THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MODES OF PROOF IN ROBERT S. KERR'S SENATE SPEECHES ON CONSERVATION

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

BY

WILLIAM B. ENGLISH

Norman, Oklahoma

1964

UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
LIBRARY

Downloaded from SHAREOK. Persistent Handle URL: https://hdl.handle.net/11244/323805

378.76
OkO
En365a
cop. 2

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MODES OF PROOF IN ROBERT S. KERR'S SENATE SPEECHES ON CONSERVATION

A THESIS

APPROVED FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH

APPROVED BY

[redacted]

THESIS COMMITTEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Justification of the Study	1
	Purpose and Scope	3
	Previous Research	6
	Availability of Materials	8
	Plan of the Study	10
II.	BIOGRAPHY OF KERR'S LIFE	11
	Early Life: 1896-1942	11
	Heritage	11
	Education	13
	Early Career	14
	Oil Career	15
	Early Political Career	16
	Governor: 1942-1946	17
	The Campaign	17
	Accomplishments as Governor	17
	The 1944 National Campaign	20
	Senator: 1948-1963	22
	Interests as a Senator	22
	Influence as a Senator	24
	Kerr's Plan for Conservation	26
	Events Which Influenced Kerr's Interest in Conservation	26
	Action Taken in the Senate	28
	Kerr's Book	29
III.	KERR'S ASSETS AND LIABILITIES	31
	Introduction	31
	Heritage	32
	The Kerr Fortune	32
	Political Philosophy	34
	Kerr as an Oklahoman	34
	The Oklahoma Criterion	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Applying the Oklahoma Criterion	36
	Conflict of Interests	38
	Religion	39
	Intellectual Traits	44
	Intelligence	44
	Memory	45
	Listening	45
	Diligence	46
	Physical Traits	46
	Stamina	46
	Size	47
	Voice	48
	Speaking Traits	48
	Study of Legislation	48
	Preparation of Speeches	49
	Debating Ability	49
	Sarcasm	51
	Wit and Humor	57
	Kerr's Gregariousness	59
IV.	THE MODES OF PROOF	60
	Introduction	60
	Logical Proof	64
	Importance	64
	Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of Kerr's Logical Proof	66
	Argumentative Development in Kerr's Senate Speeches on Conservation	67
	Exposition	67
	Arguments and Evidence	70
	Emotional Proof	82
	Importance	82
	Factors Contributing to the Success of Kerr's Emotional Proof	83
	Emotional Appeals in Senate Speeches on Conservation	85

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Explicit Appeals	85
	Implicit Appeals	89
	Ethical Proof	92
	Importance	92
	The Kerr Image	93
	Political Philosophy	93
	Sarcasm and Invective	95
	The Kerr Fortune	95
	Heritage	96
	Religion	96
	Physical Traits	97
	Personality	97
	Intellectual Traits	98
	Speaking Traits	99
	Ethical Appeals in Kerr's Senate Speeches on Conservation	100
V.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	104
	Assets and Liabilities	104
	Assets	104
	Liabilities	105
	The Modes of Proof	106
	Kerr's Use of the Modes of Proof	110
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	112
	APPENDIX A	117
	APPENDIX B	122

AN ANALYSIS OF THE MODES OF PROOF IN ROBERT S. KERR'S SENATE SPEECHES ON CONSERVATION

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Justification of the Study

"A giant has fallen,"[1] editorialized the Daily Oklahoman in reference to Senator Robert Samuel Kerr's death on January 1, 1963. Kerr was, perhaps, one of the most powerful political figures in the history of Oklahoma and certainly one of the state's most colorful. At the age of sixty-six, and in his third term as a United States Senator, Kerr was in the prime of his political power. Said Republican Governor-elect Henry Bellmon, "Few men in our history have reached the pinnacle of power attained by Senator Kerr."[2]

Kerr served as chairman of the Senate Aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee and headed the Rivers and

---

[1] Daily Oklahoman (Oklahoma City), January 2, 1963, p. 1.

[2] As cited in ibid.

Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee. He was also the ranking member of the powerful Finance Committee and a member of the Policy Committee. President Kennedy remarked that in the preceding two years alone "almost every major bill enacted bore the mark of his untiring leadership and skill."[3]

From the time he became governor of Oklahoma in 1943, through his Senate tenure, Kerr was frequently the object of nationwide attention. President Franklin D. Roosevelt asked Kerr to keynote the Democratic National Convention in 1944. Characteristically, Kerr tore up a speech prepared by the Democratic National Committee and delivered one of his own invention. The delegates loved it; and, from that time on, Bob Kerr was a national figure. As a Senator, Kerr was the first to come to the support of President Truman after the dismissal of General Douglas MacArthur and was one of the first in Congress to publicly attack President Dwight D. Eisenhower's policies.

Kerr's only political defeat came in 1952, when he attempted to gain the Democratic Party nomination for President. After his defeat, he said he had no further political ambitions in this direction but would be content to serve Oklahoma in the United States Senate.

Every senator serves his state. Bob Kerr did more

---

[3]As cited in ibid.

than that. He was the champion defender and developer of Oklahoma. No other man fought so hard and achieved so much in the area of conservation projects for his state. His tireless efforts and long hours earned him the title "Uncrowned King of the Senate."[4] "Where is the leader who can take his place?" asked the Daily Oklahoman. It is an appropriate question, for, indeed, Robert Kerr would be more than difficult to replace.

The U. S. News and World Report described Kerr as a "burly Oklahoman," "accomplished orator," and "canty politician."[5] Said William White of the Senator, "He is one of the best rough-and-tumble debaters in the Senate."[6] As early as 1950, when Kerr had been in the Senate only two years, Bendiner stated, "Robert Kerr has the reputation of being one of the most persuasive statesmen on Capitol Hill."[7]

Purpose and Scope

Even Kerr's political opponents agreed that he was an effective orator and debater. It took, of course, more than oratory to gain Kerr the title "Uncrowned King of the

---

[4]Joe Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Kansas City Star, September 16, 1962, Sec. D.

[5]"Democratic Prodders Take Field: Seek to Win Congress Back in '54," U. S. News and World Report, XXIV (February 20, 1953), 59.

[6]William S. White, "Democrats Board of Directors," New York Times Magazine, July 10, 1955, p. 10.

[7]Robert Bendiner, "The Raid on the Gas Fields," Nation, CLXX (March, 1950), 218.

Senate." Numerous accounts, however, indicate that his ability as a speaker contributed to his position as one of the most powerful figures in the Senate.[8]

Since Kerr's persuasiveness as a speaker constituted a major reason for his political power, one is justified in seeking the reason or reasons why he was a successful orator. Such a study is in the realm of the rhetorical critic, for as Thonssen and Baird have stated:

> Rhetorical criticism helps to interpret the function of oral communication in society. It serves as an effective link between the theory of public address and the outside world. Devoted largely as it is to a determination of the effect or outcome of a speech, it reveals the nature of the process by which a communicative intent finally implements, or fails to implement, social action. . . . Rhetorical criticism traces the major steps in oral communication straight through to the effect, immediate or delayed, of the spoken discourse upon society.[9]

This study is limited to only one aspect of Kerr's rhetoric—artistic proofs. In the Rhetoric, Aristotle draws a distinction between artistic and inartistic proofs:

> By the latter [inartistic proofs] I mean such things as are not supplied by the speaker but are there at

---

[8]Business Week for July 28, 1962, "Kerr Switches Sides to Push Trade Bill," p. 85, believed Kerr's power in the Senate stemed from four major sources: (1) his masterful skill as a debater and speaker; (2) his position on some of the most powerful purse-string committees in the Senate; (3) his membership in the inside informal brotherhood in the Senate; and (4) his personal fortune estimated at more than $40 million. This list, however, is by no means complete. Among other assets, Kerr enjoyed an excellent staff, a pleasant personality, and an outstanding memory.

[9]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949), p. 21.

> the outset—witnesses, evidence given under torture, written contracts, and so on. By the former [artistic proofs] I mean such as we can ourselves construct by means of the principles of rhetoric. The one kind has merely to be used, the other has to be invented.[10]

According to Thonssen and Baird, the components of artistic proofs—or, as they are popularly known, the modes of persuasion—constitute the basic pattern for much of the contemporary work in rhetorical criticism.[11] Rhetoricians generally accept Aristotle's concept that the modes of persuasion "are of three kinds, consisting either in the moral character of the speaker or in the production of a certain disposition in the audience or in the speech itself by means of real or apparent demonstration."[12] These modes of persuasion in the order mentioned by Aristotle are referred to as ethos, pathos, and logos.

In short, while recognizing that many factors contributed to Kerr's success, this study tests the hypothesis that Kerr's use of the modes of proof constitutes a major reason for his success as a speaker. It is limited to an analysis of the modes of proof in Kerr's Senate speaking and makes no effort to consider the characteristics of style, delivery, or arrangement. Such material is, perhaps, an area for further investigation.

---

[10]Trans. by W. Rhys Roberts, in The Basic Works of Aristotle, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), 1355b.

[11]Thonssen and Baird, p. 59.

[12]Rhetoric, 1356a.

This study is further limited to an analysis of Kerr's Senate speeches on conservation. For the purpose of this study, the word "speech" is defined as oral discourse, including debates, questions, and short explanatory statements.[13] The term "conservation" is defined as that which is concerned with the development of natural resources and thus includes speeches dealing with electric power generated by dammed water.

The audience to be considered in this study is the immediate one—United States Senators. While one could argue that Kerr considered a second audience, his constituents, in his use of the modes of proof, it is common knowledge that few citizens read the Congressional Record wherein Kerr's Senate speeches are contained. In essence, the public is usually informed through the media of the press, and even then, the majority of material is released by the public official himself.

Previous Research

A search in Doctoral Dissertations Accepted by American Universities; Dissertation Abstracts: Abstracts of Dissertations and Monographs in Microfilm; Auer's "Doctoral Dissertations in Speech: Work in Progress"; Knower's "Graduate Theses: An Index of Graduate Work in Speech"; Cleary's "A Bibliography of Rhetoric and Public

---

[13]An annotated list of the speeches used in this study appears in appendix A. All of Kerr's Senate discourse concerning conservation was examined.

Address"; and the Index of the Quarterly Journal of Speech revealed that no research has been done in the subject area of this thesis. Moreover, examination of the above sources indicated that no previous graduate research has been attempted concerning any facet of the speaking of Robert S. Kerr.

However, shortly before the Democratic National Convention in 1952, an article entitled "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," appeared in the October issue of the Quarterly Journal of Speech. This study was an attempt to understand and analyze contemporary public speaking. John W. Keltner and R. Victor Harnack, then teaching at the University of Oklahoma, contributed a brief evaluation of Kerr's political speaking to the symposium.[14] This paper represents the only known published attempt to analyze the late Senator's rhetoric.

There is no definitive biography of Kerr's life, although a member of Kerr's staff is in the process of writing one. However, biographical sketches of the Senator's early life appear in Who's Who in America, XXVI (1950-1951) and the fourth edition of Current Biography: Who's News

---

[14]"Robert S. Kerr," in "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (October, 1952), 295-297.

and Why (1950).[15] Other sources which shed light on Kerr's life and speaking include Marquis W. Childs's article "The Big Boom from Oklahoma,"[16] "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," by Daniel Seligman,[17] and "The Tall Teetotaler from Indian Territory," by Arthur Krock.[18]

Availability of Materials

In 1948 Senator Kerr selected the manuscripts division of the University of Oklahoma library as the repository for his papers and documents. Upon Kerr's election to the Senate, the division received the Senator's papers, which ranged from 1909 until 1946 when he completed his term as governor of Oklahoma. This material has been classified and stored. Shortly before Kerr's death, the manuscripts division began receiving the remainder of the Kerr Papers. At this date, they have received the entire

---

[15]The best biographical sketch of Kerr appears in Current Biography: Who's News and Why. The earliest biographical sketch of Kerr is by Otis Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," in Public Men In and Out of Office, edited by J. T. Salter (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946), pp. 415-427. The article is concerned only with Kerr's term as governor of Oklahoma.

[16]Saturday Evening Post CCXXI (April 9, 1949), 22-23, 118-120.

[17]Fortune, LIX (March, 1959), 136-138, 179-188.

[18]New York Times, February 7, 1952. Other items supplying biographical data are located in the bibliography.

Kerr Collection.[19]

Gaining access to the collection of Kerr's Papers at first posed two problems. Only a small portion of the papers are classified, and the material necessary for this study was unclassified.[20] Moreover, they are closed and became available for this study only by permission of the Kerr family.[21] Further, it was necessary to gain authorization to work in the unclassified material of the collection. Examining these papers presented the second problem: The papers had been shipped in mail sacks with the contents not designated. Moreover, they had not been properly bundled and were in a state of total confusion. A complete examination, therefore, could be conducted only by a review of all the papers. This review revealed a great deal of material relevant to this study, but more that was irrelevant.

The other sources necessary for this project are available and in print. These include national magazine articles regarding Kerr's Senate tenure and political

---

[19]The Kerr Papers include legislative materials primarily concerning military affairs, agriculture, conservation and water projects, fiscal policy, and the petroleum industry. Other papers include Kerr's general correspondence, campaign materials, speeches, services to constituents and veterans, letters from constituents, the original typed manuscript of Kerr's book Land, Wood and Water, pictures, and newspaper clippings.

[20]Dr. A. M. Gibson, head of the University of Oklahoma Manuscripts Division reports that classification of the remainder of Kerr's Papers will not begin until late in 1964 and will probably take a year to complete.

[21]See letters in appendix B.

philosophy, the Congressional Record from 1949-1963, the Daily Oklahoman 1941-1963, and the New York Times 1941-1963.

The Plan of the Study

Following this introduction, Kerr, the man, is examined in Chapter II. The purpose of this chapter is not, however, to present a complete biography of Kerr's life, but to consider only those aspects of his life that contributed to his political philosophy and speaking ability.

Chapter III is devoted to an examination of Kerr's assets and liabilities and, like Chapter II, is descriptive rather than analytical. Eight of Kerr's characteristic traits are studied: heritage, wealth, political philosophy, religion, intellectual traits, physical traits, speaking traits, and personality. In essence, the chapter provides, as does Chapter II, the background material necessary for Chapter IV.

Chapter IV is an analysis of Kerr's use of ethos, pathos, and logos in his Senate speeches on conservation. The chapter is divided into three parts, each examining a single mode of proof. The three parts are subdivided into an examination of (1) those qualities which Kerr brought to the rhetorical situation which were significant in the development of the proof, and (2) an analysis of the proof itself in Senate discourse.

A final chapter is devoted to a summary, an evaluation of Kerr's use of the modes of proof, and the conclusions drawn from this study.

CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHY OF KERR'S LIFE

The purpose of this chapter is not to present a complete examination of Kerr's life but, instead, to consider only the most important aspects and events of Kerr's career which are essential to understand him as a speaker. Thonssen and Baird contend that the preparation of the speaker and his background figures strongly in an analysis of the modes of proof. They state: "Studies rest on sound precedent . . . in stressing the importance of the orator's background for a full understanding of the speeches. . . ."[1]

Early Life: 1896-1942

Heritage

John W. Keltner and R. Victor Harnack have called Kerr a "modern Horatio Alger,"[2] and a review of his biography gives justification to the claim. He was born in a log cabin on September 11, 1896, and was one of a few politicians

---

[1]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949), p. 336.

[2]"Robert S. Kerr," in "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (October, 1952), 295.

who could accurately claim that distinction. His parents, William Samuel Kerr and Margaret Wright Kerr, were of Scotch-Irish and English descent. Mrs. Kerr gave birth to six children, Bob being the second and the oldest boy. Following the birth of their first child, the Kerrs moved from Texas, across the Red River, to Indian Territory and leased 160 acres of restricted Indian land in what is now South Central Oklahoma. They lived in a tent the first winter and until Sam Kerr built a log cabin, fourteen feet square.[3] The log cabin still stands as a monument marking the birth of Oklahoma's first native-born governor and United States Senator.

Sam Kerr, young Bob's father, was a man of many talents. He was a farmer, rancher, rural school teacher, merchant, and cotton buyer. When Oklahoma was admitted to the Union in 1907, Sam Kerr owned a small country store. He sold his store and accepted a position as the first county clerk of Pontotoc County. When his term as county clerk had expired, Sam Kerr found himself without a means of support for his family.[4] It was then that Robert Kerr received his first advice concerning politics. His father told him that he could reach any goal in life, even governor of the state, if he would only work hard enough; and he warned, "But don't go into politics before you have built economic security

---

[3]"Bob Kerr's History, as He Lived It in Oklahoma," Kerr Papers, University of Oklahoma Division of Manuscripts, pp. 1-2.

[4]John Gunther, Inside U.S.A. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 882.

for your family and yourself. That's the best way, and there is no sense in both of us making the same mistake."[5] It was sound advice which Bob followed.

Education

Robert Kerr received his early education in the public schools in Ada. He later attended Oklahoma Baptist University at Shawnee and the East Central State Normal School in Ada, thereafter teaching elementary school for two years. The autumn of 1915 found young Robert borrowing $350 to attend the University of Oklahoma Law School.[6] At the University he wrote his father for permission to play football. His father's reply—"I would rather have made Bryan's Cross-of-Gold speech in 1896 than to have won every athletic contest which has taken place since Cain and Abel ran their first foot race on the banks of the Euphrates"[7]—ended Bob's football career before it began and was perhaps the embryonic stage of his interest and success in public speaking. Following his father's advice, Bob joined the University debate team, remaining active until he exhausted his money which forced him to leave school in 1916.

---

[5]As cited in "The Kerr Story," Kerr Papers, University of Oklahoma Division of Manuscripts, p. 3.

[6]Otis Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," in Public Men In and Out of Office, edited by J. T. Salter (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946), p. 425.

[7]As cited in Marquis W. Childs, "The Big Boom from Oklahoma," Saturday Evening Post, CCXXI (April 9, 1949), 23.

Early Career

In the summer following his year at the University of Oklahoma Robert Kerr began a brief career as a magazine salesman. In Webb City, Missouri, he made a sales talk to B. Robert Elliott, a lawyer. After a period of strenuous argument Elliott said, "I don't give a damn about your magazine, young man, but I'll give you one hundred dollars a month to work for me."[8] Kerr accepted the proposal, but only after Elliott agreed to purchase a subscription to the magazine. This association lasted until the United States entered World War I almost a year later.

With the outbreak of the first World War, Kerr enlisted and received training at Fort Logan H. Roots in Arkansas. He went overseas in August of 1918, commissioned a second lieutenant, but the Armistice was signed while his division was preparing to go to the front.[9]

On his return to the United States in 1919, Kerr married and borrowed capital and entered the produce business near his home in Ada. His career was short-lived. A fire destroyed his uninsured produce house and left him in heavy debt. Tragedy again struck Robert Kerr when only a short time later his wife and son died in childbirth.[10]

---

[8]As cited in Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," p. 425.

[9]Ibid.

[10]Robert T. Elson, "A Question for Democrats: if Not Truman, Who?" Life XXXII (March 24, 1952), 126.

With the produce business destroyed, Kerr renewed his study of law, reading privately, and passed the bar examination. 1925 found Kerr a struggling lawyer making fifteen hundred dollars a year with debts amounting to ten thousand dollars.[11]

Oil Career

On December 29, 1925, Kerr married his second wife, Grayce Breene of Tulsa. Her brother-in-law, James L. Anderson, was in the oil drilling business and needed a lawyer for his company. Robert Kerr was the logical choice, and the two men formed a partnership. Kerr soon became interested in drilling oil wells as well as the legal aspects of the business.

Bob Kerr's big chance came with the discovery of oil in Oklahoma City. Many of the residents did not want to see the city defaced by oil derricks, and, more important, they felt that large scale operations would constitute a major fire hazard to the city. K. S. Adams of the Phillips Petroleum Company asked Kerr to head a campaign to convince voters that to approve drilling operations would be advantageous to the city.[12] In two hard-fought elections the citizens approved oil drilling within the city limits, and Kerr had won his first campaign.

The only pay Kerr asked in return for his efforts

---

[11]Edwin C. McReynolds, Oklahoma: A History of the Sooner State (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954), p. 383.

[12]Childs, "Big Boom from Oklahoma," 22-23.

in the campaign was the opportunity for the Anderson-Kerr Company to drill wells for the Phillips Petroleum Company. Adams agreed and that marked the beginning of the Kerr fortune.[13] Instead of taking a fixed fee for drilling the well, Kerr would take a share of the well itself as pay. A portion of a dry well is nothing, but this problem did not plague the Anderson-Kerr Company. Almost every well hit oil, and thus Bob Kerr made his fortune during the period that the rest of the country was plunging into a depression.

Kerr's influence in the oil business grew, and in 1936 he received the position of president of the Kansas-Oklahoma division of Mid-Continent Oil and Gas Association. He held this office until 1942 when he resigned to become a candidate for governor of Oklahoma.

Early Political Career

Kerr's interests in politics began in 1924 when he joined the American Legion. Only one year later he was elected Commander of Oklahoma's Legion, the youngest commander in the nation. In 1932 he moved to Oklahoma City and became further involved in politics. As soon as he had made any appreciable sums of money, Kerr became a steady contributor to the Democratic Party in the state. "By 1940 he was a major source of funds for the party and was elected a

---

[13] Ibid.

national committeeman."[14]

Governor: 1942-1946

The Campaign

Bob Kerr's interest and influence in the Democratic Party grew, and in 1942 he announced his candidacy for governor of Oklahoma. The campaign was a bitter one but resulted in the election of the first native Oklahoman to the executive office—Robert Samuel Kerr. His administration faced a battle from the outset. He was elected by a 16,500 vote majority, the smallest given any governor since statehood with the exception of R. L. Williams in 1914. Moreover, the Democratic Party controlled the lower house of the legislature by only a small majority.[15]

Accomplishments as Governor

Kerr's objectives as governor were "a sound fiscal program, retirement of the state debt, a business-like administration, curbing the power of the governor, a minimum of political squabbling, and a friendly governor in the executive office."[16] He accomplished these objectives as well as many others during his four years in the executive office.

---

[14]Daniel Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," Fortune, LIX (March, 1959), 184.

[15]Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," p. 420.

[16]Ibid.

That Kerr was able to fulfill his ambitious campaign promises under such adverse circumstances is striking. But even more striking—especially to those who knew Senator Kerr, the rough-and-tumble debater with "a wit like a rasp and a backbone of iron"[17]—is the method he employed in achieving support for his program. He set out to win his political opponents by friendly conferences and without using the power of the executive office.[18] Such procedure was markedly different from the one he would employ to achieve his goals as a United States Senator. Upon his election to the Governorship, Kerr said, "We intend to humanize the governor's office."[19] In his inaugural address he stated: "Members of the legislature may expect from the executive office no threats, no domineering, and no bad faith . . . that we may reason together what is good for the state."[20] Robert Kerr won respect for himself and support for his program by keeping his word.

The main points of Kerr's program were written into law as his first year as governor came to an end, and the legislature had completed their work in the shortest session in twenty years.[21] Kerr's primary objective as governor

---

[17]"Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," Newsweek, LX (August 6, 1962), 15.

[18]Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," p. 421.

[19]As cited in ibid., p. 422.

[20]As cited in ibid.

[21]Ibid., p. 421.

was to reduce the state's debt of $44 million. Not only was this debt paid off, but when Kerr left the governor's office in 1946, the state treasury held a surplus of $40 million.

Kerr took state-supported higher education out of politics by providing a constitutional Board of Regents for the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, and the state's six junior agricultural colleges. He initiated another constitutional amendment which, with voter approval, created a Pardons and Paroles Board and thus decreased political corruption in the issuance of pardons and paroles. In short, Kerr remained true to his campaign promise to curb the power of the governor's office.[22]

As governor of Oklahoma, Kerr increased workers' compensation payments and teachers' salaries by forty percent, while decreasing by forty-five percent compensation insurance rates. Unemployment compensation payments were increased and the payment period extended. Assistance payments to the aged and dependent children were increased twofold while the payroll of relief department workers was cut two-thirds and direct relief payments were increased from five to seven times.[23]

Kerr's other accomplishments as governor include the

---

[22]"Bob Kerr's History as He Lived It in Oklahoma," p. 2.

[23]Ibid.

initiation of programs to improve hospital and medical facilities, the largest highway building program in the state's history up to that time, and a teacher retirement system.[24]

Some of the state's outstanding businessmen accepted positions in Kerr's administration. One of these was an executive earning $75,000 annually in private business. He left his position to direct the state's Board of Public Affairs for a yearly salary of $5400.[25]

The 1944 National Campaign

While being a conservative in state government, Kerr was a liberal on most issues of national significance.[26] He vigorously supported the New Deal and Roosevelt's fourth term as President. Kerr's position on the New Deal was decidedly different from most conservative oilmen in Oklahoma. The majority opposed President Roosevelt and supported Governor Thomas E. Dewey and the anti-new deal campaign. In explaining his support for the national administration, Kerr stated:

> A program that gives opportunity for economic progress to the greatest number of citizens is the essence of democracy. I am in the oil

---

[24] Ibid.

[25] "Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner: Script for Narration by Chet Huntley and Frank McGee, N.B.C. News," Prepared by The Pate Organization (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, May 31, 1962), p. 4.

[26] Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," p. 416.

> business. The greatest security the oil business can have is the widespread ability of the average citizen to purchase the production of the oil industry. I think the opportunity for the individual to prosper is the greatest in a society where general prosperity exists. Therefore, I believe in providing general prosperity on the theory I will do better as an individual than if I devote all my energies to my individual prosperity.[27]

Kerr's unalterable support of Roosevelt and the Democratic sweep to victory in 1944 left him the undisputed leader of the Democratic Party in Oklahoma. Moreover, because of his campaigning, the Democratic Party, and more particularly Roosevelt himself, asked Kerr to keynote the National Convention in Chicago.

Previous to his keynote speech, Kerr was relatively unknown outside Oklahoma. This speech, however, gained him a national political reputation. "Keynote speakers often suffer the fate of prize fighters who come on in the preliminaries to fill in until the main bout comes on. That is to say, they are scarcely observed at all."[28] Kerr was determined that he should not suffer such a fate. He tore up a manuscript prepared by the national committee, went into seclusion, and spent several weeks working on a speech that would arouse the convention. As a result of his efforts Sullivant declared, "His ringing speech at Chicago placed him in the limelight as a political orator. He was the

---

[27]As cited in ibid., p. 418.

[28]Childs, "Big Boom from Oklahoma," 119.

speaker most in demand with the national committee."[29] Such national recognition was a contributing factor to Kerr's election to the United States Senate in 1948.

Senator: 1948-1963

Interests as a Senator

Kerr's interests as a senator included a large number of subjects, but with the exception of his pet natural gas bill and civil rights, his voting was "party line" on most issues.[30]

As an outstanding Senate spokesman for farm cooperatives, Kerr led the fight to secure rural electric and telephone lines, helped amend tax laws that enabled farmers and ranchers to claim income from the sale of breeder livestock as capital gains, and advocated expanding support prices for farm products at one hundred percent of parity.[31]

In the realm of foreign policy, Kerr vigorously supported the ratification of the Atlantic Treaty, the Marshal Plan, military aid to foreign allies, the Point Four Program, and the Mutual Security Program.[32]

United States Senators became immediately aware of

---

[29]Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," p. 417.

[30]Keltner and Harnack, "Robert S. Kerr," 295.

[31]"Bob Kerr's History as He Lived It in Oklahoma," p. 3.

[32]"What Senator Kerr Stands For," Kerr Papers, University of Oklahoma Division of Manuscripts, p. 1.

Kerr's interest in the oil industry when he introduced the controversial Kerr Natural Gas Bill. The bill was designed to encourage greater exploration of oil and thus increase the production of the natural resource. Kerr secured passage of the bill after heated debates only to have President Truman veto it. The major points of Kerr's program, however, were later achieved when the existing law received a new interpretation.

In the area of finance and business Senator Kerr voted for reorganization of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, more effective anti-trust laws, and controls to protect consumers from price gouging.[33]

In his campaigns as well as in Senate debate, Kerr would frequently attack the Republican Party, dubbing them "bewitched, bothered and bewildered,"[34] and would seldom miss a chance to lambast the Hoover administration. He was the first in Congress to openly attack the Eisenhower administration and also among the first to support President Truman after he had dismissed General Douglas MacArthur.[35] The sentiment of the country was behind MacArthur, and Kerr remarked that the resulting scene was "as hot as any depot stove."[36]

---

[33] Ibid., p. 2.

[34] As cited in Keltner and Harnack, "Robert S. Kerr," 295.

[35] William S. White, "Democrats Board of Directors," New York Times Magazine (July 10, 1955), Sec. VI, 10.

[36] As cited in ibid.

Influence as a Senator

Kerr exerted an unusual amount of influence on Capitol Hill, and one frequently heard him referred to as the second most powerful man in Washington. "There is, by act of Congress, the President, you know."[37] Early in his first term as a senator, Josephine Ripley exclaimed, "He is rapidly stepping to the forefront of the Democratic Party as one of the party's most able leaders."[38] This prediction came true when several years before his death Kerr became known as the "Uncrowned King of the Senate."[39] Crawford pointed out a prime reason: "It was his chairmanship of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee, an obscure post that makes few national headlines but much political hay,"[40] that gave him power. Thus, Kerr placed practically all senators under obligation to him by promoting their pet projects, and "he never hesitated to collect on those obligations later, when the votes were needed."[41] As a result, Kerr found his position in the Senate one of extraordinary influence with his sponsorship of a measure practically a guarantee of passage

---

[37]"Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 12.

[38]As cited in "Bob Kerr's History as He Lived It in Oklahoma," p. 4.

[39]Joe Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Kansas City Star, September 16, 1962, Sec. D.

[40]Kenneth Crawford, "The Senate's Ways," Newsweek, LXI (January 14, 1963), 27.

[41]Ibid.

and his opposition "the kiss of death."[42]

President Kennedy remarked that in the last two years "almost every major bill enacted bore the mark of his [Kerr's] untiring leadership and skill."[43] Newsweek described his power in another way by stating, "Kerr, if he chooses, can make a hash of almost any bill the President sends up to the Hill."[44] An example of his influence occurred when Kennedy's medical care for the aged bill failed to receive Senate approval. Kerr was one of the key figures in the defeat of the bill.

Kerr was a man that President Kennedy could not afford to alienate. As one strategist pointed out, though Kennedy may have had a somewhat unsuccessful record with the 87th Congress, "without Bob Kerr, the President wouldn't have any record at all."[45] Joe Lastelic put it more colorfully when he said, "President Kennedy, when he gets down on his knees and says his rosary, ought to thank Bob Kerr every night. Without him, no Kennedy programs would have passed in this session."[46]

Robert Samuel Kerr was inducted into the Oklahoma

---

[42]"Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," 15.

[43]As cited in Daily Oklahoman, January 2, 1963, p. 1.

[44]"Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," 16.

[45]As cited in ibid., 17.

[46]Lastelic, Kansas City Star, Sec. D.

Hall of Fame in 1956. As both Governor and Senator he was loved by the people of Oklahoma. As Business Week stated, less than a year before his death, Kerr's "position as a Senator is as secure as his vast oil and cattle lands."[47]

Kerr's Plan for Conservation

Throughout his life, the problem that had most interested Kerr was the conservation of natural resources. In his first campaign for the United States Senate, he said:

> If America is to continue to be able to feed its own people and meet its destiny as world leader in winning the peace, stopping the spread of Communism, and guaranteeing the security of our own people, we must do more than ever before to rebuild the soil and conserve and use the water. This is America's greatest responsibility—this is Oklahoma's finest opportunity.[48]

Events Which Influenced Kerr's Interest in Conservation

Heritage. Bob Kerr's concern for the preserving of natural resources was evident in his early childhood. He often said, "There on this farm chopped out of the wilderness I could plainly see our existence. As I grew to manhood I realized that this trio of natural wealth [land, wood and water] is the foundation of all prosperity and essential to a better way of life everywhere."[49] Undoubtedly, Sam Kerr

---

[47]"Kerr Switches Sides to Push Trade Bill," Business Week, No. 1717 (July 28, 1962), 86.

[48]As cited in The Enid Events "Democrats Can Win in November," Special publication by the Kerr for Senate Club, July, 1948.

[49]As cited in "Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 1.

played a major role in his son's interest in conservation. He often told young Bob that when he settled he should choose a homestead where the land would be fertile and one with plenty of wood and water.[50] Sam Kerr was interested in conservation himself and told his son, "Bob, I want you to help refurnish the land that men have stripped, and clear the streams they have muddied."[51]

Before his term as Governor. The two events which influenced Kerr's interest in conservation before he became governor were the dust bowl of the 1930's and Governor Phillips' fight against the federal dams.[52] Kerr was outspoken in favor of cooperation with the federal government in behalf of the program. Kerr publicized the benefits of the program and, in the long run, helped to gain the necessary support to bring about the desired water development.

As Governor. Kerr began Oklahoma's contemporary conservation program. As governor he supported agricultural research to eliminate the waste of land and secured increased appropriations for Oklahoma's agricultural education program. In 1943 both floods and drouth spread across Oklahoma and strengthened Kerr's resolution to conserve natural resources.[53]

---

[50]Daily Oklahoman, January 6, 1963, p. A 17.

[51]As cited in Robert S. Kerr, Land, Wood and Water (New York: Fleet Publishing Corporation, 1960), p. 355.

[52]"The Kerr Plan: Conception, Adoption, Operation," Kerr Papers, University of Oklahoma Division of Manuscripts, p. 1.

[53]Ibid.

He watched his state first suffer from too much water only later to see it cry for moisture as winds blew the precious topsoil across the prairie.

In response to the 1943 flood and drouth Kerr proposed the Arkansas Navigation Project—a program of soil conservation, flood control, irrigation and drainage, and hydroelectric power. Kerr did not invent the Arkansas Navigation program. The idea had existed in Oklahoma in a kind of "wish dream status" since 1907. Kerr, however, seized on the idea so completely that he gained the title "Admiral of the Arkansas."[54]

Action Taken in the Senate

Kerr was elected to the United States Senate for a six-year term that began January 3, 1949, running on a program of conservation. His campaign slogan of "land, wood and water" became famous. The first bill he introduced in Congress was authorization for the establishment of the Arkansas-White-Red River Basin Interagency Committee. The flood control-navigation project resulting from this initial study is expected to be completed in 1970 at a cost of $1.2 billion.

The project got its first appropriation of $1.7 million only two years after Kerr entered the Senate. Appropriations swelled until they reached $85 million in

---

[54]Keith Wheeler et al., "Pork Barrel Outrage: Too Much Money Spent Foolishly," Life, LV (August 16, 1963), 56.

fiscal 1962. Before Kerr went to the Senate, Oklahoma had received only $63 million of federal money for water development projects. Since 1948, the Army Engineers have spent some $312 million in Oklahoma.[55]

A look at the map of Oklahoma in 1963 shows it to be a land of watersheds and lakes. That Wheeler has called Oklahoma the land of "Kerr's lakes"[56] demonstrates his achievements in the area of soil and water conservation for his native state. At the height of his political career Kerr took most pride in his accomplishments to conserve natural resources in Oklahoma. Only a month before his death, as he was flying over the state, he said, "If I live ten more years in this job, there won't be a muddy stream left in Oklahoma."[57]

Kerr's Book

Bob Kerr's interest in conservation was so great that he wrote a book on the subject, giving it the title of his famous slogan, Land, Wood and Water. Kerr was such an avid supporter of conservation that he rarely missed an opportunity to bring up the subject in conversation. In fact, he talked so much about conservation that some people said his book should have been labeled, Land, Wood, Wind and Water.

---

[55] Ibid.

[56] Ibid.

[57] As cited in "Death of a Senator," Time, LXXXI (January 11, 1963), 23.

Previous books on conservation had been dull and difficult to read because of their technical vocabulary. Before the Senator's book was published many feared it would be no different. Moreover, since the book was published in 1960 and bore the Senator's well-known slogan, others expected it to have political ramifications. An examination of the book, however, quickly refutes both impressions. The work is almost free from partisanship. It is both comprehensive and concise and is written in a pleasant and readable style. As one reviewer stated:

> This book is a labor of love by one of the most eloquent men in Congress. The language is so picturesque and vibrant, that the book is deserving of attention for its literary quality alone. Yet it has much more and should be required reading for high school and college students, the general public, and policy makers at every level of government.[58]

When Robert Kerr was a small boy, he set forth his ambitions: "A family, to make a million dollars, and to be governor of Oklahoma"[59]—in that order. He achieved all of these and much more before his death at the age of sixty-two.

---

[58] Resource-Use Review, (A publication of the Conservation and Resource-Use Education Project by the Joint Council on Economic Education), No. 3, Winter, 1961, p. 7.

[59] "Death of a Senator," Time, 23.

CHAPTER III

KERR'S ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

Introduction

To ascertain those factors which contribute to individual ability in the logical, emotional, and ethical development of ideas is admittedly difficult. The rhetorical critic can, however, "point to some of the outward manifestations of inventive skill which influence the arguments men compose and deliver."[1] It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the factors which contributed to Kerr's inventive skill. The chapter seeks neither to analyze nor evaluate those characteristics which influenced Kerr's *ethos*, *pathos*, and *logos*, but only to describe them. In essence, this information serves as a background for Chapter IV and will be analyzed when the modes of proof in Kerr's Senate speeches are examined.

In short, this chapter identifies those "outward manifestations of inventive skill," which represent the particular characteristics Kerr brought to the rhetorical

---

[1]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949), p. 335.

situation. Some of these manifestations were assets, some were liabilities, and others were at different times and for different persons both assets and liabilities. While the reader might find it difficult, at this point, to understand the relationship of Kerr's assets and liabilities to an analysis of the modes of proof, such a relationship is indeed significant and will be treated in Chapter IV.

Heritage

Robert Kerr's heritage was a dominant influence in his life. He was proud of his humble birth and frequently reminded his audiences that he rose from the people. These traits were especially emphasized in the 1952 Democratic National Convention when Kerr was seeking the nomination for President.[2]

From his father, Robert Kerr received an amount of invaluable advice on topics from philosophy to politics. In fact, Kerr said frequently that his father was "the greatest man that ever lived"[3] and that he owed more to him than any other person.

The Kerr Fortune

Kerr worked at several professions early in his

---

[2]"Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner: Script for Narration by Chet Huntley and Frank McGee, N.B.C. News," Prepared by The Pate Organization, (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, May 31, 1962), p. 10.

[3]As cited in Daily Oklahoman, January 4, 1963, p. 3.

career but achieved little success in any of them. He made his first million relatively early in his life, but only after he had turned to the oil business. His success in that profession was remarkable. He had the foresight to help found the Kerr-McGee Oil Industries, Inc., a company which he and his family controlled. Later Kerr branched out into cattle and uranium mines, and upon his death, the Kerr fortune was estimated at $51 million.[4]

Kerr was quick to recall that he made his fortune and did not inherit it. When Kerr's political opponents made cracks about his wealth, he would scornfully remind them that in 1925 when he married he was making $125 a month and add, "You should have seen me and my family under Hoover."[5]

Kerr used his fortune to obtain information which he used in debate. Supporting this position, Seligman related the following story:

> In the Senate's 1957-58 investigation of the financial condition of the United States most of the Finance Committee's time was taken up in listening to the wrangles between Kerr, on one side, and officials of the treasury (including George Humphrey) and several representatives of the F.R.B. on the other. Kerr was, as usual, carefully prepared—he had spent $15,000 to procure some exhaustive research—and, also as usual, he had the last word in all the arguments.[6]

---

[4]"Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," Newsweek, LX (August 6, 1962), 15.

[5]"Wildcatter," Time, LIX (February 25, 1952), 24.

[6]Daniel Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," Fortune, LIX (March, 1959), 138.

Political Philosophy

Kerr as an Oklahoman

Robert Kerr was a conservative in the administration of state government but became more liberal when he entered the United States Senate.[7] Daniel Seligman reached the conclusion that Kerr was neither a liberal nor a conservative.[8] Kerr was less likely than Monroney to vote with the northern liberals. Moreover, he held little interest in the issues that preoccupied liberals in both parties during his third term as a senator. On such issues as segregation, McCarthyism, labor law, civil liberties, and aid to underdeveloped nations, he routinely voted with the Democratic center.[9]

In the majority of senatorial arguments between the "spenders" and the "budget cutters," however, Kerr was firmly aligned with the spenders and certainly could not be called a conservative. Kerr contended that the 1958 recession was brought on by "tight money, excessive foreign imports, and Ezra Benson's program of flexible farm price supports."[10] Such views were the direct opposite of those upheld by the Eisenhower administration and the Federal Reserve Board.

---

[7]William S. White, "Democrats Board of Directors," New York Times Magazine (July 10, 1955), p. 10.

[8]Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 138.

[9]Ibid.

[10]As cited in ibid.

In an attempt to define Kerr's political philosophy Seligman states:

> He often seems to speak in the accents of the "Agrarian radicals" who organized the Populist movement in the 1890's and who later gained control of the Democratic Party under the leadership of William Jennings Bryan. In his strictures against big eastern bankers, in his impassioned arguments against hard money and for the farmer's way of life, multimillionaire Kerr often sounds oddly reminiscent of Bryan.[11]

Seligman further postulates that aside from "Agrarian radicalism" it is difficult to find a label for Kerr's ideology. Time magazine, however, offered a more accurate description of Kerr's political philosophy when they stated, "Kerr defied description either as a liberal or a conservative. He could only be explained as an Oklahoman."[12]

The Oklahoma Criterion

Kerr was dedicated to the conviction: "What's good for Oklahoma, is good for the nation."[13] He once summed up his political philosophy by stating, "I'm against any combine Oklahoma ain't in."[14]

Kerr advocated this position frequently and openly, and as one would expect he was often attacked by his political

---

[11] Ibid., 136-137.

[12] "Death of a Senator," Time, LXXXI (January 11, 1963), 23.

[13] As cited in Katherine Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," Daily Oklahoman, June 11, 1963, p. 3.

[14] As cited in Norman Transcript, January 2, 1963, p. 1.

opponents. They argued that he was more concerned with the welfare of Oklahoma than the security of the United States. In answer Kerr would say, "You say I'm an Oklahoma Senator more than a national senator? Yes, that's what I'm here for."[15]

Applying the Oklahoma Criterion

Regarding Senator Kerr's application of the Oklahoma criterion, Chet Huntley offered the following observation: "There was a bill up for debate, and some members of Congress were worried because they didn't know if he would stay with the Democratic majority or bolt the party. Then a friend told them, 'Don't worry about Bob Kerr—whatever he does, he'll vote Oklahoman.'"[16] Lastelic believes that Kerr would "trade with the devil,"[17] if it meant shoving through something for Oklahoma. To be sure, Kerr would often perform favors in return for support of Oklahoma legislation. On one occasion opponents suggested that Kerr had made a deal with President Kennedy. Kerr boldly replied, "If I do a good job on this bill, then don't you think I'll have more bargaining power with the President?"[18]

Kerr liked to tell the story about the time Harry

---

[15]"Death of a Senator," 23.

[16]As cited in Daily Oklahoman, June 11, 1962, p. 19.

[17]Joe Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Kansas City Star, September 16, 1962, Sec. D.

[18]As cited in "Kerr Switches Sides to Push Trade Bill," Business Week, No. 1717 (July 28, 1962), 86.

Byrd was introduced as the "watchdog of the U. S. Treasury," and Kerr as the man who wasn't. "I got up and told them that there had been more government money spent in the state of Virginia than any other state, and . . . as soon as I got it so that more money was spent in Oklahoma than any other state—then I'd become the 'watchdog of the Treasury.'"[19]

Robert Kerr was a protectionist, and his sentiments were based on the undesirable effects that foreign imports had on Oklahoma lead, zinc, and oil industries. Oklahoma had a high proportion of pensioners and older persons, and Kerr repeatedly sponsored legislation to expand social-security coverage.[20]

Even Kerr's spirited support of President Truman's dismissal of General Douglas MacArthur related to the Oklahoma criterion. Seligman reports that William S. White and other liberals lauded Kerr for upholding "the great democratic principle of civil control of the military."[21] In actuality, however, Kerr's support of Truman resulted from the fear that, if left alone, MacArthur would expand the Korean War to the point that Oklahoma's National Guard Thunderbird Division might be called into combat.[22]

---

[19]As cited in "Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," 16.

[20]Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 179-180.

[21]Ibid.

[22]"Death of a Senator," 23.

Kerr's concern for Oklahoma appears to have occupied his thoughts and actions at all times. As Frank McGee stated:

> Even his Washington social events are with a purpose. The purpose is to further his influence with people who are in a position to help Oklahoma. Bob Kerr doesn't idle time with many ambassadors or tall social people. They can't produce a nickel's worth of help in getting a favorable ruling out of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, or talking the Agriculture Department out of some extra soil conservation money, or even swinging a key finance committee vote on taxation of independent oil producers. So Bob Kerr prefers to hob-nob with the less-dazzling "little" folks who have jobs which are merely crucial to Oklahoma. He gives an annual party for them.[23]

The result of Kerr's support of legislation for his native state was summed by U. S. Senator Mike Monroney when he said, Kerr's "service to Oklahoma spanned more than a third of a century and touched every phase of Oklahoma's religious, political, and industrial life."[24]

Conflict of Interests

Senator Kerr was often accused of supporting legislation which was beneficial to his personal position in private business without consideration of how it would affect the rest of the country. One such controversial issue was the Kerr Natural Gas Bill which proposed giving oil producers freedom to market their product wherever they could sell it to the highest bidder. Kerr never denied that the bill

---

[23]"Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 10.

[24]As cited in Cullen Johnson, "Grief Voiced by President," Daily Oklahoman, January 2, 1963, p. 2.

promoted his own interests and was always willing to answer any political opponents' accusations concerning his position.

> If you look on the Agriculture Committee you will find there many farmers. If you look on the Labor Committee, you will find there as many men who were formerly associated with labor. You will find bankers, lawyers, professional men on the Finance Committee. No man in the Congress of the United States can avoid voting on things that, in one way or another, affect him because they affect his people, and if he has a community of interest with the people of his state, then he is going to have an identity there, and the conflict of interest that would worry me would be a conflict of interest with my people—not with you or any other man reporting or any man attempting to pass judgment on me. They [the people of Oklahoma] don't want to send a man here who has no community of interest with them, because he wouldn't be worth a nickel to them. The only way that a man can vote in the Congress of the United States on something he had no interest in whatever would be to make a pauper's oath and prove it, and then he would still be ineligible to vote for the money that pays his own salary, or the legislation that fixes it.[25]

In essence, he said that any Oklahoma senator would vote the way he did because it promoted the interest of Oklahomans and that any senator who never voted on legislation affecting his own personal holdings would have to sign a pauper's oath before entering the Senate.

Religion

Robert Kerr was a deeply religious man. Early in his childhood, his religious beliefs were formed. One day he attended a Methodist Church and was sprinkled in a

---

[25]As cited in "Senator Kerr Talks about Conflict of Interest," U. S. News and World Report, LIII (September 3, 1962), 86.

baptismal service. When his mother found out what he had done, she went to the church and told the minister, "You'll just have to unsprinkle him . . . because he is a Baptist."[26] From that time on, Bob Kerr never forgot his church.

For more than fifty years he served his denomination by holding nearly every layman's post in his local church, the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City, and the Baptist General Convention of Oklahoma.[27] He taught a Sunday school class in his home church for more than twenty years. Even during his political campaigns he would fly home on Sunday in order to meet the class.[28] When he went to the U. S. Senate, Bob Kerr continued to serve his church by teaching the Men's Bible Class of the First Baptist Church of Washington, D. C.

In 1950, Bob Kerr was the Oklahoma chairman of Brotherhood Week sponsored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews. He was often asked to address local and state church conventions and was twice the main speaker at the National Baptist Convention. Only a month before his death, Kerr was re-elected president of the board of directors of the Baptist Foundation of Oklahoma for his third term.

Because of his religion, Kerr was a two-way teetotaler.

---

[26]As cited in "Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 6.

[27]Daily Oklahoman, January 4, 1963, p. 3.

[28]Ibid.

He neither drank nor smoked and declined to serve alcohol in his home. When he went to Washington, a city famous for its cocktail parties, Bob Kerr carried his convictions with him. He was intense in his belief that a leader in government should abstain from the use of intoxicants because of the responsibility of position. After he had been in the Capitol only a few weeks, Kerr publicly reprimanded government officials for drinking, contending that alcohol dulled their minds on matters concerning the security of the country.[29]

Kerr supported his church by giving more than thirty percent of his vast wealth.[30] This was not, however, the totality of his economic support. He frequently spearheaded campaigns for church organizations. He was most proud of his chairmanship of the Oklahoma Baptist Orphan's Home Committee which raised $400,000 for building funds in two drives.[31]

Kerr believed that faith in God and service to his fellow man were more important than fame, riches, or power. He believed that a human being's highest privilege was to

---

[29]"Bob Kerr's History, as He Lived It in Oklahoma," Kerr Papers, University of Oklahoma Division of Manuscripts, p. 1.

[30]"Death of a Senator," 23.

[31]"Bob Kerr's History, as He Lived It in Oklahoma," p. 1.

"acknowledge and worship God"[32] and second, "to make some contribution to the environment in which we live."[33] "Of all investments," he said, "an investment in human value is the soundest. Where else can you trade money for such a high return in character and spiritual value?"[34]

Upon Kerr's death, Dr. Herschel H. Hobbs, minister of the First Baptist Church of Oklahoma City eulogized, "Kerr [was] a man of vision, . . . wisdom, . . . courage, . . . faith and . . . a man in the highest sense of that word."[35] Said Dr. John W. Raley, Chancellor of Oklahoma Baptist University, "He was big—in body, mind and spirit."[36] But it was, perhaps, Ed Edmondson who best summarized the feeling of all those who knew Kerr when he said, "The death of Senator Kerr is the greatest loss Oklahoma has suffered in a generation. We have lost a great leader . . . in the field of spiritual life of our state and nation."[37]

Both in private conversation and speeches, Kerr frequently quoted the Bible. In fact, his Biblical learning is one of his major resources in rhetorical discourse.

---

[32]As cited in Gilbert Hill, "Kerr in a Mild, Mellow Mood for Festive Dinner," Oklahoma City Times, June 11, 1962, p. 11.

[33]As cited in ibid.

[34]As cited in Daily Oklahoman, January 4, 1963, p. 11.

[35]As cited in Norman Transcript, January 4, 1963, p. 1.

[36]As cited in Francis Tethford, "O. B. U. Pays Tribute to Its Best Friend in Stirring Service," Daily Oklahoman, January 4, 1963, p. 11.

[37]As cited in Daily Oklahoman, January 2, 1963, p. 2.

On one occasion, Kerr used a quotation from the Bible to the considerable detriment of a candidate running against Monroney. Monroney's opponent, the Reverend W. H. Bill Alexander, announced that after communication with the Almighty, he had decided to enter the senatorial race in the Democratic primary. Soon afterward, however, he sought the Republican nomination. Senator Kerr, campaigning for Monroney, commented on Alexander's change of parties: "If the Lord told Bill Alexander to run as a Democrat, who told him to become a Republican?"[38] Kerr then quoted Hebrews 13: "Remember them which have the rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God: Whose faith follow . . . Jesus Christ the same yesterday, and today, and forever." Seligman suggests that Reverend Alexander had little chance after that.[39]

Another occasion when Kerr turned to the Bible for source material was in the 1950 controversy over the building of a dam on the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon. Kerr attempted to justify the project on the grounds of the increase in the supply of water. He said:

> The battle for water is not new among the people of this land nor among the people of this earth. In the first book of the Bible, we read of one of the historic struggles of antiquity for water. In the twenty-sixth chapter of Genesis, we learn that in the early dawn of life of the race, water

---

[38]As cited in Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 179.

[39]As cited in ibid.

was a controlling factor in the welfare of man. I read from Genesis 26:

"And Isaac digged again the wells of water which they had digged in the days of Abraham his father;

And Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water.

And the herdmen of Gerar did strive with Isaac's herdmen, saying, The water is ours.

And they digged another well, and strove for that also.

And he removed from thence, and digged another well; and for that they strove not; and he called the name of it Rehoboth; and he said, For now the Lord hath made room for us, and we shall be fruitful in the land."[40]

Thus, by his story, Kerr demonstrated the age old fight for water and its necessity for survival.

Intellectual Traits

Intelligence

From his father, Robert Kerr inherited a desire for knowledge. He read a great deal in a variety of fields. As a result, some of Kerr's colleagues say, "He has one of the sharpest minds in the Senate."[41] Even Harry Byrd, long-time opponent of Kerr, was quick to admit, "He was a man of great brilliance and great ability."[42]

On his death, U. S. Senator John Tower of Texas said,

---

[40]U. S., Congressional Record, 81st Cong., 2nd Session, 1950, XCVI, part 2, 2046. (Later cited as Record.)

[41]"Changing the Senate's Finance Watchdog," Business Week, No. 1486 (February 22, 1958), 24.

[42]As cited in Johnson, "Grief Voiced by President," p. 2.

"He was one of the most able men in the Senate,"[43] and Hatch exclaimed, "His wit and gift of oratory was equalled only by his penetrating mind."[44]

Frank McGee once contended that Kerr was imaginative enough to make 2 x 2 equal 8.[45] New Mexico's Democratic Senator Clinton Anderson agreed and often told Kerr that he would like to take a knife, open up his skull, and examine the convolutions of his brain. "He's the smartest man I know."[46]

Memory

Robert Kerr had a remarkable memory. He could recall names and faces readily, apparently never forgot a story or joke, and repeatedly quoted statistics and facts that other senators, because of the lapse of time, had long since forgotten. Keltner and Harnack point out that his skill in recalling facts was often used in floor debates,[47] and Seligman declared, "Kerr's mastery of detail was remarkable."[48]

---

[43] As cited in ibid.

[44] Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," 6.

[45] "Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 13.

[46] As cited in "Death of a Senator," 23.

[47] John W. Keltner and R. Victor Harnack, "Robert S. Kerr," in "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (October, 1952), 296.

[48] Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 137.

Listening

Robert Kerr was reported to be one of the best listeners in Washington. In fact, he listened so intently that visitors wasted little time in rambling discourse.[49] In Senate debates, Kerr was quick to catch the mistakes made by his opponents.

Diligence

Kerr was always on the move and Chet Huntley contends "he was one of the busiest men in the Senate."[50] Said Mike Mansfield:

> One aspect of the Senator's service . . . has received too little comment. That is the very great range—testifying to the capacity of the Senator from Oklahoma, for long, painstaking, hard work. His record in that regard equals or exceeds that of any other member who has served here since I entered this body.[51]

When asked why he worked so hard and kept such long hours, Senator Kerr replied, "I came here to do a certain job for Oklahoma. It is a big program. It takes a long time. I can't figure any other way to get it done except to work."[52]

Physical Traits

Stamina

To achieve such accomplishments, Kerr had to have a

---

[49]"Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 12.

[50]Ibid., p. 11.

[51]Record, 87th Cong., 1st Session, 1962, CVIII, part 14, 2631.

[52]As cited in Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Sec. D.

great deal of physical stamina. Crawford pointed out that "Kerr was a man of extraordinary vigor, mental and physical,"[53] and Lastelic observed that Kerr seemed to be tireless as he continued, even at the age of sixty-six, to put in a fourteen-hour day.[54]

In 1944 Kerr made over three hundred speeches. Most of them required long drives or train rides. He spoke to almost every type of audience from eighth grade graduating classes and church conventions to the National Democratic Convention at Chicago.[55] From 1944 until his death, Kerr continued to be a popular speaker filling many more requests than the average senator.

Size

Robert Samuel Kerr was a big man physically. He stood six feet three inches tall and weighed 235 pounds when he died. Kerr carried his weight well and presented an impressive picture as a speaker.

At frequent intervals, however, Kerr had problems controlling his weight. At one time he weighed more than 265 pounds before going on a diet. Kerr enjoyed food,

---

[53]Kenneth Crawford, "The Senate's Ways," Newsweek, LXI (January 14, 1963), 27.

[54]Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Sec. D.

[55]Otis Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," in Public Men In and Out of Office, edited by J. T. Salter (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946), pp. 418-419.

especially ice cream. He often told the joke on himself that he could not pass a Dairy Queen without stopping, even if it was only nine o'clock in the morning.[56]

Voice

Kerr's speaking voice matched his physical size. He was a booming speaker who could arouse drowsy spectators in the balcony of the Senate chamber. He did not have to shout to accomplish this feat but could rely on his deep, resonant voice to achieve the task.

Speaking Traits

Study of Legislation

Senator Kerr spent a great deal of time studying legislation, especially legislation which was of particular interest to him. Marquis Childs, Washington correspondent, believed Kerr to be "one of the most resourceful men ever to come to the Senate,"[57] and Business Week commented that he always arrived at the committee bench "loaded with facts."[58]

Even his political opponents had praise for his study and knowledge of legislation. Said one Republican senator, "My how he studies those bills. He is able—probably the

---

[56] Ibid., p. 418.

[57] "Bob Kerr's History as He Lived It in Oklahoma," p. 4.

[58] "Changing the Senate's Finance Watchdog," 25.

most knowledgeable tax man on the finance committee."[59]

As a result of his assiduous concentration on legislation, especially those bills which had special meaning for Oklahoma, few senators would dare to clash with him. Those who did often wished they had not.

Preparation of Speeches

That Kerr was cognizant of audience analysis is evidenced by the method he used to prepare his speeches. He would usually talk out a speech with a dictaphone and then get a friend to act as a sounding board while listening to it.[60] Although Kerr relied heavily on his well-trained staff to provide information for his speeches, he rarely used a speech written by a "ghost writer." When Kerr keynoted the Democratic National Convention in 1944, he tore up a speech prepared for him by the national committee and delivered one of his own invention. Usually, the final product of the Kerr speech was a combination of his work and that of special assistants.

Debating Ability

Kerr was one of the most feared and admired debaters on the Senate floor. He had experience with debate in his college career and "always loved a good contest."[61] He

---

[59]As cited in Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Sec. D.

[60]Keltner and Harnack, "Robert S. Kerr," 296.

[61]Ibid.

was especially fond of shifting the burden of proof to his opponent. Another of his favorite devices, said Huntley, was to "pounce upon a witness's misuse of words or phrases."[62] He would, related Huntley, call for a dictionary and proceed "to tear apart the grammar and syntax of the ill-prepared witness."[63]

Bob Kerr was at his best on cross-examination. Business Week testified, "He is disarming to the witness who has not seen him in action before, the witness who makes the mistake of believing that he has only a plain politician as an adversary."[64] "And woe to the witness who came ill-prepared or tried to hood-wink his interrogators with shady logic,"[65] exclaimed Hatch.

Kerr's ability to cross-examine is best observed by reviewing a portion of an actual debate. This particular examination of a witness occurred in the finance committee in 1957 when the fiscal conditions of the United States were being examined. The exchange took place between Kerr and William McChesney Martin Jr., then chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, who was "normally a lucid and articulate man."[66]

---

[62]"Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner," p. 7.

[63]Ibid.

[64]"Changing the Senate's Finance Watchdog," 25.

[65]Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," p. 6.

[66]Seligman, "Robert S. Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 138.

Senator Kerr: You said in your report we had achieved a degree of economic stability in 1952.
Mr. Martin: That is right.
Senator Kerr: Why are you saying now you were moving in 1953 to overcome the inflationary situation of 1952?
Mr. Martin: It got out of hand here. Do you want to comment on this?
Senator Kerr: You are the one who made the statement.
Mr. Martin: Well, I stand on the statement.
Senator Kerr: You can't stand on both of them, because they are in contradiction to each other.
Mr. Martin: Mr. Riefler, I have gotten confused under the questioning. Will you bail me out of this?
Senator Kerr: Who are you?
Mr. Martin: This is Mr. Riefler, assistant to the chairman of the F. R. B.
Senator Kerr: I'll tell you, if you can bail him out of that one I want to get acquainted with you.
Mr. Riefler: I thought he wanted to correct himself. He was not saying in 1951-52 we were having active inflation.
Senator Kerr: You can say that is what he wanted?
Mr. Riefler: That is right.
Senator Kerr: I'll tell you if you can read men's minds, I want you out of this room.[67]

Concerning this ability, Hatch wrote: "Senator Kerr could dissect a question or construct an answer with aplomb and insight that left fellow senators helpless in the rough-and-tumble arena of senatorial debate."[68]

Sarcasm

Senator Kerr held a vast amount of power in the United States Senate and often exercised it, sometimes through invective and sarcasm. He was unusually rough on opponents. One Republican commented that he was "as poisonous as a

---

[67]As cited in ibid., 138 and 179.

[68]Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," p. 6.

scorpion's tail."[69] Keltner and Harnack indicate that Kerr was a master at coining satirical phrases such as "Wherry-go-round" and "MacArthuritis,"[70] and Hatch contended, "His repartee cut down Senate adversaries like a scythe."[71]

On one occasion Senator Proxmire gained the Senate floor and said, "Mr. President, I do not like to puncture the Senator's [Kerr's] magnificent oratorical balloon"—Kerr interrupted to say, "Have at it." Replied Proxmire, "I will have at it." Kerr answered by saying, "I ask no quarter and give none."[72] Kerr remained true to this promise throughout his Senate tenure and was well-known for his sarcastic attacks.

In the course of a debate in 1952, Kerr remarked that Senator Homer Ferguson appeared to be confused about a pending bill. Rising to Ferguson's defense, another Republican senator suggested that it was Kerr who was confused and probably the confusion was related to the defeat Kerr had just suffered in the Nebraska presidential primary. The following statement by Kerr is a good example of his use of sarcasm and invective:

The Senator from Oklahoma wishes to say that he

---

[69]As cited in "Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," 16.

[70]"Robert S. Kerr," 296.

[71]Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," p. 6.

[72]Record, 87th Cong., 2nd Session, 1962, CVIII, part 13, 17860.

> is not confused as to what happened in Nebraska, nor was the result so detrimental that he is unable to recognize at this time another chapter in the continuing confusion of the distinguished Senator from Michigan. So far as I know, the Senator from Michigan has had no such jolt in the recent past as to justify the belief that the condition under which he labors at the present time is either temporary or that with reference to it there is any hope of recovery or improvement.[73]

It was not necessary, however, for another senator to be insulting or sarcastic to Kerr for him to receive a taste of Kerr's sarcasm. Senator Lausche once asked Kerr, "May I ask another question? Perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma can answer."[74] The Senator's request was not out of the ordinary, but Kerr replied, "I would not be surprised but what I could."[75] In another instance, Senator Capehart had made reference to the fact that he was a farmer and that he understood the problems confronted by farmers. Kerr rose and said:

> The Senator from Indiana says he is a farmer; and he well may be, because he certainly has indulged in a lot of hogwash on the floor of the Senate, talking about the taxpaying proclivities and capacities of the private utilities.[76]

Senator Proxmire was one of Kerr's favorite sparring partners, and Kerr rarely missed an opportunity to insult

---

[73]As cited in Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 137.

[74]Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 5, 6110.

[75]Ibid.

[76]Record, 84th Cong., 2nd Session, 1956, CII, part 6, 8235.

him. In the debate on the Lake Michigan Water Diversion proposal, Senator Proxmire was discussing one aspect of the issue—a sewage plant to be built in Chicago. He was arguing that the plant should be constructed in Milwaukee. Kerr interrupted his speech:

> Mr. Kerr: Will the Senator yield for a question?
> Mr. Proxmire: I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma for a question.
> Mr. Kerr: The Senator from Oklahoma would ask his good friend from Wisconsin just what it is about Milwaukee sewage which gives it an advantage in the matter of purity over the sewage of the city of Chicago? Is it the contents, the origin, the treatment?
> Mr. Proxmire: I point out to my good friend from Oklahoma that in all those regards the sewage from Milwaukee is far superior.
> Mr. Kerr: I wish to say to my good friend that the observation of the Senator from Oklahoma is that the examples seen here on the floor would tend to give credence to his statement.[77]

The most publicized incident involving Kerr's invective and sarcasm occurred in 1957 with President Eisenhower and Senator Capehart of Indiana receiving the brunt of the attack. Capehart was arguing for the appointment of an Advisory Committee to President Eisenhower to study the fiscal affairs of the nation. Kerr challenged Capehart's justification of the committee saying, "No man can help Eisenhower study the fiscal policies of this government, because one cannot do that without brains, and he [Eisenhower] does not have them." Capehart tried to interrupt, but Kerr continued, "If the greatest fiscal

---

[77] Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19524.

experts this nation has ever produced marched in solid phalanx before Eisenhower for months . . . he would emerge from the experience just as uninformed as he is now." Capehart, now outraged, received an opportunity to speak and told Kerr that he should be ashamed of saying the President of the United States had no brains when the gallery was full of school children. Kerr then amended his statement to read that the President had no "fiscal brains," and said, "I reserve that broad and sweeping accusation for some of my cherished colleagues in this body." Capehart refused to quit. He asked, "Who are those cherished colleagues, and am I one of them?" Kerr asked for permission to further amend his statement. "I desire to have the word some changed to the word one and . . . the word colleagues changed to . . . colleague."[78]

On another occasion, Senator Douglas disagreed with Kerr concerning the provisions of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1957. Following Douglas's speech, Kerr rose and examined him in the typical Kerr fashion. A portion of the debate is printed below:

> Mr. Kerr: Did the Senator from Illinois attend any of the hearings on the pending bill?
> Mr. Douglas: No, I did not.
> Mr. Kerr: Has the Senator examined the reports of the Bureau of the Budget, of the Corps of Army Engineers or of other agencies of the Government with reference to individual projects in the bill?
> Mr. Douglas: There are some 182 projects, I believe. The bill was submitted to us on Monday. Since

---

[78]As cited in "Brainstrom," Time, LXX (July 29, 1957), 11.

then we have been quite busy with the revenue bill. The Senator from Illinois has tried very hard to study the bill, and he has worked nights on it. He has not read all the projects. However, I have studied the hearings, and I may say that I hold in my hand a report from the Bureau of the Budget, in which I notice that---

Mr. Kerr: Can the Senator tell me anything about the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget without referring to its report?

Mr. Douglas: Just a moment.

Mr. Kerr: Can he?

Mr. Douglas: I can answer the Senator's question much better if I refer to the report.

Mr. Kerr: Can the Senator from Illinois tell the Senator from Oklahoma anything about the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget contained in the report without looking at it now?

Mr. Douglas: Yes. There is the Milwood Reservoir in Arkansas and Oklahoma involving $53 million. The Bureau of the Budget recommends that it should not be put into effect.

Mr. Kerr: What do they say as to their reasons, and what suggestions do they make? Can the Senator tell me, without referring to the report?

Mr. Douglas: I do not think the Senator from Oklahoma has the right to demand that I memorize the entire wording by heart. Can he quote the thirty-nine articles?

Mr. Kerr: I am not demanding anything. I am requesting either that the Senator from Illinois manifest some knowledge of this matter or stand here branded with the ignorance of it. That is what I am doing.[79]

Kerr was abrupt, demanding, and sarcastic, but he got his point across. Douglas knew little about the legislation under debate, could never successfully answer Kerr's stinging questions, and perhaps wished he had not opposed Kerr.

Wit and Humor

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish between

---

[79]Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 4, 4606.

Kerr's use of sarcasm and his use of wit and humor. Often they were the same. In other words, Kerr was usually sarcastic in a witty manner or humorous in a satirical style. There is no question, however, that Kerr was both witty and humorous. Business Week contends that one of Kerr's major sources of power in the Senate was his "Will Rogers styled wit,"[80] and Katherine Hatch exclaimed, "His trenchant wit convulsed the galleries and squeezed rueful laughter from his colleagues."[81] Herschel Hobbs maintained that Kerr's "ready wit was exceeded only by his sober judgment,"[82] and McReynolds labeled Kerr as a man with "a keen sense of humor."[83]

A good example of Kerr's sense of humor occurred in 1952, when he attempted to gain the Democratic nomination for the presidency. After lasting only through the first roll call he said that the Democrats "were not aware of the fact of how superior a product had been made available to them."[84]

An example of Kerr's humorous sarcasm occurred when

---

[80]"Kerr Switches Sides to Push the Trade Bill," 86.

[81]Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," p. 6.

[82]As cited in Norman Transcript, January 4, 1963, p. 3.

[83]Edwin C. McReynolds, Oklahoma: A History of the Sooner State (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954), p. 385.

[84]As cited in Lastelic, "Senator Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Sec. D.

Drew Pearson criticized him for having a conflict of interests in the Natural Gas Bill he was supporting. At that time, Pearson had a weekly radio program that was followed by a show sponsored by Airwick. Kerr's remark to Pearson's criticism was, "And then there's Drew Pearson, who's on the air each Sunday. No wonder A.B.C. has Airwick for fifteen minutes following his broadcast."[85]

Kerr could poke fun at himself as well as others and often did just that. When asked about his title the "Uncrowned King of the Senate," Kerr would remark that he was not uncrowned in the Senate but had been crowned many times during his tenure, and each time with a crown of thorns.[86]

Only five months before the Senator's death, President Kennedy was Kerr's guest at his Kermac Ranch at Poteau, Oklahoma. Reporters asked Kerr what he and the President had done on a particular afternoon, and Kerr replied, "We had our picture taken with a great big bull. . . . We were on the same side of the bull."[87]

Kerr's Gregariousness

Though Kerr was frequently sarcastic in Senate debate,

---

[85]As cited in Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," p. 6.

[86]As cited in Lastelic, "Senator Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Sec. D.

[87]As cited in Business Week, July 28, 1963, 86.

he had a pleasant and friendly personality. In fact, his personality was a big factor in his election to the governorship. Bob Kerr liked people, and people liked him. He contended that he never saw a bad day, and as a result, his friends gave him the nickname of "Smiling Bob."[88]

In summary, Kerr's assets include his heritage, religion, intellectual traits, physical traits, and personality. Among those traits that could be considered either assets or liabilities (depending on the occasion and audience) are his fortune, political philosophy, and certain speaking traits. Kerr's assets and liabilities will be further discussed in Chapter IV.

---

[88]Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr," p. 418.

CHAPTER IV

THE MODES OF PROOF

Introduction

This study is primarily concerned with the method by which Kerr established audience approval of his ideas. Such an analysis, however, presents several problems. As Thonssen and Baird have stated, "Speeches are totalities made up of several interrelated aspects, and the study of one aspect automatically directs attention to all others."[1] Thus, an analysis of the modes of proof, of necessity, will occasionally include information which would normally be considered under the canons of arrangement, style, or delivery. In other words, to analyze a speaker's modes of proof in total disregard of the other rhetorical canons is impossible, and when such information is helpful in determining or understanding the modes of proof it will be included in the study.

A second problem similar to the first is the difficulty in separating logos, pathos, and ethos. While Aristotle attempted to make a concrete distinction between the three

---

[1]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949), p. 391.

modes, Quintilian believed that the difference between pathos and ethos was more difficult to observe than Aristotle had indicated. In the Institutes of Oratory he stated that the two were often of the same nature, "the one in a greater degree and the other in a less degree, as love for instance, will be pathos, and friendship ethos, and sometime of a different nature, as pathos, in a peroration, will excite the judges, and ethos soothe them."[2]

Lee indicates that John Quincy Adams held a similar position in regard to the difference between ethos and pathos. Lee states:

> Pathos he [John Quincy Adams] translates as passions or "tumultous agitations . . . keen and forceful affections of the mind." These are adapted to control hearers, but they are momentary and have only occasional influence. These passions are considered individually as anger, fear, shame, envy, etc., and affect men as individuals. In contrast the ethos is defined as the system of habits, those "mild and orderly emotions . . . and peaceable impulses."[3]

Modern rhetorical scholars have also recognized the difficulty in separating the modes of proof. Thonssen and Baird contend, "The task of drawing distinctions between logical and emotional material is far from easy."[4] Further, they state, "It is apparent that the distinction between

---

[2]Quintilian, The Institutio Oratoria, translated by J. S. Watson (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960), vi, 2. 12.

[3]Irving J. Lee, "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI (1939), 68-69.

[4]Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 370.

emotional and ethical proof is not always clear; and in some cases it may be virtually nonexistent."[5]

Supporting the above position, Bauer has stated:

> These three modes [ethos, pathos, and logos] are not as individual or separate as the classification might lead one to believe. They are bound up together, and at times cannot be separated. For instance, a speaker's attempt to make himself appear credible might arouse strong emotion in the hearers, or his very arguments might establish his character or arouse emotion.[6]

In other words, the orator may relate a story which logically substantiates his contention (logos), emotionally arouses his audience (pathos), and reveals a credible source (ethos).

We have seen that often proofs do not fall into distinct and separate categories such as logical, emotional, and ethical. For purposes of analysis, however, this division of the proofs into logos, pathos, and ethos appears to be the one which best affords structure to the study, and, thus, a separation of the proofs is attempted. Supporting this position, Bauer states, "Even though these means of persuasion are closely knit together, a discussion of the subject will be materially aided if we examine each division separately."[7]

That this separation of the proofs is possible is

---

[5] Ibid., p. 368.

[6] Marvin G. Bauer, "Persuasive Methods in the Lincoln-Douglas Debates," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIII (February, 1927), 30.

[7] Ibid.

suggested by Edward Pross when he stated:

> Students of rhetoric may take a speech delivered by a speaker of another era, and upon securing a thorough insight into the nature of the audience, occasion, and speaker can make a reasonably good analysis and differentiation of the forms of proof in that address.[8]

Attention will be given to an interrelation of the proofs in Chapter V.

The substantive material of the chapter is divided into three parts. In turn, logical, emotional, and ethical proof are examined. Each mode of proof is examined first by considering factors which contributed to its effectiveness and second by examining how Kerr employed it in Senate speeches on conservation. The information presented in Chapter III (Kerr's assets and liabilities) serves as background material for Chapter IV in that it represents those factors which influenced Kerr's use of the modes of proof. In the analysis of ethical proof, however, Kerr's assets and liabilities are actually a substantive implicit ethos. In other words, his assets and liabilities formed "the Kerr image"—or his audience's perception of him before he spoke.

Logical Proof

Importance

In the Rhetoric, Aristotle emphasizes logical proof

---

[8]Edward L. Pross, "Practical Implications of the Aristotelian Concept of Ethos," Southern Speech Journal, XVII (May, 1952), 259.

and attacks his contemporaries for not giving the proper attention to logos.

> Now, the framers of the current treatises on rhetoric have constructed but a small portion of that art. The modes of persuasion[9] are the only true constituents of the art; everything else is merely accessory. These writers, however, say nothing about enthymemes [rhetorical arguments] which are the substance of rhetorical persuasion, but deal mainly with non-essentials.[10]

Regarding this point, Kennedy says that "Aristotle is not very generous with his predecessors in rhetoric and least of all in this branch. He claims that they have almost completely neglected what was the most important part of their subject."[11] Kennedy argues, however, that rhetoricians were probably more mindful of logic than Aristotle represents them. Nevertheless, few rhetorical scholars would disagree that at the time Aristotle wrote an emphasis upon logos was badly needed.

In defining logical proof, Aristotle states:

> With regard to the persuasion achieved by proof or apparent proof; just as in dialectic there is induction on the one hand and syllogism or apparent syllogism on the other, so it is in rhetoric. The example is an induction, the enthymeme is a

---

[9]W. Rhys Roberts suggests that by the term "modes of persuasion" Aristotle here means those attempts at logical argument on which he would himself like to see rhetoric rely.

[10]Trans. by W. Rhys Roberts, in The Basic Works of Aristotle, ed. Richard McKeon (New York: Random House, 1941), 1354a. Later cited as Rhetoric.

[11]George Kennedy, The Art of Persuasion in Greece (Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1963), pp. 87-88.

> syllogism, and the apparent enthymeme is an apparent syllogism. I call the enthymeme a rhetorical syllogism, and the example a rhetorical induction. Everyone who effects persuasion through proof does in fact use either enthymemes or examples: there is no other way. And since everyone who proves anything at all is bound to use either syllogisms or inductions, it must follow that enthymemes are syllogisms and examples are inductions. When we base the proof of a proposition on a number of similar cases, this is induction in dialectic, example in rhetoric; when it is shown that, certain propositions being true, a further and quite distinct proposition must also be true in consequence, whether invariably or usually, this is called syllogism in dialectic, enthymeme in rhetoric. It is plain also that each of these types of oratory has its advantages.[12]

In other words, Aristotle says that the orator, if he proves anything at all, must employ either enthymemes or examples. The difference between the enthymeme and example is that the enthymeme is a deduction and the example is an induction. Either or both may be used in rhetorical discourse and each has its advantages.

Kerr's arguments in his Senate speeches on conservation are mainly arguments from induction rather than deduction. Thus, if Aristotle's terms are used, the analysis of Kerr's logos, in this study, will be an examination of examples rather than enthymemes.[13] Such an analysis

---

[12] Rhetoric, 1356b.

[13] Since Aristotle, the term rhetorical induction has broadened to include kinds of reasoning not discussed by Aristotle. For the purpose of this study, the term rhetorical induction is considered in the broader sense and is defined as arriving at a general principle through the examination of particulars. Such a definition includes argument from causal relation, specific instance, authority, and analogy as types of rhetorical induction.

will be presented when Kerr's arguments and evidence are considered. Now we turn to an examination of those assets and liabilities which contributed to the effectiveness of Kerr's logical proof.

Factors Contributing to the Effectiveness of Kerr's Logical Proof

As previously indicated, Kerr used his wealth to an advantage in procuring valuable information for Senate clashes as well as political campaigns. Certainly a Senator who could afford to spend the necessary money for comprehensive research would be in a more advantageous position than one who could not. In all campaigns, Kerr spent a considerable amount of money to secure a survey of voter sentiment in advance of the election.[14] Kerr also spent money to determine his audience's position on the matter on which he was to speak.

Robert Kerr's diligence in the study of legislation, while closely related to the use of his fortune, deserves separate attention as a contributing factor to the development of his logical proof. Rarely was Kerr unprepared, and when he spoke, his utterances were based on facts. A second speaking trait which contributed to Kerr's logos was his debate experience. Perhaps because of his debate training, he could quickly recognize the crux of an issue.

---

[14]See page 33 for an example of how Kerr used his fortune to secure information which he used in speeches.

Both in private conversation and in speeches, Kerr frequently quoted the Bible. In fact, his Biblical learning was one of his major resources in rhetorical discourse.[15]

Argumentative Development in Kerr's Senate Speeches on Conservation

Exposition

Exposition is an important factor in rhetorical discourse since an understanding of the ideas or arguments is a necessary prerequisite to audience acceptance. Kerr was careful to define or illustrate the issue at hand before advancing arguments for his case.

Definition. One of the methods Kerr frequently employed to insure audience understanding was a definition of the issue or issues involved in the clash. In the 1949 debate concerning the Interior Department Bill for the Southwestern Power Administration, Kerr summarized the controversy before giving his speech:

> There are four things about which this [debate] has arisen. One is the transmission line to southeastern Missouri. Another is a transmission line to western Oklahoma; the third is operation and maintenance expenses, and the fourth is the continuing fund.[16]

Thus, before Kerr launched his arguments, he took time to define carefully the crux of the controversy.

Other examples of Kerr's use of expository definition

---

[15]See examples cited in Chapter III, pp. 43-44.

[16]U. S., Congressional Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11449. (Later cited as Record.)

are plentiful. In 1961 Kerr reported to the Senate the results of a study conducted by a special committee on water resource development. His opening statement defined the purpose of the report. "This report today is concerned with general recommendations as to how we can best meet our water needs for farm, home, and factory in an expanding economy as we move into 1980 and the end of the century."[17]

Perhaps the best example of Kerr's ability to define the purpose of a bill occurred in a 1959 speech on the Lake Michigan Water Diversion Bill. Again, before advancing arguments, he carefully defined the bill's purpose.

> Mr. President . . . H. R. I. is a bill to provide additional diversion of water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois Waterway, and to provide a study to determine the effect of such diversion upon the navigation of the Great Lakes, of the Illinois Waterway, and other waterways connecting with the Great Lakes, and also upon the problem of sanitation in the Chicago Sanitary District.
>
> The bill pertains to the waters of the United States of America, the navigation of those waters, commerce by transportation on those waters, and sanitary conditions in connection with the use of those waters. Therefore, it is very appropriately before the Senate.[18]

Example. Kerr's favorite expository device was the

---

[17] Record, 87th Cong., 1st Session, 1961, CVII, part 2, 1412.

[18] Record, 86th Cong., 1st Session, 1959, CV, part 13, 17006. See also Record, 86th Cong., 1st Session, 1959, CV, part 10, 13049; Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11454; and Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 12032 for other examples of Kerr's use of expository definition.

use of an example, more particularly a story, which served the purpose of explaining the issue. During the 1951 debate on the Oolagah Dam Project, Kerr urged Congress to approve the necessary appropriations for the project. Kerr's colleague, Monroney, led the opposition. After Monroney had offered reasons why the dam should not be built, Kerr spoke:

> I remember a story about the great Senator from Tennessee and the former governor of his state, Bob Taylor. In one of his campaigns for the United States Senate one of the controversial issues was whether or not to build a flood-control dam. In that historic fight, as in the present controversy, many of those immediately above the proposed dam site were against the dam. Most of those below the dam site were in favor of it. A great meeting was promoted and a picnic was had at the proposed site of the dam. People came from far and wide to hear the candidates discuss the controversial issue. Finally it came the turn of the distinguished Bob Taylor. After his introductory remarks, he said, "My friends and fellow citizens of Tennessee. We are engaged in a great campaign, one of the issues of which is whether to build the proposed dam, or not to build it. A large delegation of my friends has come to me and said that I must take a position on that issue." He said, "Up until this time, when I have been above the place where this dam was to be built I have been against it. When I have been in the area below where this dam was to be built, I have been for it. Today, I want to tell the world, here on the site where the dam would be constructed, if it were built, before God, and all people assembled here, I am neutral!"
>
> Mr. President, my distinguished colleague represents the viewpoint of those above the dam site.[19]

---

[19] Record, 82nd Cong., 1st Session, 1951, XCVII, part 8, 10025.

Thus, by relating the above story, Kerr was able to define his opponent's position as well as to establish recognition that another side of the issue had not been presented.

Kerr's Senate speeches frequently employ such a device. In discussing the federal drouth relief program, Kerr said:

> The Secretary has put into effect a hay program, and I wish to tell the Senate what that is. If the State makes a certain contract to supervise, participate, designate, and cooperate, the Department of Agriculture will pay half the freight on hay at a cost not to exceed $10 a ton. I ask Senators what benefit that is to a farmer who cannot pay for the hay, let alone half the freight? It is like placing a sumptuous, alluring feast in front of starving men and building a partition of bulletproof glass between them and the food, placing men with shotguns on guard to shoot them down in case they succeed in breaking through the glass. That would do them as much good as what the Secretary of Agriculture is doing under the guise of putting into effect a drouth disaster relief program for certain designated counties.[20]

Argument and Evidence

Contemporary rhetorical scholars disagree concerning the proper method of analyzing argument and evidence. Some postulate that they may be considered separately; others that they must be analyzed at the same time because they cannot be separated. Thonssen and Baird belong to the school that advocates a separate examination of argument

---

[20] Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part II, 15002. See also Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11452; and Record, 82nd Cong., 1st Session, 1951, XCVII, part 6, 7784 for other examples of Kerr's use of this device.

and evidence. Concerning argument they state, "Chief among the types of inductive argument are those of causal relation, specific instance, authority, and analogy."[21] Referring to evidence they state, "Apart from reference to his own authority, the two principal types of evidence are statistics and testimony."[22]

This writer, however, sees no difference in argument from authority and authoritative evidence. Moreover, what is the difference between an argument from specific instance and evidence which consists of an example? An argument merely represents the speaker's contention concerning the question at hand, and any logical proof which supports the contention must be labeled as evidence.

Evidence, of course, has no significance if it is totally disconnected from argument. On the other hand, argument is meaningless without supporting material. Thus, these two facets of Kerr's rhetorical discourse will be considered at the same time. First, Kerr's argument will be stated; then the evidence will be presented.

In the general development of his argumentative pattern, Kerr relied on inductive argument rather than argument from deduction. Kerr routinely arrived at a general principle through the examination of particulars. In the examination of particulars, Kerr usually presented

---

[21]Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 348.

[22]Ibid., p. 342.

statistics, testimony of experts, authoritative assertions, illustrative examples, or analogies to establish proof.

Statistics. Keltner and Harnack point out that Kerr's evidence in congressional debate and committee hearings is "factual, specific, and abundant."[23] An examination of Kerr's Senate speeches on conservation shows this statement to be true. In the 1957 debate on the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act, Kerr argued that the programs of the bill were necessary to insure enough water for the future and presented the following statistics to prove his contention.

> In 1850 the per capita consumption of water in the United States was about fifty gallons a person. In 1950 it had increased to the point where it exceeded 1,000 gallons per capita every day.
>
> In the development of our industrial economy, in the environment of the improved methods of agricultural production, there can be little question that in the next thirty-five or forty years the amount of water required, on a per capita basis, will be double the present requirement.
>
> When we realize that the population of our country, on the basis of the present increase, will very likely double in that same period of time, we are confronted with the realization that the necessity of the population for water could well be four times the amount required today.[24]

In the 1957 debates on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendments, Kerr relied on much the same type of statistics in demonstrating the increased consumption of electric power.

---

[23] John W. Keltner and R. Victor Harnack, "Robert S. Kerr" in "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (October, 1952), 296.

[24] Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 4, 4535-4536.

> Every member of the Senate is aware of the fact that the demand for electric power has been growing by leaps and bounds. The annual consumption in 1956 was approximately sixteen times as much as it was in 1920. The annual consumption during the past few weeks or months has been at the highest rate in history, and is running from eight to ten percent above that of a year ago.[25]

In another speech on the same topic he said, "Industrial engineers tell us it is fully expected that within the next thirty-five years the consumption of electric energy in the United States probably will be sixteen times what it is today."[26] As the examples indicate, Kerr was fond of using statistical data to contrast the past with the present or future. This trend began early in his senatorial career and extended until his death. In one of his first Senate speeches, Kerr argued for increased appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration on the grounds that

> Before the coming of R.E.A. less than two percent of farms [in the southwest] had electric power. Today in Oklahoma almost 73,000 of the 165,000 farms, or forty-four percent, have electric service. Throughout the entire Southwest approximately fifty percent of the farms are presently being served, but Mr. President, there are some 500,000 farm homes even now being denied the opportunity for electric lights, washing machines, refrigerators, and a multitude of other labor-saving devices.[27]

Other examples of Kerr's use of statistical data are too

---

[25] Ibid., part 10, 14073-14074.

[26] Ibid., 14074.

[27] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11453.

numerous to present here.[28]

Testimony of Experts. Frequently, Kerr used the testimony of experts to substantiate his arguments. During the 1949 debate concerning appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration, the legality of the Power Administration's authority to purchase power and lease lines under the Flood Control Act of December, 1944 was questioned. Kerr obtained the opinion of the Solicitor of the Department of Interior on the matter and offered his opinion as refutation to those who contended the Power Administration did not have the legal right to purchase power and lease lines under the 1944 act.[29]

The above procedure, however, was not the one Kerr most frequently employed in using the testimony of experts. More often, he would only refer to the fact that the experts approved the measure which he supported. These examples are much more numerous than the actual quoting of expert testimony. In support of the 1957 Tennessee Valley Authority amendments, Kerr said, "The President of the United States, through his Bureau of the Budget, has advised Congress that he favors a program authorizing the

---

[28]For other examples of Kerr's use of statistical data see Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11453; Record, 82nd Cong., 1st Session, 1951, XCVII, part 6, 7788; and Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7229.

[29]Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11449.

Tennessee Valley Authority to issue self-liquidating revenue bonds.[30]

In the proposal concerning the Department of Defense's request for additional land then contained in the Wichita Wildlife Refuge, Kerr argued, "The Department of Defense tells us that if the Artillery School is to meet its requirements of tomorrow it must have more room."[31]

In a 1957 speech entitled "Oklahoma's Worst Flood," Kerr pictured the tragedy for his colleagues. He said that if the Keystone Reservoir had been constructed there would have been no flood at Tulsa or Bixby. "This fact was confirmed," he said, "by the Chief of Engineers, Major General E. C. Tischner."[32]

Thus, while Kerr used the testimony of experts in Senate speeches, he more often merely referred to their names and indicated that their position concerning the matter was the same that he advocated.[33]

Authoritative Assertion. Early in his career as a United States Senator, Kerr rarely relied upon authoritative

---

[30]Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 10, 14074.

[31]Record, 84th Cong., 1st Session, 1955, CI, part 9, 11500.

[32]Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7229.

[33]For other examples of Kerr's use of expert testimony see Record, 82nd Cong., 1st Session, 1951, XCVII, part 8, 10025; and Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19462.

assertion to establish his ideas. On several occasions, however, he did depend primarily on his own authority. In the 1949 issue of appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration, opponents attempted to cut the $660,000 provided for general equipment to $100,000. In reference to this proposed cut, Kerr said:

> This would make it impossible for the Southwestern Power Administration to provide itself with necessary trucks, dispatching boards, tractors, and energized line equipment. Mr. President, these items will be absolutely necessary for the minimum operation of the facilities for which S.P.A. is responsible.[34]

In the above argument, Kerr offered only his authoritative assertion to support it.

As Kerr became a recognized authority on questions relating to conservation, he increased his use of authoritative assertions to establish proof. In his speech "Oklahoma's Worst Flood," he declared that had the Caldwell and Corbin Reservoirs been constructed, there would have been no flood at Blackwell. Further, he contended that there would have been no flood at Waurika had the Waurika Reservoir been constructed.[35]

During the 1961 debates concerning the Delaware River Basin Project he stated, "Mr. President, in my judgment, S. 856 would provide an efficient and practical means of

---

[34] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11450.

[35] Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7230.

carrying forward a much needed program in the Delaware River Basin."[36] Often, after he became an expert on matters concerning conservation, he made the statement, without evidence other than his own assertion, that "very few communities in this nation have enough water to sustain even their present population on the basis of demands expected twenty years from how."[37]

Example. In support of his arguments, Kerr usually relied upon examples. Examples illustrating his point were numerous in all Senate conservation speeches. A good illustration of Kerr's use of examples is found in his 1949 speech concerning appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration. The Senate committee severely cut the appropriations for S.P.A. as well as for several projects seeking authorization under the bill. When the issue came before the Senate, Kerr's attack of the committee's recommendations was comprehensive and devastating. His primary argument was that the committee had followed, to the letter, the requests of the private utility companies. A portion of his development of that idea is printed below.

> If the Senators will read the hearings held before the Senate committee, they will find there this amazing and astonishing fact: The action of the committee conforms absolutely to the recommendations made by representatives of the electric utility

---

[36] Record, 87th Cong., 1st Session, 1961, CVIII, part 15, 19681.

[37] As cited in Norman Transcript, January 6, 1963, p. 6.

companies, operating in the area of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. Langston Ashford, representing Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., at page 1422, Senate subcommittee hearings on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1950, said: "The particular appropriation which we oppose is one for $3,169,000 to build a 154 kilowatt line from Norfork Dam to Essex, Missouri."

At page 1424 of the same volume, Mr. Byron, vice president of the Missouri Utilities Co., stated: "My purpose is to oppose this line from Norfork to Essex just covered by Mr. Ashford, which comes into our territory in southeastern Missouri."

The committee followed these recommendations by striking that item from the bill.

Pages 1578 and 1579 of the same volume show two lists of projects submitted by Mr. Hamilton Moses, president of the Arkansas Power and Light Company. One list describes "projects of Southwestern Power Administration which should not be built with public funds." The other begins: "Projects not objected to by companies in the Southwest."

With but few minor variations, the Senate committee followed all suggestions contained in these two tables. Almost without exception, the items which Mr. Moses says "should not be built" are stricken. The ones "not objected to by the Southwest Power Companies" are permitted to remain in the bill.

On page 1408 of the same volume Mr. Walter B. Gesell, vice president of the Oklahoma Gas and Electric Co., said: "Operation and maintenance, marketing and administrative expenses do not need the $525,000 requested—$350,000 is probably more than adequate in the fiscal year 1950."

The amount allowed by the Senate committee is $330,000.[38]

Kerr's attack continued, demonstrating that the Senate committee had usually followed the recommendation of private utility companies.

In the same debate, opponents to the legislation argued that the lines S.P.A. proposed to build were

---

[38] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11451.

duplicating lines. In answering the argument, Kerr offered examples of lines that were not in duplication to existing lines. He said, "There is no line from Norfork, in northern Arkansas, to Essex, in southeastern Missouri. There is no line from Lulu, in eastern Oklahoma, to Anadarko, in western Oklahoma."[39]

Analogy. To prove a point Kerr was especially fond of citing humorous and colorful analogies, particularly in the form of stories.

When Oklahoma suffered a drouth in 1954 and the Department of Agriculture failed to declare the region a disaster area which would enable farmers to receive government support, Kerr declared:

> It reminds me of the accused man who was standing in court after having been convicted of having committed a capital offense. The judge directed him to stand and receive sentence. It was in the dead of winter. The judge described the conditions on the outside. He described the thick snow and ice on the ground, the bleak, cold, frigid temperature. Then the judge pictured the coming of the glories of spring. He talked about the flowers blooming in the meadows, the grass growing along the creeks, and the lambs and other animals grazing on the abundance and verdure of nature. He said the sun above would remind men of glory and abundance and the beneficence of Providence. Then he said to the accused, "But that won't do you any good, because next Saturday morning at 10 o'clock you are going to be hanged by the neck until you are dead."
>
> What does it benefit a family out yonder in the drouth-stricken and parched plains of the

---

[39] Ibid., 12033. See also Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19462; Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11452; and Record, 84th Cong., 2nd Session, 1956, CII, part 6, 7935.

> country, whose cattle cannot survive for a week without water, to be told, "Be at ease. Thirty days from now, who knows; maybe we will do something."[40]

In 1949, in debates concerning the S.P.A. and private utility companies, Kerr advocated that the S.P.A. should be allowed to build power lines to service preferred government customers. Opponents argued that the private utilities had promised to build the same lines. In answer, Kerr speculated that the only reason the private utilities had offered to build the lines was because they thought Congress might appropriate money for the Southwestern Power Administration to build them. He then indicated that although the private utilities had promised to build the lines, they had not done so, and it appeared as if they were reluctant to fulfill their promise. He then offered the following analogy in support of his argument.

> It [the action of the private utility companies] reminds me somewhat of the story of Sandy when he was fishing and had with him his Scotch preacher. A storm came up and it looked pretty serious. Sandy said, "Preacher, I'll row if you'll pray, and we'll see if we can make out." So they started for the shore, each one doing his assigned job with all the energy he had. As it got darker Sandy said, "Preacher, pray a little harder. She's lookin' rougher." After a while Sandy thought he felt the front end of the boat touch the sand of the shore, and he immediately said, "Preacher, slow up on them commitments. It looks like we're going to make it."[41]

---

[40] Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part 12, 15476.

[41] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11452.

In another issue involving S.P.A. and private utilities—this one over a fund which would enable S.P.A. to make contracts with private utilities—opponents argued that it was unnecessary to provide such a fund since the two parties were now on friendly terms, and they would work together in peaceful cooperation for the welfare of the country. Replied Kerr:

> Senators say they are no longer enemies, and perchance they are not. But I wish to say that their conversion is of very recent date and of very limited degree. I am reminded of the story of the hillbilly in the Ozarks, in the eastern part of our State or in the western part of our great neighbor State. He came into the doctor's office one Saturday morning with a tall, gangling boy, and he said, "Doc, I wish that you would fix up my son-in-law."
>
> The doctor said, "What's the matter with him?"
>
> "Oh," he said, "I shot him in the leg yesterday and lamed him up a mite."
>
> The doctor said, "Why, shame on you, shooting your own son-in-law."
>
> "Aw doc," he said, "he wasn't my son-in-law till I shot him."
>
> I want to see contracts made with the utilities, but if there is going to be any shooting done, I want the Government in the position to do it, and not put the Administrator in the position where he will have to take all the shooting.[42]

In summary, Kerr frequently relied on analogies to develop his ideas but also made use of statistics, testimony of experts, authoritative assertions, and illustrative examples.

---

[42] Ibid., 12033.

Emotional Proof

Importance

Aristotle defined pathos as "putting the audience into a certain frame of mind."[43] He amplifies this statement by saying that "persuasion may come through the hearers, when the speech stirs their emotions. Our judgments when we are pleased and friendly are not the same as when we are pained and hostile."[44] According to Lee, the effect of pathos is the direct excitation of emotion. He claims that "pathos [is] a matter of arousing emotions."[45] The definition of pathos has, however, been broadened by modern rhetorical theorists. Thonssen and Baird claim that emotional proof (pathos) may be defined as "all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas."[46]

John Ward recognized the significance of pathos when he said, "Bare conviction is not sufficient for many persons, to excite them to action. They will acquiesce in the truth of a thing, which they cannot contradict, or will not give themselves the trouble to examine; and at

---

[43] Rhetoric, 1356a.

[44] Ibid.

[45] Lee, "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal," 70.

[46] Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 358.

the same time remain unconcerned to prosecute it."[47] In other words, logical proof alone is almost never sufficient to gain the desired response from the audience. A. K. Rogers attempts to explain this phenomenon when he says that the "normal human mind is not content merely to be logical and realistic; it craves food for the emotions also."[48] There is a great deal of truth in Cicero's dictum:

> Mankind makes more determinations through hatred, or love, or desire, or anger, or grief, or joy, or hope, or fear, or error, or some other affection of the mind, than from regard to truth, or any settled maxim, or principle of right, or judicial reform, or adherence to the laws.[49]

It is of necessity, therefore, that the speaker puts his audience in the proper frame of mind to receive his ideas.

Factors Contributing to the Success of Kerr's Emotional Proof

If a speaker is to be successful, he must adapt both himself and his ideas to his audience. Audience adaptation should occur while the orator is preparing his speech as well as during its formal presentation. When Kerr used someone as a sounding board to listen to his speech, he demonstrated his recognition of the importance of audience adaptation. Often, he would alter the speech if the reaction was not a favorable one.

---

[47] As cited in ibid.

[48] As cited in ibid., p. 359.

[49] De Oratore, translated by J. S. Watson (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1864), ii, 44.

Kerr relied on his knowledge of the Bible as a primary source for emotional materials. Both frequently and freely he tapped the Bible for pathetic proof.[50]

Kerr's sarcasm and invective added a double contribution to the effectiveness of his emotional proof. Senators were sometimes reluctant to disagree with Kerr because they feared his vehement attacks. As one Southern Senator said, "You have to think twice before crossing Bob Kerr."[51] Moreover, when another senator did challenge him, Kerr often became personal, and the emotional appeal involved was one of fear—fear of destruction of reputation or humiliation before one's colleagues. Seligman related that because of this, "Several Senators have as much as admitted that when Kerr rises to argue with them, their instinct is to run for the cloakroom."[52]

Thus, through sarcasm and invective, Kerr could put certain members of his audience in the proper frame of mind. That proper frame of mind was not to disagree or harass Kerr while he was speaking.[53]

---

[50]Examples of Kerr's use of the Bible for source material are found on pp. 43-44.

[51]As cited in "Kerr Switches Sides to Push Trade Bill," Business Week, No. 1717 (July 28, 1962), 86.

[52]Daniel Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," Fortune, LIX (March, 1959), 137.

[53]Examples of Kerr's use of sarcasm and invective are found on pp. 52-56.

Emotional Appeals in Kerr's Senate Speeches on Conservation

Pathetic proof may be either explicit or implicit. Kerr's appeals were of both type, but usually he relied more on the implicit ones rather than those which were explicit. Kerr appealed either explicitly to the audience's social responsibility, fair play, loyalty, or sense of national security, or by implication to their individual security or social responsibility. Appeals concerning social responsibility and national security occurred most frequently.

Explicit Appeals

Social Responsibility. In a speech concerning the continuing fund for the Southwestern Power Administration, Kerr said:

> The Senate cannot escape its responsibility to see that facilities are available by which to deliver the power. Therefore, we must either give our representative equal bargaining position and power to negotiate for its delivery, or put him in such a position that the utilities will be the judge of whether or not a contract is to be made, and on what basis.[54]

In a later speech on the same topic, Kerr again appealed to the Senate's sense of social responsibility when he said:

> Shall we pass this legislation on the basis requested and urged by the people, or shall we

---

[54] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 12033.

> submit to control by the private utilities of the public power policy of this Government?
>
> Shall we comply with the wishes of the people, or shall we conform to the desires of the electric utilities?
>
> Shall we accede to the petitions of the many, or yield to the demands of the few?
>
> Shall we dedicate great projects built with public funds, which are largely self-liquidating, to the service of American citizens? Or shall we, in opposition to the people's desires, place these projects at the disposal of private interests for their financial profit?[55]

Fair Play. Kerr appealed to his colleagues' sense of fair play during the debates over the 1956 Flood Insurance Bill. He argued that the bill should also provide insurance for victims of tornado and cyclone damage. On one occasion he said, "I submit that in simple justice, the victims of tornadoes and cyclones are equally entitled to the protection provided by the bill for victims of flood damage or destruction."[56] In a 1953 debate concerning a conference report to cut appropriations for an Interior Department bill, he said, "If we adopt this conference report, Mr. President, Congress shall have betrayed the faith of the people."[57]

---

[55] Ibid., 11454. See also Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11455; Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part 12, 15473; and Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part 12, 15475.

[56] Record, 84th Cong., 2nd Session, 1956, CII, part 6, 7935.

[57] Record, 83rd Cong., 1st Session, 1953, XCIX, part 8, 9944. Other examples of Kerr's appeal to his colleagues' sense of fair play are Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part 12, 15475; and Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11454.

Loyalty. In the 1949 debate over the continuing fund, Kerr appealed to his colleagues' loyalty. He asked, "As between the two, which one is entitled to the confidence of Senators, the Administrator or the public utilities? Which one is accountable to us? The utilities are not, the Administrator is. Which one's failure would reflect upon us?"[58] In essence, Kerr was saying that the S.P.A. was a creation of Congress, and a vote against the continuing fund would be a betrayal of loyalty.[59]

National Security. The majority of Kerr's explicit appeals in his Senate speeches on conservation were directed at national security. In 1961 when he reported the findings of the Senate Special Committee to Study Water Resource Development, he said:

> In the words of my favorite phrase, the "Land, Wood, and Water" are the basic elements of economic strength, and these elements must be diligently conserved and wisely used if we are to maintain our security and reinforce our world position. President Kennedy has said we must negotiate with the Russians from a position of strength, and this report verifies the fact that the basic foundation of our enduring strength consists of our natural resources.[60]

Further in the report, he said, "We hope that its [the

---

[58]Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 12033.

[59]Other examples of Kerr's appeal to his colleagues' sense of loyalty can be found in Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part 12, 15473; and Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11455.

[60]Record, 87th Cong., 1st Session, 1961, CVII, part 2, 1412.

committee's] recommendations will bring bold and vigorous response. This alone can produce a stronger, sounder, safer, and enduring America."[61]

In a 1949 speech concerning an Interior Department appropriation bill for the Southwestern Power Administration, Kerr called for the support of the bill on the grounds that it would strengthen America. He said:

> In considering the fiscal policies of the Government it is well to know that dollars and cents are not the only standard of national wealth. It has been said that a nation loaded with money, but whose resources are dissipated, is a poor nation; but that a nation whose resources are conserved and developed, is a wealthy nation, though her financial resources alone may be limited. I do not consider that the United States of America is short in any of these regards. I say that programs having to do with the development of the economic resources of the nation, the conservation and building of the soil, the conservation and use of water, the development of an industrial structure, the development of the people of the nation to the point where they know how to get the most out of those resources—these things make for a wealthy nation indeed.[62]

Implicit Appeals

Individual Security. Although Kerr never explicitly appealed to his colleagues' concern for individual security, the implication was often found in his speech that, should

---

[61] Ibid.

[62] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11449. Other examples of Kerr's appeal to his colleagues' sense of national security can be found in Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CII, part 10, 14074; and Record, 87th Cong., 1st Session, 1961, CVII, part 2, 1413.

the Senate not follow his suggestions, they might possibly suffer personal loss. In the 1949 issue over appropriations for S.P.A. he implied that the voters were in favor of the bill. He said, "Mr. President, there is far more involved in this controversy than mere reduction or increase of the amount of an appropriation. The basic power policy of the Government is involved. The people are keenly aware of the issues we face here today. Let us be no less aware than they."[63] Using this same technique in a later speech, he said, "Mr. President, there are a million farm families in the area affected, seeking to be served by this power. It is their emancipation proclamation. They have come by the hundreds to the Senate and asked that the action of the House of Representatives be accepted and approved by the Senate."[64]

Thus, Kerr often implied that if certain measures were not passed, senators would lose popularity and, more important, votes.

Kerr's Senate speeches also contain other implicit appeals to individual security but in a different context. When other senators did something that made Kerr especially angry, he always managed to leave the implication that he would, in the future, return the favor. Such a case occurred in a 1958 debate over the Lake Michigan Water Diversion

---

[63] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11451.

[64] Ibid., 12033.

program. Kerr asked the Senate's unanimous consent to ask a question of another senator. Kerr had the floor to make a statement concerning the issue being discussed. In order to ask a question he first had to gain unanimous approval. Such a procedure is common; but the senator from Vermont objected, and Kerr's request was denied. Regarding the objection, Kerr said:

> It was a little unusual. I sat in my seat while the distinguished Senator from Michigan had the floor. I must say there was as near to a three-ringed circus going on on this floor as I have seen in my lifetime, and I have been to the Dallas Fair twice. No senator objected to that informal discussion, because either a contribution was being made to the subject before the Senate or gratification on the part of Senators to be heard was being had by them.
>
> Yet, when I asked unanimous consent to prepound a question to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Vermont, who had been in violation of the rules of the Senate this afternoon with impunity and without objection on my part, exercised his right and privilege, which he is certainly entitled to do, if he so desires, to become technical with the Senator from Oklahoma. It is interesting and illuminating with reference to the attitude of the Senator from Vermont.[65]

After such a statement, there could be little doubt in the senator from Vermont's mind that Kerr would, at his first chance, repay him twofold.

Social Responsibility. In a 1957 speech entitled "Oklahoma's Worst Flood," Kerr said, "In Sunday's Washington Star, on the front page, was a glaring headline: 'Thousands in Oklahoma Flee State's Worst Flood, Wide Area from Tulsa

---

[65] Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19461.

Southward Menaced; Eight Dead, Damage in Millions.'"[66] The statement was an appeal to the Senate's social responsibility. Kerr was implying that had certain dams and projects been constructed, the flood would have never occurred, and it was the responsibility of all senators to promote projects in the future to prevent such disaster from happening again.

In the controversy involving assistance to drouth relief areas in 1954 in Oklahoma, Kerr said:

> I was advised by the Governor [of Oklahoma] that several thousand farm families are now in the process of winding up their business and disposing of their limited assets because they are being literally driven from the farm by the devastating drouth and the resulting damage and disaster.[67]

Here, Kerr implied that it was Congress's responsibility to assist the farmers who had suffered damage from the drouth. While he did not openly say that such was the Senate's duty, the implication was clearly there.

Ethical Proof

Importance

The term ethos is derived from the Greek word for

---

[66] Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7229.

[67] Record, 83rd Cong., 2nd Session, 1954, C, part 12, 15473. Other examples of Kerr's implicit appeal to his colleagues' sense of social responsibility can be found in Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11453; Record, 81st Cong., 2nd Session, 1950, XCVI, part 2, 2047; and Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7230.

custom or habit. In its earliest usage, ethos referred to the habits and traditions that distinguished one social group from another. Ethos in the rhetorical context may be defined as characteristic traits of the speaker derived from traditions, habits, or moral standards.[68]

Rhetoricians agree in declaring that the character of the speaker is instrumental in facilitating the acceptance of belief. Aristotle wrote, "There is no proof so effective as that of character."[69] Contemporary critics and theorists have, however, modified Aristotle's definition of ethos. He believed that what the orator did, while speaking, was of primary concern, and the audience's perception of the speaker, before he spoke, was not directly related to the modes of persuasion. Commenting on this position, Thonssen and Baird have stated:

> This restriction is artificial since the attitude of the audience toward the speaker—based on previous knowledge of the latter's activities and reputation—cannot accurately be separated from the reaction the speaker induces through the medium of the speech.[70]

In short, the audience's impression of the speaker, which he has generated before he comes to the platform, is just as much a part of ethical proof as the impression he leaves

---

[68]William M. Sattler, "Conceptions of Ethos in Ancient Rhetoric," Speech Monographs, XIV (December, 1947), 55.

[69]Rhetoric, 1356a.

[70]Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 385.

with the audience while speaking. In fact, to separate the two is impossible. Thus, this study is concerned with both facets of ethos.

Ralph Waldo Emerson recognized the importance of ethical proof when he said, "The reason why anyone refuses to assent to your opinion, or his aid to your benevolent design, is in you. He refuses to accept you as a bringer of truth, because, though you think you have it, he feels that you have it not."[71]

The Kerr Image

Several factors had an undesirable effect on Kerr's image both as a politician and as a speaker. Elements of his political philosophy, his use of sarcasm and invective, and his fortune all harmed Kerr's image.

Political Philosophy

Kerr's political philosophy of "What's in It for Oklahoma?" gave him the reputation of being a porkbarrel senator. Said Wheeler:

> The unchallenged all-time king of the pork barrel . . . was Oklahoma's late Robert Kerr. Over his four years as governor of Oklahoma and his fourteen years in the Senate, Kerr tapped the Rivers and Harbors bill so repeatedly and successfully that a trip around his once half-arid prairie state is now known as a tour of "Kerr's Lakes."[72]

---

[71]As cited in ibid., p. 383.

[72]Keith Wheeler, et al., "Pork Barrel Outrage: Too Much Money Spent Foolishly," Life, LV (August 16, 1963), 56.

The same article called Kerr's Arkansas River Navigation Project "100 percent pure pork."[73] The purpose of this study is not to question the validity of that statement. Whether or not it is true makes little difference to the Kerr image. What his audience thought is the important thing; and without fear of contradiction, one can say that the Senate either had suspicions or actually believed that Kerr was a pork-barreler.

In trying to get as much as possible for Oklahoma, Kerr once obtained the Cherokees a $14 million settlement from the government. This caused Drew Pearson to say that Kerr would probably like to move everything to Oklahoma except the Washington Monument. Replied Kerr, "Drew Pearson underestimates my intentions."[74] He then said, "How beautiful the monument would appear on the Oklahoma prairie."[75] Undoubtedly such a position did not contribute favorably to his image in Washington.

Sarcasm and Invective

Kerr was notorious for using sarcasm. He would often say that he never gave it to others unless they asked for it. The opinion held by most senators, however,

---

[73]Ibid.

[74]As cited in Hatch, "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," p. 3.

[75]As cited in Joe Lastelic, "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Kansas City Star (September 16, 1962), Sec. D.

was that one asked for it anytime he disagreed with Kerr.[76]

Thonssen and Baird suggest that a speaker helps establish the impression of sagacity if he "acts with tact and moderation."[77] Only infrequently did Kerr act with tact and moderation when another senator disagreed with him. More often, he was cutting and sarcastic. Even his colleague from Oklahoma, Mike Monroney, said, "I think he sometimes gets too personal in debate."[78] Such a reputation did not contribute favorably to Kerr's image.

The Kerr Fortune

Keltner and Harnack point out that in some circles Kerr's wealth caused distrust.[79] When Kerr ran for governor of Oklahoma, the majority of voters were "suspicious of and prejudiced against men of wealth—especially oilmen."[80] While the rise from a log cabin birth to governor or senator of a state is not unusual in America, it is unusual for an Oklahoman to step from a prosperous oil company to the governor's office.

---

[76]Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 137.

[77]Thonssen and Baird, Speech Criticism, p. 387.

[78]As cited in Seligman, "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," 137.

[79]Keltner and Harnack, "Robert S. Kerr," 296.

[80]Otis Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," in Public Men In and Out of Office, edited by J. T. Salter (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1946), p. 416.

Thus, while Kerr used his vast wealth to a great advantage in securing information, at times, it was an undesirable aspect of his image.

Factors which favorably contributed to Kerr's image include his heritage, religion, physical traits, personality, intellectual traits, and speaking traits.

Heritage

Gunther describes Kerr's career as "archetypically American."[81] Kerr often referred to himself as a "man of the people," concerned about his fellow citizens' welfare. His humble birth, frontier family, and success in business and politics were an important part of the Kerr image.

Religion

One of Kerr's big assets was his religion. His religious faith prompted Rucker to say, "In his heart of hearts, Robert S. Kerr was a humble man. Humility was there, deep within him."[82] That Kerr took his religion with him in his daily life was quickly recognized and remembered by all who knew him.

Physical Traits

Bob Kerr's ethical proof was supported by his size,

---

[81]John Gunther, Inside U. S. A. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 882.

[82]Tom Rucker, "Senator Kerr Valued Countless Favors out of Friendship," Daily Oklahoman, January 3, 1963, p. 2.

informality on the platform, and booming voice. Big in size, six feet two inches, Kerr had a deep resonant voice to match.

Personality

Sullivant declared that Kerr's genial personality was one of his biggest assets. Said Sullivant, "He makes friends in all ranks and is at home in any company. He can talk the language of the farmer, the laborer, the banker, and the business executive. He has a genuine enthusiasm for people, a friendliness that is real, and people like him."[83]

Krock accurately described Kerr as being "very folksy."[84] While Kerr was governor of Oklahoma, a Brooklyn housewife wrote him asking for a gallon of Oklahoma sorghum. Not only did the woman receive her request, but also an opportunity to meet the governor of Oklahoma. Kerr personally delivered the sorghum. Because of this and similar antics, he became known as "Sorghum-Packing Bob" and "Smiling Bob."[85]

Intellectual Traits

Such traits as Kerr's memory (he easily remembered

---

[83]Sullivant, "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," p. 418.

[84]Authur Krock, "The Tall Teetotaler from Indian Territory," New York Times, February 7, 1952, p. 10.

[85]Robert T. Elson, "A Question for Democrats: If Not Truman, Who?" Life, XXXII (March 24, 1952), 126.

people's names, and apparently never forgot them), intelligence, and the fact that he was a good listener, all contributed to Kerr's ethos.

Of his intellectual traits, however, it was his diligence that offered the greatest contribution to his image. Kerr was admired by all for untiring work on a project. Said Raymond Gary, who intended to run against Kerr in 1966, "I have always admired Kerr because of his ability, courage, and untiring efforts he would put forth to make a success of whatever he undertook to do."[86]

The late Speaker Sam Rayburn colorfully described Kerr as the "kind of man who would charge Hell with a bucket of water and think he could put it out."[87] Kerr was dedicated to his work, and both friend and foe could not help but admire him for it.

Speaking Traits

Kerr's outstanding speaking trait was his use of wit and humor. Kerr had a joke, it appeared, for every subject, and even in the midst of a heated debate, he would often crack a joke. In a debate on the Lake Michigan Water Diversion Project, Kerr commented:

> I said a while ago that on the basis of the record, the Milwaukee sewage disposal plants return the

---

[86]As cited in Cullen Johnson, "Grief Voiced by President," Daily Oklahoman, January 2, 1963, p. 2.

[87]As cited in "Death of a Senator," Time, LXXXI (January 11, 1963), 23.

> effluent to Lake Michigan. There is this statement in the Record by the Senator from Wisconsin: "We remove up to 95 percent of the sewage." I merely wish to say that if I lived in a community below there, which would be dependent on the effluent for its water supply, I would want to know how near up to 95 percent was removed.[88]

On another occasion, a Republican senator asked that the Senate adjourn early because a party had been planned for the following day to entertain newly elected Republican senators. The context of the request, and Kerr's reply are printed below:

> Mr. Wiley: The event is planned for tomorrow night. It has been arranged for a number of weeks. I doubt whether it would be very comfortable to have all the Republicans leave under those circumstances.
> Mr. Kerr: I, for myself, would like to say that that would be an experience I should like to find out how comfortable it would be.[89]

Kerr was well known for his wit and humor, and coupled with his genial personality, it strongly supported his ethical proof.

Ethical Appeals in Kerr's Senate Speeches on Conservation

Kerr's explicit demonstration of ethical proof was primarily of two types. He often relied upon his own authority and personal experience to establish an idea, and by attacking his opponent's authority he would usually establish his own.

---

[88] Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19463.

[89] Record, 86th Cong., 1st Session, 1959, CV, part 13, 17005.

Reference to Personal Experience And Authority

Frequently, Kerr's speeches contained statements such as, "As I sat in the committee, week after week, listening to the testimony in this controversy . . .,"[90] "Mr. President, I have studied the Texas Light and Power Contract,"[91] and "The Senator from Oklahoma probably heard more of the evidence on the proposed legislation than did any other member of the committee,"[92] which established his authority on the issue.

At other times, a reference to his personal experience would precede an argument: "Mr. President, although I have been familiar for a long time with the damage done by floods, although on many occasions I have seen the terrible havoc which floods have wrought. . . ."[93] Another example is found in his 1957 speech on "Oklahoma's Worst Flood." "I have just returned from Oklahoma, where I spent a good part of the last three days in flying over those areas of

---

[90] Record, 81st Cong., 2nd Session, 1950, XCVI, part 2, 2047.

[91] Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11453.

[92] Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19124.

[93] Record, 82nd Cong., 1st Session, 1951, XCVII, part 8, 10026.

Oklahoma which are suffering disaster from floods."[94]

Kerr usually relied on one of the two methods discussed above to establish his authority on the question. Statements of this nature, however, became less necessary, and in turn, less frequent as Kerr became a recognized authority on issues concerning conservation.

Attacks on Opponents' Authority

Through vehement attacks on his opponents' authority, Kerr not only demonstrated his own knowledge regarding the subject, but he also revealed his interest in and conviction on the legislation under question.

In the Lake Michigan Water Diversion debates, Kerr quoted a treaty in support of his argument. Senator Wiley asked Kerr if he had not left out one very important clause of the treaty. Replied Kerr:

> I wish to say to my good friend—I am sure to his great surprise—that there are fourteen articles to the treaty, and a resolution of the United States, which became a part of it. So the Senator knows that the Senator from Oklahoma knows he has not read all the treaty. I am surprised that the Senator from Wisconsin did not know that. If he had been remotely familiar with this treaty he would have known that I had not read five percent of it. However, what I read, I have read accurately.[95]

---

[94] Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7229. For other examples of Kerr's use of personal experience and authority see Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19125; Record, 81st Cong., 2nd Session, 1950, XCVI, part 2, 2046; and Record, 84th Cong., 2nd Session, 1956, CII, part 6, 8220.

[95] Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19462.

On another occasion concerning the same question, Senator Proxmire asked:

> I notice on page 355 of the hearings a map which I presume is the basis for the findings of the determination of the committee to submit this part of the amendment. I wonder if this is the authority or the basis, in part at least, for this language in the amendment.

Replied Kerr, "The Senator from Wisconsin, if he read the hearings, would be aware of the fact that the map was a part of the evidence offered by those who said this area of the lake should be studied."[96]

During the controversy concerning the Wichita Wildlife Refuge, Senator Neuberger asked, "When the range of artillery becomes greater than that which the Senator has described, will the Department of Defense take from the wildlife refuge another 10,700 acres?" Kerr's reply went like this:

> That illustrates the lack of information my friend has about the location and terrain of this fish and wildlife refuge. If weapons with a greater range should be developed, the area used would be farther to the west. It would not involve a greater area where fish and wildlife are found, because the fish and wildlife area goes roughly north. If a greater range is required, it will be to the west. That would not involve an area adapted to a fish and wildlife reserve. I am happy to give that comforting information to my friend.[97]

In summary, the Kerr image was a combination of factors both advantageous and detrimental to his implicit

---

[96] Record, 86th Cong., 1st Session, 1959, CV, part 13, 17135.

[97] Record, 84th Cong., 1st Session, 1955, CI, part 9, 11501.

ethos. Demonstrations of ethical appeals in Senate speeches were of two types: (1) reference to personal experience and authority, and (2) attacks upon his opponents' knowledge of the issue, thereby establishing his own concern and authority.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Assets and Liabilities

Certain characteristics (outward manifestations of inventive skill) that Kerr brought with him to the rhetorical process were assets to his position as a speaker while others were liabilities. Moreover, some of these characteristics were both assets and liabilities—depending on the occasion and the audience.

Assets

Because of his humble log cabin birth, Kerr enjoyed a distinction that few of his contemporaries did. He was a self-made man and frequently reminded his political opponents as well as his friends that he was also a man of the people. There is little doubt that Kerr's heritage contributed to his election as governor of and U. S. Senator from Oklahoma.

Kerr made his fortune before he entered politics. In his campaigns for governor and senator he spent a great deal of money to secure voter sentiment. When he was elected to the United States Senate, Kerr continued

to use his fortune to obtain valuable information which he used in his speeches and debates. A fortune, of course, is not a prerequisite to become a U. S. Senator, but money for research can enable a senator to obtain information which would be otherwise unavailable to him.

Robert Kerr was a religious man. He took his religion with him to Washington and this undoubtedly contributed to his image. In addition, Kerr frequently called on his knowledge of the Bible for examples which he used to support or illustrate his position.

That Kerr's intellectual traits of intelligence, memory, diligence, and his listening ability were assets is easy to see. He worked hard on legislation, especially that which was of particular interest to Oklahoma. He listened carefully to what other senators said and was quick to react. In debate he frequently called on his memory to produce significant facts, a humorous story, or an analogy to illustrate his position.

Both Kerr's speaking traits and physical traits were assets. His physical characteristics favorably contributed to his image as a speaker, and more than once Kerr used his abilities in debate, sarcasm, and wit and humor to win his point.

Liabilities

However, some of Kerr's characteristics were, at certain times, disadvantageous and could be labeled

liabilities. In regard to his colleagues in the Senate, Kerr's political philosophy was one of his greatest liabilities. He was referred to by many as a pork-barrel senator because of his continual effort to pass legislation favorable to Oklahoma. His criterion of "What's in It for Oklahoma?" undoubtedly caused senators to be suspicious of any legislation that Kerr supported.

A second major liability was Kerr's use of sarcasm and invective. We have seen that Kerr used this trait to his advantage on many occasions, especially when someone disagreed with him. However, even his colleagues (Monroney, for example) felt that Kerr was often too personal in debate and that this was detrimental to his image.

Thus, Kerr's traits were both advantageous and disadvantageous depending on the occasion and audience. Kerr's success, however, indicates that more often these characteristics were assets rather than liabilities.

The Modes of Proof

Of the modes of proof, Kerr relied most on logos. His speeches were usually filled with sufficient evidence to support the argument. In his Senate speeches on conservation Kerr, during his early period as a senator, relied almost exclusively on logos and pathos. As he became a well-known authority on the topic of conservation, however, he relied more heavily on ethos as a mode of proving. His speeches still reflected logos but to a

lesser degree than in his first term as a senator.

Kerr's use of pathos was more often implicit rather than explicit. Examples of both implicit and explicit pathos were found, but implicit appeals were more frequent than explicit ones.

The difficulty involved in separating the modes of proof was observed in Chapter IV. Perhaps it is difficult to separate the modes because the successful orator blends them together and uses all three in supporting an argument. It is the thesis of this study that Kerr not only effectively employed the modes of persuasion but that he was particularly skilled in blending the modes while supporting a single argument. This point can best be examined by examples from Kerr's Senate speeches on conservation.

In a speech entitled "Oklahoma's Worst Flood," Kerr argued that if certain conservation projects had received appropriations there would have been no flood in certain areas. He said:

> In the southern part of Oklahoma, the fine city of Waurika is again having to dig out from under high-floodal flows. More than fifty families were forced to leave their homes for the third time in a month, as Cow and Beaver Creeks converged on this town with their devastating flood waters. Mr. President, the President's budget contains funds for a survey report of the Waurika Reservoir on Beaver Creek. Had this reservoir been constructed, there would have been no flood at Waurika.[1]

---

[1]U. S., Congressional Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7230. (Later cited as Record.)

Here Kerr used his own authoritative assertion as well as the testimony of an expert, the President, to support his argument. He quoted statistics concerning the number of families forced to leave their homes. Here Kerr's emotional appeal to social responsibility is implicit but obviously apparent. He establishes ethical proof by his familiarity with the situation as well as by his authoritative assertion that Waurika would not have been flooded had the reservoir on Beaver Creek been constructed. Another similar example appears in the same speech. "The report in the Sunday Star," Kerr said, "indicated that twenty-three square blocks were flooded in this town. Had the Caldwell and Corbin Reservoirs been constructed, there would have been no flood at Blackwell."[2]

In the 1955 debate concerning the Wichita Wildlife Refuge, Kerr argued that part of the land contained in the Refuge was necessary for national defense.

> I was at Fort Sill a few weeks ago and saw a demonstration of the firing of some of the modern artillery with which the Department of Defense has reinforced our country's defense. I saw there a gun which on its carriage would cover an area longer than the Senate chamber, and is capable of firing I do not know how many miles. But before that gun could be fired, it was necessary to point its muzzle a little above forty-five degrees in elevation, because there was not the range to test its efficiency and the result of its firing to the extent and limits of which it is capable. That gun has never been fired on the Fort Sill Reservation, and there are now hundreds of young Artillery

---

[2]Ibid.

> officers training there, who have never been permitted to operate that great piece of defense equipment in the way in which it was built to be operated, because of an inadequate range.[3]

In developing the argument, Kerr offered information concerning the gun's ability and the fact that it could not be fired properly. His reference that he had visited Fort Sill and talked with men there enhanced his ethos. His emotional appeal is directed to his audience's feeling for national security and to a lesser degree their sense of social responsibility.

In arguing for the Oolagah Dam Project in 1958, Kerr made the following statement:

> Provision was made for a survey of the need for flood control in this area more than fifteen years ago. After a long and studious investigation by the Corps of Engineers, that distinguished and outstanding organization in the executive branch of our Government submitted a report in which they stated that Oolagah would be the key project in the control of floods on the Verdigris River, and furthermore, that Oolagah is one of the key projects to the flood control of the Arkansas River.[4]

Here Kerr makes excellent use of the testimony of experts to prove his point. The appeal to the Senator's sense of social responsibility is implicit rather than explicit. Because the project had been investigated more than fifteen years earlier and had not yet been acted upon,

---

[3] Record, 84th Cong., 1st Session, 1955, CI, part 9, 11500.

[4] Record, 82nd Cong., 1st Session, 1951, XCVII, part 8, 10025.

and because it was called one of the key projects to the flood control of the Arkansas River, Kerr suggests that approving the measure is a matter of social responsibility.[5]

In summary, Kerr in his Senate speeches on conservation relied most heavily on logos as a mode of proving early in his career as a senator. His emotional appeals were directed toward the audience's sense of social responsibility, fair play, loyalty, national security, and individual security and were implicit more often than explicit. As he became an authority on the subject of conservation, Kerr relied more heavily on his ethos than he did during his early senatorial career.

Evaluation of Kerr's Use of the Modes of Proof

Kerr's skillful use of the modes of proof contributed to his success as a senator speaking on conservation. Kerr, in most instances, overcame his liabilities and used his assets to a great advantage. He also employed and blended the modes of proof advantageously while supporting a single argument. Moreover, Kerr's effectiveness in using the modes of proof is attested to by his ability to get legislation on conservation that was favorable to Oklahoma. Further, Kerr's title "Uncrowned King of the Senate" indicates that

---

[5]For other examples of Kerr's ability to use all three modes to prove a single argument see Record, 85th Cong., 2nd Session, 1958, CIV, part 15, 19124; Record, 85th Cong., 1st Session, 1957, CIII, part 6, 7229; Record, 84th Cong., 1st Session, 1955, CI, part 9, 11500; and Record, 81st Cong., 1st Session, 1949, XCV, part 9, 11453.

indicates that he was generally persuasive in his arguments.

While Kerr's powerful position certainly resulted from many forces, his use of the modes of proof was at least a contributing factor. Kerr's persuasive ability was one of the reasons that led Crawford to say, "United States Senators, like the denizens of Orwell's animal farm, are all equal, but some are more equal than others. Senator Robert Kerr of Oklahoma achieved the ultimate in equality."[6]

---

[6]Kenneth Crawford, "The Senate's Ways," Newsweek, LXI (January 14, 1963), 27.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Aristotle. Rhetoric. Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. The Basic Works of Aristotle. Edited by Richard McKeon. New York: Random House, 1941.

Cicero. De Oratore. Translated by J. S. Watson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1864.

Gunther, John. Inside U. S. A. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.

Hollon, Eugene W. The Southwest: Old and New. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Kennedy, George. The Art of Persuasion in Greece. Princeton: New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Kerr, Robert Samuel. Land, Wood and Water. New York: Fleet Publishing Corporation, 1960.

McReynolds, Edwin C. Oklahoma: A History of the Sooner State. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1954.

Quintilian. The Institutio Oratoria. Translated by J. S. Watson. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1960.

Thonssen, Lester and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1949.

Articles

Bauer, Marvin G. "Persuasive Methods in the Lincoln-Douglas Debates," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XIII (February, 1927), 29-39.

Bendiner, Robert. "The Raid on the Gas Fields," Nation, CLXX (March, 1950), 217-219.

"Brainstorm," Time, LXX (July 29, 1957), 11.

"Changing the Senate's Finance Watchdog," Business Week, No. 1486 (February 22, 1958), 24-25.

Childs, Marquis W. "The Big Boom from Oklahoma," Saturday Evening Post, CCXXI (April 9, 1949), 22-23, 118-120.

Crawford, Kenneth. "The Senate's Ways," Newsweek, LXI (January 14, 1963), 27.

"Death of a Senator," Time, LXXXI (January 11, 1963), 23.

"Democratic Prodders Take Field: Seek to Win Congress Back in '54," U. S. News and World Report, XXIV (February 20, 1953), 58-61.

"Democrats," Time, LIX (April 7, 1952), 20-21.

"Disputants in 'The Club,'" U. S. News and World Report, XLIII (July 26, 1957), 18.

Elson, Robert T. "A Question for Democrats: if Not Truman, Who?" Life, XXXII (March 24, 1952), 118-133.

"High Ride for Gas," Time, LV (April 10, 1950), 20.

"High Versus Low," Time, LIX (March 31, 1952), 21.

"The Inflation Row Turns into a Three-Ring Rumpus," Business Week, No. 1452 (June 29, 1957), 44-45.

"Kefauver Knocks Out Kerr," Life, XXXII (April 14, 1952), 40-41.

Keltner, John W. and Harnack, R. Victor. "Robert S. Kerr," in "Political Speaking in 1952: A Symposium," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII (October, 1952), 295-297.

Kerr, Robert S. "Views on the President's Point Four Plan and Its Political Implications," Congressional Digest, XXXI (January, 1952), 16-20.

"Kerr Switches Sides to Push Trade Bill," Business Week, No. 1717 (July 28, 1962), 84-86.

"The King's Bill," Time, LXXX (September 14, 1962), 26.

Lavine, Harold. "Dollar Derby," Newsweek, XLIII (May 24, 1954), 26-27.

Lee, Irving J. "Some Conceptions of Emotional Appeal in Rhetorical Theory," Speech Monographs, VI (1939), 67-86.

"Oklahoma's Kerr—the Man Who Really Runs the U. S. Senate," Newsweek, LX (August 6, 1962), 15-17.

Pross, Edward L. "Practical Implications of the Aristotelian Concept of Ethos," Southern Speech Journal, XVII (May, 1952), 259-264.

Resource-Use Review (A publication of the Conservation and Resource-Use Education Project by the Joint Council on Economic Education) #3, Winter, 1961.

Sattler, William M. "Conceptions of Ethos in Ancient Rhetoric," Speech Monographs, XIV (1947), 55-68.

Seligman, Daniel. "Senator Bob Kerr, the Oklahoma Gusher," Fortune, LIX (March, 1959), 136-138, 179-188.

"Senator Kerr Says He'll Fight for Imports Control," The Oil and Gas Journal, April 16, 1962, p. 58.

"Senator Kerr Talks About Conflict of Interest," U. S. News and World Report, LIII (September 3, 1962), 86.

"Shift in Men—Shift in Policy," U. S. News and World Report, XLIV (February 21, 1958), 90-92.

Sullivant, Otis. "Rich Man's Race," Nation, CLXXVIII (June 29, 1954), 542-543.

Sullivant, Otis. "Robert S. Kerr: Realist in Politics," in Public Men In and Out of Office. Edited by J. T. Salter. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1946, pp. 415-427.

"Taking Over Money Probe," Business Week, No. 1442 (April 20, 1957), 47.

"Truman's Won't-Run Bombshell Sets Off Democratic Campaign," Newsweek, XXXIX (April 7, 1952), 29-31.

Wheeler, Keith, Henry Suydan, Norman Ritter, Bill Wise, and Howard Sochurek. "Pork Barrel Outrage: Too Much Money Spent Foolishly," Life, LV (August 16, 1963), 29-61.

"Wildcatter," Time, LIX (February 25, 1952), 24-25.

Newspapers

Daily Oklahoman (Oklahoma City, Oklahoma). 1941-1963.

"Democrats Can Win in November," Enid (Oklahoma) Events, Special Edition, July, 1948.

Hatch, Katherine. "Appreciative City Goes All Out in Salute to Senator Kerr," The Daily Oklahoman, June 11, 1962.

Hatch, Katherine. "Kerr Was One of the Most Powerful Figures in Oklahoma History," Daily Oklahoman, June 11, 1963.

Hill, Gilbert. "Kerr in a Mild, Mellow, Mood for Festive Dinner," Oklahoma City Times, June 11, 1962.

Johnson, Cullen. "Grief Voiced by President," Daily Oklahoman, January 2, 1963.

Krock, Arthur. "The Tall Teetotaler from Indian Territory," New York Times, February 7, 1952.

Lastelic, Joe. "Bob Kerr Gets Things Done for Oklahoma," Kansas City Star Sec. D. September 16, 1962.

New York Times. 1941-1963.

Norman (Oklahoma) Transcript. January 2, 1963.

Norman (Oklahoma) Transcript. January 4, 1963.

Rucker, Tom. "Senator Kerr Valued Countless Favors Out of Friendship," Daily Oklahoman, January 3, 1963.

Shaw, Gaylord. "Life's Work, Dreams of Senator Kerr Live on in Sooner State," Norman (Oklahoma) Transcript, January 6, 1963, p. 6.

Tethford, Francis. "OBU Pays Tribute to Its Best Friend in Stirring Service," Daily Oklahoman, January 4, 1963.

White, William S. "Democrats Board of Directors," New York Times Magazine (July 10, 1955), Section VI, p. 10.

Government Documents

Congressional Record. 1948-1963.

Unpublished Materials

Kerr Papers, University of Oklahoma Division of Manuscripts.

"Senator Kerr Appreciation Dinner: Script for Narration by Chet Huntley and Frank McGee N.B.C. News," prepared by The Pate Organization. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, May 31, 1962.



APPENDIX A



UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA
LIBRARY

KERR'S SENATE SPEECHES ON CONSERVATION

1. August 15, 1949: "Interior Department Appropriation Bill for Southwestern Power Administration," Volume 95, part 9, 11449-11456.

Kerr's maiden speech in which he answers opponents of the bill who attempt to cut the appropriations for the Southwestern Power Administration. He argues that the S.P.A. has the legal right to make contracts with private utility companies to buy or rent power lines. Kerr also argues that without the continuing fund the S.P.A. would be helpless.

2. August 23, 1949: "Amendment to Interior Department Appropriation Bill for Southwestern Power Administration," Volume 95, part 9, 12032-12036.

Kerr offers an amendment to the above bill to increase the continuing fund of S.P.A. from $300,000 to $660,000.

3. February 21, 1950: "Colorado River Dam at Bridge Canyon," Volume 96, part 2, 2046-2048.

The controversy is between California and Arizona concerning water rights of the Colorado River. Kerr urges acceptance of the bill which would authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of a dam and other works in the main stream of the Colorado River at Bridge Canyon, and would be beneficial to Arizona.

4. April 17, 1950: "Committee Report of Rivers, Harbors, and Flood Control Projects," Volume 96, part 4, 5274-5275, 5279.

Senators asked Kerr questions concerning his explanation of projects authorized by the Senate committee.

5. July 9, 1951: "Amendment to Interior Department Appropriation Bill to Eliminate Continuing Fund of Southwestern Power Administration," Volume 97, part 6, 7784-7788.

Kerr opposes the amendment pointing out the necessity of the continuing fund.

6. August 15, 1951: "Oolagah Dam Project," Volume 97, part 8, 10025-10027.

Kerr attempts to gain Senate approval of the committee's recommendations for appropriations for the Oolagah Dam Project.

7. July 27, 1953: "Department of Interior Appropriation Bill," Volume 99, part 8, 9942-9948.

The conference report of House and Senate recommends that no funds should be used for the purpose of implementing existing contracts with R.E.A. co-operatives which provide for the lease-purchase of transmission or generating facilities. Kerr opposes the report.

8. August 18, 1954: "Drouth Relief," Volume 100, part 11, 15001-15002.

Short statements concerning areas not considered disasters by the Secretary of Agriculture. He suggests that the Secretary's agriculture programs are ineffective.

9. August 20, 1954: "Assistance to Drouth Relief Areas," Volume 100, part 12, 15472-15476.

Kerr describes the drouth in Oklahoma and points to the necessity of government relief to the farmers.

10. July 26, 1955: "Wichita Wildlife Refuge," Volume 101, part 9, 11499-11501.

Kerr argues that a portion of the Wichita Wildlife Refuge is needed for purposes of national defense.

11. May 10, 1956: "Flood Insurance Bill," Volume 102, part 6, 7934-7936.

Kerr offers an amendment to the bill to include tornadoes and cyclones.

12. May 16, 1956: "Niagara River Power Development," Volume 102, part 6, 8219, 8223, 8224, 8234, 8235, 8240.

Kerr argues for appropriations for the project.

13. March 27, 1957: "Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control

Act of 1957," Volume 103, part 4, 4535-4536, 4606, 4615.

A bill to authorize the construction and repairs of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation and flood control. Kerr advocates total acceptance of the bill.

14. May 20, 1957: "Oklahoma's Worst Flood," Volume 103, part 6, 7229-7230.

Kerr argues that the flood and destruction would have been prevented if the Keystone Project had been completed.

15. August 8, 1957: "Tennessee Valley Authority Amendments," Volume 103, part 10, 14073-14076.

Kerr favors amendments that would allow T.V.A. to issue self-liquidating revenue bonds to enable them to build additional facilities.

16. January 27, 1958: "Water Resource Project Report," Volume 104, part 1, 1055-1058, 1060, 1063-1065, 1067, 1072.

Kerr reports to the Senate on the committee's recommendations to secure water for the country's growing need.

17. March 6, 1958: "Public Works Appropriations," Volume 104, part 3, 3574-3575.

Kerr favors a general public works bill.

18. April 2, 1958: "Rivers and Harbors and Flood-Control Bill: Conference Report," Volume 104, part 5, 6109-6110, 6114-6117.

Kerr reports to the Senate on the committee's recommendations and advocates the acceptance of the recommendations.

19. August 22, 1958: "Lake Michigan Water Diversion," Volume 104, part 15, 19124, 19125, 19459-19464, 19524, 19529, 19530, 19532.

Kerr supports the bill which would provide an increase in diversion of the water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway.

20. July 9, 1959: "Tennessee Valley Authority," Volume 105, part 10, 13047-13052, 13055, 13063-13064, 13067-13071.

Kerr supports a self-financing bill for T.V.A.

21. August 26, 1959: "Lake Michigan Water Diversion," Volume 105, part 13, 17005-17011, 17135-17138.

Kerr supports the bill which would provide an increase in diversion of the water from Lake Michigan into the Illinois waterway.

22. September 9, 1959: "Sewage Treatment Plant Construction," Volume 105, part 14, 18782-18783.

Kerr favors a bill to provide for construction of a sewage treatment plant in connection with the Lake Michigan Water Diversion Project.

23. January 30, 1961: "Committee Study of Water Resource Development," Volume 107, part 2, 1412-1419.

Kerr reports from a committee which studied the future water needs of the country.

24. September 15, 1961: "Delaware River Basin Project," Volume 107, part 15, 19680-19684, 19686, 19687.

Kerr supports a bill providing appropriations for the control of water and development of natural resources in the Delaware River Basin.

APPENDIX B

April 24, 1963

Mr. Burl Hayes
c/o Office of the late
Senator Robert S. Kerr
U. S. Senate
Washington, D. C.

Dear Burl:

Greetings from Oklahoma. Work on the Kerr files is proceeding, if slow.

One of our graduate students in Speech, William B. English, is hopeful of producing a thesis on the "Oratory of Senator Robert S. Kerr." Can I select speeches from the file for Mr. English to study?

Sincerely,

A. M. Gibson, Head
Division of Manuscripts

AMG/ven

[redacted]

May 1, 1963

Dr. A. M. Gibson
Head
Division of Manuscripts
The University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma

Dear Dr. Gibson:

Burl has shown me your letter of April 24, advising that one of the graduate students in speech, William B. English, who is working on a thesis entitled, "Oratory of Senator Robert S. Kerr," has requested that you select some of Dad's speeches for him to study in preparing his thesis.

It is kind of you to ask if this is all right, and I certainly have no objection to your selecting these speeches for him. At some future date, when his thesis is completed, I would be interested in seeing it, if he has no objection.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for the splendid job you have done and are doing in assembling, cataloguing and indexing the Kerr papers. I am very indebted to you and your associates.

With all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

Rob't S. Kerr, Jr.

RSK/mb

This volume is the property of the University, but the literary rights of the author are a separate property and must be respected. Passages must not be copied or closely paraphrased without the previous written consent of the author. If the reader obtains any assistance from this volume, he must give proper credit in his own work.

A library which borrows this thesis for use by its patrons is expected to secure the signature of each user.

This thesis by William B. English has been used by the following persons, whose signatures attest their acceptance of the above restrictions.

NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE
[redacted]	Feb 1968
[redacted]	July 16, 1968
[redacted]	Feb. 1970
[redacted]	Sept. 25, 1970