 1950, 1952, 1954, and 1956.

Personality

Some of the more tangible aspects of Williams, the man, have been presented, and certain of his personality characteristics as a youth have been mentioned. What of his personality as an adult?

Williams exhibits qualities of good sportsmanship, and he shows a sincere interest in people. The use of anecdotes may best make clear these personality characteristics, which in turn provide a key to an understanding of Williams' political accomplishments. The following anecdote related by the superintendent of schools in Atlanta, Michigan, a small northern town, provides some insight into Williams' principles of good sportsmanship.

Williams participated in a wild-cat hunt near Atlanta, but objected to the usual procedure of shooting the animal while it was held at bay in a tree. He felt that such tactics were not fair to the quarry and insisted that, after the cat was treed, it should be allowed to run. Williams shot the wild-cat on the run; but only after the cat was tracked down

and treed three times was Williams successful in hitting the target. The people of Atlanta were impressed by this display of good sportsmanship.

There are many anecdotes illustrative of Williams' interest in people. The two which follow concern happenings observed personally by this writer.

In September, 1952, Williams made his customary day-long visit to the annual Saginaw (Michigan) County Fair. The Saginaw News, which carried an account of his activities at the fair reported:

> Saginaw County Democratic party leaders had expected Williams to station himself at their booth near the Manufacturing Building. However, Williams, arriving at the Ray Street gate and realizing few candidates ever won an election by waiting for the voters to come to them, took exactly two hours to walk the not-too-far distance to the Democratic party booth.
>
> While Democratic party leaders sweltered in the heat and trudged down the midway at his side, Williams, who seemingly never tired, never missed a chance to shake hands with all comers. The only time he looked straight ahead was when he passed the girls' dancing shows. Even then, he cocked a wayward eye, something like a husband in tow with his wife at the bathing beach.
>
> The governor even had a few words with the volunteer workers at the Republican party booth, much to their amazement and concern, and also took time to sign a few autographs.[55]

At the annual Maple Syrup Festival, held in the small village of Vermontville, Michigan, Williams customarily makes the opening address, afterward mingling with the crowd and taking part in the activities. His manner of meeting people,

---

[55] Saginaw News, September 12, 1952.

as observed by this author, seems to consist of the following procedure: Approaching an individual, Williams holds out his hand and says, "How are you?" In one instance, the governor made a special effort to greet a little, old, shabbily-dressed country lady. After shaking hands with her and making his customary greeting, he realized by her puzzled expression that she had no idea who he was. Williams explained that he was the governor of Michigan, whereupon the lady became visibly excited. The rest of the conversation was lost to the writer, but upon completion of their conversation, as the governor was walking away, the lady was heard to say, "My, isn't he a wonderful man!"

Another facet of Williams' personality is his democratic manner, which is exhibited in the way he runs the governor's office. According to Time, "From his office on the second floor of the State Capitol in Lansing, Governor Williams runs Michigan with a fine air of democracy and honest folksiness."[56] The doors to the governor's office are never closed; and, although the office is usually humming with activity, the governor frequently takes time to greet individuals and groups who happen to be in the capitol.

Further testimony of Williams' democratic attitude is the fact that "he lives well within his $22,000 a year salary. There is only one maid to help run their rambling house. He frequently answers his own telephone."[57] Further-

---

[56]"Clean-up for Soapy", Time, Vol. LII, No. 20, November 15, 1948, p. 28.

[57]Time, Vol. LX, No. 2, September 15, 1952, p. 27.

more, Williams sends his three youngsters to public schools.

Another aspect of Williams' personality which is worthy of mention is his intelligence. It has already been noted that as a student Williams exhibited above-average intelligence. Williams' intellectual superiority has not gone unnoticed as an adult. Life gave a hint of his intelligence in saying: "Although he makes decisions slowly, he has brains."[58] The Detroit Free Press, which has not always agreed with Williams' political stands, had this to say about his intelligence: "The governor is a most intelligent man. His I.Q. is one of the highest among holders of the office."[59]

Coupled with his intelligence, Williams has a prodigious memory and often surprises his aides by recalling information which to them is quite obscure. Once when Williams was preparing an outline for a speech, he wrote from memory a passage from The Odyssey. The aide, whose responsibility it was to look up the passage in order to make sure that it was complete and correct, reported that he was surprised to find that Williams had written the passage exactly as it was in The Odyssey.[60] Williams' memory helps him, too, in remembering people and their names, thus serving as an important aid in adapting his speeches to the audience.

---

[58]Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 116.

[59]Detroit Free Press, editorial, October 12, 1949.

[60]Personal interview with members of Williams' staff, July 2, 1956.

Williams' press secretary, Paul Weber, supplied an interesting thumbnail sketch of Williams: "He has a feeling of personal moral confidence that he is doing the right thing. He has no personal doubts. His dominant characteristic is equanimity. He never gets excited; he never runs down, but just rolls right along."[61]

- -

Although Williams was born into a wealthy Republican family, he became a Democrat, in part as the result of ideas with which he came into contact while in college and through associations with two people who had influence upon him--his wife-to-be, Nancy Quirk, and Frank Murphy. Under Murphy's guidance, Williams began to realize his ambition to "play some part in government".

Reports from various sources indicate that Williams has intelligence, a good memory, a democratic manner, a sincere interest in people, and a well-rounded personality. These are qualities which should contribute to the effectiveness of an individual as a speaker. Let us now examine Williams, the speaker.

---

[61]Personal interview with Mr. Weber, July 10, 1956.

CHAPTER IV

WILLIAMS, THE SPEAKER

In providing a picture of G. Mennen Williams, as a speaker, the writer will discuss five aspects of his speaking: (1) appearance, (2) voice, (3) speech preparation, (4) bodily activity, (5) mode of delivery. These five factors were suggested by Thonssen and Baird in their book, Speech Criticism,[62] in which they list the following five elements that provide a fuller understanding of orators and oratory: (1) the orator's method of preparing his speeches, (2) his method of delivery, (3) physical factors conducing to his effectiveness as a speaker, (4) his bodily action in delivery, (5) his use of the voice as an instrument of persuasion.[63]

The writer could find little recorded material in either newspapers or periodicals pertaining to any of these five specific aspects of Williams' style of speaking. The writer has, however, had several opportunities to listen to Williams speak in person and has studied a tape recording of one of Williams' major addresses. In order that the ideas contained in this section would not be solely the writer's

---

[62] In general the writer's five categories used to describe Williams as a speaker cover the same areas as those suggested by Thonssen and Baird. The terminology has been simplified somewhat in an effort to better suit them to the writer's purpose.

[63] Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 435.

opinion, he had conferences with members of Williams' personal staff, in which specific aspects of Williams' speaking style were discussed. These personal observations have been integrated with such newspaper and periodical comment as was available, and the result is a compendium of thought concerning Williams' appearance, voice, speech preparation, bodily activity, and delivery.

Appearance

G. Mennen Williams is "a giant of a man",[64] standing six feet three and one-half inches tall and weighing two hundred and twenty pounds. He is trim and well-built, with an athletic appearance. He has dark hair, blue eyes, and regular facial features. Time reports: "Williams is one of the handsomest individuals in American politics."[65] The fact that he has a ready smile, which may be characterized as a "boyish grin", enhances his appearance.

Williams is neat and well-groomed. He wears well-cut conservative clothing[66] and customarily wears a green polka-dot bow-tie which has become a kind of "Williams trademark". He commenced to wear bow-ties partly through preference and partly through one bitter experience. After his marriage to Nancy, and while he was Assistant Attorney General of Michigan, the newly-weds invited Governor Murphy and a few

---

[64]Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 116

[65]Ibid., p. 116.

[66]He has, however, been known to appear at the capitol wearing blue jeans and a T-shirt, with tennis shoes.

other notables to dinner at their apartment; "the air was heavy with dignity and Soapy began to feel that an Assistant Attorney General is, after all, a man of some importance. But as he sat down to dinner, beaming at his guests, he lowered his four-in-hand into a plate of soup."[67]

Williams' well-groomed appearance and his towering stature, topped with a friendly grin, no doubt contribute materially to his effectiveness as a speaker.

Voice

Williams' speaking equipment includes a voice which "could perforate the average eardrum at one-hundred feet."[68] The voice, which is of a baritone pitch, seems to exhibit a youthful, vigorous quality.

The Christian Science Monitor, in an article which commented upon Williams' effectiveness as a speaker, used the term "a nasal, gravel voice".[69] This nasality seems to be present most pronouncedly when the governor is delivering a speech from manuscript; it is not noticeable in conversation. It should be noted, too, that Williams speaks in the accent of the mid-West, and that this type of speech is often marked by a nasality or "twang" effect.

In speeches delivered from manuscript, Williams tends to maintain the same tone throughout the entire course of a speech, seemingly without using to the fullest extent possible

---

[67]Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 115.

[68]Ibid., p. 117

[69]Christian Science Monitor, May 6, 1954.

the changes in pitch and time. One of Williams' aides felt that this lack of variety may result from the fact that Williams seems to read "words" instead of word groupings. This possibly may be accounted for, in part, by the fact that Williams has had little formal training in speechmaking.[70]

Williams' pronunciation and enunciation are correct and understandable, without affectation, according to mid-West standards of speech.

Speech Preparation

Williams, in common with many men in public office, has a staff of assistants, each of whom is a specialist in a given area; at various times each of them has helped Williams prepare speeches. This assistance may include writing the speech and giving it to the governor ready to be used, or Williams himself may prepare the entire speech. The occasion and amount of time available seem to be the deciding factors. For example, during a campaign when Williams is doing a great deal of speaking, delivering as many as two speeches a day, the former type of preparation may be used. The ideas for these campaign speeches are usually determined in conference, and many of the ideas originate with Williams; all of the ideas have his approval.

---

[70]While in the University of Detroit School, Williams took a few lessons at the Detroit School of Elocution under the tutelage of Mr. Sam Slade. While in law school Williams was a member of the University of Michigan Toastmaster's Club which held regular meetings and which received criticism from members of the University of Michigan English Department. Thus, he had two extra-curricular experiences in speech making but no formal speech training.

Other speeches, when the occasion demands a more carefully prepared speech and when there is no particular press for time, are prepared in quite a different manner. Sometimes the ideas for the speech will originate in a staff meeting, or at least be discussed by members of the staff. From this formulation of ideas a rough draft is submitted to Williams, who makes corrections and suggestions as to content, organization, and style. Next, a manuscript is prepared by an assistant and is re-submitted to Williams, who again edits the speech. Following this editing, the final manuscript is prepared.

Still another manner of preparation is sometimes used in which the governor makes an outline in ink, from which one of the staff members prepares a manuscript. The manuscript is submitted to Williams, who makes corrections and revisions. The speech is then sent back to a secretary for final manuscripting.

Whatever the manner of speech preparation, after the final manuscript has been prepared, Williams frequently makes changes and additions. In most speeches outside the realm of campaign speeches Williams is the originator of the content and style of the speeches he delivers.[71]

Bodily Activity

When speaking, Williams stands erect and at ease and

---

[71]Information in this section was obtained from interviews with members of Williams' staff, July 2, 1956.

exhibits no distracting mannerisms. However, there are those who feel that his gestures are somewhat ineffective. In the writer's opinion, the gestures are inclined to be unnatural and studied, but the writer does not feel that they serve as a distracting influence. When the writer has observed Williams speaking, his gestures were few and unvaried--generally sweeping movements of the arms.

Williams' eye-contact is generally good. It has been observed, however, that occasionally when delivering a speech from manuscript Williams tends to devote a disproportionate amount of attention to his manuscript, slighting his audience in this respect.

It is the writer's opinion that Williams' facial expression varies with the type of speaking. When presenting impromptu remarks, as he does at the beginning of most speeches, his facial expression exhibits animation and warmth--usually through a broad smile and flashing eyes. When delivering a speech from manuscript, however, the spontaneity of the facial expression diminishes and the expression then váries from grave to impassive.

Mode of Delivery

Williams delivers most of his speeches from manuscript. On some occasions he simply reads the manuscript; on other occasions he uses the manuscript as a guide for an extempore delivery. During his first campaign he delivered many speeches extemporaneously, using only brief notes jotted down in transit from one speaking engagement to another.

Since then, however, the governor has largely delivered his speeches from manuscript.

Williams' preparation for the delivery of a speech varies greatly, and the determining factors seem to be the amount of time available and the occasion.[72] When there is sufficient time and when the occasion warrants, Williams devotes considerable attention to preparing for the delivery of the speech. First, he marks the manuscript in places where there should be pauses and makes notations for other purposes, such as emphasis, regulation of rate, and use of gestures. The writer was unable to obtain a copy of a manuscript which had been so marked, but the governor's aides indicated that he uses such a system. Next Williams may practice the speech aloud. The amount of time spent on practice will again vary according to the amount of time available and with the occasion. While traveling to the place where the speech is to be given, Williams reads the manuscript over to himself, gesticulating where indicated by the guide marks he has made on the manuscript. This procedure on one occasion proved to be somewhat embarassing to Williams. According to members of his staff, Williams was traveling by plane to deliver a speech before the Convention of Young Democrats of Colorado and was practicing the speech while enroute. After the plane landed in Denver, Williams continued to practice while waiting in the terminal

---

[72]The information that follows was obtained from interviews with members of Williams' staff, July 2, 1956.

for transportation to the convention. As he sat intently rehearsing, oblivious to those around him, a lady whom he knew saw him and inquired, "What on earth is the matter?"

Thus, we get the picture that the amount of attention given to delivery depends upon the amount of time available and the importance of the speech occasion.

Newspaper and Periodical Comment

In two of the five areas discussed above, some adverse comment was made regarding some of Williams' specific speaking techniques. However, as a member of Williams' audience, the writer has felt that a good rapport was established between the speaker and the audience and that the speech was well received.

Newspaper and periodical comment lends credence to this feeling. The Detroit Free Press said: "During his three years as governor, Williams has proved himself a formidable campaigner, a candidate who can get close to the people and apply the charm and force of his personality at the grass roots level."[73] The Detroit Free Press further reported: "Both the governor and his wife Nancy are warm-blooded and hospitable. They like people. In response, even the skeptics are warming up."[74] A report in Life on Williams' first gubernatorial campaign contains the following statement: "Williams actually believed every word he said, and could con-

---

[73]Detroit Free Press, editorial, September 22, 1951

[74]Detroit Free Press, January 9, 1949.

vince others that he believed it".[75] The Saturday Evening Post gave a somewhat similar report: "The audience at Williams' formal addresses found him a sincere speaker with well-documented arguments, but not a spell-binder".[76] The Lapeer County Press reported: "Michigan's governor came to Lapeer Thursday night and charmed the crowd of 325 that filled the State Home dining room".[77] The Belding Banner stated: "G. Mennen Williams, governor of the state of Michigan, niched a new spot in the hearts of nearly 250 people who heard him speak at the Junior Chamber of Commerce banquet here last night".[78] The Mount Clemens Daily Monitor said: "The 38-year-old governor, making his first official visit to Mt. Clemens, won hearty applause in a brief informal talk".[79] The Holland News reported: "The governor earned the admiration of the crowd; almost to a man, the comment was 'The governor is a good sport'".[80] The Saginaw News reported, on another occasion: "The governor arrived late, but stole the show with friendly charm".[81] The St. Petersburg Times said of Williams: "He is a master at making

---

[75]Robert Wallace, op. cit., p. 116.

[76]R. Thruelsen, op. cit., p. 114.

[77]Lapeer County Press, March 10, 1949.

[78]Belding Banner, June 30, 1949.

[79]Daily Monitor, [Mount Clemens, Michigan,] July 5, 1949.

[80]Holland News, May 17, 1949.

[81]Saginaw News, July 31, 1949.

every group feel that he wants what it wants."[82] The Lansing State Journal summed up Williams' appeal in these words: "The answer to the paradox is simple; Williams likes people, and people like him. He makes every woman think he is just a boy at heart. He can discuss the Bible, take a ski jump, sip a cocktail, call a square dance, or guy a law-maker with all the boyish innocence and enthusiasm that a mother attributes to her children when they come home with a black eye."[83]

The comments above suggest that Williams makes a good impression on his listeners and leaves them with the desire to champion his cause. Let us now examine five selected speeches of G. Mennen Williams.

---

[82] St. Petersburg [Florida] Times, editorial, January 29, 1956

[83] Lansing State Journal, October 23, 1949.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF SELECTED SPEECHES

The purpose of this chapter is to give an analysis of five selected speeches of G. Mennen Williams. It is not the writer's intent to give a definitive, detailed analysis; rather, the intent is to give an analysis of a more general nature which will better serve the purpose of this study.

This chapter will contain: (1) an explanation of the selection of the speeches for analysis, (2) an explanation of the techniques for analyzing the speeches, (3) the analyses of the speeches.

Selection of Speeches

Most of Williams' speaking has been deliberative in nature. His speeches have been concerned mainly with politics, both on a state and national level. He has delivered speeches in all parts of the state of Michigan and a few speeches outside of the state, to many types of audiences, on many different subjects.

These factors both simplified and complicated the task of selecting five speeches representative of those which Williams has delivered. The fact that his principal speeches have been deliberative limited the selection to one category, thus simplifying the task; but the fact that he has delivered speeches on a variety of subjects and to a variety

of audiences complicated the task. A further complication arose when the author, intending to use only campaign speeches in this study, discovered that this type of speech is not always prepared by Williams but may be prepared by members of his staff. This, then, limited the selection still further, making it necessary to choose political speeches outside the realm of campaign speeches or, at least, to locate speeches of which Williams had been the prime originator of content and style.

From the governor's office the writer obtained copies of speeches known to have been prepared largely by Williams. From these, five speeches, which the author feels to be representative of Williams' speaking, were selected. They are largely concerned with political matters of the state or nation. The dates of delivery were spread over the period that Williams has been governor, and the speeches were delivered before different types and sizes of audiences.

The first speech analyzed is Williams' first inaugural address, which was included because it was his first major address as governor. The audience at the inaugural ceremonies was made up of both Republicans and Democrats; many in the audience came to hear other officials who were being inaugurated. The second speech was Williams' part of a debate before the Economic Club of Detroit. The debate was an intensely partisan contest between Williams and his Republican opponent for governor. The speech took place in the middle stage of Williams' governorship, to date. The au-

dience on this occasion was made up largely of people who held political views opposite to those of the governor. The third speech, in which Williams expressed his ideas concerning the role which the state should play in relation to penal institutions, was delivered before a relatively small group of Michigan judges. The fourth speech is one delivered at a convention of Young Democrats of Colorado and gave Williams an opportunity to express his views concerning national politics, this time before a large group of people who held political beliefs similar to those of Williams. The fifth and last speech analyzed was delivered before the National convention of Catholic Charities, and here Williams expressed his opinion of the role that the state should play in religion. The audience this time was relatively small and was made up of leaders in the Catholic faith.

Technique of Analyzing the Speeches

Since the purpose of this chapter is to give a general analysis of the five speeches selected, the writer will include a description, analysis, and interpretation of the speeches with regard to the following topics: (1) ideas, (2) organization, (3) evidence and reasoning, (4) psychological and emotional appeals, and (5) style. This instrument for analysis has been adapted from the tenets of speech criticism handed down to us by the critics of antiquity who, according to the classical tradition, divided all rhetoric into five parts: invention, disposition, elocution, memory,

and delivery.[84] In the classical conception of invention three modes of persuasion were recognized: ethos, which consisted of the moral character of the speaker; pathos, which included emotional appeals; and logic, which was the persuasiveness of the arguments by themselves. This writer's instrument has been developed from the classical concept, and the following changes have been made: First, the writer's sections on ideas and on logic and evidence will contain those elements of logic considered by the ancients as a part of invention; second, the elements of pathos and ethos, also considered by the ancients as part of invention, will be combined and included in the writer's section on psychological and emotional appeals; third, the section allotted to memory by the ancients has been eliminated, because it is generally conceded that memory no longer plays such a significant part in modern speech-making; fourth, the material on delivery will not be considered in the analysis because the subject has already been covered in the chapter, "Williams, the Speaker"; last, the ancients' terminology, "elocution", will be termed "style, and "disposition" will be called "organization."

Ideas.--This section will contain an isolation of the ideas of the speeches, with an attempt to describe and identify them. A further attempt will be made to point, where possible, to items in the speaker's background which

---

[84]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, op. cit., p. 78.

relate to the ideas expressed, in an attempt to indicate the derivation of these ideas.

Organization.--In this section an attempt will be made to determine Williams' method of organization, using the analysis suggested by Brigance in his book Speech Composition.[85] Brigance suggests three methods of arranging speeches: (1) The chronological order, which arranges events in their natural order of occurence. This method has limited application, being used in such speeches as biographical essays. (2) The topical order, which breaks the speech theme into various parts or topics and arranges them in their most effective order. This type of organization, according to Brigance, is most commonly used in speeches to inform and to stimulate. (3) The logical order, which is the order inherent in the laws of reasoning. This type of order is best fitted for speeches to convince and to persuade.

Since most of Williams' speaking falls into the category of speeches to persuade, we will expect to find this type of organization used by Williams.

Evidence and reasoning.--In this section the writer will attempt to describe Williams' mode of substantiation by isolating the factors of inductive reasoning, deductive reasoning, and the elements of testimony of fact and of opinion.

Psychological and emotional appeals.--This section will deal with the elements of pathos and ethos which the ancients included in invention. However, no attempt will

---

[85]William Norwood Brigance, Speech Composition, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1937), pp. 90-100.

be made to label these elements of emotion and moral character of the speaker with the terms "pathos" and "ethos". Instead, the writer will combine these two elements in this section and a functional description of each will be given. In so doing, the writer will discuss the factors concerning the character of the speaker (ethos) and audience adaption and impelling motivational appeals[86] (pathos).

Style. In this section the writer will attempt to describe the style of Williams' speech-making by isolating such stylistic devices as alliteration, parallel construction, personal pronouns, humor, and figures of speech.

Analyses of Speeches

First Inaugural Address

Background.--At the time G. Mennen Williams was elected governor of Michigan in 1948, there had been only five Democratic governors in the state Capitol in Lansing since the formation of the Republican party in 1854. We have examined, in Chapter II, the political changes that had taken place in Michigan since 1854 and have shown that the shift of population within the state and the influx of people into the state caused the growth of urban centers which tended to vote Democratic. We have further noted the rise of the C.I.O., which

---

[86] As a guide to impelling motivational appeals, the writer followed the lead of Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird in their book, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948), p. 366, in which they list A.E. Phillips' ten appeals: patriotism, fear, social responsibility, fair play, expediency, personal honor, family life, self-assertion, social recognition, and social approval.

aided Williams in his election battle. All of these factors, plus the unpopularity of the Republican candidate for governor in 1948, culminated in the election of G. Mennen Williams. Other than Williams, the only Democratic administrative officials elected were Lt. Governor John W. Connolly and Attorney General Stephen J. Roth. The state legislature was controlled by the Republicans. There were nine Democrats and twenty-three Republicans in the Senate, and in the House there were thirty-nine Democrats and fifty-nine Republicans. While this was a comfortable majority for the Republicans, there were enough Democrats in the House of Representatives to uphold a governor's veto in that branch of the legislature.

Williams was a political unknown who had done most of his campaigning in a personal, face-to-face manner. Although he had traveled 21,000 miles throughout the state, there were many people who had never seen or heard him. The newspapers had carried accounts of his wealthy Republican background. He was the third youngest governor ever elected by the people of Michigan. Factors such as these generated much public interest in the inaugural address.

The inaugural occasion was solemn, and there was much ceremony. The National Guard, Army units, and Naval units paraded, and eight planes from the Grosse Isle Naval Air Base zoomed overhead before the ceremonies began. Fifteen hundred people gathered on the lawn of the Capitol, in spite of the cold weather and the snow on the ground.

Hicks Griffiths, Williams' ex-law partner and campaign

manager, was the master of ceremonies. The inaugural ceremony, which went off according to schedule, was opened by the administering of the oath of office by Chief Justice of the State Supreme Court Edward M. Sharpe. The National Guard then fired a nineteen-gun salute.[87] Following the salute the other officials were sworn into office. Then the new governor gave his inaugural address, which was followed by the benediction.

On the speakers' platform with Williams were such notables as Gus Scholle of the Michigan CIO; Frank X. Martel, the Wayne County AFL chief; Federal Judge Raymond W. Starr of Grand Rapids; and the national Democratic committeeman and committeewoman, George S. Fitzgerald of Detroit and Mrs. Margaret Schwinger of Saginaw.

Text of speech. A copy of the First Inaugural Address was secured from Williams' office. The writer checked the text of the speech as reported in the Lansing State Journal[88] and could find no discrepancies in the two copies. However, it is not known that Williams stayed with the manuscript exactly; it is possible that the Lansing State Journal Copy was a press release from the governor's office. The writer believes the manuscript to be as accurate as can be obtained.

Statement of purpose and synopsis of speech. In stating the purpose of this first inaugural address, Williams

---

[87]The concussion from the exploding guns broke three windows in the north end of the capitol.

[88]Lansing State Journal, January 1, 1949.

formulated a slogan which he placed in the latter section of the address. He said, in the third from the last paragraph:

> I ask only that we all work together during these two years, as a team--the Michigan team!

The following is a synopsis of the speech:

1. The United States is a part of the Christian world, which was promised by Christ life abundant. Inventive and productive genius held a promise of fulfillment of this abundant life in the twentieth century.
2. There are two obstacles to the fulfillment of the promise.
3. Michigan has made progress toward the formation of a better world.
4. Action should be taken to further this progress.
5. Much can be done if everyone works together.

Ideas. In point four above, Williams advocated policies in the following areas: improved housing for veterans, assistance to the aged and to the unemployed, improved educational facilities, promotion of first class citizenship, better highways, conservation of water resourses, better farm marketing, and promotion of better labor relations between workers and industrial leaders. These policies coincide with the areas which the Saturday Evening Post declared were "New Deal proposals".[89] We would expect Williams' ideas to be a reflection of the New Deal philosophy[90] for many items in his background lead to this conclusion as indicated

---

[89] Supra, p. 16.

[90] Supra, p. 7.

in the preceding chapters. He was indoctrinated into government during the New Deal regime in Washington. He was the protege of one of the New Deal's foremost practitioners, Frank Murphy. He had the backing of labor.[91]

The ideas show a good understanding of the wants and needs of the people of Michigan. Whether one agrees with the proposals or not, it can be stated that the program includes nearly all of the people of the state in one way or another.

Organization. The First Inaugural Address has an introduction, body, and a conclusion. In the introduction Williams attempted to predispose the audience to accept the ideas in his address. He did so by making reference to the holiday occasion. The first sentence of the speech was: "A happy New Year to all the citizens of Michigan." Williams then took the part of spokesman for all of the recently elected officials, and on their behalf offered further holiday greetings.

The ideas in the body of the speech are organized in a logical manner--that is, "according to the continuity of the reasoning process."[92]

In the conclusion, Williams gave a brief summary of the main points in the speech. It is interesting to note

---

[91]The Political Action Committee of the C.I.O. backs candidates who support liberal political ideas, especially liberal social policies.

[92]William Norwood Brigance, op. cit., p. 94.

that he used a Biblical quotation to begin the speech and that he closed with another reference to the Deity, tending to give unity to the over-all organizational pattern.

Evidence and reasoning. In substantiating his ideas, Williams in this speech used evidence in the form of testimony of fact and of opinion as a basis for his argumentation. He used deductive reasoning (reasoning from a general truth to a particular conclusion) to a greater degree than inductive reasoning (reasoning from a particular truth to a general conclusion), although both types are present in the address. The speech is tied together with exposition--that is, statements designed to make the ideas clear. Williams' method of handling exposition is shown in the section indicating the action he felt should be taken. Williams stated:

> We have been somewhat callous to the just requirements of our aged citizens, of those injured in industrial accidents, and of those who are out of jobs through no fault of their own.
>
> We have not succeeded in maintaining educational opportunity at the high standards to which the children of Michigan are entitled.
>
> We have fallen short in guaranteeing first class citizenship to all of our people.
>
> We have abused our rich water resources.
>
> We have not succeeded in making rural Michigan famous for its fruits and foods, as industrial Michigan is famous for its automobiles and other factory products.
>
> We have failed to establish the legal and governmental basis for harmonious co-operation of workers and employers.

It seems probable to the writer that this list of items

serves the purpose of informing the auditors of the kind of legislation which their new governor favors, and as such may be considered exposition.

Williams' preference for deductive reasoning over inductive reasoning is apparent in the introduction to the section quoted above. He said:

> All of us, regardless of party, want to make progress. If there has been, in the opinion of some of us, a relaxation of effort in the last several years, it has surely been due not to lack of good will, but to disagreements as to the course we should follow.

This introduction may be considered a deductive enthymeme. Williams used deductive reasoning in at least four other places throughout the speech. In the main introduction, he used deductive reasoning when he stated:

> Not quite 2,000 years ago, Jesus of Nazareth said that he came into this world so that men might have life and life abundant. He spoke, it is true, of the life of the spirit. But he enjoined all men to have a care for another, not only in matters of the spirit, but in the production and distribution of the necessary goods of this world.

Thus he reasoned: Jesus promised abundant spiritual and material life. The Western World is based upon the teachings of Jesus. Therefore, the West should have an abundant spiritual and material life. This Biblical syllogism is the first of a series of syllogisms, which lead to the substantiation of the conclusion that everyone should cooperate in the improvement of state government.

Williams used inductive reasoning next when he asserted that "the very material progress which held this bright promise created problems which challenge the depth of our

spiritual strength." As proof of the assertion, he cited the "great depression". Then he related the problem to Michigan by referring to the growth in the size of the cities and the growth in industrial complexity. He used induction to establish the considerable progress that has been made.

In introducing the areas which still demand legislative action to achieve "progress", Williams started a chain of reasoning, the salient features of which are:

1. None of these problems is insoluble.
2. The solutions can be found if we all work together.
3. The solution rests upon all the people.
4. In order to arrive at the best solutions, the people must keep themselves informed.
5. The media of information must inform truthfully.

Through this chain of reasoning Williams apparently hoped to establish the idea of co-operation in the minds of the listeners; at the same time he issued a veiled threat --that if the legislators fail to co-operate they would have to answer to the electors.

Psychological and emotional appeals. In this speech Williams attempted to adapt his remarks to the audience by referring to the holiday occasion. Another important means of audience adaption was the extensive use of personal pronouns. In the first paragraph he used nine personal pronouns, and throughout the rest of his address he used many others. This use of pronouns probably had the effect of creating

rapport between the speaker and the auditors, making the audience disposed to accept the speaker in a favorable light. For example, in the conclusion Williams stated:

> In this task I plead for and expect the co-operation of every official, and every citizen. I am conscious of my responsibility and of my limitations. I ask no man to wear my collar, or to sacrifice his honest convictions.

Here is a plea to accept the speaker as a reasonable person. There are few other examples of emotional appeals in the speech, but in the following passage we can detect an appeal to the patriotism of the listeners:

> The continued active interest of the people of Michigan in good government, in fair government, in government for the public interest, is the keystone of hopes with which all of your officials today take up the burden of government.

The use of "we" throughout the speech implies a shared responsibility, thereby presumably making easier for the listener the decision to accept the proposals.

Style. Stylistically, some of the speech has a "Roosevelt-ian" flavor. For example, in the first part of the speech Williams used the term "arsenal of democracy" in describing the industrial composition of Michigan. On December 29, 1940, Franklin D. Roosevelt said in a Fireside Chat: "We must be the great arsenal of democracy".[93] Later in the speech Williams used the term "mandate" in reference to the circumstances of his being elected governor; Roosevelt used the term in a similar manner on March 4, 1933, in his first

---

[93] B. D. Zevin (ed.), Nothing to Fear (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1946), p. 257.

inaugural address.[94]

Williams' use of particularization, at least in one place, is reminiscent of the frequent use that Roosevelt made of this device. Williams stated:

> You must constantly discuss these matters in the shops, the farms, the market places, the halls of business, and the Union meetings of the commonwealth.

The style of the above quotation is similar to that which Franklin Roosevelt used on December 29, 1940, in a Fireside Chat on national security:

> I saw the workmen in the mills, the mines, the factory, the girl behind the counter; the small shopkeeper; the farmer doing his spring plowing; the widows and the old men wondering about their life's savings.[95]

Another example of the Roosevelt influence may be seen in the use of the term, "I pledge you", which williams used in his speech. Roosevelt said, in his acceptance speech before the Democratic National Convention at Chicago, Illinois, on July 2, 1932:

> I pledge you, I pledge myself to a new deal for the American people.[96]

That Williams was influenced by Roosevelt in speech-making is not to be wondered at, for again it can be remembered that Williams obtained his basic training in government during the years just previous to the Second World

---

[94] Ibid., p. 17.

[95] Ibid., p. 248.

[96] Ibid., p. 12.

War and was associated with Roosevelt and other New Deal leaders of the day.

At one point in the speech Williams paraphrased Lincoln's Gettysburg Address. He stated:

> We have been forced to fight two great wars, testing our belief that all men are created equal, and to ensure that government of the people, by the people, and for the people shall not perish from this earth.

At another point Williams said, "so today we here highly resolve . . . "

Williams made frequent use of the device of parallel construction. He made quite an extended parallelism in the section devoted to "things" to be done to insure progress. In seven successive paragraphs, "We have" was used as an introduction, and Williams employed the term "You must" six times in succession. This passage illustrates another aspect of Williams' style--the use of personal pronouns. Finally, Williams' used alliteration when he said "workshop of the western world" and "famous for its fruits and foods."

Summary. As we might have suspected from Williams' background, the ideas in this speech are similar in character to those of the New Deal. The ideas are inclusive; that is, they are directed to all of the people of the state. The speech is organized in a logical manner and each point in the speech is a natural introduction of the succeeding point, giving the speech an over-all organizational unity.

In this speech the evidence and reasoning used as proof would seem to be satisfying to the listener. Most of

the reasoning seems to be deductive. There are very few psychological appeals in the speech; the most frequently used appeal is the use of personal pronouns, which tends to place the speaker favorably in the opinion of the auditors.

Debate before the Economic Club of Detroit

Background. The candidates for governor of Michigan, chosen in the primary elections, customarily start their campaigns by debating before the Economic Club of Detroit. Each nominee presents a constructive argument followed by a five-minute rebuttal. Following this exchange of views, there is a question and answer period in which each contestant is allowed six minutes. The questions come from the floor.

Williams had been unopposed for the Democratic nomination; Donald S. Leonard had won the Republican nomination after a hotly contested battle in the primary elections.

There was much interest in this campaign in Michigan since the Republicans were determined to return the governor's office to their party. In Donald S. Leonard they had put their best foot forward. He had been the popular head of the State Police. He had just resigned as chief of the Detroit police department upon accepting the nomination to run for governor. Since he had held two state posts it was felt by the Republicans that Leonard would make a strong candidate. They felt he would run well in Wayne County since he had been chief of the Detroit police department, and they

reasoned that his experience as head of the State Police would make him an attractive candidate for the independent voter.

The face-to-face clash of the two nominees for governor occurred at Veterans' Memorial Building in Detroit, on September 20, 1954. More than a thousand members of the club jammed into the ball-room. Top-flight Democrats and Republicans and most of the Administrative Board candidates were on hand. Federal Judge Arthur F. Lederle, former Democratic County Chairman, moderated the debate. One ex-governor, Murray D. VanWagoner, was among the guests. The moderator was introduced by Allen B. Crow, the president of the club. Lederle, the moderator, presented the contestants.[97]

The members of the Economic Club are businessmen from the Detroit area, but it would be misleading to say that the debate was aimed solely at the audience assembled. It can safely be assumed that the debaters hoped their remarks would reach a wider audience than had assembled. The speeches were delivered during the lunch hour, strict time limits were imposed, and there was a time-keeper.

Text of Speech. The text of this speech was obtained by the writer from the governor's office. The following notation is made at the bottom of the manuscript:

> The above transcript has been prepared from a wire recording of what was said at this meeting. Gov-

---

[97]Detroit Free Press, September 21, 1954.

> ernor G. Mennen Williams, however, has not returned his edited copy, so that it might be incorporated in this record.

From this we can infer that Leonard may have edited his remarks, while Williams did not. The copy of the speech, insofar as Williams' remarks are concerned, was checked by the author with the transcript reported in the Detroit Free Press[98] and no significant differences in the two copies could be found. This transcript, however, does not contain the entire account of the proceedings, since some of the introduction was deleted. For example, Mr. Allen B. Crow, upon introducing the moderator, made some remarks to the effect that the club was growing rapidly and concluded with this statement:

> The officers of this club do not know the location of next week's [luncheon] meeting.

It is necessary to quote Mr. Crow's remark in order to understand Williams' reply in the introduction to his speech when he said:

> Gentlemen, all this plays right into the hands of the Democrats. Here before me are a thousand of the city's best known businessmen. And you don't know where you're going to eat next week.

Statement of purpose and synopsis of speech. Williams states the purpose of the speech in the first sentence following the introduction. He said:

> It is difficult enough to discuss the most important issues in the coming state campaign with-

---

[98] Ibid.

> out a start like that,[99] but I will try and begin by saying that I earnestly believe that the people of Michigan want to see continued the forward drive to meeting the growing needs and problems of our great community of Michigan.

Thus, the basic purpose of the debate was to discuss the important issues in the coming campaign. Williams followed the statement of purpose with an analysis of what he considered to be the people's wants. After the statement of purpose, the body of the speech, as shown by this synopsis, followed:

1. Michigan's historic needs are many.
2. The fulfillment of the needs was not effectively met by the Republicans.
3. The Democrats have already effected certain solutions.
4. The Democrats hope to effect further solutions.

Ideas. As in the speeches already analyzed, the cast of Williams' political philosophy can be detected. In point four above he suggested the following solutions:

1. Developing harbors, roads, and port facilities of Michigan.
2. Expanding the program for colleges and universities.
3. Building schools and recruiting more teachers.
4. Improving the Unemployment Compensation Law.
5. Continuing and expanding the work of the State Department of Economic Development.
6. Expanding the work of the Emergency Industrial Production Committee.

---

[99]Williams referred to the humorous remarks which preceded in the introduction.

7. Continuing and expanding the farm marketing program.

8. Using the influence of the state to reduce or eliminate the excise tax on automobiles.

9. Working with the Democrats in the United States Congress to place the automobile on the "write-off" list for income tax purposes.

The correspondence to New Deal social legislation can be noted; and, again, the inclusiveness of the program seems evident.

Organization. This speech is divided into introduction, body, and conclusion. In the introduction Williams prepared the audience for the remarks which followed by using humor. He said:

> It is a great pleasure once again to have the opportunity to address this particular meeting --and it goes without saying, I am looking forward to doing it again in the future.

Williams utilized humor again in relating the plight of the members of the club to the aims of the Democratic party. Through this use of humor, which in both instances is directly related to the members of the club and the situation, he attempted to make the members of the club, most of whom may have been on the opposite side of the political picture, more receptive to his remarks.

The arrangement of the body of the speech is logical in nature--that is, the points are steps in the reasoning process.

Evidence and reasoning. The purpose of this speech was to give Williams' program for the 1954 gubernatorial election; thus, much of the speech was in the form of an

exposition of the platform. He prepared a base upon which to rest the exposition by saying:

> They, the people, do not want to see, and return to, the good old days of Republican one-party rule, when the problems and needs of greater Michigan loomed too big for the timid and quarreling leaders to tackle.

To substantiate the above example, Williams pointed out needs which he said the Republicans had ignored--the most dramatic example, perhaps, being the need for a bridge over the Straits of Mackinac. He pointed out other examples, such as the need for mental hospitals, tuberculosis hospitals, a tuberculosis prevention program, and better medical schools. He gave more examples of such needs by pointing to workman's compensation, old age assistance, and unemployment insurance laws. These examples, bulwarked with fact, culminated in the conclusion that the Republicans did not recognize and solve these problems when they were in office.

In Williams' remaining constructive remarks he used exposition, in an effort to make clear the program which he and his party advocated. In his exposition he used considerable factual evidence in the form of statistics to show the need for the programs he proposed. For example, he said he proposed to have schools built and to have teachers recruited and trained. To show the need for this action, he said:

> Every year from sixty to seventy thousand additional children come knocking at the doors of public schools.

Williams used statistics further when he dealt with the subject of building roads. He said: "And next year

we should have done the $500 million revenue bond issue". When he stated his intention of bringing more federal contracts into the state, he used statistical evidence for the purpose of substantiating the need for this program. He said: "Two hundred thousand of our people are out of work." The debate contained much of this type of statistical evidence, which appeared to lend weight to Williams' arguments.

The clash of ideas in the rebuttal was lively and interesting. One of the most important points made by Leonard in his constructive remarks had been that if the people were to elect a Republican legislature, they should also elect a Republican governor. Williams spent the entire amount of rebuttal time in answering this argument. He said: "Having a Republican governor and a Republican legislature is no guarantee of action." Following this statement he gave examples of Republican governors and Republican legislatures which had not worked harmoniously. Then he asserted that Democratic governors and Republican legislatures have accomplished much, using as an example the term of Democratic Governor VanWagoner and the Republican state legislature with which he served. He concluded this argument with evidence from his own administration, which has always had a Republican legislature.

Leonard stated in his constructive speech that Michigan's Unemployment Compensation Law was the best of its kind in the nation. Williams presented a convincing

argument when he pointed out that the passing of this excellent law was done under his regime with a Democratic governor and a Republican legislature.

Psychological and emotional appeals. This speech contains little of an emotional nature, the only notable emotional devices being the use of personal pronouns and humor. Williams used the pronoun "we" extensively in setting forth the program which the Democrats proposed to follow. Using pronouns in this way may be considered an emotional factor, for by doing so the speaker tends to place himself in favorable light before the listeners.

In initiating the rebuttal, Williams employed humor by saying:

> Well, Don, I don't know whether you have the better of the argument, or there are more Republicans here, but I would rather assume that these gentlemen when they return home, Don, will say that their three dollars or two dollars wasn't [sic] too much for the show we put on.

In another place in the rebuttal Williams used humor in order to cover an embarassing mistake. He said:

> I think we will have a Republican--or Democratic rather--(laughter). After all these years it is pretty hard to say a Democratic House (laughter), but it is going to happen nonetheless.

Style. In style the speech has little variation. Although the language for the most part is plain, there are some examples of adornment. Williams said, for example:

> They said that the winds at the Straits were too fierce, the ice was too thick, the water was too deep and the rocks under the Straits too thin.

Through the use of "too" in the paragraph an effective parallel construction was set up. There are other examples of parallel construction in the speech. In the exposition of the program proposed by the Democrats, Williams used an extensive four-paragraph parallel construction, each paragraph beginning with the phrase "We propose." In the last section of the body of the speech he used another parallel construction starting with the words "We will."

One interesting figurative analogy made its appearance in the previously quoted paragraph, when Williams continued:

> It wasn't the rocks under the Straits of Mackinac that were too soft. It was the spirit and the will of those in the one-party control of the state.

Summary. Williams' ideas, which correspond to those of the New Deal philosophy, are presented in a logical order. In this speech, in which exposition is widely used, considerable use of inductive reasoning, based on statistical evidence, is made. Williams used personal pronouns and humor as psychological and emotional devices. The style was characterized by the use of parallel construction, figurative analogy, and personal pronouns.

Speech Before Michigan Judges' Association

Background. Governor Williams was one of the guest-speakers who addressed the members of the Michigan Judges' Association at their annual banquet on September 2, 1954, in Charleviox, Michigan. The principal speaker of the evening was former United States Senator Prentice M. Brown.

Other outstanding guests introduced to the capacity crowd of over two hundred persons were United States Senator Homer Ferguson and the Honorable Harry F. Kelly, Justice of the Supreme Court of Michigan.

Text of Speech. The Manuscript of this speech was given to the writer by one of Williams' assistants. The newspapers did not publish a transcript of the speech.

Statement of purpose and synopsis of speech. Williams withheld the statement of the purpose of the speech until the conclusion of his speech, when he said:

> My chief purpose in reviewing these points is to seek your co-operation and to offer mine in the extension and improvement of our probation services.

In preparing the ground for this statement, Williams organized the speech into four divisions, as can be seen from the following synopsis:

1. Probation is an effective sociological and economic device.
2. The use of probation in Michigan can be increased.
3. We are not dependent on probation alone in the salvaging of young people from a life of crime.
4. We have been doing a good job, but we can do better.

Ideas. In this speech Williams gave his conception of the role the state government should play concerning its penal institutions. He showed himself to be concerned about the rehabilitation of young criminals. He showed a willingness for the state to assume more responsibility in the matter of rehabilitation, for he said: "I will recommend an

increase of at least twenty-five probation officers for next year and for the coming years, until we come closer to this desirable standard". This quotation reveals Williams' belief that the government should provide for the well-being of individuals.

Organization. This speech is divided into an introduction, body, and conclusion. In the introduction, which is brief, Williams quoted an adage and then plunged into the heart of the speech.

The body is organized in a logical manner. The main points are in the form of a chain of reasoning. They are:

1. Probation is effective sociologically and economically.
2. Probation can be increased.
3. We aren't depending on probation alone.

In the conclusion Williams summarized his beliefs concerning probation and reaffirmed his desire to salvage as many youthful criminals as possible--a desire expressed in the introduction. Williams' closing remark was a definite appeal for support from his listeners.

Evidence and reasoning. The opening argument is in the form of a hypothetical syllogism. Williams said:

> If we can prevent one young man from becoming a hardened criminal, the social and economic savings to society are great and multiplied many times...However, at our present state of knowledge about what makes people criminals, we cannot expect to reach the desired goal of completely preventing crime. We must, therefore, direct our attention towards salvaging as many youthful offenders as we can as we go along.

Thus, he opened the speech by reasoning: If we can prevent one youth from a life of crime, society will benefit; we can't prevent all crime; therefore, we must salvage as many youthful criminals as we can. Through the use of this syllogism Williams initiated his argument. He continued the speech by using a balance of deductive argument and exposition, in making a clear statement of the system of parole which he favored for youthful offenders.

Williams' use of statistics is illustrated by the following example:

> An inmate at Marquette costs Michigan taxpayers $1,734 a year. At Jackson this cost would be $1,007. On probation, the cost would average about $100 per case.

Later in his speech Williams used evidence based upon the McCormick report, which was issued following riots at the State Prison of Southern Michigan, in Jackson. Following this, Williams used statistics to show the extent to which probation has been used in Michigan over the years. He said: "The number of felons on probation has risen from 5,542 to 9,278."

These examples serve to indicate the manner in which Williams used evidence to substantiate his ideas. With the exception of the McCormick report, no source for the statistics was given.

Psychological and emotional appeals. Williams made an emotional appeal during his analysis of the probation system as it has been used in Michigan. He said:

> The record of its [probation's] performance is

> written clearly and demonstrates that courts possessed of the proper tools can do a fine job of rehabilitation and correction especially of the youthful offenders.

A kind of psychological appeal is contained in this statement since the remark was directed to a group of judges--men who administer the probation system. For this reason, the statement may be an appeal to the listeners' sense of self-assertion because it shows how well they have done with the tools they have and implies that they could do better with better tools.

The only other examples of psychological appeal that may be detected in this speech are the use of references to personages who had been active in the field of administering judges, and the use of personal pronouns. As an example of the use of reference to persons, Williams says: "A sponsoring committee of citizens, headed by Judge Stephen J. Roth, was set up to give advice." Later he referred to a leader in the effort to get legislative approval of a proposed probation system; he said: "Judge Pugsley of Hart, and his efforts, I am sure, are well-known to all of you." Through references to these well-known men, who had the respect of the judges assembled, Williams created a kind of psychological appeal.

Through the use of "I", and "we", and "you", Williams attempted to place himself favorably before the audience. The following list of phrases illustrates Williams' use of personal pronouns, which have been underlined by the writer:

1. If <u>he</u> [the youthful offender] turns out well,

and most of them do, we have saved a good future citizen.

2. At my suggestion last year . . .

3. We in Michigan have made increased use of probation over the years.

4. I recommended to the legislature that we add seventeen probation officers to the office staff.

5. I will recommend an increase of at least twenty-five probation officers for next year.

6. I can assure you that I will support this idea.

7. I bespeak your comment and co-operation.

By using personal pronouns Williams gave the listeners an opportunity to share in the conclusions. More important, perhaps, their use tended to build up the prestige of the speaker.

Style. Stylistically, this speech is devoid of many of the techniques which make a speech varied and interesting. There is little use of alliteration, parallel construction, rhetorical questions, or figures of speech.

Williams introduced the speech with the adage, "An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure." From this adage he draws a figurative analogy comparing "An ounce of prevention" to the use of probation in Michigan.

In general, the speech is simple in style and easy to follow. The wording of the speech is clear; that is, Williams did not use words that were difficult to understand or confusing in context.

Summary. We may conclude that the speech, while not

particularly varied in style, seems to give a clear understanding of Williams' beliefs concerning probation.

Speech Delivered at Convention
of Young Democrats of Colorado

Background. The occasion of this speech, as indicated by the title, was a convention of the Young Democrats of Colorado, which was held in Denver, Colorado, on November 26, 1955. Governor G. Mennen Williams was the main speaker. His speech is one of the few he has given which is primarily concerned with national issues.

Text of speech. The text used for analysis came from the governor's office. A tape recording of the speech had also been made, and the writer noted that the manuscript copy of the speech did not contain all that was said in the actual speech. Williams delivered about three minutes of impromptu remarks before beginning the manuscript copy of the speech. In his impromptu remarks he mentioned or greeted prominent people present, including former Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan.

Statement of purpose and synopsis of speech. The purpose of this speech was to present the speaker's views on the national political situation existing within the Democratic party. Prior to Williams' speech, Adlai E. Stevenson, defeated Democratic presidential candidate of 1952, had declared from Chicago to a television audience that he favored a moderate attitude in solving "national

problems, especially civil rights."[100] Williams referred to Stevenson's speech as the "Spirit of Chicago"; and he expressed his viewpoints, which were at variance with those held by Stevenson, the leader of the Democratic party.

A synopsis of Williams' speech follows:

1. The Democratic party stands for progress.
2. Due to automation and advances in science, we are on the threshold of many changes.
3. The changes facing us bring many problems in education, peace, and prosperity.
4. Large segments of population do not agree with moderation policies in dealing with the problems and issues facing us.

Ideas. In this speech, delivered in 1955, we can see that Williams throughout his years in public life has steadfastly maintained a single point of view. He said:

> If we can produce goods--as surely we can, and as we surely will in even more staggering flow under the new technology--then it seems to me that, given the will, given the energy, given the imagination, we also can devise a technique for distributing real income, real prosperity, rather than a prosperity which is borrowing on the prospects of earnings to come, betting against the possibility of accident, ill health, lay-offs, other hazards which so few escaped in the years the nation's leaders should remember, but apparently do not.

By this statement, Williams again established the trend of his political philosophy and showed the tenacity with which he maintains a single point of view.

Organization. This speech has a definite introduction, body, and conclusion.

---

[100] Saginaw News, August 5, 1956.

In the introduction Williams delivered about three minutes of impromptu remarks. These remarks were designed to put the audience at ease and to dispose them to accept the ideas of his speech. The remarks were personal and inclusive. The remainder of the introduction contained quotations from Patrick Henry, after which Williams compared the importance of the occasion in Patrick Henry's time with that of the present time. By so doing, Williams established a base upon which to rest his observations.

The body of the speech is arranged in a logical manner. To establish his central theme, that we should not accept a council of moderation, Williams made several points as were shown in the synopsis. The points are steps in the reasoning process.

In the conclusion Williams paraphrased the famous plea of Patrick Henry's "Give me liberty or give me death" statement. He said:

> At this moment I am not sure who stands where in the fight for social justice and human betterment. I know not what course others may take. But as for me, I would rather be hanged as a rebel in the ranks of those fighting for a fuller life for all of our people than to hold a commission in the army of General Apathy and General Despair.

Following this paraphrasing, Williams reiterated his theme and concluded the speech with these words: "This is the spirit of Democracy--the spirit of America--the spirit of victory in '56."

Evidence and reasoning. Williams used statistical evidence as a basis for his reasoning.

As explained, Williams introduced his speech with a quotation from Patrick Henry from which he drew an analogy comparing the need for responsibility to God and country in 1775 to the same need in 1955. He carried the analogy on with the idea that there were in 1775 those who counseled moderation as there are in 1955, and that if the moderates had carried the day then the United States would not have been able to rise to such great heights of achievement. He then asserted that "we are expected--indeed obliged--to express ourselves fully and freely and to fight to the end for the things in which we believe with all of our hearts."

Inherent in this analogy is the deductive argument that if the moderates had carried the day in 1775 we would not have progressed. The moderates did not carry the day; therefore, we did progress. By implication Williams reasoned: If the moderates carry the day now, we will not progress.

There are other examples of deductive argument in the speech. Following the introduction discussed above, Williams said:

> These debates are the one time above all when the greatest and the very least of us are expected--are obligated to express ourselves fully and freely and to fight to the end for the things in which we believe with all of our hearts.

Here, in reference to the presidential nominations which were impending, Williams said, in effect: Our democracy is built on free discussion by the members of society. I am a member of society; therefore, I should discuss.

In further preparation for the substance of the speech, Williams used a series of arguments based upon deductive reasoning. He asserted that the "Spirit of Chicago" is moderation, and that moderation will not solve immediate or future problems. He further asserted that we have been resting (an obvious slap at the Republican regime) for three years. He also asserted that the "Spirit of Chicago" would not give the electorate a choice in the forthcoming election. Following this reasoning Williams presented proof to substantiate his claims. He pointed to the splitting of the atom and the imminence of automation, which he summarized as a revolution in technology and science.

Arguing from the premise that we are in the midst of a social and political revolution the whole world over, Williams concluded that our immediate program must be to the third quarter of the twentieth century what Woodrow Wilson's program was to the first quarter and what Franklin D. Roosevelt's and Harry S. Truman's programs were to the second quarter--all of which served as a reminder to this group of Democrats of the tradition of the Democratic party.

To give substance to his remarks, Williams pointed up some of the problems of the day, the first being in the field of education. He used this statistical evidence: 300,000 classrooms and 160,000 teachers are needed. Williams did not use many statistics but had a good balance between statistical evidence and example. To point up the need in the field of education, Williams used the dramatic

examples that some schools are operated in buildings which are "fire-traps" and others do not have toilet facilities of any kind. He then pointed to the amount of money necessary to meet educational needs, sixteen billion dollars. Following this, Williams reviewed the Republican educational program, which provided one-hundred million dollars. He compared the Republican solution to the educational problem with the solution offered by the "Spirit of Chicago", and he concluded that greater expenditures and effort were necessary.

Williams used the same type of argument, from deduction with an admixture of induction and based upon evidence of fact, to expound his views upon peace, agriculture, labor, and social legislation in general. Throughout the speech he used deduction enough to give the speech a logical, reasonable tone; he used statistical and factual proof which he hoped would satisfy the listeners.

Psychological and emotional proofs. Of the five speeches analyzed, this speech has the greatest number of psychological appeals. Most of them are appeals to the listeners' feelings of patriotism and sense of duty. Williams made references to such historical events as "our struggle for independence" and "unrest, rebellion, killings, destruction and despair in much of Africa, the Near East, and the Far East." Thus he used these emotional elements to give additional appeal to ideas expressed. The speech is colored with figurative language, which may be considered as

having an emotional impact.

Williams used two quotations from Patrick Henry, one at the beginning of the speech and one at the closing; he used one quotation from Franklin D. Roosevelt. We have already noted one of the quotations from Patrick Henry. In quoting Roosevelt's famous words, Williams said:

> We must have no smaller courage, no lesser vision. Let us remember the words of Franklin Delano Roosevelt--"The only thing we have to fear is fear itself--nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

These quotations have an emotional connotation, since the men quoted were prominent figures in United States history. The use of Franklin D. Roosevelt's name is emotion-packed, especially when uttered in Democratic circles.

Style. Williams employed many techniques of style in this speech. He used figures of speech, alliteration, and the figurative analogy.

Williams made wide use of figures of speech, such as, "harbor of destiny" and "rocks of disaster." He constantly referred to the speech of Adlai Stevenson as the "Spirit of Chicago". He used the term, "incinerated by this great new power". Later he referred to "electronic brains, the electronic hands, and the electronic backs." He referred to "the uncharted sea of the over-extension of consumer credit." He referred to the farmers as being "plowed under." In the conclusion, when he paraphrased the famous remarks of Patrick Henry, he used the term, "army of General Apathy and General Despair."

These figures of speech may be considered original and somewhat different from the general tone of many of the speeches delivered by Williams. In any event, they serve to enliven the speech and to make it more "listenable."

There are many examples of alliteration in this speech. A few are: "the timid, the temporizers," "craven cowardice," "spineless and self-defeating", and "fully and freely to fight to the end."

The use of alliteration to such an extent is somewhat novel in Williams' speeches, but even more novel is the use of the rhetorical question. He asks:

> For how much longer does the Spirit of Chicago urge that we continue resting? How long does the Spirit of Chicago estimate that it takes a vigorous and aspiring people to catch its breath?

Williams used the figurative analogy in this speech. He compared the political and social revolution that the United States and the world is experiencing to a storm at sea. The boat represents the political institutions. He said:

> It is not the moment to speak fearfully of rocking the boat. The boat is already tossing like a cork on the waves of such revolution as man never before in his whole history has experienced until now. It is not for us fearfully to whimper about rocking the boat. It is for us determinedly and fearlessly to chart a course toward the harbor of the great potential which is ours, rather than cower fearfully in dark uncertainty.

This is the only example of a figurative analogy in this speech, and it is one of the few that Williams has used in speeches which the writer has read or heard.

Williams made full use of parallel construction. In the latter portion of the speech he began five successive paragraphs with the phrase, "If it means." Later, he began five paragraphs with the word, "Certainly." Earlier in the speech he had used parallel construction when he said:

> I am made heartsick by those in my own party, who do not militantly resist the spurious doctrine that, so long as our aged have some security--so long as the most indigent get some medical care--so long as unemployment is below the critical level part of the time,-- our job is done, we can rest.

Thus, through the use of the rhetorical question, alliteration, parallel construction, and figurative analogy, Williams gave more variety to this speech than any of the other speeches that the author analyzed.

Summary. In this speech the conformity of Williams' ideas to those of the New Deal is evident; he showed himself ready to use the facilities of the government to give security to individuals. The ideas seem to be well-arranged in a logical manner. As proof, Williams used a considerable body of statistical and other factual evidence, together with a variety of inductive and deductive methods of reasoning, particularly example and analogy. His emotional appeals were largely appeals to patriotism and duty. He referred often to well-known historical events. In style there is considerable variation; such devices as figures of speech, alliteration, and figurative analogies are employed.

Speech Before the National Conference
of Catholic Charities and Annual Meeting
of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul

Background. The National Conference of Catholic Charities met in Grand Rapids, Michigan, on November 9, 1955, at six-thirty o'clock in the evening. The meeting, at which G. Mennen Williams spoke, was also the annual national meeting of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; and many important national figures of the Catholic faith were present. Williams' speech dealt with a subject that is very important to him: religion.

Text of speech. The manuscript of this speech was given to the writer by one of the governor's aides. In the legend at the top of the manuscript is the word, "excerpts", which may mean that part of the speech is missing. The aide assured the writer, however, that the only part that may be missing would be impromptu remarks at the beginning of the speech. The aide who made the copy available to the writer said that the speech was prepared principally by Williams, and that the ideas expressed are an expression of Williams' views on religion, as related to politics.

Statement of purpose and synopsis of speech. This speech is an exposition of Williams' beliefs concerning the role of government in relation to religion.

The following is a synopsis of the speech:

1. Each man is his brother's keeper.
2. Modern technology is providing a new life of more abundant living.

3. Greater emphasis must be placed on the spirit of brotherhood and on neighborliness.

Ideas. In this speech we can get a picture of the religious and philosophical convictions upon which Williams rests his political philosophy. He gives a clear elucidation of the relationship of the church and government. He feels that the underlying significance of religion is to help mankind seek a brotherhood, and that the role of government is to further this attempt. Williams said:

> Without this neighborliness, this friendliness, this constant concern of all these groups for all others, GOVERNMENT, at whatever level, and however strong, would be a helpless and frustrated thing.

In making clear his conception of the relationship of God to government, Williams made a clear statement of his beliefs concerning government when he said:

> They and you together are the government. That government is not some kind of amorphous thing, a cancerous growth on the body politic, but that government and the people are, or ought to be, synonomous. We, all of us together, are the government, and we must not permit ourselves to be split apart, divided, to be driven to cross-purposes.

Later, Williams used a quotation from Abraham Lincoln to make clear the kinds of activities in which he feels the government should engage. He said:

> To do, of course, is one of government's main functions: to do, as Lincoln said, "to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all--or cannot do so well-for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities." The tragedy lies in the fact that a situation has developed in which the government has had to step in.

Thus, we can see that Williams' conception of govern-

ment is one that is active on behalf of the individuals of society.

This speech illustrates an aspect of Williams speaking which is of particular interest. He is able to make each group to which he talks feel that it is engaged in worthwhile activities, and he gives the group assurance that he is supporting it. He said, for example:

> It is heart-warming and inspiring to participate in the activities of such groups as are assembled here tonight. I thank you for counting me in.

Organization. The over-all organization follows the usual pattern: introduction, body, and conclusion.

In the introduction Williams attempted to make the audience accept his ideas by thanking the group for the opportunity to participate in its activities.

The body of the speech is organized in such a way that the points when listed form a causal relationship. The ideas of the body of the speech are arranged in this way:

1. Each man is ruled by a spirit of Christianity.
2. Modern technology is providing a new life of more abundant living.
3. Therefore, greater emphasis must be placed on the spirit of Christianity.

The conclusion contains a summary of Williams' beliefs concerning the respective roles of government and religion in democracy. He said:

> The work which government, which the professionals do, is a good and necessary work. The job must be done. But other groups, such as those represented

> here tonight, supply the pulsating heart, the Christian, as distinguished from the merely charitable, drive.

Williams' concluding sentence is tantamount to a prayer. He said: "May our good Lord bless you in all of your undertakings, as I pray that he will guide and inspire me."

Evidence and reasoning. In this speech Williams used logic and citation of authority. The most frequent form of logic employed is deductive. As can be seen from the preceding section on organization, the body of the speech is organized in the form of a causal relationship. Thus, Williams reasons: (1) Each man is his brother's keeper. (2) Modern technology is providing a new life which threatens to "whet our old avarice." (3) Greater emphasis, therefore, must be placed on spiritual matters.

Each of the above statements is a link in the causal chain. For example, the Christian philosophy is that each of us is our brother's keeper; we live in a Christian world; therefore, we are our brother's keeper.

This speech, an exposition of Williams' conception of the relationship of government and religion, makes little use of factual proof. In citing the advances of modern technology, Williams reasoned that automation, atomic energy, and solar energy should make available more leisure time. He said:

> It is a gateway not only to a new, richer fuller way of life; it is a gateway to what almost might be called a new culture, so splendid in its prospect--the push button prospect, the solar energized, automation-organized prospect of an economy of great leisure.

He again reasoned:

> We are equally hampered by those who are ignorant of the legitimacy and necessity of our purposes, and hence are frightened by them. We are hampered by sloth. We are hampered by a strange and truly alarming kind of dissolution of our fundamental institutions--the family, respect for authority, the acceptance of responsibility. We are hampered even by our misunderstanding of each other.

Thus, through the use of logic, as shown by the two examples above, Williams offered proof for his ideas. An example of the use of deductive argument as support for his contention should suffice to make clear his use of this type of proof. To support the contention that religious groups must help prepare mankind to accept the new culture promoted by technological advances, Williams said:

> If the new abundance is permitted to whet our old avarice, we are lost, economically as well as spiritually.
>
> And it is for this reason that new and greater emphasis must be placed now and forever henceforth on the spirit of brotherhood, the spirit of neighborliness.

Proof takes the form of logic or citation of authority. Williams, at the point in the speech following the previously mentioned syllogism, stated his theme: "Without this neighborliness . . . government, at whatever level, and however strong, would be a helpless and frustrated thing." To substantiate this theme, Williams used a quotation from a well-known priest, Father Mark Fitzgerald of Sacred Heart Church at Notre Dame University. Williams said:

> Father Mark Fitzgerald . . . argued that the

> reverse, of course, is true also. The best of us in our noblest pursuits . . . would be thoroughly and utterly frustrated, if it were not for the civil authority.

Williams used other citations from authority to substantiate his speech. To establish his conception of the main functions of government, he used a quotation from Lincoln. Another quotation used by Williams originated with Monsignor O'Grady, a member of the group which Williams was addressing. He said:

> Your own Monsignor O'Grady has put forth the suggestion that it would be tragic were government to usurp or intrude upon the services which the various religious organizations should provide, and would provide, did they have adequate support of an adequate number of people.

Psychological and emotional appeals. In this speech Williams made an appeal to the patriotic instincts of the listeners when he said:

> Ours is a great and much blest nation. Much of its strength lies in the activities and the cohesion and the philosophy of just such groups as are represented at this conference of Catholic Charities.

Underlying this appeal to patriotism, there was an appeal to the group's sense of accomplishment, since Williams made a direct statement of the good work and the necessary work that such Christian organizations do.

Williams appealed to the listeners' sense of cooperation when he said:

> You, in your field, are doing a great and charitable work in help you are able to give to your government, and the help you freely accept from your government, in providing such care for [mentally retarded] children as

both of us together are able to give.

He appealed to the listeners' sense of love and compassion when he said:

> But where are the hearts, where is the Christian charity of those others, who profess not to understand what we are about in the current crisis, who would provide us, for crass dollars and cents reasons, with facilities which at best are grossly inadequate to do the job?

Williams used many personal pronouns throughout the speech. It is through the use of pronouns that he made his major attempt at audience adaption. For example, he said:

> We are hampered, both of us--you in your charities and the government in its responsibilities--by those who do not know that THEY and YOU together are the government. .....We, all of us together, are the government, and we must not permit ourselves to be split apart, divided, to be driven to cross purposes.

He continued to use many personal pronouns, particularly "we" in combination with "you", "your", and "our".

Williams attempted to place himself in a favorable light in the eyes of this audience by using the pronoun "I". In reference to the statement of Monsignor O'Grady, he said:

> With this I am in fullest agreement. And I am sure the Monsignor also will be in full agreement with me, when I assert that the tragedy lies not so much in the fact that government tries to do what it properly can do in this field. . . .

Finally, the numerous religious references have considerable emotional appeal. The psychological appeal results from the fact that Williams was talking to a group of persons who had devoted their lives to the betterment

of mankind, through the dissemination of information concerning Christian principles. Williams, by affirming his own deep convictions concerning these Christian principles, placed himself favorably before the group.

Style. In general the style of this speech is more adorned than are Williams' speeches delivered prior to 1955. The sentence structure in some instances is rather complicated. Williams said, for example:

> We cannot, of course, inquire into God's purpose, but it is perhaps permissible to wonder if it may not be because he wishes to show us at long last that there is such little reason for so much of our blundering, wishes to demonstrate that the earth all of these centuries has been planted with sufficient fruit for all, wishes to show that poverty and depression we do not always have to have with us, wishes to show that He has provided for even us the least of His children, and that for all of our darkness there is in each of us a God-given light which can show through if we will but let it.

Williams contrived to make the above sentence contain a number of ideas. As a result, some of the ideas may be difficult to grasp because of the length of the sentence.

The sentence quoted above contains an extended parallel construction, having four ideas introduced with the term "wished to." Another example of parallel construction is Williams use of the words "We are hampered" at the beginning of five separate sentences in one paragraph.

There are a limited number of figures of speech in this address. In the opening argument, Williams referred

to automation and the use of solar and atomic energies as "a gateway". He referred to the abundance with which nature has endowed the world as "fruit". He referred to the efforts of mankind as "darkness", which he contrasted with the God-given light. He referred to the villages of the country as "crossroads."

At one point in the speech Williams employed humor. He stated that the civil government and the religious institutions were mutually interdependent. He continued:

> Even were our temporal society composed exclusively of the sanctified, it still would need a civil authority to coordinate and direct the efforts of its citizens toward a common goal. Even the saints do not think as one. (As a Democratic governor who currently is embattled with certain Republican legislators in the State Senate, I might perhaps be excused for venturing here the thought that certainly the unsanctified do not always think as one.)

There were other stylistic devices employed in the speech. Williams used alliteration, for example, when he said "push-button prosperity" and "current crisis". In addition, he used two rhetorical questions in the speech. Finally, the extensive use of pronouns, in addition to the psychological function they serve, may be considered an aspect of style--one which Williams employs extensively in speech-making.

Summary. This speech is an exposition of Williams' beliefs concerning the relationship of religion and government. The ideas are organized in a logical manner; in fact, the ideas of the body of the speech are arranged in

the form of a chain of reasoning. The reasoning is largely of a deductive nature. The psychological appeals are to patriotism and social approval. Williams frequently used personal pronouns. The style of the speech is somewhat adorned, through the use of alliteration, figures of speech, and rhetorical questions.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSIONS

Specific Conclusions Regarding the Rhetorical Nature of the Five Selected Speeches

The purpose of this study was to describe, analyze and interpret the speaking of G. Mennen Williams, primarily through the analysis of five selected speeches. Let us first summarize the findings in each of the areas selected for making the speech analysis.

Ideas. The ideas expressed in Williams' speeches seem to correspond with those of the New Deal philosophy, a basic concept of which includes using government as an active agent operating for the benefit of individuals in society. In the first Inaugural Address, for example, Williams stated that the state government should act on behalf of the individual in the areas of housing, labor, assistance to the aged, and conservation of natural resources. In the speech delivered before the Young Democrats of Colorado, Williams made a proposal that the national government act on behalf of individuals in similar areas. In the speech before the Michigan Judges' Association, Williams suggested using the state's resources for the benefit of individuals in society to expand the use of probation. In the two other speeches analyzed Williams gave definite in-

dication that he favors using government to benefit individuals.

Organization. In all of the speeches analyzed Williams employed a definite introduction, body, and conclusion. His introductions were designed to make his listeners disposed to accept his ideas. He attempted to accomplish this goal by using references to the occasions and to individuals present or known by those present.

In the bodies of the speeches Williams favored what may be termed a logical organization--that is, grouping together the ideas which are closely associated in such a way that the points become a part of the reasoning process. Usually the last point was the conclusion of the foregoing points. This logical organization is exemplified by the speech delivered before the National Conference of Catholic Charities, which was arranged in the form of a chain of reasoning.

In the conclusions Williams gave unity to the speeches by relating the conclusions to the introductions. In the First Inaugural Address, for example, Williams used a Biblical quotation in the introduction and another in the conclusion. In the speech before the Young Democrats of Colorado he used a quotation from Patrick Henry in the introduction and another quotation from Patrick Henry in the conclusion. In the other speeches we find the introductions and conclusions related, although not so specifically. For example, in the speech before the Michigan Judges' Associa-

tion, in the introduction Williams affirms his belief in salvaging youthful criminals; in the conclusion he reiterates this belief.

Evidence and reasoning. Williams used a considerable volume of evidence, employing statistics in each of the speeches analyzed except the speech before the National Conference of Catholic Charities. In addition to this use of statistical evidence, Williams used quotations from authority, favoring citations from Patrick Henry, Abraham Lincoln, and Franklin D. Roosevelt. Williams used this evidence of fact and opinion as a basis for several types of deductive and inductive reasoning. In four of the five speeches analyzed, Williams seemed to use deductive reasoning to a greater extent than inductive; in the speech before the Economic Club of Detroit he seemed to favor inductive reasoning.

Psychological and emotional appeals. In the five speeches analyzed, Williams used psychological and emotional appeals sparingly. One consistent psychological appeal employed was the use of personal pronouns, a device which seemed likely to emphasize the good will of the speaker. There were appeals made to the listener's sense of patriotism, duty, love, and co-operation. Judging by newspaper comment, some examples of which may be found in Chapter III of this paper, the appeals apparently leave the listener with the feeling that the speaker has sincerity and integrity.

Style. Williams used parallel construction in each

of the five speeches, while other stylistic devices, such as alliteration, analogy, rhetorical questions, and figures of speech, were used less consistently. One device which Williams employed with frequency was the use of personal pronouns. Two of the speeches, the one delivered before the Conference of Catholic Charities and the one delivered before the Convention of Young Democrats of Colorado, were somewhat more adorned than were the other three. These two speeches were delivered much later, chronologically, than were the other three.

- -

What interpretation can be made as the result of analyzing the five selected speeches? In general, it can be said that Williams' speeches contain considerable evidence of fact and opinion. They are well-organized and logical. They may not be stylistically imaginative; and, though they are generally not marked by wide use of psychological and emotional appeals, they enable Williams to present himself favorably to the listener. It is the author's opinion that the listener accepts first the speaker, then the ideas.

General Conclusions Regarding the Role of Williams as a Speech-maker

The writer believes that Michigan was ready to accept a Democratic governor in 1948. The political complexion of the state had changed in 1932, after the depression, when the Democrats swept the nation and the state. Subtle

changes, however, had been taking place previous to that time. Because of the growth of industry, people collected in urban areas, which became centers of Democratic strength in the state. Labor unions became a political force in Michigan. At present, the Congress of Industrial Organization, more commonly known as the C.I.O., has been politically active on behalf of G. Mennen Williams and the Democratic party. The split that existed within the Republican ranks, although difficult to assay, produced effects favorable to the Democrats. Further, the change in the political complexion of Michigan produced a large number of independent or non-organization voters. The independent voters base their votes not upon party affiliation but upon the personal qualifications of the office-seeker. Finally, the unpopularity of Kim Sigler enhanced the chances for a Democrat to be elected. All of these factors, combined with Williams' particular personal characteristics, produced the success which the Democrats have enjoyed.

In spite of these many factors which produced changes favorable to the Democrats, Michigan was in 1948, as today, considered a Republican state. What the Democrats needed in 1948 was a leader who could visualize these changes which had evolved and capitalize upon them. Williams seemed able to impress the voters of Michigan with his qualifications, and certainly an important means of creating this impression was his speech-making.

APPENDIX

January 1, 1949

INAUGURAL ADDRESS
By
GOVERNOR G. MENNEN WILLIAMS

A Happy New Year to all the citizens of Michigan!

I am sure that the greetings of your new Governor are joined in by your outgoing Governor, who is here today in a fine spirit of cooperation and good sportsmanship; I am confident that your judiciary, your new legislature and all of the men and women of your new state administration, join me in wishing you all a Happy New Year.

The term of office to which you have elected your legislature and executive will mark the end of the first half of the Twentieth Century.

Not quite 2,000 years ago, Jesus of Nazareth said that He came into this world so that men might have life and life abundant. He spoke, it is true, of the life of the spirit. But he enjoined all men to have a care for another, not only in matters of the spirit, but in the production and distribution of the necessary goods of this world.

We of the Western democracies live in a civilization built upon the teachings of the Man of Nazareth. It is for this purpose---that men may in fact live together as brothers having a care one for another---that modern democratic states exist.

Our century began with great promise of abundance for all mankind and with high hopes that the tradition of Moses and Jesus might finally flower in our lifetime in true freedom for all men. The inventive and productive genius of the American people--nowhere more strongly manifest than in Michigan---seemed to promise that everyone, everywhere, might have a sufficiency of the good things in life.

But the very material progress which held this bright promise created problems which challenge the depths of our spiritual strength. We have passed through a great depression because we had not discovered how to distribute abundance. We have been forced to fight two great wars, testing our belief that all men are created equal, and to ensure that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from this earth.

In Michigan, as nowhere else in the world, we have felt the impact of these new problems. Where once a few hundred men were employed in wagon factories, great industrial complexes now lift their smoking chimneys to the skies. Once a rural community of small towns, Michigan has become the arsenal of democracy and the great workshop of the western world.

It is not surprising that we have met with difficulties and disappointments, in adjusting our government to the problems of this new industrial civilization.

We have, indeed, made considerable progress. We have started to improve the machinery of our government so that it can be more responsive to the people's needs. We have made beginnings, in other fields, recognizing the responsibility of government for the aged, for the support of those thrown out of employment, for the peaceful solutions of quarrels between management and labor.

All of us, regardless of party, want to make progress. If there has been, in the opinion of some of us, a relaxation of effort in the last several years, it has surely been due not to lack of good will, but to disagreements as to the course we should follow.

In certain areas, it seems plain that we have not kept up with our times, or with the progress of sister states.

Many of our returning veterans who fought to defend our homes, have been unable to find homes of their own. The cost of this failure, in individual and public morale, health and decency cannot be calculated.

We have been somewhat callous to the just requirements of our aged citizens, of those injuried in industrial accidents, and of those who are out of jobs through no fault of their own.

We have not succeeded in maintaining educational opportunity at the high standards to which the children of Michigan are entitled.

We have fallen short in guaranteeing first class citizenship to all of our people, regardless of creed or color.

We have permitted our highway system, the basic transportation medium of the people, to deteriorate.

We have abused our rich water resources upon which the prosperity of farms and factories as well as public health and recreation depend.

We have not succeeded in making rural Michigan famous for its fruits and foods, as industrial Michigan is famous for its automobiles and other factory products.

We have failed to establish the legal and governmental basis for harmonious co-operation of workers and employers.

But let us not waste time asking why these things have not been accomplished. The responsibility in the final analysis lies not upon any man or group of men, but upon all of us, the people of Michigan.

But none of these problems is insoluble. All of them can be solved--or substantial progress made toward a solution--if we will make up our minds to work together. I am sure that the people of Michigan have elected men and woman who WILL work together in all the branches of the government.

I want to speak plainly to my colleagues on this point. Under our democratic system, political campaigns are basic and fruitful. Without the give and take of partisan debate, the issues would never become clear, the people could not choose their course, and we should soon find ourselves under the heel of a one-party dictatorship.

But another thing is equally true:

Our democratic system also requires that partisans be broad-minded enough to forget partisanship, after the election, in all matters effecting the public welfare. This principle applies with special force in our present circumstances. The people of Michigan have NOT chosen to give their trust completely into the hands of any one party. They have elected a bi-partisan administration!

The meaning of the people's decision is plain. They believe that we, whom they have elected, possess the moral strength to subordinate partisan interests to the common good. The people expect that all of their officals will co-operate in the public interest.

I believe the people are right, that we CAN, regardless of party differences, work together for good government. I pledge you to do my part to carry out this the most unmistakeable mandate we have been given.

The people of Michigan have a right to expect this type of co-operation. But there exists no right without a corresponding duty. To the people of Michigan I say: You have a duty to us, your elected leaders, and to yourselves.

It is your duty to continue, without relaxation, the high interest you have shown in the affairs of your state. Whatever success your legislature and your executive may

achieve in your behalf during the coming two years, will depend, finally, upon you!

The continued active interest of the people of Michigan in good government, in fair government, in government for the public interest, is the keystone of the hopes with which all of your officials today take up the burden of government.

You must be eternally vigilant if you would be free. You must observe closely what is being done--or not done--beneath the dome of this venerable capitol. You must understand the vital and often complex issues which come before the legislature. You must weigh the recommendations of your Governor. You must constantly discuss and debate these matters in the shops, the farms, the market places, the halls of business, and the union meetings of this commonwealth. You must judge for yourselves whether you are getting the kind of government for which you voted.

Of course, the people cannot judge intelligently unless they know the facts. To you, the press and radio and other information media of Michigan, I say you too have a duty.

In this land, thank God you are free--free to report the truth, free to distort the truth, if that is your pleasure.

The protecting arm of the people keeps you free, and informing the people fully and truthfully is your sole final title to profit on your operations.

I know that you, too, will co-operate, and I pledge you, that I will do my part. No fact of public interest shall be withheld from you, no avenue of public information shall be closed to you, if I, as governor, can prevent it.

There are, of course, the great problems of public morality which transcend real political issues. The morality and health of our state is the job of the churches and the schools. I know that these great agencies, without which good government cannot exist, will continue to teach and preach those basic principles upon which all sound legislation must be founded.

So today we here highly resolve that we shall work together in a mighty cause, to advance our commonwealth along the path to a better life for all its people.

In this task I plead for and expect the co-operation of every official, and every citizen. I am conscious of my responsibility and of my limitations. I ask no man to wear my collar, or to sacrifice his honest convictions.

I ask only that we all work together during these two years, as a team--as the Michigan Team!

To all of the people of Michigan on behalf of all of us in whom you have reposed your trust, I say thanks, thanks, and thanks again!

We shall do our best to be worthy of the honor you have given us, so help us God!

"WHAT ARE THE DETERMINING STATE ISSUES IN THE NOVEMBER ELECTION?"

Guest Speaker

THE HONORABLE G. MENNEN WILLIAMS
Governor
State of Michigan

DONALD S. LEONARD
Former Commissioner of Police
City of Detroit and State of Michigan

BEFORE THE ECONOMIC CLUB OF DETROIT

Monday Noon, September 20, 1954
Veterans Memorial Building
12:15 P.M.

PRESIDING OFFICER

THE HONORABLE ARTHUR F. LEDERLE, LL.D.
Chief Judge
United States District Court
Eastern District of Michigan

ALLEN B. CROW
President
The Economic Club
of Detroit

(The meeting was opened by President Allen B. Crow.)

HON. ARTHUR F. LEDERLE: Thank you, Allen, for that nice introduction. I'm going to move around here a bit and see if we can get this microphone in the right place so that we can start both of these contestants off here about even.

I suppose I should especially thank Allen for that advertising he gave me, but I can assure all of you now that I have definitely decided that I wouldn't even be a candidate for reelection as Judge at the expiration of my present term. (Laughter)

I assume that all of you have read the fine biographical sketches of our speakers today. It occurred to me that if we had kept all of these announcements up to the present time, we would have a very fine biography of the leaders not only of Michigan and the United States, but many of the leaders of the world, who have come to us to deliver their messages. I doubt whether there was ever an occasion, however, that was more important than the present one. I am not going to say a word about what is printed in the announcement, but I hope you will pardon me for a little personal pride that I take in both of these young men who are here today. Perhaps you might want to know how I know they're young. I know that I'm young, and they're younger than I am, and therefore they must be young.

Governor Williams came into my court room about 20 years ago. He was just starting out in the practice of law. He made an impression upon me. I decided he was going places. I haven't been disappointed in his career, and I'm proud that he belongs to the legal profession. And I want to thank you at this time, Governor, for that nice letter that you sent me when you were just a nice young boy.

It is a pleasure indeed to present the Governor of the State of Michigan, The Honorable G. Mennen Williams.

(Applause)

HON. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, Judge Lederle, Commissioner Leonard, distinguished guests, members of the Economic club of Detroit and friends:

It is a great pleasure once again to have the opportunity to address this particular meeting -- and it goes without saying, I am looking forward to doing it again in the future. (Laughter)

Mr. Allen Crow, knowingly or not, has given aid and comfort to the Democratic Party. After this lunch, we Democrats will be able to report that he said -- and what he says carries a lot of weight -- that things are so confused

among businessmen that a thousand of the most prominent people of Detroit don't know where they are going to eat lunch next week. (Laughter)

It is difficult enough to discuss the most important issues in the coming State campaign without a start like that, but I will try and begin by saying that I earnestly believe that the people of Michigan want to see continued the forward drive to meeting the growing needs and problems of our great community of Michigan. They do not want to see, and return, to the good old days of Republican one party rule, when the problems and needs of greater Michigan just loomed too big for timid and quarreling leaders to tackle.

The record shows very clearly that many of these major needs were ignored, and shoved under the bed during the period of Republican one-party rule; that these problems have received an effective answer only during the last few years.

Perhaps the most dramatic example of this is the Mackinac Straits Bridge. Everyone knows that the bridge was abondoned by a Republican Legislature and a Republican Governor. Everyone knows that when it was revived in 1949 it met with ridicule. They called it "Soapy's Folly" and came up with many reasons why the job was too big for the people of Michigan. They said that the winds at the Straits were too fierce, the ice was too thick, the water was too deep, and the rocks under the straits were too thin. Even up to the day the bonds were successfully sold, there was opposition from Republican sources, including one of the candidates now running with my opponent on the Republican ticket. Today the bridge is under construction. It wasn't the rocks under the Straits of Mackinac that were too soft. It was the spirit and the will of those in one-party control of the state. The people of Michigan will decide in November whether to return to that kind of government, and I think their decision will be in favor of continued progress.

It had been apparent that we needed a great expansion of our mental hospital system, more tuberculosis hospitals, a TB prevention program and better medical schools. We needed to improve our Workmen's compensation, Old Age Assistance and Unemployment Insurance laws. These great public needs, which were obvious long ago, remained unfilled during the years when the Republican Party had the full responsibility it now seeks to gain again.

Today many of these needs have been met. If Michigan goes Democratic this Fall, and I hope and believe it will, what are the major tasks we propose to carry out?

We propose to develop the harbors, roads and port

facilities of Michigan, so that when the St. Lawrence Seaway comes to our shores we can take the full advantage of it. I have already appointed a state-wide commission, headed by one of your colleagues here, C. Allen Harlan, which will get this major job under way.

We propose to build roads. Neither the bridge nor the Seaway can produce their full benefits to Michigan without a better highway system. Steps are already under way to end the Highway Department's present system of hit-and-miss, patchwork, planless construction, and to get our road-building on the basis of the 2-year program required by Michigan's laws. And next year we should have done the $500 million revenue bond issue, which will enable us to catch up on our present lag by building tomorrow's roads today.

We propose a new program for the expansion of our colleges and universities. Already a committee of educators is at work, at my request, drafting a long-range higher education building program.

We propose to build schools and train and recruit more teachers. Every year from sixty to seventy thousand additional children come knocking at the doors of our public schools. The state must lead in the next two years in developing a state-wide program of school expansion.

Those are just some of the highlights of the Democratic program. Obviously I cannot in the time alloted here give a complete program statement. Our plans will be outlined in more detail to the people during the campaign.

My candidacy for reelection is based on the conviction that the people appreciate the job that we have already done. We Democrats hope and believe that they will entrust their future to the party whose leadership has brought results in the last five and a half years.

It would be wonderful indeed if these were the only problems which confront the people of Michigan. But Michigan also has serious problems which do not originate in our own state. They were made in Washington. Mistaken Federal economic policies have put more than 200,000 of our people out of work, causing a huge loss in purchasing power which is adversely affecting Michigan's business.

Our Administration policies have caused distress and disillusionment on the farmers.

It is not my intention to run for Governor against the National Administration, but the fact is that these issues are state as well as national issues. Michigan has been hurt more severely by Washington's mistakes than most other states. Because our economy is a barometer of the

national economic weather, we felt more keenly than most states the chill winds of Republican recession. Whatever may be said of Federal policies in the national picture -- and I think they have hurt the nation -- it is undeniable that they have brought unemployment, reduced business activity and brought farm distress to Michigan.

Our efforts to get Federal contracts into Michigan plants have been hampered and frustrated. Our pleas for aid to the auto industry through reduced excise taxes have fallen on deaf ears. Our protests against such policies as reduction of dairy price supports to 75 per cent of parity have been ignored. Under such circumstances, Michigan not only needs Patrick V. McNamara in the United States Senate and more Democratic Congressmen in Washington, Michigan also needs an Administration in Lansing which is ready and able to stand up for the interests of our state.

No man who seeks to serve the State of Michigan in a high office can decently sidestep these bread and butter questions.

Now, this would be a good occasion for my opponent here to tell where he stands on some of these issues. Do you concede, sir, that we have serious unemployment in Michigan since the Republicans took over in Washington, or do you stand with the Administration spokesmen who are telling us that everything is all right. Do you defend, sir, the Administration's reduction of dairy supports to 75 per cent of parity, which seriously damaged Michigan's dairy farmers? Do you defend, sir, the Republican decision to keep automobile taxes high, at a time when Michigan desperately needs to sell cars? These are questions to which the people seek answers. These are things that can be done in Lansing.

We Democrats have been actively doing these things and we propose to do more in the next two years. We propose to improve further our Unemployment Compensation Law, which the President himself has called our first line of defense against depression. We will continue and expand the work of the State Department of Economic Development, which has helped to locate 66 new industrial plants here in Michigan. Our state must build a diversified industry to replace the losses resulting from automobile decentralization. We propose to expand and continue the work of the Emergency Industrial Production Commission which has done so much under the able leadership of another of your colleagues here, Walker Cisler, to get Michigan a fair share of defense and other Federal contracts.

We will continue and expand the farm marketing program which was approved by the last Legislature to help Michigan farmers recover some of their lost income, and we will carry forward without hesitation or delay the program

now under way to improve the state parks and otherwise attract business for the tourist industry.

We will put the full influence of the state behind a move to reduce or eliminate the excise tax on automobiles, and we propose to work with Michigan Democrats in Congress for a revision of the income tax law so that the family car -- a necessary piece of equipment in earning a living these days -- may be written off like any other income-producing machinery. That is the kind of a program we Democrats stand for, and I believe the desire of the people for the vigorous carrying out of such a program will prove to be the determining issue of this election.

(Applause)

HON. ARTHUR F. LEDERLE: Thank you, Governor Williams. As citizens of Michigan we are proud of our industry, proud of our tourist attractions and proud of all of the other natural resources we have, but I think that we should be especially grateful for our human resources.

Detroit is not the automobile center because it was strategically located for that industry, but rather because we had men of vision in our community. I think Michigan is especially fortunate at this particular time to have two such outstanding candidates for Governor. They are both men of character, ability, independence, courage, and they are both industrious.

Just a word about the next speaker. I have known him for about a quarter of a century. I knew his good mother before him. I had the good fortune of having him in my classes in law school, and of course whatever success he has achieved -- and it has been very marked -- I am sure that he knows he owes in no small degree to the teaching that he received at my hands. (Laughter)

I have been proud of you, Don, and it is a pleasure indeed to present our former Police Commissioner, former Commissioner of the State Police Department, The Honorable Donald S. Leonard.

(Applause)

HON. DONALD S. LEONARD: Judge Lederle, Mr. Crow, Governor Williams, distinguished guests and good citizens all:

I deeply appreciate the privilege of being invited to appear and speak before such a distinguished assemblage of fellow Detroiters and Michiganders.

Two years ago it was my privilege to sit with you during the Alger-Williams debate. At that time Mr. Crow

announced that Mayor Cobo had just appointed me as Detroit's Police Commissioner. It has been a real pleasure and an opportunity for me to be a part of Mayor Cobo's outstanding administration in the City of Detroit, and I have considered it an honor to be the head of the finest municipal police organization in the United States -- that of the Detroit Police Department. (Applause)

I wish also to take this opportunity of thanking not only you and the other citizens of Detroit and Wayne County, but also those of outstate Michigan, in selecting me as the Republican gubernatorial nominee. Let me assure you, gentlemen, that if I am elected your Chief Executive on November 2nd, I shall put full time on the job of Governor of the State of Michigan, serving all of the people of the state to the very best of my ability. (Applause)

To serve as Governor of a great state such as Michigan is an honor that falls to but few. It is a privilege that I would never forget. I would do my utmost to serve in the public interest. But I want to tell you right here and now that there are some prices that I do not intend to pay for that high honor.

I do not intend, for example, to engage in any campaign of attempted character villification or assassination. I don't intend to say goodbye to any of my friends. I don't intend to do anything from a political expediency viewpoint that will be a sacrifice to principles that have remained steadfast with me during over 30 years of governmental service, and would put me in a position of embarrassment in explanation to my four-year old, eight-year old and ten-year old children or to my wife and to my friends of this great city in which I have always resided. (Applause)

Although there are many, many problems confronting state government today -- and we can only discuss a few of them because of time limitations -- we must bear in mind that there is but one crucial and predominant issue and that is to send to Lansing a governor of the same political faith as the legislature. Unless and until this is done, we can't even have an approach towards the solution of these problems. Frankly and in good conscience, gentlemen, I would tell you that if the people of Michigan sent a Democratic majority to the Legislature, then by all means they ought to send a Democrat to occupy the Governor's chair in Lansing. But Michigan has been and will continue to be a predominatly Republican state. It will send this time a Republican majority to the Legislature. This being the case, if we are interested in progress, in a solution of our many serious problems, and in the welfare of our citizenry, then it is imperative to send to Lansing a governor of the Republican party faith who will work in co-operation and in harmony with the Republican majority in the Legislature and the Democrats who make up the balance. We just cannot afford

to have a continuance of the stalemate and deadlock that has existed in Lansing for nigh onto the past six years.

The Governor has referred to some accomplishments, but I want to tell you gentlemen that at no time during the past session of the Legislature, for example, did the present Governor meet or attempt to meet with any of the important leaders of the Legislature on the Republican ticket in an honest attempt to bring about a solution of the problems confronting state government.

Oh yes, there has been reference to unemployment. I agree with the Governor and the rest of you, as all good people should, if there is a single case in Michigan where a person who is able and willing to work cannot find employment, it is a most serious problem; but it has been brought about -- not as the Governor suggested, because of the recent entry into Washington of a Republican Administration trying to make up for the fumbling of 20 years of Democratic rule -- but rather because -- (Applause) -- there has been a transition from a war-time to a peace-time economy. And let's be honest about that.

Unemployment cannot be attributed to either of the great political parties. It has existed in Democratic as well as Republican administrations. Unemployment in 1949-50-51 was ended only by our involvement in the Korean War. It is indeed a sad commentary, and rather an indictment on civilization itself, to think that we must depend upon war and destruction in order to bolster our economy and provide employment. Thank God the Korean War has been ended. (Applause)

Only last week I was in Iron Mountain in the Upper Peninsula, and there talked with a druggist. He said to me, "Oh, things up here aren't just what they should be. My business isn't quite as good as it should be. But my neighbors and I thank God that the Korean War has ended, that the slaughter has been stopped. I for one am willing to tighten my belt a little bit, and I think all good Americans feel the same way about it." (Applause)

Things are getting better.

Our economic situation in this Detroit area, for example, has been aggravated because there has been a change-over in models by some of our great automobile plants. With the new models coming out, employment will be better. The condition of employment one month from today will be much better than it is at the present time.

Last year our legislature, with full realization of this problem, broadened the base of Unemployment Compensation and extended the benefits, until today Michigan has the most

liberal unemployment benefit compensation features of any state in the Union, and this, my friends, was brought into reality by a Republican Legislature.

I want to say, too, that there are many things that we can do in connection with unemployment compensation. I think that we should extend the benefits to those employees of plants where the employment is limited to 4 instead of 8 or more employees. We could give the small businessmen and the small employers the immediate advantage of merit-rating provisions of the law, so that, according to employment experience, they can have a tax rate of one-tenth of one per cent, instead of the present three per cent.

Yes, I agree that we should have an office in Washington. I think it would be helpful. If we open up an office there, the small businessmen would have an agency that would be constantly on the lookout for business that could be brought into Michigan. As long as we have the threat of aggressor nations, we're going to have to have defense contracts; and as long as Michigan is the Arsenal of Democracy, we should see to it that we have an alert office staff in Washington bringing that business into the State of Michigan. But the sad part of it is that we have not had that office. There has been dereliction in that respect. California and New York have gotten the bulk of defense contracts. Certainly I would want to see to it that we could do this.

Time is going on. I believe I have only two minutes more. Reference was made to highways. Certainly we all agree that we must have highways, but the Legislature very properly refused to pass on a pig-in-a-poke for the decision of the electorate. They refused to buy a $500 million bond issue suggested in the dying days of the Legislature for a decision by the people, without the facts relating to the decision. Instead they created a Study Commission. It would be my intention, if elected governor, to add some members to that Study Commission, so that when the Legislature convened on January 1st we could have the reports of that Study Commission and build our highways where they are needed. We can't build political roads in the state of Michigan. I would do my utmost to co-operate in a proper roadbuilding program for the state.

We have a very serious problem in the field of education. There are over one and one-quarter million students who returned to school the week before last, representing one-fifth of our Michigan population. Certainly, they must be brought up with the proper training, in good classrooms. There should be equal educational opportunities throughout the state, regardless of the area in which the child is located. And in order to give him the equal opportunity and

the proper education it is necessary that we staff the schools -- and we're badly in need of more school construction and more classrooms -- with teachers who are paid as high as any teachers are paid in the entire country. Michigan is not a poor state. We should be able to create incentive for teachers to remain in the system and for others to join our educational system by proper pay and proper annuities, geared to our present economy, instead of that of 30 or 40 years ago.

The Conlin Plan will be a step in the right direction. Time doesn't permit a discussion of it. It is a method of payment, and guarantees funds in the annuity system that are not now guaranteed.

Certainly I think that Federal aid money should be brought into the State of Michigan; and that I would advocate to the Congress of the United States, so that construction can proceed in Michigan on a matching basis with local funds.

I would say, too, that by all means we should develop the community colleges in Michigan. I would propose that the State itself finance the community colleges in Michigan rather than make it a local burden. It is a state responsibility. This would then relieve the localities of this obligation and would enable them to divert the money they now use for higher education into the primary school fund.

My time has been called. I will try to work in a few more suggestions during the rebuttal period. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

HON. ARTHUR F. LEDERLE: Thank you, Don. We provided for a timekeeper -- we didn't provide for any knockdown timekeeper. I take it that some of you haven't been watching the prizefights. The reason for that is that our guests are not that kind of people. They can disagree without being disagreeable. Under the arrangements, each of the speakers will now have five minutes for rebuttal. Governor Williams will take over first. Governor Williams.

(Applause)

HON. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS: Well Don, I don't know whether you have the better of the argument, or there are more Republicans here, (Laughter) but I would rather assume that these gentlemen when they return home, Don, will say that their three dollars or two dollars wasn't too much for the show that we put on. (Laughter)

Friends, there are just a couple of points that I would like to make rebuttal to, and I probably better serve

notice that since Don is going to make some more suggestions in his rebuttal, the first question that is asked me will probably have some rebuttal too. The most interesting argument that Don has advanced is that he wouldn't go for a Republican Governor and a Democratic Legislature. Now Don, I don't think that you ought to follow the same precedent set by the Vice-President of making predictions before the ballots are counted, as in Maine, because I think the first good argument against that proposition which you raised is that I am quite confident that while we may not, because of Constitutional gerrymandering, have a Republican Senate, I think we will have a Republican -- or Democratic rather -- (Laughter) After all these years it is pretty hard to say a Democratic House, (Laughter) but it is going to happen nonetheless.

I think your proposition falls on another point and that is, having a Republican Governor and a Republican Legislature is no guarantee of action, well at least, necessarily forward action. My predecessor happened to be a Republican. His Legislature was Republican, and I think there were more good dog fights during those two years than Michigan has had for a long time. I don't mean that there wasn't some good legislation. There was some good legislation. A Republican Governor fought through against the wishes of a Republican Legislature, the Department of Administration Act -- and all you have to do is read your paper to verify that.

The Governor preceding that was Governor Kelly, an excellent friend of mine, but if some of you gentlemen would go back into the newspaper files of that time, you will see that at least at the end of his first administration, the editorials were virulent that nothing had happened. Well, something is happening to me. However, I think that we better get to the end of this argument and I will leave the few other things to later on.

The other branch of the argument doesn't hold water either because Democratic governors and Republican legislators have gotten together, and I have the beaming face of your friend, Pat Van Wagoner, as witness to that. But furthermore, one of the greatest periods of Michigan's achievements was under Governor Ferris, who was a Democrat, with a Republican Legislature. As a matter of fact, we very seldom have a Democratic governor with anything but a Republican Legislature.

Now I was afraid that Don would indict not only me but a Republican Legislature for having done nothing during the last five and half years. Our list of accomplishments is long and rather than give you a speech, I have left a pamphlet out in back, which will indicate for example that during the last five and a half years we have built more hospitals than in any comparable period in the history of

our state. This is a good time for me to say that I have to quit, because I could give you a lot of other firsts during that period of time. And I am glad that Don called attention himself to one achievement that this Unemployment Compensation Law, which he says is the best in the country, was passed under a Democratic Governor and a Republican Legislature.

(Applause)

HON. ARTHUR F. LEDERLE: Time is passing. Commissioner Leonard.

HON. DONALD S. LEONARD: I am going to be forced to give a few examples here, gentlemen:

Several years ago Mayor Cobo tried to get proper action in Lansing for authorization of Detroit's expressway bond program issue. The matter was taken up with the Governor at that time. The Governor balked at the proposal and insisted -- or, rather, raised the question -- as to why the Mayor would not get behind his proposal for a corporation tax, indicating that some $18,500,000 then would be available for the purpose of enabling Detroit to build its expressways and road construction. The Legislature gave authorization to the City of Detroit, not because of, but in spite of, the Governor.

And Detroit's expressways will be built with no credit to the Governor of Michigan, whatsoever.

During the last session of the Legislature, when the Legislature was considering the dire financial status of the state and considered several revenue measures, it proposed a business receipts tax. The Governor ridiculed their every effort. He sat on the sidelines as a complete heckler. It was not until the Legislature took the bull by the horns and passed the Business Receipts Act, that the Governor, instead of having the fortitude to veto it, or the nerve to approve it, allowed the Bill to become a Law without any action on his part whatsoever. Then a year later when his own Controller established the fact that Michigan was solvent, had been brought out of the red, and was $3 million or more in the black, the Governor had the unmitigated gall to say, "WE have solved the state's financial dilemma." (Applause)

One of our leading newspapers editorially said:

"Politics at its cheapest. 'We,' said Governor Williams, 'have wiped out the state's deficit and put a $3 million surplus in the Treasury.' The 'we' in Mr. Williams' statement represents what might and should have been. It does not represent

the facts in the case. His spending proposals for the fiscal year recently closed were almost $50 million in excess of the then anticipated revenues. His only suggested remedy was renewed urging of a corporation profits tax, already rejected by the Legislature out of fear that a tax burden so concentrated would drive industry out of the state. It was not Williams but the Legislature which trimmed his budget by $6,500,000. It was not Williams but the Legislature which hit upon the idea of a gross receipts tax spread thinly over all business for a minimum adverse effect on Michigan's employment. Governor Williams' role in solving the state's budget crisis was that of a bystander and a heckler. When wise counsel and effective leadership were the need, his attention was elsewhere."

I submit, gentlemen, that you can have co-operation.

The Governor referred to one-party and two-party systems, but we're involved in a split-party system. And it is important that we have leadership of the right kind. You can't make headway until there is a disposition on the part of the Governor to work with other people instead of insisting solely that his own program should be fulfilled. This is not in the public interest.

(Applause)

HON. ARTHUR F. LEDERLE: Thank you, Don. We're going to have a few minutes for questions here, and Mr. Crow will present the questions.

ALLEN B. CROW: When we came into this building, there was a sign in the lobby that said, "No Sleeping Here". I turned it around because I didn't think we would need that precaution. I see that we didn't.

We have some questions addressed about equally to each of the guest speakers. I think it would be well to limit the replies to one minute each because it is 1:45. If some of you find it necessary to go, perhaps now would be a good time. We will try to finish the meeting not later than two o'clock with these questions. The first question is directed to Governor Williams.

(Reading Question) "GOVERNOR, THE BUSINESS RECEIPTS TAX PASSED BY THE REPUBLICAN LEGISLATURE IN 1953 PROVIDED THE REVENUE WHICH BALANCED MICHIGAN'S BUDGET. YOU CAMPAIGNED AGAINST THIS MEASURE AND REFUSED TO SIGN THE BILL. UPON WHAT BASIS DO YOU TAKE CREDIT FOR HAVING BALANCED THE BUDGET?"

HON. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS: Well, somebody saved me the time of making a rebuttal here. Let me before I answer

that, very briefly set two pointsof fact straight.

One, the State of Michigan does have an office in Washington of the Economic Development Commission. It isn't as large as we would like it to be, but it is as large as present funds permit.

Secondly, these expressways that you ride over did not happen in spite of the Governor. The Governor had a meeting in his office where the Mayor appeared, and where the mayors of several other cities appeared. A joint program was worked out to the approval of all concerned, and passed by the Legislature.

Now, the Governor claiming credit for balancing the budget is even a longer story than I thought we would get in today, so I will have to tax my memory a bit.

In 1948, when I was elected Governor, I conferred with Governor Sigler's Controller and asked him what the financial condition of the State of Michigan was. He said that we had money in the bank, but that we had an annual deficit position and that in order to become solvent on a regular basis it would be necessary to have additional taxes as the state was spending more money each year than it was taking in. He then gave me a list of possible taxes, including a list of nuisance taxes and a list including an income tax, a corporation profits tax and possibly one other. He said, "If you took all of these nuisance taxes and put them together they would not provide sufficient funds with which to balance our outgo. From the other, you can choose, but either one will provide sufficient funds." We checked into the situation and discovered that the State of Michigan was slightly out of balance with other states in the proportion of taxes which went to the consumer in sales and excise taxes. For that reason, in the message to the Legislature of that year, I called the Legislature's attention to the fact that Michigan was in this deficit position. And I recommended as a solution a corporation profits tax. Those of you whose memory is long, (and I'm sorry; I just want to take time to answer this; I think that the people want it), will remember that the Republican legislators, some of whom are here, said, "The Governor sees a deficit under his bed," and it took us two years to convince the Legislature that we were running into difficulty.

When we did, the Legislature came up with a program of taxes such as the soda pop tax, tax on beer, tax on hotels, motels and the like. As you recall, we fought an election on that particular issue, as to whether we would have that kind of a tax, or a corporation profits tax. Perhaps the issue was a draw because more Republicans went to the Legislature, and the Democratic Governor was returned.

We then looked at the tax situation again, as there were several measures proposed, and eventually the corporation franchise tax was increased and then it was advanced. Now to say that anybody campaigned against the gross receipts tax is a complete fallacy because that tax was passed within a period of ten days and nobody could have campaigned against that during that time. So, when I say "we balanced the budget", I think it is a pretty accurate statement, because the Republicans in the Legislature didn't end up with their proposal of excise taxes, nuisance taxes; the Governor didn't end up with his proposal of a corporation profits tax; but instead you ended up with a tax which really falls on profits and wages. So, I don't think that anybody can say, in the Legislature or in the Governor's office, that they proposed that particular Bill. The reason why the thing was signed, although the Governor didn't like that particular tax, was that it was more important that the processes of government continue than for the state to go bankrupt. And as a consequence the Governor chose the way of permitting the Bill to become a law without signing it and giving it his approval. He approved of the idea of balancing the budget but not of the specific tax. I'm sorry I have taken so long.

(Applause)

ALLEN B. CROW: Gentlemen, we have many questions. We shall direct one to Commissioner Leonard, and then allow him the corresponding six minutes that Governor Williams has just taken. (Laughter) Also, Commissioner, understand that your answer to this question will be within the six minutes. (Laughter)Then we shall adjourn the meeting because we shall have between now and the first Tuesday in November to continue this discussion. Commissioner Leonard, the question is:

(Reading Question) "THE DEMOCRATS HAVE STATED THAT THEIR PARTY IS THE ONLY PARTY INTERESTED IN LABOR AND LABOR PROGRAMS. HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS?"

HON. DONALD S. LEONARD: Well, that is a very fair question, Mr. Crow.

During my long service with the Michigan State Police and with the Detroit Police Department, there was not a time when I thought that I did anything else but protect the public interest. My relationships with the working man and the labor union officials were always most cordial. There is nothing that would prevent me from having -- and I would insist upon it -- an open door policy to the front office of Lansing, for not only labor, but also for all other segments of Michigan's population.

I think at times that the average working man has been sold a bill of goods by his union leader, that the

Democratic Party is the only party interested in his welfare. That is decidedly not the case. I have been a working man all of my life, and have personally earned every dime that I have. Incidentally I am unemployed at the present time, too! I'm trying to remedy that situation after January 1st. I thought it was the proper thing to do, to quit as Police Commissioner, instead of campaigning on the public payroll.

But at any rate, coming back to the question, I want the working man to know that the Republican Party does have his interest at heart. One of the things that grieved me during the campaign was to pick up the papers of the labor unions. They had the slates of candidates with the recommended candidates -- and they just had the Democratic candidates and the Democratic Party. They didn't even indicate who the Republican candidates were, and this was in a primary. Certainly, I think that they would be entitled to show a preference between the Republican and Democratic nominees in the run-off in the election, but in a primary I think that the working man is entitled to know from his union people who they consider on either party would be a friend of the working man.

I want to assure labor in Michigan that if I am Governor of the State of Michigan, at all times will I recognize the valid objectives of labor. The door of the Governor's office will at all times be open.

I think that that puts my position rather unequivocably before you. And I do want to add that in situations that involve labor disturbances, the thing that is generally overlooked is that there is a public interest that is paramount to the selfish interest of either side of a labor dispute. (Applause) As Governor of the state of Michigan I would insist that the public interest be protected throughout, and I would be fair to all parties concerned -- management, as well as labor. Thank you.

(Applause)

HON. ARTHUR F. LEDERLE: I know we are all grateful to these two busy men for coming here at this time. You have been an excellent audience. The meeting is adjourned.

(Applause)

A D J O U R N M E N T

THE ABOVE TRANSCRIPT HAS BEEN PREPARED FROM A WIRE RECORDING OF WHAT WAS SAID AT THIS MEETING. GOVERNOR G. MENNEN WILLIAMS, HOWEVER, HAS NOT RETURNED HIS EDITED COPY, SO THAT IT MIGHT BE INCORPORATED IN THIS RECORD.

Excerpts from Address by Governor Williams
Annual Meeting, Michigan Judges' Association
Charlevoix, Michigan
September 2, 1954

The old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure finds its proof in no field more strongly than in the field of corrections, for, if we can prevent one young man from becoming a hardened criminal, the social and economic savings to society are great and multiplied many times. Such prevention would be a real blessing to society.

However, at our present state of knowledge about what makes people criminals, we cannot expect to reach the desired goal of completely preventing crime. We must, therefore, direct our attention towards salvaging as many youthful offenders as we can as we go along.

The courts of the state have available to them the use of probation as a substitute for imprisonment. Under the system of probation, we keep the offender out of an institution, place him under the supervision of a probation officer responsible to the court, and try to fashion a program of training and education to meet the needs of the probationer. If he turns out well, and most of them do, we have saved a good future citizen. If the probationer does not live up to his opportunity, the court may still sentence him to an institution.

Probation has been in use for many years now. The records of its performance is written clearly and demonstrates that courts possessed of the proper tools can do a fine job of rehabilitation and correction, especially of the youthful offender.

Aside from the sociological considerations that point in the direction of keeping good probation risks out of institutions where possible, the dollar and cents considerations weigh heavily on the side of using probation. This, of course, assumes adequate use of supervision so that society may be protected.

It may interest you to know that, on the dollar and cents side of the ledger alone, during the month of June 1954, men on probation in Michigan who were permitted to continue to be productive members of society earned over $1,504,000 in salaries and wages. And this does not measure the indirect savings -- the cost to the counties and the state when homes are broken and, through our welfare institutions, we must accept the responsibility of supporting dependent wives and children.

Looked at another way, in terms of dollars and cents cost to the state, an inmate at Marquette costs Michigan taxpayers $1,734 a year for his maintenance. At Jackson this cost would be $1,007.

On probation, the cost would average about $100 per case.

On a nationwide basis, the best estimates available indicate that our criminal courts throughout the country are using probation in about 35 per cent of their felony cases and in less than 10 per cent of the misdemeanor cases. The rate of use of probation seems to go up where the probation services are readily available to the courts and are of a high degree of competence.

The McCormick report which was issued following the Jackson riots gives some basis for believing that probation could be safely increased in Michigan while at the same time protecting the community. In order to determine if this is so and to what extent probation could be safely increased and what this would require in the way of personnel, the Corrections Department, at my suggestion last year, invited the National Probation and Parole Association to make a thorough study of probation services throughout Michigan. A sponsoring committee of citizens, headed by Judge Stephen J. Roth, was set up to give advice and guidance in this survey which is now nearing completion and the results of which will be available before the end of the year.

We in Michigan have made increased use of probation over the years. Since 1946 the number of felons on probation has risen from 5,542 to 9,278. This group has been served by a probation staff of 122 county probation officers and 13 state probation officers. According the recommendations of the National Probation and Parole association, a probation officer can give adequate guidance and supervision to 75 probationers or he can make 150 complete presentence investigations per year.

To reach the standards recommended, we in Michigan are short approximately 100 probation officers. Recognizing that the lack of qualified probation officers may be one reason in limiting a further increase in the use of probation in Michigan, I recommended to the Legislature that we add 17 probation officers to the state staff. This past session of the Legislature approved an increase of six.

In order to increase the available trained staff, as we sit down to prepare next year's budget, I will recommend an increase of at least 25 probation officers for next year and for the following years, until we come closer to this desirable standard.

However, we are not depending upon probation officers alone, and we have also recommended the establishment of a "pilot" probation recovery camp to handle those probationers who might not be able to make the grade if kept in their own community but who require a removal from their present environment if they are to be given the chance to be rehabilitated. The decision to move in the direction of increasing the probation staffs and to set up such a camp was the outgrowth of a meeting held in 1953 which was attended by representatives of the Attorney General and the associations of judges, chiefs of police, prosecutors and sheriffs. The leader in the effort to get legislative approval of this idea has been Judge Pugsley of Hart, and his efforts I am sure, are well known to all of you.

So far the legislation to permit the establishment of such camps passed the Senate but was not reported out of the Ways and Means Committee in the House. In order to move forward and obtain approval for this experiment, the Corrections Department informs me that it will again recommend the creation of a probation recovery camp, and I can assure you that I will support this idea.

While we may be doing a good job now, I am sure all of you agree that we probably could do still better given the tools with which to work.

Those young people, the first offenders, who can be salvaged should be accorded that opportunity, without sending them to prison if at all possible. We have a moral obligation to rehabilitate those first offenders who can be made into decent citizens. In addition to the moral obligation, the wise use of probation is a more economical use of society's limited funds.

My chief purpose in reviewing these points is to seek your co-operation and to offer mine in the extension and improvement of our probation services. I sincerely request your comments as to how the state can be further helpful to you, and I would like to know whether local government can undertake to do more than they are already doing.

The matter of saving or salvaging human lives by this process is of supreme importance, and the possibility of saving the taxpayer money in rendering greater service is not unworthy of our consideration. So again, in thanking you for your hospitality, I bespeak your comment and co-operation.

Excerpts from Address
by
The Honorable G. Mennen Williams
Governor of Michigan

Convention of Young Democrats of Colorado
Denver, Colorado
November 26, 1955

One hundred and eighty years ago, when he was about the age of you Young Democrats assembled here tonight, Patrick Henry arose in Virginia's House of Burgesses and pronounced the classic justification for all honest dissent, the classic challenge to those who would drift with the current despite the direction of the harbor of destiny or of the rocks of disaster.

The Declaration and Resolves of the First Continental Congress, clearly foreshadowing our Revolutionary War, were six months in the past at that moment, and the Declaration of Independence was still six months in the future. And, as Patrick Henry rose to speak, the timorous, the temporizers, the moderate shifted uneasily in their seats.

"Mr. President," said he. "No man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as the abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen who have just addressed the House. But different men often see the same subjects in different lights; and, therefore, I hope that it will not be thought disrespectful to those gentlemen, if, entertaining as I do, opinions of a character very opposite to theirs, I shall speak forth my sentiments freely and without reserve.

"This is no time for ceremony. The question before the House is one of awful moment to this country. In proportion to the magnitude of the subject, ought to be the freedom of the debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to God and our Country."

Thus spoke Patrick Henry, and thus, too, conscience obliges each of us to speak.

Gentlemen, no man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism, as well as the abilities, of the very worthy gentlemen and great Democrat who urged a course of moderation when he addressed the nation on television from Chicago last weekend. But this is no time for ceremony, anymore than it was 180 years ago. The question before us is one of awful moment now as it was then. Responsibility to God and country is no less compelling in 1955 than it was in 1775.

At the onset of our struggle for independence, there

undoubtedly were those who urged, as there are those who urge now, that moderation should be the spirit of the times, that our young nation should pause to catch its breath.

But I say to you what you must know already. If the timid, the temporizers, the compromisers had carried the day then, we would not be standing now where we stand tonight, on the free and independent soil of the greatest nation on earth -- a nation to whom the whole world so eagerly looks -- one half of it looking to us for leadership and hope, the other with a calculating eye to take advantage of our every slip, our every weakness.

Now our nation is beginning another of its quadrennial debates. We would be guilty of the most craven cowardice were we to permit this debate, through our own default, to degenerate into a spineless and self-defeating formality. These debates are the one time above all when the greatest and the very least of us are expected -- are indeed obligated -- to express ourselves fully and freely and to fight to the end for the things in which we believe with all of our hearts.

I would remind you, however, that the temporizers, those who look backward, those who are satisfied with the status quo, those who today grudgingly yield to the necessities of yesterday and hence never progress but always and inexorably slide back, are traditionally on the other side, not ours.

Democrats, traditionally and, God willing, forever, in spite of all odds, push doggedly ahead on the broad highroad to a greater and still greater tomorrow. It is upsetting now to hear from our side counsels for a pause for breath-taking and moderation -- counsels which I find difficult to believe can be seriously considered as Democratic Party policy.

As the Governor of one of our large industrial states, I have stood for seven years with my hat off to the determination, the courage and the capacity of our American people. For seven years as Governor, and in other official capacities before that, I have shared their hunger, not for bread -- they have that -- most of them -- but their hunger to begin to achieve the unsatisfied potential which they know they have in them -- their hunger for the fuller life God intended for all his children.

In candor, I must say that I was acutely disappointed by the Spirit of Chicago -- the spirit of temporizing with present problems, the spirit of doing nothing about burgeoning problems of the future until they are upon us as overwhelming emergencies, almost too great to handle -- the spirit of seeing the vision of a bright new day not as an

opportunity for a fuller life to be seized with gusto but as a problem of which to be apprehensive as requiring imagination and energy and courage -- a spirit of apprehension which would bed down and tuck in this great and aspiring people, urging upon them a tired and weary counsel of rest.

We have been resting for three years now, and have another year of rest ahead of us. For how much longer does the Spirit of Chicago urge that we continue resting? How long does the Spirit of Chicago estimate that it takes a vigorous and aspiring people to catch its breath?

If we followed the counsel of Chicago, I suspect we would find that we had relaxed ourselves into a position where we would have lost the last shred of our Democratic Party's identity as the nation's great and moving force -- a force without which this nation of ours never would have advanced, as it has advanced, from one great plateau to another in a long succession of ever higher and higher plateaus to the great height of our present eminence.

The Spirit of Chicago could bring us to the point where the American electorate, as it goes to the ballot box next November, could be hard put to distinguish between the parties -- even harder put to find the reason for making the change which must be made if we are not to turn flabby from resting.

This, far from being a fit time for resting, is a time which demands of our people some of the most far-reaching decisions any people anywhere ever has been called upon to make.

Our people may not yet know -- but it is incumbent upon their leaders to know -- that at this very moment we are on the threshold of the most astounding changes which man ever has made in his whole mode of living.

We have split the atom. But we, who must be the masters of the incredible power we have released, have not yet assured that we will not be its slaves. We have not yet assured that we will not be incinerated by this great new power which waits to be converted to peaceful and productive purposes in our factories, farms and homes.

Automation, for the first time in the history of man, opens our eyes to the possibility of freeing man from the back-breaking, sour-searing, animal tasks which are an affront to his dignity.

But we have not yet assured, we are far from assuring -- that the electronic brains, the electronic hands, the electronic backs now moving onto our assembly lines and into our offices will not merely displace humans by the millions without at the same time enabling them to enjoy the greater abundance of all of the world's goods which ever poured forth

from any cornucopia ever conceived this side of Heaven itself.

This is no time for resting, if we are to assure that the great mass of men will be enriched by the new techniques rather than impoverished, dislocated, and embittered by them.

We are at the beginning of a revolution in all of our sciences. We are at the beginning of a power revolution in which the challenge is to make a somewhat better use of the infinite power of the sun itself than it was in us to make of other, traditional, power sources.

We are at the beginning of a revolution in technology, a revolution which must be channeled in such a way that it will lead, for the first time in the history of man, to the human use of human beings.

We are in the midst of a political and social revolution the whole world over, a revolution which will overrun us with the rest of civilization -- maybe us first -- if we do not now exert ourselves to channel it toward good and noble ends rather than ends which are ignoble and unworthy.

The moment which faces us with the obligation to remold our political and social organizations in such a manner that they will not be outdated by the changes which already are coming to pass in science and technology, is not the moment to speak fearfully of rocking the boat. The boat is already tossing like a cork on the waves of such revolution as man never before in his whole history has experienced until now. It is not for us fearfully to whimper about rocking the boat. It is for us determinedly and fearlessly to chart a course toward the harbor of the great potential which is ours, rather than cower fearfully in dark uncertainty.

Our program in 1956 must be, to the third quarter of our century, what Woodrow Wilson's was to the first quarter and what Franklin D. Roosevelt's and Harry S. Truman's was to the second.

They were not timid men. They were not tired men. They did not pause to catch their breaths. In the face of great disaster or great opportunity, they did not counsel moderation.

We are a free people today, a going concern, only because they were men of courage who dared to face up to the problems of their time, men of vision who could see the tomorrow which is our today. We must have no smaller courage, no lesser vision. Let us remember the words of

Franklin Delano Roosevelt -- "The only thing we have to fear is fear itself -- nameless, unreasoning, unjustified terror which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

Consider just some of the problems of our day, and tell me then whether you believe that this is a time for resting.

Our school system is the despair of those to whom we have entrusted the responsibility of preparing our children for the real enjoyment of life and the duties of citizenship.

Right now, after three years of conferences and other meaningless gestures by a national government, which has no intention of doing what needs to be done, we are 300,000 classrooms and 160,000 teachers short of current needs.

At least one and one-half million children, a minimum estimate, are getting only such education as can be given them on double and triple sessions in temporary barracks, unused garages, church basements; almost half of the nation's school buildings are more than 30 years old; more than one out of every five are a half a century old or older.

It is estimated that more than a million children are attending schools which have nothing better than outside toilets, almost as many are going to schools which have no toilets of any kind, either inside or out. Twenty per cent of our children attend classes in buildings which are recognized firetraps. All this in a nation whose founders equated freedom with education, eventual slavery with the lack of it.

The Republican administration, whose experts have estimated that our construction needs in the elementary and secondary categories alone total at least $16 billion (a need for which I will submit a proposal to a White House Conference next week, incidentally) contributes, at the same time, the niggling sum of $100 million a year, or one one hundred and sixtieth of the need.

The Spirit of Chicago is scarcely more effective or munificent. It would tackle the problem with tools which would do scarcely more than the next-to-nothing which the Republican Administration is doing. Neither of them appears to have any proper realization of our children's educational needs, let alone the needs of millions of our adult citizens -- citizens who will be in no way prepared to cope with the new civilization which right now is dawning, until and unless they are educated or re-educated

in new techniques, upgraded in old skills.

We hear the fears expressed that we may not much longer be able to maintain our lead over Russia in certain technical skills on which the real life, not merely the economic life, of the nation depends. The fact is that the Russians already have passed us in several categories, and right now are graduating twice as many students from their technological schools as we are from ours. This does not seem to me to be an instance in which moderation, or comfortable resting, will quite fill the bill.

Nor does it seem to me that there is room for complaisance elsewhere. I detect a disposition to be hypnotized by the Republican chant of peace and prosperity.

But peace, to you and to me, means something more tranquil, more hopeful, than the current dissolution and rumbling all over the world, including Korea, out of which the Republicans reaped such a shameful and unconscionable harvest in the last campaign.

Peace, to you and to me, means a just peace, a peace where people have the right freely to select governments of their own choosing. A Republican peace which is a greenhouse for the seeds of unrest, rebellion, killings, destruction and despair in much of Africa, the Near East and the Far East is not the kind of peace that you want or I want.

As to prosperity, of course the nation prospers on a wide front. But the total production of goods and services must not be permitted to become the sole yardstick for measuring the prosperity of which this great nation is capable.

I for one do not believe there is any time for resting, any time for moderation, any time for complaisance, so long as millions of American families, even at the height of our prosperity, are still forced to exist, in some manner of their own miraculous devising, on wages which official Washington itself admits are inadequate for anything more than subsistence living.

It is not a resting time when some six million people have left the farm in the past decade to escape poverty, and when those who remain face a constant and progressive drop in income.

So long as some fifteen million American families are still housed in substandard dwellings, I would be ashamed to harken to the counsels of those who have proposed, in effect, that this is the ideal moment for a national coffee break.

I am made heartsick by those in my own party, who

do not militantly resist the spurious doctrine that, so long as our aged have some security -- so long as the most indigent get some medical care -- so long as the most uninhabitable of our tenements are torn down -- so long as unemployment is below the critical level part of the time -- our job is done, we can rest.

There is no time for resting, there is time only for doing, so long as the consumption of our great industrial output can be floated only on an uncharted sea of the overextension of consumer credit. Liberal credit, it is true, is one of the essentials of our economy. But if we can produce goods -- as we surely can, and as we surely will in even more staggering flow under the new technology -- then it seems to me that, given the will, given the energy, given the imagination, we also can devise a technique for distributing real income, real prosperity, rather than a prosperity which is borrowing on the prospects of earnings to come, betting against the possibility of accident, ill health, layoffs, other hazards which so few have escaped in the years the nation's leaders should remember, but apparently do not.

If moderation means the building of inadequate little dams instead of an adequate big one, as in your own neighboring Hell's Canyon, then I for one am opposed to moderation.

If it means hesitance in harnessing our great rivers for the service of the whole nation, then I am opposed to it. I would be as energetic and as unawed as were our forefathers, who in pursuit of a manifest destiny, hollowed the mountains, cut the forests, plowed the prairies to build a civilization from sea to shining sea.

If it means that our farmers must continue to be plowed under, as they are being plowed under, merely because the glib and the ignorant have attached opprobrious names to such proposals as the Brannan Plan -- probably the best hope yet submitted for feeding both the hungry and the farmer -- then I am opposed to it.

If it means the support or retention of legislation, such as the McCarran-Walter Act, which is an affront to the dignity of our own citizens and a continuing threat to our esteem abroad, I am opposed to it, for I do not see how a man can subscribe both to the constitutional theory that all men are born equal and, at the same time, to legislation which is based on the opposite theory that some of them are more equal than others.

If it means anything less than constant drive, anything less than the pushing of political democracy into all corners of the earth, anything less than the creation of economic democracy, anything small when it is something big which alone will suffice, then I am opposed to it.

To me, the suggestion that we can coast along for yet another little while is just plain nonsense. There is only one direction in which it is possible to coast -- down hill.

And what, I ask, is in store for the nation which coasts down the hill instead of driving up? Who, then, favors moderation, a pretty euphemism, but coasting, even so? Certainly not the American farmer who has suffered the whiplash of moderation and so-called flexibility until he has been driven to desperation. Today the American farmer demands not moderation but a program of heroic courage.

Certainly not American labor, as it now undertakes the gigantic task of forming one single house for all the organized workers of America! Certainly not labor, as it drives ahead against all odds to win for American workingmen the guaranteed annual wage which they should have had long ago to help to assure against the hazards of unemployment, seasonal, so-called, or otherwise.

Certainly American management has not espoused moderation -- management which, in the last year, has invested more in capital improvements than at any time in our history!

Certainly not management, which, next year, even while the timid are urging moderation, will invest more than thirty-three billion in capital outlay.

Certainly the American people do not espouse it -- the American people who look forward to the future with such confidence that they are filling our great land with more new and larger family units than ever before.

Certainly the Democratic Party should be the last to espouse it! Certainly the Democratic Party should admit no moderation in its devotion to the cause of human dignity. Certainly, in these grandly adventurous and challenging times, the Democratic Party should stand more firmly and vigorously than ever for the principles which have brought it the trust of the people and the responsibilities of leadership.

At this moment I am not sure who stands where in the fight for social justice and human betterment. I know not what course others may take. But as for me, I would rather be hanged as a rebel in the ranks of those fighting for a fuller life for all of our people than to hold a commission in the army of General Apathy and General Despair.

This, I say to you, is not the time for moderation; it is not the time for continued resting; it is not the time for catching our breath.

This is the time for vision. This is the time for courage. This is the time for action. It is the time for getting up off the seat of our pants, and confidently and courageously doing the job that waits to be done.

This is the spirit of Democracy -- the spirit of America -- the spirit of victory in '56.

Excerpts from Address by Governor Williams
National Conference of Catholic Charities and
Annual Meeting, Society of St. Vincent de Paul
Grand Rapids, Michigan
November 9, 1955. 6:30 p.m.

For many reasons, including the contribution which you will make to my own thinking on many matters, it is heart-warming and inspiring to participate in the activities of such groups as are assembled here tonight. I thank you for counting me in.

Ours is a great and much blest nation. Much of its strength lies in the activities and the cohesion and the philosophy of just such groups as are represented at this conference of Catholic charities and meeting of the St. Vincent de Paul Society -- great groups who proudly, freely and fully assent to the Divine teaching that all men, as children of God, are brothers one to another, and that each of us is his brothers' keeper.

This is not always an easy concept, and I think perhaps it needs to be explored. It involves something of a conflict in our very nature.

And it is for this reason -- the reason that we are brothers no matter how we might sometimes wish to deny it, and that we must stem our conflicts -- it is for this reason that we might look tonight, I think, through a gateway which has not yet been opened all of the way to us, but which is now on the verge of opening. It will, I hope, be a mutually profitable look -- profitable to you as church and civic leaders in communities spread out over all sections of this great land of ours, profitable to me who prayerfully strives to merit the trust which our people put in their Governors and other public servants.

It is a gateway not only to a new, richer, fuller way of life; it is a gateway to what almost might be called a new culture, so splendid is its prospect -- the push button prospect, the solar energized, automation-organized prospect of an economy of abundance rather than of scarcity, an economy of great leisure rather than of the sweat of men's backs and brows, an economy in which man, for the first time since Adam's fall, will have the opportunity to spend less of their concern on the earning of the mere wherewithal of life and more on spiritual things and the legitimate joys of living.

It is a remarkable prospect which opens; so remark-

able that even the most reverent --(perhaps it is BECAUSE they are reverent) -- will wonder why it is that the Creator of all things has picked this particular moment in man's history for blessing us as we can be blessed in this new day which is dawning.

Can it be because we have proved ourselves worthy? In some ways, it seems to me that ours may be one of the least worthy of all of the ages of Man. We cannot, of course, inquire into God's purpose, but it is perhaps permissible to wonder if it may not be because he wishes to show us, at long last, that there is such little reason for so much of our blundering, wishes to demonstrate that the earth all of these centuries has been planted with sufficient fruit for all, wishes to show that poverty and depression we do NOT always have to have with us, wishes to show that He has provided for even us the least of His children, and that for all of our darkness there is in each of us a God-given light which can show through if we will but let it.

It is not at all certain that we have yet prepared either our minds or our hearts for tomorrow's great promise. If the new abundance is permitted to whet our old avarice, we are lost, economically as well as spiritually.

And it is for this reason that new and greater emphasis must be placed now and forever henceforth on the spirit of BROTHERHOOD, the spirit of NEIGHBORLINESS. May you continue to foster this spirit around our churches and other religious organizations, (not only of your own, but of all denominations), around our civic groups as well, and, even more particularly, around that most important of all of the units of our society, the family unit.

Without this neighborliness, this friendliness, this constant concern of all of these groups for all others, GOVERNMENT, at whatever level, and however strong, would be a helpless and frustrated thing. One of your own great priests, Father Mark Fitzgerald, at Sacred Heart Church at Notre Dame a few years ago, argued that the REVERSE, of course, is true also.

The best of us in our noblest pursuits -- (and even if we ALL were noble) --would be thoroughly and utterly frustrated, if it were not for the civil authority. He shocked some, I think, with his cogent and certainly not humorless argument, that even were our temporal society composed exclusively of the sanctified, it still would need a civil authority to coordinate and direct the efforts of its citizens toward the common good, it being his point that even the saints do not think as one. (As a Democratic Governor who currently is embattled with certain Republican leaders in the State Senate, I might perhaps be excused

for venturing, here, the thought that certainly the UN-sanctified do not always think as one.)

The point which the good priest wished to make was simply the point that WE ARE mutually dependent -- you, in the church and civic groups to which you give so much of your time, and your President, your Governors, your legislators and others who have been vested with the civil authority.

Here let me pause both for example and for tribute to a great leader of the church and an outstanding citizen of our state and nation, the late well-beloved Bishop Haas.

As you well know, the presence, at long last, of a Fair Employment Practices law on the statute books of the state is in no small measure due to his inspiration and efforts. FEPC legislation is, of course, legislative promotion of brotherhood. As we all recognize only too well, one can LEGISLATE neither BROTHERHOOD nor MORALS, but by legislation one can help PROMOTE the spirit of BROTHERHOOD and MORALITY and can help DETER the forces of DIVISION and AMORALITY. Bishop Haas evidently believed this, and his good works will continue to bless the people of Michigan not only through the love of God and man instilled in countless hearts, but in the civil authority and administration he set up to help keep men in the paths of brotherhood.

It is this point of mutual dependence of yourselves and the civil authority in reaching common objectives which I too would like to emphasize, for there are those who are so curiously frightened by the NEIGHBORLINESS to which you in your private charities have dedicated your lives, and so contemptuous of the efforts of government to attain this selfsame kind of BROTHERHOOD amongst men, that they would frustrate both of us.

They impede you by insisting that the responsibility which you have shouldered is the state's responsibility. They impede the state by the contrary insistence that the responsibility rests in private hands outside of the state's authority. By the impediment which they erect on all sides, they hamper both of us in the full exercise of that Christian charity with which all men have been charged by their Creator.

We are hampered in all of our undertakings. And it is not always by the rapacious. We are equally hampered by those who are ignorant of the legitimacy and necessity of our purposes, and hence are frightened by them. We are hampered by sloth. We are hampered by a strange and truly alarming kind of dissolution of our fundamental institutions -- the family, respect for authority, the acceptance of responsibil-

ity. We are hampered even by our misunderstandings of each other.

We are hampered by those who argue that Government has grown too big and too powerful, yet forget that Government is only a part of ourselves and operates only with our help.

In the field of juvenile delinquency, for example, Government, without the active help of parents, is powerless to do anything but open its houses of detention, and this, believe me, is not the cure for the hoodlumism that is plaguing us not only in all of our big cities but at our crossroads as well.

We are hampered, both of us -- you in your charities and the government in its responsibilities -- by those who do not know that THEY and YOU together are the government, that government is not some kind of amorphous thing, a cancerous growth on the body politic, but that government and people ARE, or OUGHT to be, synonomous. We, all of us together, are the Government, and we must not permit ourselves to be split apart, divided, to be driven to cross purposes.

We have mutual responsibilities in more fields than can be explored here tonight. Our responsibilities are mutual, we need each other, in the field of CHILD care, to name one of these areas -- and even more particularly in the field of MENTALLY RETARDED children, if you will forgive me for coming right down to instant cases.

You, in your field, are doing a great and charitable work in the help you are able to give to your government, and the help you freely ACCEPT from your government, in providing such care for these unfortunate children as both of us together are able to give. But where are the hearts, where is the Christian charity of those others, who profess not to understand what we are about in the current crisis, who would provide us, for crass dollars and cents reasons, with facilities which at best are grossly inadequate to do the job?

Your own Monsignor O'Grady has put forth the suggestion that it would be tragic were government to usurp or intrude upon the services which the various religious organizations should provide, and WOULD provide, did they have adequate support of an adequate number of people.

With this I am in fullest agreement.

And I am sure the Monsignor also will be in full agreement with me, when I assert that the tragedy lies not so much in the fact that Government TRIES to do what it

properly can do in this field, but that in the field where it properly can do things, it does less than, in humanity, it should do.

To DO, of course, is one of Government's main functions: to do, as Lincoln said, "to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done but cannot do at all -- or cannot do so well -- for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities." The tragedy lies in the fact that a situation has developed in which the Government has HAD to step in.

At the other end of the scale, in the area of the aged as distinguished from our children, the problem repeats itself, as it does in so many other areas.

Government can do for the aged some of the things which neither the aged themselves nor all of the charitable agencies in the nation can do so well. It can provide them, in one degree or another and through one device or another with the necessities of life, even with a sense of decency.

But it has not provided them with what they need even more than bread: the satisfaction of their craving to be useful, to do constructive work, to maintain their independence, their initiative, their dignity.

Government cannot do all of this alone, of course. But Government policy should be to encourage rather than to discourage. And we as a people should re-orient our thinking and our customs to promote and establish such a situation.

It is you and your kind who can and DO so do to the limits which are possible.

The regret is that there ARE LIMITS beyond which even you cannot go , in the present GENERAL lack of the Christian charity which you yourselves exercise.

What is lacking in all this -- what is lacking in so many and such influential places in this otherwise great land of ours -- what is lacking, indeed, throughout the world -- is the lack of a proper understanding of a concept set forth so beautifully by Monsignor O'Grady in a letter to to my office last week.

"That concept" -- and I am quoting here from his letter -- "is the fundamental Christian concept that all Christians are members of the Mystical Body of Christ, and that the neighborhood personal service or charity is the great bond that joins them together; it is in fact the bond that joins ALL men together, whether they know it or not."

Your own Monsignor O'Grady, again, has suggested that the kind of help which Government can give to our people, the kind of service which the professionals in the field can offer, may not supply the kind of dynamism which is necessary for a truly democratic American community of organized brotherhood. This must come from volunteer groups such as your own, from our families, from the teachings with which our children are imbued in their earliest beginnings.

This can perhaps be put another way.

The work which GOVERNMENT, which the PROFESSIONALS, do, is a good and necessary work. The job must be done. But other groups, such as those represented here tonight, supply the pulsating heart, the CHRISTIAN, as distinguished from the merely CHARITABLE, drive.

May our good Lord bless you in all of your undertakings, as I pray that he will guide and inspire me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Acheson, Dean. A Democrat Looks at His Party. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.

Bald, F. Clever. Michigan in Four Centuries. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1954.

Bone, Hugh A. American Politics and the Party System. New York: McGraw Hill Company, Inc., 1949.

Brigance, William Norwood. Speech Composition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1937.

Eldersveld, Samuel J., and Applegate, Albert A. Michigan Recounts for Governor, 1950-1952. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954.

Eldersveld, Samuel J., and Pollock, James K. Michigan Politics in Transition. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1942.

Gilman, Wilbur E., Aly, Bower, and Reid, Loren D. The Fundamentals of Speaking. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951.

Gray, Giles W., and Wise, Claude M. The Bases of Speech. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Herring, Pendleton. The Politics of Democracy. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1940.

LaPalombara, Joseph. Guide to Michigan Politics. Prepared for the Citizenship Clearing House, affiliated with the Law Center of New York Union, Washington Square, New York 3, New York.

Oliver, Robert T. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1946.

Rothe, Anna (ed.). Current Biography. Newark: H. H. Wilson Company, 1949.

Thonssen, Lester, and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1948.

Zevin, B. D. (ed.). Nothing to Fear. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1946.

Articles and Periodicals

Norton-Taylor, Duncan. "What's Wrong with Michigan?" Fortune Magazine. January, 1955.

Thruelsen, R. "When Michigan Woke Up He Was Governor," Saturday Evening Post, February 12, 1949.

Time. September 15, 1952, and November 15, 1948.

Wallace, Robert. "Soapy' Williams," Life, March 7, 1949.

Newspapers

Belding (Michigan) Banner. June 30, 1949.

Christian Science Monitor. May 6, 1954.

Courier Buffalo Express. November 18, 1955.

Daily Monitor (Mount Clemens, Michigan). July 5, 1949.

Detroit Free Press. November 29, 1955.
July 20, 1949.
October 12, 1949.
September 22, 1951.
January 9, 1949.
September 21, 1954.

Holland (Michigan) News. May 17, 1949.

Lansing (Michigan) State Journal. January 1, 1949.
October 23, 1949.

Lapeer County Press (Lapeer, Michigan). March 10, 1949.

Saginaw (Michigan) News. September 12, 1952.
August 5, 1956.
July 31, 1949.

St. Petersburg (Florida)Times. January 29, 1956.

Tuscola County Pioneer Times (Vassar, Michigan). August 5,1949.

Other Sources

Carr, Edmund Samuel. Personal letter, July 10, 1956.

Members of G. Mennen Williams' staff. Personal interviews, July, 1956.

Weber, Paul. Personal interview, July 10, 1956.

Williams, G. Mennen. Personal interview, July 8, 1956.

_____. Manuscript of speech delivered at Alpena, Michigan, October 18, 1954.