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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Origin of the Study

Then that little man in black there, he says women can't have as much rights as men, 'cause Christ wasn't a woman! Where did your Christ come from? . . . From God and a woman! Man had nothing to do with him . . . If the first woman God ever made was strong enough to turn the world upside down all alone, these women together . . . ought to be able to turn it back again.

These are the words of Sojourner Truth, a former slave, at the Ohio Woman's Rights Convention in 1851. American women have been delivering similar messages since the 1600s. Yet it was not until the 1960s and the rejuvenated Women's Liberation Movement that scholars began to examine the history of the women's movement. Two of them are We, the American Women by Beth Millstein and Jean Bodin and Century of Struggle by Eleanor Flexner. Some studies of the general rhetorical themes of the various eras in the women's movement have been done. One such study was a master's thesis written by Ann Logan. But I was unable to locate many studies on the rhetoric of individual female orators. This became the initial inspiration for the following work.

On July 19, 1848, the Declaration of Sentiments was presented at the Seneca Falls convention. This convention was the result of many Americans frustrations
with the fact that women were not given the same rights and privileges as men.³

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, Jane Hunt, Martha Wright, and Mary Ann McClintock organized the Seneca Falls Convention and drafted the Declaration of Sentiments patterned after the Declaration of Independence. In it the women wrote that

all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. . . . The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries. . . . on the part of man toward woman, having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over her. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world.⁴

Many resolutions were passed at this meeting. The most controversial issue was the demand for women's right to vote.⁵ It took seventy-two years to win this right. "Among those at Seneca Falls was Charlotte Woodard, who, alone of those present, lived to vote for President of the United States in 1920."⁶

On July 19, 1984, exactly 134 years after the Seneca Falls convention, Geraldine Ferraro became the first woman to receive the nomination for Vice-President by a major political party.⁷ She became Walter Mondale's Democratic running mate for the 1984 Presidential election. Her life, career, and campaign became a focal point for all Americans, especially the members of mass media.
Born on the anniversary of the passage of the Nineteenth Amendment and nominated for vice-president on the anniversary of the Seneca Falls convention, Geraldine Ferraro has continued the fight for equal opportunity for women. As the daughter of a young uneducated widow, Ferraro learned the necessity for women to be educated and employable. As a woman reentering the work force after a fourteen year absence, she experienced economic suppression. As assistant district attorney in Queens, New York, Ferraro witnessed the pain of rape victims. And as a United States Congresswoman, Ferraro discovered the overwhelming inequities that still exist in America. During her political career, Ferraro joined the effort her foremothers began over one hundred years ago. She initiated legislation on pension reform, improved day care standards, and flextime in an effort to seek economic fairness for all men and women in America. And Geraldine Ferraro actively campaigned for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment. Her efforts have earned her a prominent place in America's history and her rhetoric is an appropriate subject for study.

Statement of Purpose

Just as the events of the Seneca Falls Convention changed the lives of women in America, Geraldine Ferraro's
vice-presidential nomination has provided new opportunities for a new generation. It is the purpose of this study to examine the rhetoric of Ferraro and determine the motivation for the method of style used in her speeches. In rhetorical terms style refers to word choice and usage. 10

The motivating factors and specific style developed by Ferraro were determined by answering the following questions:

1. What historical, economical, and social factors influenced Ferraro's career choices?

2. How are the recurring themes in Ferraro's rhetoric related to major events in her life?

3. What, if any, parallels can be drawn between the rhetoric of Ferraro and the elements of moral drama? These questions will be expanded in later chapters.

Procedures

1. To determine if other scholarly studies have been made of the rhetoric of Ferraro, a review of Master's Thesis Abstracts through 1984-85 and a computer search of doctoral dissertations and ERIC revealed that, at this time, no other studies have been made.

2. A total of five speeches were selected that were given between 1982 and 1985. Transcripts of these speeches were obtained from various sources. The selected
speeches are listed below and transcripts are located in Appendices A through E.

A. August 26, 1982 speech to Northeast Program Service Center, Social Security Administration—Women's Equality Day.


D. Campaign Speech delivered at Valley College in Van Nuys, California on November 2, 1984.

E. Speech delivered at a political fundraiser for Congressman Tom Daschle in Sioux Falls, South Dakota on September 6, 1985.

In addition to the speeches, a copy of Ferraro, my story, Ferraro's first major publication, was obtained.

3. It will be noted that the book, Ferraro, my story served as a primary source for the study. When I contacted Ferraro's office to request that she complete a questionnaire for me, her personal aide, Barbara Leahy, told me that Ferraro had attempted to answer any questions that might be asked of her in the book. I found the
book to be thorough and in it I was able to locate information considered to be pertinent to this study.

4. The next step in this process was the establishment of a critical tool with which to analyze the rhetoric of Geraldine Ferraro. The use of moral drama as a stylistic tool was developed and applied to Ferraro's discourse.

5. The completion of this study was achieved by examining Ferraro's life and career, determining the rhetorical style of morality plays, analyzing the rhetoric of Ferraro and establishing the presence of moral drama, and then drawing conclusions concerning the development of Ferraro's rhetorical style.

Organization of the Study

Major events in Ferraro's life that were influential in the development of her rhetoric were identified in Chapter II. In Chapter III, I examined the definition of style in rhetorical terms, the prevailing characteristics of the morality plays of medieval England, and Kurt Ritter's use of moral drama as a critical tool. Based on the conclusions drawn from these elements, a set of criteria to be applied to Ferraro's discourse were established. With the information obtained in the two previous chapters, an analysis of the
selected speeches for elements of moral drama and recurring themes was performed and conclusions were drawn.
ENDNOTES


3 Millstein and Bodin, p. 98.


5 Ibid.


8 Ferraro, speech delivered to Northeast Program Center, Social Security Administration, location unknown, August 26, 1982, p. 1.


CHAPTER II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF GERALDINE FERRARO'S
POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

It is Richard Weaver's belief that "It is to history that the rhetorician turns for his means of persuasion."¹ In other words, the development of rhetorical style evolves from factors in the rhetorician's life and various historical events. In this chapter I will examine Geraldine Ferraro's life and career and in the analysis chapter I will determine what events in history and in her life have shaped her rhetoric.

"Don't forget your name. Ferro means iron. You can bend it, but you can't break it. Go on."² These words of inspiration from her mother have been the driving force in Geraldine Ferraro's life. Her mother, Antonetta Ferraro, would reiterate this statement often when encouraging her daughter to continue her education.

Geraldine Ferraro is "the daughter of Dominick, an Italian immigrant, and Antonetta Ferraro, a first generation Italian American."³ When Geraldine was eight years old, her father died of a heart attack. Antonetta, thirty-nine, was left to support her young son and daughter. In her book, Ferraro, my story, Ferraro often
refers to her mother's struggle to survive and her determination to raise an educated self-sufficient daughter. Ferraro states, "My mother taught me by word and example how important it was—for men and women—to be self sufficient." 

When discussing motivating factors in her life, Ferraro comments,

My father's death changed my life forever. I found out how quickly what you have can be taken away. From that moment on, I had to fight for whatever I wanted, to work and study my own way out of the South Bronx and take my mother with me. For every plan I made, I made sure I had an alternative to fall back on. I had learned that the hard way—so had my mother.

The death of Dominick Ferraro forced Ferraro to accept the realities of life at an early age. In her effort to remove her mother and herself from poverty, Ferraro financed her college education by working two or three jobs at a time. She then put herself through law school at night by teaching grade school during the day.

On February 10, 1960, Geraldine Ferraro married John Zaccaro. She retained her maiden name for the following reason, "I wanted to pay public tribute to my mother, to give her recognition for all she had done for me. That was why I had kept her name professionally after I got married, to honor her."

After spending fourteen years at home raising her three children, Ferraro re-entered the work force
in 1974 as an assistant district attorney in Queens, New York. The transition was difficult and fourteen years away from the legal profession presented a new challenge to Ferraro. She states,

A whole new criminal code had been written in the interim. What was I going to do? Take the new statute with me on vacation with the kids and plunge in, studying all the new laws and legal terms—that's what. As long as I have time to prepare, to learn the details of whatever project I'm working on, I feel confident.

"Displaced homemaker" is a term Ferraro grew to understand. She comments that,

Women reentering the work force face psychological hurdles... When I began to work full time as a lawyer, people assumed that because I was older and because my cousin Nick Ferraro was the district attorney at that time, I was a stupid relative who was going to goof off and not do her job. I felt that strain of proving myself then, and so understand from the inside what it's like—the fear that your skills have rusted, that you can't compete.

In addition to the stress of proving herself as a competent worker, Ferraro discovered that the men in the district attorney's office were paid significantly higher wages than she was for the same position. When she inquired about the reasons for her lower pay, she was told that she didn't need the money because she had a husband. She tells women, "If you're wondering what the statistic about women earning fifty-nine cents on the dollar means, that attitude is part of the reason why."
In 1977, Ferraro was appointed a bureau chief. She defines the responsibility of her bureau. We were to handle all the sex crimes in the county, all the referrals from family court on child abuse, all the violent crimes against senior citizens, as well as to implement the recent battered spouse legislation. The primary victims were women, children, and the elderly. Originally each case had been presented by a different assistant for each proceeding, thus forcing the victim to relive the horror of the experience several times. Under the system Ferraro worked with one assistant [who] stayed with the case through criminal court and grand jury to the supreme court. This was a humane innovation, and the bureau became a model in the city.

Because she was the chief, Ferraro felt a responsibility to every victim who came in. "The result was that every abused kid became mine, every sexually abused young woman was my daughter or me, every frightened senior, my mother." She found herself becoming personally involved even though she knew it was wrong. Ferraro reflects,

I had seen enough of rape victims and unwanted children suffering from abuse during my years in the district attorney's office to sear my memory forever. There was nothing abstract about rape or the agony of those unwanted children. Ferraro felt inadequate and wanted to make a greater contribution to those victims. "I had had enough of reacting to problems by punishing without solving."
This then became the motivating factor for Ferraro's decision to run for public office.

During a conversation with Mario Cuomo, Ferraro expressed her interest in running for office. Cuomo suggested Congress, which was something Ferraro had not considered. She began to think about what she wanted to do and comments,

I wanted to make a difference in the most direct way I could, to create opportunities instead of neglect. It was my neighborhood, and these people were my neighbors, and so in 1978 I ran for Congress in the Ninth District of Queens, New York.

It is Ferraro's opinion that criminal rehabilitation is ineffective due to the fact that the criminal is not in jail long enough and the majority return to crime once they are out. Her experience in the district attorney's office revealed that the defendants were usually unemployed, often came from poor families, had a low literacy level that kept them unemployed, and "lived in the jungle of high crime neighborhoods." Ferraro strongly believed that

We had to change those neighborhoods. If we invested in Head Start programs, health care, adequate nutrition, and parenting courses, education, and job-training programs we could break the cycle of poverty—and eventually of crime—in this country for many. It's cost effective, and it's the right thing to do.
As a member of the House of Representatives, Ferraro knew from the beginning what type of office she wanted for the people of Queens:

a congressional office that functioned as a storefront, where people could feel free to walk in off the street any time and find someone to help them. In fact, I insisted that the entrance have no steps at all, not only for the symbolism but for the practical use of the handicapped and the elderly, who I hoped would come to us.

She vetoed blinds on the windows so that passers-by could see her staff at work. She states, "I wanted to capture the feeling that is the best of the American spirit: informality and a helping hand." 21

Caseworkers "who really cared" 22 were hired to work in the office and make housecalls when necessary. Ferraro's office took to the road three days a week in the form of a mobile unit and parked in various parts of the district.

Ferraro reflects,

Looking back, I remembered how when I was first elected in 1978 I knew less about the inside of Congress than my daughter Donna, who had spent a week on the Hill that summer in a program called A Presidential Classroom for Young Americans. 23

She recalls going into "total congressional immersion" 24 by attending breakfast meetings given by the Library of Congress and joining numerous congressional caucuses to gain expertise on a range of issues. Ferraro comments,

My right arm must have stretched two inches lugging around my briefcase stuffed with reading
material from the Library's Congressional Research Service on everything from the latest on nuclear arms to political unrest in the Philippines. It was her sincere desire to become as knowledgeable as possible on the many complex issues facing her constituents and all Americans.

Ferraro expresses her frustration with the low percentage of women in Congress. She states,

When I arrived in Congress in 1979 I had joined the Congresswomen's Caucus. But there were too few women in the House and Senate--only eleven Democrats and six Republicans--to sway any votes among the 435 members.

Legislation on women's issues was dying in committees and there was only one woman in a House leadership role. Ferraro recognized the need for more women to take the initiative to bring women's issues to the forefront and to pursue more leadership roles in the House. She credits women like Bella Abzug for "breaking through the front lines of defense." After gaining tenure in the House, Abzug was appointed to President Carter's National Advisory Council on Women where she continued to argue that "the environment, the budget, and the arms race were women's issues." Ferraro thanks women like Abzug for making it possible for Congresswomen to begin focusing on the real issues.

"I wanted to be part of what was going on in the House, to be an effective, not passive, member of
Congress representing my district and my state." All new members of Congress are assigned to committees. Ferraro's committee assignments were Public Works, Post Office and Civil Service, and the Select Committee on Aging.

During one of her first hearings on the Public Works Committee Ferraro was overwhelmed while listening to the men on the committee sound like experts on subjects like retrofitting of engines to meet noise standards. She asked her staff, "Is it in their genes that they know all this stuff about decibel levels?" Her staff reassured her that those men had been sitting on those committees for years. "From then on, before any committee meeting I read whatever testimony there was ahead of time so that at least I could ask intelligent questions." 

Crime was an obvious worry in my district. When there was a move to save money by cutting the numbers of customs inspectors at Kennedy Airport, I argued the result would be an increase in drug smuggling and saved four hundred jobs--and, I hope, made a minor dent in a major problem. I also got more money for the New York City police.

Other issues she fought for in the Public Works Committee were to protect the New York water supply and to stop nuclear waste shipments through Queens.

"I felt terribly frustrated by what seemed to be the male indifference to women's issues, especially the economic predicament confronting women of all ages."
The statistics are difficult to dispute. Ferraro states that

though women represented forty-three percent of the work force, the "feminization of poverty" was growing. For most, their paychecks were essential to support either themselves or their families. Fully two-thirds of the women in the work force were single, widowed, divorced, or married to men who earned less than fifteen thousand dollars a year... In this country 2.8 million women over the age of sixty-five lived in poverty, almost three times the number of men.

One of Ferraro's primary concerns was that not only were women paid just over half of what men were, but "the jobs many women held usually provided few of the essential benefits for economic security, such as health insurance and pension plans." 35

"Pensions—or lack of pensions—for women was a critical problem." 36 Ferraro's office in Queens often heard from constituents telling of their loss of income after the death of their husbands. Younger women talked about their denial of pension benefits due to time taken off during pregnancy or to raise their young children. Ferraro comments, "one woman whose husband had worked for a major corporation for twenty-four years didn't receive a penny of his pension, because he had died of cancer at fifty instead of fifty-five." 37

These terrible predicaments were not theoretical to me. "Single head of household" was not an IRS phrase; it was my mother, going without meat (not because of health concerns but because she
Ferraro's reaction to these situations was to introduce "a bill to make private pensions fairer and to recognize marriage as an economic partnership." 39 The 1981 bill permitted all workers to start participating in pension plans at age twenty-one rather than twenty-five, it broadened eligibility requirements, and guaranteed access to benefits and continued participation during job absences such as maternity leave. Ferraro states that "this provision gave women who take leave from their jobs for child-rearing the same rights as men who leave for military service." 40 She also introduced a bill to give employers who hired displaced homemakers (women forced back into the workplace due to divorce or spouse's death) a two year tax credit. Neither bill went anywhere.

Ferraro's female colleagues were experiencing the same frustration with bills they had introduced. So they pooled their energy and in March 1983,

we again introduced our bill, this time as one major piece of legislation--the Women's Economic Equity Act--with significant improvements in the separate bills that were its components. The package included my two previous bills ... and a third to provide Individual Retirement Accounts for homemakers. Other provisions called for tax relief for single heads of households, whose incomes were usually low and family expenses high; civil service pension reform to aid wives and widows in receiving their spouses retirement benefits; tax credits for child- and elderly-dependent care and funds for community child-care
information and referral services; non-discrimination in insurance; elimination of federal rules and regulations that hampered women in business; and a fairer system of child-support enforcement, recognizing that both parents have a financial responsibility for their child's welfare.\[1\] These women faced the fact that the package would not pass in its entirety, but the publicity would attract attention allowing easier passage of some of the bills. "Though the Republicans were the majority in the Senate, they knew about the gender-gap vote, too, and knew they had to reach out to women."\[42\] The Congresswomen worked with members of the Senate to have the package introduced in both bodies at the same time. As a result, debates were spearheaded in the House and Senate. Not all bills were successful, but many key pieces of the package became law. Ferraro's pension-equity bill was signed by President Reagan on August 23, 1984. Ferraro comments, "But let no one think winning came easily. My pension equity legislation had been signed three and a half years after I introduced it, a time loss that somewhat muted my gratification."\[43\] 

But not all the women in Congress worked as a team. Ferraro states that, "Under President Carter, the women who joined the Congresswomen's Caucus--Democrats and Republicans--had spoken in one voice on women's issues, regardless of party affiliations."\[44\] The caucus rules required that no policy statement could
be made without unanimous consent of all members because their effectiveness depended on a united group.

After Reagan's election, however, many Republican women did not bother to join the caucus at all, and some of those who did voted along straight party lines. Ferraro accuses these women of forgetting their gender "to align themselves with Reagan's popularity--and his destructive and heartless budget proposals that hurt the very constituency we in the caucus were supposed to be guarding."

According to Ferraro, co-chair of the caucus, Peggy Heckler, "vetoed whatever criticism the caucus leveled at her President's policies."

Several members of the Congresswomen's Caucus, including Ferraro, felt they were becoming powerless. Ferraro states that "We needed numbers to effect change, and the solution was simple. In 1981, we opened the caucus to men, inviting those whose stand on the issues were the same as ours to join us."

The Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues with over one hundred and twenty-five qualified men joining it became "the biggest single group and one of the most influential in the House. You don't have to be a woman to dislike discrimination. Most men do too."

"In fact, by 1981 the balance of sexual power was shifting." Ferraro discusses her fascination with the "internal political process in Congress." She talks
about lobbying and trade-offs. Ferraro states that, "You had to learn to play the game to be effective." During the 1982 Congressional campaign, the Congresswomen found themselves in demand. Their male colleagues were asking the women to campaign for them. Ferraro's response was,

I was happy to oblige—in exchange for backup on legislation. I went out to Orange County, California, for Jerry Patterson to speak with him at a women's event. I campaigned in Connecticut for Bill Ratchford, in Oklahoma for Michael Synar, and in South Dakota for Tom Daschle. In return I got their support for my bill on Flextime, a bill that allowed federal employees to fill their required forty-hour work weeks with various alternate schedules to better accommodate the needs of their families. When Congress passed the bill in July 1982, I was delighted.

In her book, Ferraro, my story, Ferraro often discusses her concern over properly representing her constituents and being sufficiently informed on issues facing Congress. She gives one example of her own views conflicting with those of her constituents. She states,

I was from a conservative district in Queens, and often my conscience conflicted with my obligation to be sensitive to those I represented. My support for the gay-rights bill, for example, might have been upsetting to my constituents, but to me gay-rights is a matter of civil rights. So I worked out a compromise with myself. When I was asked to co-sponsor the gay-rights bill, I declined, not wanting to enflame my constituents. But had it come to a vote, I would have supported it as a matter of conscience. It was important for me to vote for what I thought was right, despite political risks, but there was no need to be provocative about it.

Foreign policy was always an area that Ferraro was uncomfortable with. She states that "I didn't feel
right unless I knew as much as possible about the issues we were voting on in Congress, every detail, every nuance." As a result, Ferraro decided to do some more traveling. In January of 1984, Barbara Kennelly of Connecticut, Teddy Weiss of New York, and Ferraro embarked upon a ten day trip to El Salvador, Nicaragua, Honduras, and Costa Rica. Ferraro reflects that it was

grueling, starting with meetings early in the morning and continuing into the night. We met with forty-seven different groups in the four countries, including representatives from both the leftist guerillas and the rightist government in El Salvador; the Contras, the Sandinistas, and the Maryknoll nuns in Nicaragua; political and business leaders in Honduras, the Miskito Indians and a group of former Sandinistas called the ARDE in Costa Rica.

Ferraro found the trip enlightening and realized that the United States "could not achieve a military solution in South America without involving our own armed forces, a disastrous outcome." Despite her disappointing discovery, Ferraro considered the trip a personal success. "Once more, because of my seeing firsthand what was going on in Central America and talking to representatives on all sides of the conflicts, I felt any vote I would cast when I got home would be more informed and more intelligent." Ferraro continually argues that more women need to be politically active. She justifies this argument by saying, "Women's voices were essential in government,
and not because they were necessarily better than men or more caring or more effective. Rather women added another dimension to the political process—one that was crucial." Ferraro refers to Carol Gilligan's book, *In a Different Voice* and says that according to Gilligan, women were more apt to negotiate. Instead of looking at short term solutions to problems, women were more apt to think in terms of generations to come. Instead of thinking in win-loss terms, women were more apt to consider the grey areas in between.

Ferraro has always found life challenging and seldom settles for present achievements. There is always something else to do and she wants to do everything she can to make this a better world to live in. Her first four years in Congress had been satisfying, but she wanted to do more. She had made major contributions to the committees on which she had been assigned, but Ferraro knew there were more effective committees to serve on. She states, "After my reelection in 1982, I set my sights on a seat on the powerful House Budget Committee, which sets the target of funding for every program that comes before Congress and frames the debate on spending priorities for each proposal." Ferraro saw this not only as an important position but an educational one. The members of the Budget Committee heard testimony from every major office and cabinet member on issues ranging
from defense funding to hunger in America. Ferraro comments,

It was here that I would be able to speak up on behalf of the people in my district and state on issues such as housing and transportation—and, I hoped, put a strong and Democratic imprint on what could be fair allocation of resources to the citizens of this country.

"My chances of getting elected to Budget, however, were slim." Not only did Ferraro face the feminine barrier, but there were already two Democratic members from New York and no other state had more than two. She responded, "But so what? I'd faced odds like that all my life." She campaigned vigorously and did it "the way the guys did." She swapped votes and lobbied other Democratic members because the Budget Committee assignments had to be voted on by the full Democratic Caucus.

One of Ferraro's campaign pitches was that "women deserved to be represented in the highest echelons of Congress." She was approached about this issue. This was the exchange:

"Do you think it's appropriate to promote yourself as a woman?" one member asked me. "It's just as appropriate as male members asking me to campaign for them in their districts because I am a woman," I replied.

As a member of the Democratic party, Ferraro has always worked hard for the political party she feels
represents the principles and ideals of the American people. In her book, she states,

But if the Democrats were to get Reagan out of office in 1984, we needed to smooth out our differences and develop a comprehensive agenda. To that end, I accepted as many party appointments as came my way, serving on the Committee for Party Effectiveness; the Commission on Presidential Nominations; and, as Secretary of the Democratic Caucus, served as House Liaison to the National Party Conference in June 1982.

For the Committee for Party Effectiveness, Ferraro headed the task force on women. Ferraro comments, "Out of all the panels set up to draft the Democratic Party's position on a range of issues from the environment to defense, there was to be no panel on women's issues." Democratic National Committee Chairman Chuck Manatt told Ferraro that a panel on women's issues would necessitate panels on other minorities, such as blacks and gays. Ferraro responds, "I thought that was shortsighted: the gender-gap vote could make all the difference in the presidential elections of 1984. And besides, we weren't a minority." 

"The bigger challenge would come from my appointment to the Hunt Commission in 1981, a seventy-member commission set up after our loss in 1980 to review our presidential delegate selection rules." During the 1970s, grass roots Democrats had replaced elected officials as delegates to the nominating convention. Ferraro states that "In 1980, the Democratic Convention
had been a disaster . . . Elected officials had to be brought back as delegates into the campaign process." It was a complex issue and it was not the desire of the commission to alienate the grass roots constituencies. But the elected officials had the experience of working with different constituencies and implementing legislation.

Ferraro states that "We created a new category of convention delegates called 'add ons' or 'super delegates,' elected officials who would come to the convention uncommitted to any delegate." The proposal incited heated debate over whether or not there should be super delegates and, if so, how many. Ferraro believed in the need for these delegates and fought to implement the plan. She states,

I refused to give up. And at the final meeting of the Hunt Commission at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington in March 1982, I sold what became known as the "ferraro plan." The super delegates would constitute fourteen percent of the total delegate count . . . Equal division for women and affirmative action for minorities was endorsed but not mandated among the delegates although every effort would be made to obtain it. And it would still be required of every state delegation. The job was done.

The Washington Post ran an article on the meeting and called Ferraro's solution "a personal victory for a little-known member of the House." Ferraro's colleague, Mark Siegel, said to the Washington Post, "Ferraro is a bridge between the new and old politics
and between the feminists and the organization Democrats. And she's tough enough to take them all on."    

While campaigning for the seat on the House Budget committee, Ferraro had an unexpected offer. Ferraro received a lunch invitation from John Reilly, Mondale's top political advisor. Ferraro comments, "I was surprised. I had worked with Reilly on the Hunt Commission ... but I didn't know him well." During their meeting, Reilly told Ferraro that Mondale was getting organized to run and 'we'd like you to be national chair of his campaign." Ferraro was taken aback and found herself speechless. A condition she says she seldom suffers from. She states, "Here was another door opening, another opportunity coming my way. But this time I resisted."    

In addition to running for reelection for her Congressional seat, she had spent months traveling and campaigning for other candidates. Ferraro wanted the position on the Budget Committee and finally, she stated, 

I had to think of my family. With all of the traveling I'd have to do as national chair for Mondale, I would hardly be home at all. Besides, with the election two years away, it seemed too early to make a commitment, not only to a candidate but to such demands on my time.

Ferraro told Reilly she would have to think about it. She consulted her husband John and Ferraro says that he "reinforced my reluctance."
Family is very important to Ferraro. The thought of being away from home bothered Ferraro. She states, 

I wanted to be home. I missed my family. For all the challenge of my congressional work and the energy I put into it, I was lonely in Washington and looked forward to returning to Queens on weekends.  

Ferraro talks about the lonely nights in Washington and the numerous phone calls to talk to her family. She states, "If it weren't for John, I could never, ever have accomplished what I did. He was always the Rock of Gibraltar for me." Ferraro points out that

Men in public life have always had that kind of quiet support from their wives. But in the new world of two-career couples, not all husbands have the security and self-confidence to back their wives all the way. John did. He never let me down, or the kids. He was our foundation, and the kids and I adored him.

"The kids often came down to Washington during their summer vacations. All of them worked at some point on the Hill, which was a lot of fun for me." Ferraro talks fondly of the times her children were with her in Washington. But she never considered her apartment in Washington to be her home and she hated being alone. Ferraro refers to her childhood:

I'd had enough of that as a child. I was well taken care of and had friends at the boarding school I was sent to, but it wasn't the same. I never showed anyone how lonely I felt. I did what I had to do and I got through it. But the memories remained, and even as an adult I didn't like being away from home and my family."
Despite her loneliness, Ferraro had the conviction to work as hard as necessary to achieve her goals.

As the 1984 Democratic Convention drew closer, Ferraro set her goals on getting a major position for the Convention. She examined Convention Chair, Platform Chair, and Rules Chair. Ferraro decided Platform Chair was the most appealing but realized that no woman had ever been named to that position. So she submitted her application "with Convention Chair as first choice, Platform second, and Rules third." 87

Upon her return from Central America in January 1984, Ferraro received the telephone call telling her she had been appointed Platform Chair. Ferraro recalls, "I saw my role as Platform Chair as an opportunity to create the Democratic Party's best offense against Reagan." 88

Ferraro asks, "Out of all the vice-presidential possibilities, why did the nomination come home to Queens?" 89 In November 1983 a group of women that Ferraro had come to know in Washington invited her to have dinner with them. "While I had been going about my own business, this group of five politically active women had meticulously been going through the records and backgrounds of every possible woman vice-presidential candidate--and decided I was the surest shot." 90 They had examined
every female in the country who held a major political office from governor to major.

This group of women, who called themselves "Team A," probably had as much to do with my nomination as any single group. And I never knew the half of it. Ranging from Joan McLean, a staffer of the House Committee on Banking, to Joanne Howes, the executive director of bipartisan Women's Vote Project, the core group also included Nanette Falkenberg, executive director of the National Abortion Rights Action League; Millie Jeffrey, labor activist; and my own senior staff member, Eleanor Lewis. They had twin goals—the first was to create the strongest possible personal political advocacy group in return for my cooperation in advancing the concept of a female Vice President. 91

Ferraro was thoroughly surprised and, at the same time flattered. She admits that the idea was very appealing—not only for herself, but to all women in politics. A woman vice presidential candidate would not only lend excitement to the Democratic campaign, but could be used as bargaining power for cabinet posts or other positions high in the government.

On the other hand, the actuality of getting the vice-presidential nomination continued to seem farfetched to me and out of reach. But ... I was not about to throw cold water on these women, who were offering their remarkable talent, energy, and very valuable support. 92

On July 19, 1984 Geraldine Ferraro's name became history. She reflects on the events of that week,

There had been no time for me or any of my family to grasp the enormity of what was taking place. A week ago I had been a third term Congresswoman from Queens with aspirations for the Senate or a leadership role in the House.
I was coming to the convention as the first woman chair of the Platform Committee, an honor in itself . . . Tonight, July 19, 1984, I would become the first woman in United States history to accept a major party's nomination for the office of Vice President--Incredible.

One of Ferraro's primary goals during the '84 campaign was to dispel the on-going myth that the Democratic party was ruled by special interest groups. "Anyone who grew up in hard times knows that the Democrats were the ones who came through for working Americans. We still are." In addition to this, she focused her campaign on the issues that she felt were of concern to the entire country--unfair taxation, Social Security, cuts in financial aid for higher education, foreign policy, and nuclear arms control.

On the cover flap of Ferraro, my story Linda Bird Franke relates the circumstances of Ferraro's campaign,

The campaign generated unusual excitement, but it also created unique pressures. As a Catholic, an Italian-American and a woman, Ferraro represented a triple threat to some citizens, who did not hesitate to reveal their prejudices. Her faith was under attack on the issue of abortion; her ethnic heritage led to innuendo no other candidates had to face; and her gender raised questions about competence that her record should have silenced.

Geraldine Ferraro became a household word to most women and men in America when she received the Democratic nomination for vice-president. Her candidacy raised media attention due to two primary factors--not
only was she the first woman in the United States to receive this nomination, she was the first Italian/American candidate. So in addition to contending with the accusation that a woman was not capable of dealing with the pressures of the office, she fell victim to innuendo that her Italian heritage linked her with the Mafia.

In her book, Ferraro relates one such incident when the *New York Post* wrote a story that "in 1944, my father had reportedly been arrested in Newburgh, New York, where we were living, for possession of numbers slips. On the morning my father was supposed to appear in court, he had suddenly died."96 The story continued by saying that Dominick Ferraro's death certificate had been altered. The insinuation was that the details of his death were also a mystery.

After the 1984 election, Ferraro decided to visit Newburgh and talk to the same people the *New York Post* had. The alteration on the death certificate was the date of burial. Ferraro comments that the undertaker now told her that it was changed "because my father had died on a holiday and the cemetery could not have prepared the grave in time."97 The newspaper had also claimed that the doctor who had treated Mr. Ferraro had died years before so there was no one available at the time
of the interview who could shed any light on the subject. During her visit, Ferraro learned that the attending physician, Doctor Sternhal, had died only two weeks before she arrived and that the New York Post had interviewed him.

And the story does not end there. This controversy continues today. Ferraro is no longer running for office, but the allegations continued. In a book review for The New Republic in January 1986, Sidney Blumenthal states,

One of the Newburgh's kingpins was Michael Devasto, owner of breweries and speakeasies... In 1926 Dominick Ferraro came to town to work for Devasto... Two years later, Geraldine Ferraro was born above the nightclub... In time, her father moved the Roxy nightclub to a more central location and opened a storefront. He listed himself in city records as "clerk." But in 1944, the Ferraros were arrested for operating a numbers racket. A grand jury indicted them as "common gamblers." Dominick died the day he was to appear in court, and the charge against his wife was dismissed.

Blumenthal continues the article with a story about "Salvatore Profaci, brother of Joseph Profaci, boss of one of the original five New York Mafia families, was among the underworld figures who did business in Newburgh." According to Blumenthal, Profaci fronted his brother's illegal activities with legal businesses and "his business partner was Phillip Zaccaro, John Zaccaro's father." But Blumenthal did not stop there. Before he finished the article, he managed to link her
campaign manager, Carmine Parisi, with "the Gambino crime family."\textsuperscript{101}

In the March 3, 1986 issue of \textit{The New Republic}, several letters in response to Blumenthal's article were printed. One was from Geraldine Ferraro. In it she states,

The reason I am writing is to once and for all set the record straight with reference to my father. He did not live in Newburgh in the 1920s and did not work for Michael Devasto. My father came to the United States around 1920. He lived in Astoria, Queens... He married my mother in 1927. They also bought a house in Astoria... My parents moved to Newburgh in late 1933/early 1934. I was born in Newburgh in 1935. Most of the above can be verified through public records.\textsuperscript{102}

There are some major inconsistencies in Blumenthal's story. He places Dominick Ferraro in Newburgh in 1926 and Geraldine Ferraro's birth in 1928. A difference of seven years. Ferraro concludes her letter by saying,

I've picked probably the most irrelevant item, among the many irrelevancies, to respond to, but I do so because lies about my father hurt the most. He was lost too young to a little girl who adored him. Innuendos about organized crime connections are nothing new. There isn't an ethnic who is not aware of how he/she is stereotyped including, I'm sure, Sidney. I guess I'm relying on the intelligence of your readers to see through it.\textsuperscript{103}

Among the other letters printed in that same issue of \textit{The New Republic} is one from William Fugazy, president of the Coalition of Italo-American Associations, Inc. In it he states,
Under the guise of a book review, Sidney Blumenthal's article on Geraldine Ferraro defames the entire Italian-American community. Mr. Blumenthal's piece is a vicious rehash of allegations—guilt by supposed associations and innuendos aimed at the former vice presidential candidate... Nowhere does Mr. Blumenthal mention that Ms. Ferraro has never been charged with any crime.104

Another letter is from John Frederick Martin of Washington, D.C. He comments,

Blumenthal has done a smear job. He questions the origin of the family wealth even while he admits that Ferraro may be a "paragon of legality." He says that Ferraro can only be understood in the context of the organized crime figures who crossed her family's path. But he offers no evidence that Gerry Ferraro or John Zaccaro ever participated in the activities of organized crime. That's what a smear means: all accusation, no proof.105

Norman S. Gaines of McLean, Virginia states,

Gerry Ferraro was a terrific assistant district attorney, a superb member of Congress, an effective chair of the Democratic Platform Committee, and an outstanding and courageous nominee on a ticket doomed to defeat. Not once did Blumenthal discuss her performance as a candidate or her value as a person.106

Blumenthal himself submits a response to these letters. In it he attempts to justify his accusations. Blumenthal refers to information he received from the New York Post, the same publication that claimed that Dominick Ferraro's physician was dead at the time of their investigation. His other source, also from the unpublished notes of the Post's reporter Guy Hawtin, is "a leading Newburgh attorney"107 and says "he is most
definite about the time of Ferraro's arrival.\textsuperscript{108} in Newburgh. Blumenthal then states, "we cannot mention his name."\textsuperscript{109}

Despite the media's continuous attack on her background and character during the campaign, Ferraro did not give in. The Mondale/Ferraro ticket did not win the 1984 Presidential election, but, nonetheless it was history in the making. Although it was a painful experience for Geraldine Ferraro and her family, she had no regrets.

Yes, the 1984 campaign was dirty. Yes, the Republicans beat us. But was my run for the Vice Presidency worth it? Sure was. Regardless of what it cost us personally, the benefits of my candidacy to women, all women, eased the pain. From the moment of my nomination in San Francisco,\textsuperscript{110} my candidacy touched a nerve in the country.

Ferraro has received thousands of letters from women all over the country with varying backgrounds and political convictions. One such letter reflects the feelings of many American women. Ferraro tells about it in her book,

I heard from many Republican women, one from Oak Brook, Illinois, on July 18. "I'm sitting here this morning with my coffee and this week's Time with you on the cover," she wrote me. "As I begin to read, I find myself in tears. Tears of joy, of relief, of saying at last, at last, I don't have to feel second class anymore. I'm thirty-six years old. I'm a Republican. For years something's burned inside me. Resentment about the way women are perceived in the world. Shame in halfway believing it. And now you've
come along to say--never again do I have to feel this way. I am free. Thank you for my liberation. You have changed my life--maybe even my vote! Good luck.

When asked if the timing was wrong for a woman candidate, Ferraro says, "The country is never going to be ready for anything new until people are put in the position of experiencing it." She continues by saying,

If the timing had indeed been perfect for a woman, then we would have voted in the Equal Rights Amendment, women would no longer be stuck in pink-collar jobs, people wouldn't still be looking down their noses at single heads of households. Should we have waited for another ten or fifteen years hoping that things would be better for women? No. The barrier had to be broken.

Ferraro feels that it is more important than ever for women to enter politics and make it their career. According to her statistics, women make up fifty-two percent of the population and they are drastically under-represented in the policy-making bodies of this country. She says, "An important voice--springing from the knowledge of women, their bond to living things--is not being heard."

As was cited earlier, Ferraro contends that the budget and the arm's race are women's issues. During her Congressional career and the vice-presidential campaign, Ferraro tried to prove that statement by focusing on many of the issues that face American government.
focusing on many of the issues that face American government. In a review of Ferraro's book, Denis Wadley comments,

It isn't perhaps as clear as it could be that Ferraro was not running a campaign just on women's issues. Usually when someone from a hitherto disfranchised group runs in a new area, he or she stresses the topical issues mainly, if not entirely. One of Ferraro's main accomplishments may be to convince people that women if elected will care not solely about women's issues.

It is Wadley's opinion that Ferraro spoke less about women's issues "than Mondale did, and was slow to accuse others of prejudice. That was honorable as well as politically sensible." 116

Ferraro believes that more women need to be in politics, regardless of their political affiliation. But if a woman votes for legislation that is detrimental to women or the country in general, Ferraro will not only verbalize her concern, she will actively campaign against her. One example of this is when, in 1982, Congressman Barney Frank had to run against Congresswoman Margaret Heckler, both incumbents running for the same seat because of redistricting in Massachusetts. Ferraro comments,

There differences, however were more than biological. The Reagan budget was a woman's issue. By that I mean that though the budget hurt all middle-income and poor Americans, the cuts fell disproportionately on programs that affected women: Eighty-eight percent of
the recipients of Aid for Dependent Children were women, as were sixty-nine percent of those on Medicaid. Peggy had voted for the budget. Barney had voted against it. It was that simple.117

Ferraro went out and actively campaigned for Frank. She even made a television commercial for him, "saying he cared more about the issues concerning women in this country than Peggy did."118 Taking a stand on an issue is not something that Ferraro shys away from. She will pay whatever price is needed to pay, even if it means diminishing the female population in Congress.

After the 1984 campaign, Ferraro decided to write a book because "As the events of the campaign took place, the highs and the lows, I promised myself I would share them with the people of America who made a new dream possible."119 The book, Ferraro, my story, was published in November 1985. Denis Wadley's reaction to the book was that "It has a genuineness and candor that gain the reader's trust at the start."120 Wadley offers this reaction to Ferraro's experience:

This is a courageous woman who blazed a trail and suffered for it--often, one senses, from male chauvinism masquerading as concern over her inexperience or her husband's finances. But she showed anyone with a mind the least bit open (most Americans, one feels) that she could take the heat.121

Ferraro is presently using her time and energy to work for other Democrats while deciding what career choices she will make for herself. In an October 1985
interview with Newsweek magazine, Ferraro stated that she will either run for the Senate or "form a PAC [political action committee] and work for members of Congress and the Senate--Democrats--to elect them in 1986." Ferraro has been fulfilling that promise for several months by appearing free for them whenever her schedule of paid speeches brings her to the area.

The preceding pages have revealed the events that have shaped the person Geraldine Ferraro is today. From a young widowed mother who sacrificed her own life to see that her daughter, Geraldine, was well educated and self-sufficient, to working with victims of rape and abuse in the district attorney's office, to fighting to change those situations in Congress, to subjecting herself to the grueling pressures of the vice-presidential campaign, Geraldine Ferraro is indeed a woman who has earned the respect of millions of Americans. Her rhetoric has changed the lives of many and deserves examination.
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CHAPTER III

MORAL DRAMA AS A STYLISTIC TOOL

As was indicated in Chapter I, the purpose of this study will be to establish moral drama as a stylistic method used in rhetoric. The conclusions drawn from this chapter will provide the analytical tool to apply to the rhetoric of Ferraro.

For the purpose of this paper, style will be defined as language use or word choice. This definition is supported in the speech communication discipline literature. Style is a complex combination of language use. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell summarizes style in this manner,

Style is an encompassing term that describes the possibilities that exist in word choice and grammar. Style can vary in formality, precision, literalness, and redundancy. Good style is clear, vivid, appropriate, and consistent. The recourses of style are increased by strategies that contribute to proof, animate, and change connotations.

In their book, Public Speaking as a Liberal Art, John F. Wilson and Carroll C. Arnold discuss the components of effective style. They state,

a useful way of looking at style is to consider the general qualities or traits of language that contribute to effectiveness. These are qualities that combine to constitute a speaker's personal, distinctive way of speaking and the variations within it.
Wilson and Arnold are saying that style is the speaker's personal imprint on the rhetoric. Creative word choice can determine the effectiveness of the rhetoric.

Campbell examines style in her book, *The Rhetorical Act*. The style of a rhetorical act can vary in its use of figurative or metaphorical language. Campbell defines figurative language as language that grasps and defines the intangible qualities of experience.

Figurative language holds our attention. Metaphors reflect attitudes.

Campbell cites examples of both kinds of language. When referring to figurative language, she says that "Such language can be used to explain or illustrate a difficult concept." Campbell offers this example:

In a parody of the cliche's mouthed to college graduates, Tom Lehrer wrote a song that told them "Soon you'll be sliding down the razor blade of life." Such an image is painfully vivid.

Metaphor is defined by Campbell as word choice that "connects what is known and familiar with what is unknown and unfamiliar." She illustrates the use of a metaphor with these examples,

Metaphors reflect attitudes. If life is a chess game, it is a competitive struggle of wits. If life is a crap game, it is ruled by chance.

Metaphors evaluate. Sensory images express our values. A conservative refers to heophiliac liberals bleeding for every cause.
Campbell concludes her discussion of style by stating that

Literal language is precise and exact. It is part of the effort to produce careful proof. Metaphorical language enlivens ideas and arouses our participation. Effective rhetoric requires both.

Rhetorical style is the combination of every possibility that exists in language use and word choice. It is the speaker's signature on the discourse. Different types of language use are implemented to create style. Two methods were mentioned by Campbell--figurative and metaphorical. These methods are used by rhetoricians to add life to the precise language needed to prove technical points.

Style is the choice of words used by a speaker for the intention of conveying a particular message. Thus, style is the tool used by rhetoricians to achieve their desired goal--a message the audience will understand, retain, and act upon. The authors of morality plays used style to convey their messages to the audience. Before examining the stylistic devices employed in these plays, it is essential to understand the basic elements of morality plays.

A comprehensive definition of Medieval morality plays is offered by W. R. Makenzie who states that the morality play is
a play allegorical in structure, which has for its main object the teaching of some lesson for the guidance of life, and in which the principal characters are personified abstractions or highly universalized types.

Lynn Altenbernd and Leslie L. Lewis contend that the morality plays were freed from the traditional necessity of enacting Bible stories. Rather, they

dramatized abstract conflicts: Good vs. Evil; Mercy vs. Mischief; Pauper vs. Landlord; Life vs. Death. Allegory, or concrete representation of abstractions, is the prevailing method.

Allegory is the prevailing method, but the concrete representation of abstractions is not necessarily the characters themselves. The one element that is consistent in all morality plays is the enactment of abstracted conflicts such as good versus evil. Arnold Williams comments that "one can see what is wrong with the definition of the morality play as one in which that action is performed by personified abstractions." He uses The Castle of Perseverance as an example. Williams states that "in the Castle they are concerned with only one individual, Mankind, who is no abstraction, but a dramatic individual capable of generalized application." He agrees that the abstracted conflicts are dramatized in each morality play, but the characters portrayed are not necessarily personified abstractions.

In his book, The English Drama, F. P. Wilson discusses the prevailing themes and language use in the
morality plays. He states that "In these plays there is a dearth of imagery, but proverbs are plentiful."\(^{13}\)

Wilson comments on the various techniques used by morality playwrights to relay their messages. Wilson contends that the source of the message may vary but the themes of social injustice remain the same. He states that "Dramatists and preachers and pamphleteers are moralists to a man"\(^{14}\) and the difference between their approaches is "almost imperceptible."\(^{15}\) He states that "the saying 'Everyman for himself and God for us all' was abhorrent to them."\(^{16}\) Wilson comments,

> While the changing structure of society may lead an age to expose one abuse more than another, and while the rise of an aggressive and flourishing middle class presented problems, yet most social evils are ever old and ever new. Perjury, pilfery, bribery, flattery, robbery, trumpery, harlotry are always with us.

The evils of society are ever present. The primary issues remain the same, it is only the individual instances that change. Whether it be a sermon, a pamphlet, a political speech, or a play, it is rhetoric that provides the tool to express the injustices of society. Later in this chapter, I will discuss Kurt Ritter's creation of moral drama as a stylistic tool in discourse.

Wilson has pointed out that the writer of morality plays not only used personified abstractions for their characters, but they gave life to those characters with
such rhetorical techniques as figurative and metaphorical language. Morality playwrights recognized the significance of careful word choice. It was their desire to effectively deliver a message to the people of Medieval England and rhetorical style was a key element in their effectiveness.

In the book *Medieval English Drama*, Jerome Taylor reflects on the use of language appropriate to drama. He states that it "requires that the imitated action of a spiritual journey or pilgrimage be translated from geographic movement across literal time to movement across psychically symbolic space." Language choice is essential to deliver the intended message. Often the use of symbolism is implemented to create the visual image.

In his essay, "*Everyman* and the Parable," V. A. Kolve discovers that "the meaning of the action lies within the metaphoric reference of the play's language." He states that

*Words like "reckoning," "account making," "lending," and "spending," compose the essential verbal matrix of the play; and the account book Everyman brings with him is the emblem of their interrelationship. It is what the play most urgently concerns.*

The symbolic word choice in *Everyman* is definitely a key factor in determining the effectiveness of the script. The character named Good Deeds response to Everyman's
request to accompany him on the journey saying, "Here I lie, cold in the ground. Thy sins surely have me bound that I cannot stir." Knowledge consoles Everyman with these words: "Now go we together lovingly to Confession, that cleansing river fair." The use of sensual words such as "cold" and "cleansing" are implemented to create visual images for the spectator.

During a discussion of morality plays, Stanley Kahr states that moral dramas seek to involve the spectator in the life of the play as fully as possible, to provide opportunities for him to identify with the characters of the play so that he may more fully grasp the nature of the doctrinal message perveyed; the "sentence" as well as the "solace. [sic]"

It is essential to use emotional language that involves the audience. The author of Everyman does this often. At the beginning of the play, Death summons Everyman to embark on the journey. When he realizes that he has done little in life to prepare for salvation, Everyman laments,

I would to God I had never been begot!
To my soul a full great profit it would be
For now I fear pains huge and great, God wot!  

Later when Everyman begs Goods to accompany him on his journey, Everyman tells Goods that he has loved Goods all his life. Goods responds,
That is to thy damnation, I tell the a true thing
For love of me is to love everlasting controversy
But if thou hadst the while loved moderately
In such wise as to give the poor to me,
Then would'st thou not in this dolar be
Nor int this great sorrow and care.

It is the author's careful choice of emotional words
with which the audience can identify that makes these
passages effective.

It is the choice of words that establishes style.
As Kahrl states, it is the author's desire to involve
the spectator in order to grasp the total message. It
was the purpose of morality plays to teach their audiences
a "moral message."

It is my contention that rhetorical style plays
an important part in the creation of the abstractions
and it is style that determines their effectiveness.
This argument is supported by Kurt W. Ritter. In 1977
Ritter uses moral drama as a critical tool to analyze
the rhetoric of the Boston Massacre of 1770. He coins
the term "moral drama" and defines it as

an acting out of a clash between good and
evil. It is a confrontation that people
come to perceive as a struggle between the
"god terms" and the "devil terms" of their
culture.26

Ritter contends that the moral drama emerges from a
confrontation and states that for the rhetorical critic
the concept helps to explain how it is that a certain confrontation can give a particular character to an entire social movement and imbue it with a sense of moral righteousness. Once this has occurred, the moral drama can be recalled andmarshalled as a rhetorical weapon.27

Although he does not mention the morality plays of medieval England, it appears that Ritter is using the same format. Ritter discusses the struggle between forces, such as good and evil, and the abstraction of characters to represent a social movement. Due to this factor, I will use the term moral drama synonymously with morality play for ease of reference.

The development of style by an individual evolves from factors in the rhetorician's life and various historical elements. Ritter refers to Richard Weaver's statement that

rhetoric depends on history. All questions that are susceptible to rhetorical treatment arise out of history, and it is to history that the rhetorician turns for his means of persuasion.28

Therefore it is necessary to examine the rhetorician's life to gain perspective as to the events that shaped the rhetoric.

In his article, "Confrontation as Moral Drama: The Boston Massacre in Rhetorical Perspective," Ritter states,

Because it served as a moral drama, the Boston Massacre helped to define the larger conflict between America and England in terms
of good versus evil, liberty versus tyranny. The real significance of the Boston Massacre is not to be found in the riot itself, but in the rhetoric it fostered.

Ritter describes the actual events of the evening of March 5, 1770 as "a fight between Boston Townsmen in King Street." Five Bostonians were killed and six more were injured. Very few people actually witnessed the confrontation so no evidence was ever produced as to the provocation of the incident. But Samuel Adams and his radicals seized the opportunity. Ritter contends that "the Boston Massacre was really born eleven hours after these killings," when Samuel Adams called his men together to consider the events of the previous evening. Adam's group was able to transform an untidy riot into "an unprecedented slaughter of innocent civilians," with the use of "inflammatory rhetoric."

In support of his argument that language was a key element in the Boston Massacre, Ritter refers to Murry Edelman's statement that language is not simply an instrument for describing events, but is part of events, strongly shaping their meaning and the political roles officials and mass publics see themselves playing.

Ritter discusses how the choice of words enabled the rebels to use a relatively insignificant event to unite the people in a common cause. Ritter states that "Adams and his fellow patriots revealed rhetorical genius when
they seized upon the word 'massacre,' to characterize
the altercation in King Street. 35 Ritter continues
by saying that

Even strong words such as "killings" or "murders"
would not have had the impact of the designation
of "massacre" which implied a butchering of
innocent victims. A murder might occur in the
passion of the moment, but a massacre required
a cool, calculated conspiracy. 36

The Boston Massacre, by its very name, became a powerful
instrument of persuasion.

Ritter explains how the events of that one evening
evolved into a moral drama. He states that "the drama
acted out in King Street came to represent the entire
controversy between America and England." 37 The Boston
Massacre was initially only a physical confrontation.
It was to be sure a bloody event, but not a moral drama.

The radicals . . . clearly identified the actors
in the drama . . . the patriots characterized the
British troops as tools of an oppressive ministry, as personification of tyranny. 38

The completion of the moral drama "took form as the
god-term of 'liberty' became--to use Ernest Bormann's
phrase--'the ultimate legitimatization of the drama.' 39
Ritter explains that it was the creative word choice
used by the rebels that enabled them to turn a seemingly
insignificant event into a major turning point in the
American Revolution.
According to Ritter, "Whether the moral quality of the event emerges is largely a matter of rhetoric." In order to create a moral drama, Ritter concludes that, spokesmen for an agitational movement are presented with a potential moral drama, they must exploit the event in terms of its immediate context; they must interpret it so as to identify the actors in the drama as agents of good and evil, and they must gain wide adherence to their interpretation.

After the moral drama has been staged, Ritter contends that, "if the original confrontation is to remain a potent weapon for the movement, the spokesman must devise ways for future audiences to relive the event, to reenact the drama." 

As has been argued, a moral drama is created for the purpose of teaching a lesson. The method used most often is the abstraction of conflicts such as good versus evil. The particular theme that the drama stresses arises from events in history that have created an intolerable situation in the present. Whether it was suppression of tenants by landlords in medieval England, the tyranny of England over America in the 1700s or discrimination in the twentieth century, it is not the events themselves that create the moral dramas—rather the rhetoric of individuals that set the stage. As Ritter effectively argued, it is the word choice, or style, that enables a rhetorician to create a moral drama that the audience will relive and reenact.
Based on the preceding information, I will define style as creative word choice using such techniques as figurative and metaphorical language, symbolism, emotional words, and precise literal language. A method used by many rhetoricians is the combination of these techniques to create a moral drama. The elements of moral drama are the abstraction of a conflict with references to history that are of conflicting mature—such as good and evil. Concrete representations of abstractions, or allegory, is often used. It is the desire of the rhetorican to teach the audience a moral lesson and deliver a message that will inspire the audience to act upon the issue.

In Chapter IV, I will analyze the discourse of Geraldine Ferraro. Her rhetorical style will be examined to determine the presence of moral drama as a stylistic tool in her discourse. The following criteria will be applied to the rhetoric.

1. Is there evidence of allegorical structure in her rhetoric?
2. Does she create personified abstractions to illustrate the message?
3. What types of abstractions are created?
4. Does Ferraro exploit events to create a moral drama by creating agents of good and evil?
5. Does she attempt to teach a moral lesson to the audience?

6. Does she use emotional, metaphorical, or figurative language to enhance the literal language?

7. Is there an attempt to involve the audience by identifying them with characters in the drama?

8. Does she devise ways for future audiences to relive the event or reenact the drama?
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CHAPTER IV

THE APPLICATION OF MORAL DRAMA TO THE
RHEtorIC OF GERALDINE FERRARO

Five speeches will be analyzed in this chapter. The purpose of this chapter is to establish the reasons for choosing these particular speeches, examine the circumstances surrounding them, analyze the speeches to determine if Geraldine Ferraro uses moral drama as a stylistic tool in her rhetoric, and to study the rhetoric for emergence of recurring themes based on history and events in Ferraro's life.

It was my desire to obtain Ferraro discourse that represented various facets of her political career. I was able to locate two of her speeches in Vital Speeches. The first one is a speech that Ferraro delivered at the National Association of Women Judges Annual meeting on October 9, 1982. The other speech is her acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention on July 19, 1984. I contacted her office and requested a speech that dealt with legislation that she had initiated and a campaign speech from the vice-presidential race. Her office sent me the transcript of a speech she presented at the Northeast Program Service Center, Social Security
Administration on Women's Equality Day--August 26, 1982

that dealt with the Flextime bill she proposed in 1981. I was unable to determine the location of the speech. They also sent me the transcript of the campaign speech she presented at Valley College, Van Nuys, California on November 2, 1984. The last speech I obtained was one she delivered at a political fundraiser for Congressman Tom Daschle in Sioux Falls, South Dakota on September 6, 1985. These speeches can be found in the Appendixes.

Before analyzing the rhetoric, it is beneficial to understand the setting for each of the speeches. On August 26, 1982, Ferraro was the featured speaker on Women's Equality Day at the Northeast Program Service Center, Social Security Administration. Women's Equality Day is celebrated each year on the anniversary of the signing of the 19th Amendment, which granted women the right to vote. August 26 is also Geraldine Ferraro's birthday, but she states that, "I am pleased to report that I am much younger than the 19th Amendment."²

Ferraro used this opportunity to discuss her fight for economic fairness for women. The focal point of this speech was the Flextime bill she sponsored in 1981 and pension reform. The bill, which became law in July 1982, allows Federal workers to adjust working hours to accommodate the needs of their families.
The subject of economic fairness for women is often a concern of Ferraro's and she addresses the issue frequently. On October 9, 1982, Ferraro had the opportunity to address the annual meeting of the National Association of Women Judges. In this speech, Ferraro challenges women in leadership roles to continue the fight for economic fairness. As a lawyer and former district attorney, Ferraro feels women in the legal profession can and "do make a real difference in the way our society works. And I believe that women like us must continue to make a difference." ³

Ferraro's exposure to the unfair labor practices in America spurred her to challenge these issues on the floor of Congress and in other public arenas. Although Ferraro felt that women needed to take on more leadership roles, she did not feel that the major political parties were ready to accept the challenge. There were those that did not agree with her on this issue and they began vocalizing their opinions. Ferraro comments, "Many outspoken individuals in the Women's Movement began calling for a female vice-presidential candidate in 1983." ⁴

At the NOW—National Organization for Women—conference in October 1983, the Democratic presidential hopefuls were asked to appear before a panel of women. They were asked such questions as:
How would you feel about choosing a woman as a running mate? What is your stand on women's issues? How visible would these issues be in your campaign? What roles could women expect to play?

According to Ferraro, by 1983, the quarter of a million member NOW organization had become "an influential power base no candidate could choose to ignore." At its 1983 conference the organization proclaimed that the "time for a woman vice-presidential candidate is 1984."

But Ferraro was skeptical. Although she supported the idea, Ferraro did not believe that the Democratic Party would go for it. Her first clue that women were seriously being considered came on July 19, 1983, "exactly a year before I accepted the nomination in San Francisco," when Ferraro received a letter from Tom Golietta, a member of the House of Representatives from Philadelphia. In the letter, he expressed the opinion that it was time to start considering potential candidates for the vice-presidential nomination. He stated,

"Your presence on the ticket would provide the party and the country with [a candidate] who can speak to the majority of the population in a way that no other major party candidate has ever been able to do before."

Ferraro was flattered, but still did not believe anything would come of it.

In November 1983, Ferraro's administrative assistant, Eleanor Lewis, invited Ferraro to have dinner with a small group of women who "wanted to discuss my
political future with me." This group of five women, who called themselves Team A, told Ferraro that they had twin goals. "The first was to create the strongest possible ticket to defeat Reagan." Ferraro was in favor of this goal. Their second was to become Ferraro's "Personal political-advocacy group in return for my cooperation in advancing the concept of a female vice-president." Once again, Ferraro was in favor of the concept, but was not prepared for their final proposal. Team A told her that there was no point in advancing the concept if there wasn't a viable candidate. They asked Ferraro if she would "stay open to the idea of becoming the actual nominee if the concept caught fire." Ferraro was overwhelmed. These women were political tacticians. They had researched many possible woman vice-presidential candidates and decided that Ferraro was the most viable choice. Ferraro reflects, 

I had to think fast. There was no doubt that my being considered for the vice-presidency was very appealing. It could help all women in politics, which mattered a lot to me after my own experiences.

She told them she was willing to be considered. Team A and other activist women's groups went to work, advanced the concept, and on July 19, 1984, Geraldine Ferraro accepted the Democratic party's nomination for vice-president. This sets the stage for the third speech
in the analysis--Ferraro's acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention. This time her audience was much larger than the Social Security Administration and their cause was not as united as the National Association of Women Judges. Thousands of Democrats were present at the Convention and millions of Americans were viewing it on television.

In a matter of a few minutes, Ferraro had to reach millions of Americans and discuss all the issues. It was probably the most difficult speech she had delivered. In a few short sentences, Ferraro attempted to acquaint her audience with her life and to find common ground for herself and her audience. She opened her speech by saying

Tonight, the daughter of a woman whose highest goal was a future for her children talks to our nations oldest party about a future for us all. Tonight, the daughter of working Americans tells all Americans about the future that is within our reach--if we're willing to reach for it.

Tonight, the daughter of an immigrant from Italy has been chosen to run for [vice] president in the new land my father came to love.

The rest of the speech is devoted to issues ranging from taxes to Senior Citizens to defense.

That evening and that speech were only the beginning of a long and unique campaign. Presidential campaigns have always drawn media attention, but the presence of a woman added a new dimension and the media
seized the opportunity. Linda Bird Frank relates the events of the campaign by commenting that Ferraro represented a triple threat to some citizens. She was Catholic, and Italian-American, and a woman.

Her faith was under attack on the issue of abortion; her ethnic heritage led to innuendo no other candidate had to face; and her gender raised questions about competence that her record should have silenced.

The media even admitted that Ferraro's every move was scrutinized. In the article, "Letting Ferraro be Ferraro," Time comments that

Along with the political etiquette any candidate is obliged to observe, Ferraro must maneuver past the catch-22 that confronts professional women: she cannot afford to seem strident or severe, nor can she seem weak or gushy. She has to appear strong but not hard, good looking and well dressed but not frivolous or girlish.

After the election Newsweek agreed, stating that "she weathered with unflagging grace one of the toughest media hazings a political candidate had ever faced."

Ferraro held on to the end, never giving up. She campaigned until election day. On November 2, 1984, four days before the election, Ferraro delivered a campaign speech to a female audience at Valley College in Van Nuys, California. Ferraro looked forward to the opportunity to "speak to women about women." In her book, Ferraro reflects on that day and on that audience. She says that she wanted to "explore what my candidacy had meant to all of us and what it meant
for the future."^21 During this speech she linked her candidacy with other women in American history who fought for sexual equality. She stated,

*When we go to the polls next Tuesday, remember that Eleanor Roosevelt was thirty-six before she was allowed to cast her first vote. What a waste. She should never have been barred from choosing public officials. She should have been one.*

At another point in the speech, Ferraro referred to the women who began the fight for the right to vote. She states, "From Abigail Adams to the women of Seneca Falls, this moment is a triumph for all those who stood for the cause of equality through the years."^23 Ferraro completes the link with this statement,

*From Harriet Tubman and the abolitionists of the underground railroad to the suffragist, this campaign proves what Susan B. Anthony always knew: Because our cause is just, we cannot fail.*^24

Of the speeches being examined, this speech represents Ferraro's stand on women's issues more comprehensively than any other.

This woman, who was born on the anniversary of the women's right to vote and nominated for vice-president on the anniversary of the Seneca Falls convention, accepted the challenge and fought a credible battle. She was not victorious in her bid for the vice-presidency, but she, like many others, feel that her candidacy was a victory for all women. During *Newsweek's* coverage
of her concession speech at the New York Hilton, Ferraro was quoted as saying:

Even though he did not win this race . . . (Walter Mondale) waged another battle—and that battle Walter Mondale won. . . . He opened a door which will never be closed again. My candidacy has said that the days of discrimination are numbered.

In a review of *Ferraro, my story*, Denis Wadley comments, "This is a courageous woman who blazed a trail and suffered for it--often, one senses, from male chauvinism masquerading as concern over her inexperience or her husband's finances." 26

Although Ferraro's political future is still uncertain, she is committed to helping her fellow Democrats get elected and achieve a Democratic majority in Congress. In an interview with *Newsweek* on October 7, 1985, Ferraro expresses her intentions for the near future. She says that she may "form a PAC [political action committee] and work for members of Congress and senators--Democrats--to elect them in 1980." 27 The article says that Ferraro already has a heavy commitment of political appearances and fund-raisers for fellow Democrats, appearing free for them whenever her heavy schedule of paid speeches brings her to the area. 28

On September 6, 1985, Geraldine Ferraro was the featured speaker at a political fund-raiser for Congressman Tom Daschle in Sioux Falls, South Dakota. Daschle has served four terms in the House of Representatives as the Democratic Congressman from South Dakota. 29
He is presently running for the office of United States Senator. He had not yet announced his Senate bid at the time of Ferraro's speech, but was up for re-election for Congress.

This was not Ferraro's first visit to South Dakota. She campaigned for Daschle in 1981. Ferraro recalls this visit in her book. She comments, "The gender gap began to show itself, and both male and female members of Congress started using it as leverage. . . . . You had to learn to play the game to be effective." Ferraro had observed the various methods of accomplishing desired goals and decided to play the game. "With the 1982 elections looming, we women members of Congress were suddenly in great demand as our male colleagues asked us to campaign for them in their home districts." Ferraro obliged in exchange for backup on legislation. The bill she was pushing at this time was the Flextime bill mentioned earlier. She campaigned for several Congressmen, including Tom Daschle and, "in return I got their support for my bill on Flextime. . . . When Congress passed the bill in July 1982, I was delighted." In 1985, Ferraro's only motive was the re-election of a Democrat that she respected. The focal point of this speech is the election of Tom Daschle and the demise of the Reagan administration. Economic fairness again becomes an issue in this speech. This time Ferraro is
referring to the current farm crisis in America and blames the current administration for the dilemma. She states, "the narrow view held in parts of Washington over the last few years is why the people of South Dakota are where you are in 1985."33

Ferraro refers to her vice-presidential campaign and says that the Democrats work is far from over. She closes her speech with this statement,

As Democrats, we have a lot of work ahead. And I, for one, am glad we have people like Tom Daschle helping us do it. But we also have a lot of new doors to open. With your help, I know we'll go through them together.34

From a little known Congresswoman fighting for economic fairness for women to the first woman vice-presidential candidate to a woman with enough clout to command a national lecture circuit, Geraldine Ferraro has made an imprint on political history. Her rhetoric is deserving of examination and it is my intention to determine the presence of moral drama in her discourse.

The five selected speeches, found in Appendix A-E, represent the phases of her political career mentioned above and provide a sufficient sampling of rhetoric. The analysis of the speeches will provide the answers to the questions established in Chapter III. In that chapter, moral drama was characterized as a stylistic tool and I will now apply that tool to Ferraro's rhetoric.
Allegorical Structure

Since the abstraction of conflicts such as good and evil is the most consistent characteristic of moral drama, that element will be analyzed first. I will then determine if these elements serve to create personified abstractions and whether these abstractions and conflicts serve to teach the audience a moral lesson. Inspection of the rhetoric for the presence of emotive language in an effort to arouse and motivate the audience to reenact the drama will comprise the final facet of analysis.

Abstracted conflicts serve as the main element of moral drama. Ferraro uses allegory, or concrete representation of conflicts, in her rhetoric. The two primary conflicts present in Ferraro's discourse are Tyranny versus Suppression and Good versus Evil. The 1982 speeches are concerned primarily with the suppression of women in a tyrannical society and the last three speeches deal with the "good" Democratic party versus the "evil" Reagan administration. As was noted by Arnold Williams in Chapter III, abstract conflicts are dramatized in each morality play, but the characters portrayed are not necessarily personified abstractions. This is the case in Ferraro's rhetoric. The actors and actresses in her dramas are "dramatic individuals capable
of generalized applications." In the Tyranny versus Suppression dramas, generalized applications are applied to suppressed women and dominating males. The cast in Good versus Evil dramas consists of the members of the Democratic party and the Reagan administration.

In her Flextime speech to the Social Security Administration, Ferraro opens with the statement that

Sixty-two years ago today, women won the right to vote. I say we won that right because it was surely not handed to us. Our foremothers, and some of our enlightened forefathers, fought for more than a generation to achieve the 19th amendment.

Before establishing the present conflict, Ferraro reminds the audience of the battle that "our foremothers" and "enlightened forefathers" waged against the suppression of women in the 1800s and early 1900s. Ferraro refers to the historical fight to win the right to vote, which she then correlates to the battle that women are presently fighting--the passage of the new Equal Rights Amendment. Ferraro states, "We now know that winning the right to vote was just the first step for American women." Women have already invested ten years in this new effort and "we will spend as many more years as it takes to make the ERA part of our constitution." The Equal Rights Amendment failed to be ratified by the June 30, 1982 deadline, but Ferraro states,
I have long supported the Equal Rights Amendment—and have sponsored its reintroduction—because I see how government can lose the will to protect the rights of all citizens without the Constitutional imperative.  

In Ferraro, my story, she states that "when the passage of the ERA came to a vote in Congress in October 1983, the constitutional amendment lost by only six votes." Ferraro, my story, states that "when the passage of the ERA came to a vote in Congress in October 1983, the constitutional amendment lost by only six votes."  

In both situations, Women becomes the name of the protagonist, or main character, around whom the action centers, the Society becomes the generalized antagonist, or opposition. Ferraro has set the stage for the drama. Ferraro heightens the dispute by justifying the need for women to join forces and enter the battle. She contends that women do the same jobs as men but often do not get paid the same salary. She legitimizes this indictment with the statement that "in 1981 a male accountant was making $433 a week on the average. A woman accountant was making $308." Ferraro intensifies the dispute by stating that

Women are overwhelmingly concentrated in jobs that just don't pay very well. Women are nurses, secretaries, bookkeepers, and waitresses. Men are doctors, administrators, accountants, restaurant managers.  

This parallel served as an effective technique: female nurses and male doctors, female secretaries and male administrators. The male not only has the higher paying job, but holds the dominating position that enables him to control.
The confrontation is sealed with the statement that "a woman with a four year college degree can expect to make the same amount that a man makes--a man, that is, with an eighth-grade education." Ferraro has set the stage for enactment of the drama and established the conflict of suppressed women versus the tyranny of a male dominated society.

This struggle reappears in her speech to the National Association of Women Judges. Ferraro opened the speech by appealing to the women that they might unite in a common cause. She states,

All of our futures and our daughter's futures are at stake. I am talking about the future of every woman, from the migrant farm worker or ghetto mother to Untied States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Conner.

Once again, Ferraro identifies the antagonist by stating

Yes, the Old Boy Network is alive and well and living in our courthouses and our legislatures and our boardrooms. As women, we still have to work harder and we have to prove our worth over and over and over again.

After establishing the antagonist, Ferraro returns to the confrontation by contending that it is not just those who have reached the top

who are fighting this daily battle. It is a fight in which all of us--rich and poor, career and home-oriented, young and old--participate, simply because we are women.

In the early moments of the speech, Ferraro has defined the opposition and identified the actors in the play.
She says that all women are fighting the daily battle of overcoming the suppression of a male dominated society.

With these elements developed, Ferraro reaffirms the need to establish a logical strategy that will enable the actors to overcome the antagonists. She states

More and more women are working outside the home.

... Most--two-thirds--work to support themselves and their children and husbands who cannot earn enough alone to keep the family above the poverty line.

Ferraro offers statistics to establish the size of her cast by stating that "there are now 43 million women in the work force, triple the number just prior to World War II." Ferraro further legitimizes the struggle by confirming the situation with these statistics:

Sixty percent of all women between the ages of eighteen and sixty-four are workers, with eighty percent of all women who work concentrated in so-called "pink collar" jobs--jobs dominated by females and dominated by low salaries.

Ferraro very seldom accuses without supporting it with statistics. In her book, Ferraro accuses Reagan of failing to understand that most women go into the job market out of necessity. She quotes Reagan,

"Part of the unemployment is not so much recession as it is the great increase in people going into the job market, and ladies, I'm not picking on anyone, but because of the increase in women who are working today and two-worker families..." Reagan said with stunning ignorance and insensitivity in 1982.
Needless to say, Ferraro does not approve of Reagan's point of view. With definite need established, Ferraro develops a strategy for the protagonists.

According to Ferraro, the economically suppressed female protagonists are justified in their quest. She offers two reasons for this. The first is what Ferraro calls the "Me-First" reason. Ferraro argues that women are smart, hard-working, and deserving of leadership roles.

We are entitled to it and we will do anything necessary to get and keep it. Women of merit do indeed deserve their fair share of society's rewards—a share previously denied to us only because we were women.

The second reason is that women in leadership are different and Ferraro contends that this is the most important reason. She says that despite political and philosophical differences

there are certain generalizations that can be made about women judges and women legislators. We care more about other women. We show more concern for children. We try to resolve controversies by cooperation, rather than conflict.

Ferraro proposes that more women must actively pursue leadership careers. She states that "when women are named to federal courts, there is pressure to name them to state and municipal benches as well." Once a trend has been created, it will be accepted and the
walls of suppression will begin to crumble. Ferraro alleges that

When women become judges, when more and more women graduate from law school, not only government, but private enterprise, has to realize that women are a force to be dealt with and treated with respect.  

A victory can be achieved if women continue to fight. The battle cannot be won overnight and the protagonists must take the initiative themselves.

Suppression versus tyranny is the allegorical method that has been applied in these two speeches. As Ferraro enters the national arena of the vice-presidential campaign, she creates a new conflict and a different set of abstractions. It is now the "good" Democratic party versus the "evil" Reagan administration.

Ferraro develops the conflicting forces in her convention acceptance speech by establishing a set of rules that she declares are the rules that Americans wish to live by. They include the freedom to work at the job of one's choice, protection by law and punishment by law if one infringes on the rights of others, religious freedom, the right to obtain a good education, and the willingness to defend the freedom that America stands for. Ferraro contends that all "Americans want to live by the same set of rules. But under this administration, the rules are rigged against too many of our people."
She has already established the Reagan administration as the opposition.

Ferraro reinforces this notion with the statement that

It isn't right that this year Ronald Reagan will hand the American people a bill for interest on the national debt larger than the entire cost of the federal government under John F. Kennedy.  

In addition to identifying Reagan as the antagonist in this drama, Ferraro begins to define the protagonists by referring to Democratic President John Kennedy.

Ferraro contends that the Reagan administration is responsible for unfair taxation by declaring that "It isn't right that every year, the share of taxes paid by individual citizens is going up, while the share of taxes paid by large corporations is getting smaller and smaller." Ferraro then accuses the Reagan administration of breaking the faith with the American people by saying that it is not right that young people today live with the fear that they will not get the Social Security that they paid for and that older Americans fear that they will lose what they have already earned. Social Security is a contract between the last generation and the next, and the rules say: You don't break contracts.

While establishing the existence of the antagonist, Ferraro also defines the Democratic party as a protagonist that fights for the American people. She contends that
the Democrats "hammered out a fair compromise in Congress to save Social Security. Every group sacrificed to keep the system sound."\(^6\)\(^0\) The statement concludes with another assault on Reagan. She declares, "It is time Ronald Reagan stopped scaring our senior citizens."\(^6\)\(^1\)

While few references are made to past accomplishments of the Democratic party, Ferraro promises her audience that the election of a Democratic administration would ensure a return to the American dream.

Ferraro defines that dream by stating that, "Our faith that we can shape a better future is what the American dream is all about."\(^6\)\(^2\) She then proclaims, "Tonight, we reclaim our dream. We're going to make the rules of American life work fairly for all Americans again."\(^6\)\(^3\)

The speech is built to a climactic moment by proclaiming that

To those working Americans who fear banks, utilities, and large special interests have a lock on the White House, we say, Join us, let's elect a people's president; and let's have government by and for the American people again.\(^6\)\(^4\)

This theme of tyranny and evil in the Reagan administration reappears in Ferraro's campaign speech at Van Nuys, California.

Since this audience is primarily female, Ferraro introduces the conflict by reminding women of the progress
made in the women's movement. She refers to "the men and women who fought the battles of the past to ensure the opportunities of today." Ferraro mentions Abigail Adams, the women of the Seneca Falls convention, the abolitionists, and the suffragettes. She refers to their cause and declares: "Let me tell you what that cause is. The issue is not only equality. It's also choice." It is Ferraro's contention that the Reagan administration has made every effort to eliminate that freedom of choice. She states,

I don't want anyone, especially Ronald Reagan, to make my most important, personal choices. I want to make those choices for myself. That's why I want Walter Mondale to pick the next Supreme Court, not Jerry Falwell.

Ferraro continues to refer to the advancements made in women's equality in the twentieth century. She speaks of her uncle who told her mother not to bother sending Geraldine to college because after all, "She's pretty, she'll get married." These words were spoken to Antonetta Ferraro, Geraldine's mother, whose husband died young. She was left alone to raise two small children--she, with no education and no skills. Ferraro adds, "when I applied to law school, a university official asked if I was serious because, after all, I was taking a man's place."
Great strides have been gained in the area of women in professional fields. Ferraro remarks, "I'd like to see his face today--I know he'd be proud of me. He would also know that this country has changed. And we're better for it." But, in Ferraro's opinion, those in power today are threatening that progress.

Ferraro launches her strongest attack on Reagan by stating,

But in the past four years, those who never accepted that progress have come to power. They dispute our right to equal educational opportunity and ridicule our quest for comparable pay. They weaken support for our families while professing to strengthen them. They have condemned millions to poverty. They would intrude in our personal lives. And they have reversed forty years of Republican support for the Equal Rights Amendment.

Having identified the Reagan administration as the antagonist, Ferraro redefines the protagonist.

In this speech, Walter Mondale, the Democratic nominee for President, becomes the leader of the Democrats' fight to overthrow the opposition. Ferraro refers to her running mate by saying:

When Walter Mondale says, "The cause of America's women is the cause of America itself, and it is my cause as well"--He means it. He's proved it. He's with us.

Ferraro contends that when Mondale asked her to be his running mate, "he did more for equal opportunity in a single day than Ronald Reagan has done in four long years." In her final plea to these women, Ferraro rallies the audience to join in the cause for which
she and Mondale are fighting. Ferraro declares, "The
fight he [Mondale] has waged in his public life, every
American can also wage in his or her own private life.
The fight for equal opportunity never ends." 74

Although her fight for the vice-presidency is
over and Walter Mondale is no longer the leader of the
Democratic cause, Ferraro's antagonist remains the same
in her speech to Daschle supporters. This time her
audience relies heavily on an agricultural economy and
the present farm crisis is a key issue for the people
of South Dakota. So Ferraro uses this opportunity to
charge the Reagan administration with the crime of under-
mining America's farmers.

In 1985, Tom Daschle submitted the Emergency
Farm Credit bill to Congress and it passed three to
one in the House. Reagan vetoed it. Ferraro comments,

It was a strong plan: it would have taken the
administration's plan for Farmer's Home
Guarantees--which is poorly thought out and
unworkable--and made it work. . . . In my eyes,
it was a bill to support, not to sabotage.
Mr. Reagan didn't agree. He took a quick-
fix, short-term view. 75

Ferraro contends that Reagan cannot see past his pocket-
book and does not examine the advantages of long term
planning. She refers to Reagan's tactic of selling
Americans on the idea that above all else, costs must
be cut. Ferraro responds to the Dashle audience,
I say, cost cutting that undermines America's heartland farmers is bad business. Food and agriculture accounts for twenty cents out of every dollar in our gross national product—it employs one worker out of four.

Ferraro sees cost cutting as bad business. She feels that "a country with no food on the table and whole counties out of work is in serious trouble." She makes the following accusation: "Mr. Reagans economic policies are not just short-sighted solutions for the short-term—they also short-change the future of our country."

Ferraro places Tom Daschle in the position of representing the "good" Democratic party. She contends that "we can only have economic prosperity if we can all pull together." Ferraro tells her audience that

That's the fight I know Tom is leading in Washington. He's working to educate people to look at the long term. He helped me make connections between a grocery shopper in Queens, and a farmer in Rapid City.

She links Daschle to the principles that, in Ferraro's opinion, represent the Democratic party. She says, "Together, we are saying what we were saying a year ago . . . that the Reagan-Block-Stockman formula doesn't work. It is bad medicine for our country."

Ferraro claims that part of the farm problem stems from the international trade imbalance. Ferraro states that in 1984, the United States "imported $33 billion more from that nation [Japan] than we sold to
them." Ferraro contends that "You don't have to be a Washington economist to read those numbers. Anybody who can balance a checkbook--and those of us who can't--know we cannot continue that imbalance." Once again, she refers to Daschle's role in the fight for fair trade policies. She states,

Again, I see Tom Daschle taking the leadership on trade. He knows that protectionism is a slippery slope, because it can lead to retaliation against our products in foreign markets.

Ferraro blames the Reagan Administration for our trade imbalance and argues that the citizens of the United States need Democratic leaders in Washington in order to rectify these problems.

In all of the preceding speeches, Ferraro establishes abstract conflicts. In other words, Suppression, Tyranny, Good and Evil are not tangible objects, but Ferraro has given them characteristics that enable the audience to create a concrete representation in their minds. The speeches to the Social Security Administration and the National Association of Women Judges deal with suppression versus tyranny. In these speeches, Ferraro contends that women have been suppressed by a tyrannical male dominated society. The last three speeches clearly establish the Reagan administration as the evil elements and the Democratic party as the symbol of good that will fight for justice for all Americans.
Moral Lessons

It was noted in Chapter III that it is often the desire of the author of a moral drama to teach a moral lesson. Ferraro uses the abstractions she has created to teach her audiences a moral lesson. The teaching of concepts of right and wrong constitutes a moral lesson. Historical references can be used to illustrate a situation and those references may be applied to the present. The intent is to use the moral lesson as a means of affecting change in the listeners' lives. The primary lesson Ferraro teaches in her speeches is that the listeners themselves must work for change.

In the Flextime speech, Ferraro reminds the Social Security Administration that

You people . . . are the front line in our battle to keep Social Security solvent, to save it from political attacks, and to make sure it keeps its promise of fairness and financial security for all Americans.

She is telling them that it is their responsibility to restore solvency to Social Security and preserve it for all Americans.

Another issue that Ferraro deals with in this speech is the Equal Rights Amendment. She states, "The ERA would not solve all the problems which women, or men, face in our society. But it would create a climate of fairness to women in all aspects of our lives." Ferraro refers to the allegations made by some Americans
that the supporters of the Equal Rights Amendment have failed to convince others that passage of this amendment is important to all Americans.

Ferraro turns to events in her own life to illustrate the point she is making. She remembers that in the 1970s, "I didn't think about the ERA a lot and when I did I figured it was a nice idea but not very important." After reentering the work force, Ferraro began remembering events in her life that indicated that she was not being treated equally. She then started "wondering what opportunities my two daughters would have as adults." This prompted her to enter the campaign to pass the Equal Rights Amendment. She offers her audience three reasons why they should continue to seek passage of this amendment. She says, "Those reasons are job opportunity, equal pay and fair retirement." Ferraro asks her audience why they should persevere in this cause and the presents this answer:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men--and women--are created equal and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Through the course of this speech, Ferraro submits evidence, cited earlier in this chapter, to prove that economic inequality exists for women and challenges her audience to learn from this situation.
The lesson she attempts to teach women in the legal professions is similar. As was cited earlier, Ferraro claims that women in leadership roles make a difference. But Ferraro contends that despite some of the changes that have taken place, much work remains to be done. She states, "Our society has changed over the past thirty-five years--but our attitudes have not."  

Ferraro says that she has found evidence that "the fight for equity in the work force is in full swing." She is disappointed to report that it is not happening in the place that should be establishing standards for the rest of America. The result of a series of hearings conducted by Ferraro and two other Congresswomen was that "it is not happening in the marble halls of Washington. It is happening in the statehouses, the union offices, and the courts." According to Ferraro, more than twenty-five states and local governments have begun studies comparing the value of the work performed by men and women. But this is not happening at the national level. Ferraro contends that Democratic President Jimmy Carter began breaking the barrier for women in the legal profession, but Reagan brought that to a halt. She states, "Sixteen percent of Carter's appointments to the federal bench were women . . . Not enough, after years of exclusion, but a good start compared to Reagan's percentage of four percent."
Ferraro sums up her lesson this way,

As each of us devotes energy, talent, and time to the "man's" work we are doing, we owe it to our nation to remember that we are in the same boat with more than half of all Americans. As women, as judges, as lawyers—we must make a difference.

It is Ferraro's contention that women comprise over fifty percent of the American population but are still treated as a minority. Ferraro feels that it must be of major concern to all women in leadership roles to fight for equal opportunity.

Ferraro leaves this audience with the following thought:

Our responsibilities are heavy but they are not oppressive. We have an opportunity as well as an obligation--an opportunity to help create a better society for all Americans, men and women.

Although Ferraro does not close with the same quote as the last speech, the message that all men and women are created equal is present. She believes that it is the responsibility of professional women to create a better world for Americans to live in.

After establishing the Reagan Administration as the force of evil in America today, Ferraro presents her lesson to the American people in her acceptance speech at the Democratic convention. She refers to the many injustices that, in her opinion, have been served to Americans by the Reagan administration. She
promises that a Democratic administration will produce change. She says, "To the Americans who will lead our country into the 21st century, we say: We will not have a Supreme Court that turns the clock back to the 19th century." 97

On the issue of America's defense, Ferraro tells her audience that the Democrats will defend "America's security and the cause of freedom around the world." 98 But she promises that Americans will know what they are fighting for. She proclaims that

we want a president who tells us what America is fighting for, not just what we are fighting against. We want a president who will defend human rights—not just where it is convenient—but wherever freedom is at risk.

Ferraro refers to events in the past and implies that the present Republican administration has misguided the American people and it is time for change.

The lesson of the misguided Reagan administration is repeated in Ferraro's campaign speech in Van Nuys, California. Ferraro states, "Four days from now, we hold an election that will decide our future not only for the next four years, but for the rest of this century and beyond." 100 Ferraro continues the allegation that the Reagan administration is stifling the progress made in the area of economic fairness for women. She says that "this election is our crossroads." 101 Ferraro
tells her listeners to vote for the Mondale/Ferraro ticket because,

In this contest, we're doing more than changing Administrations. We're choosing between justice and injustice for American women.

Once again Ferraro tells her audience that it is their responsibility to affect the changes they desire in their own lives and it is her opinion that the wisest decision they can make is to vote for the Walter Mondale ticket. She states,

In four days, in perhaps the most important decision in our lifetimes, we will decide whether we will finally step out of the shadow of nuclear fear . . .
   ... I ask you to pull the lever for peace. Vote for freedom. Vote for our parents and our grandchildren.

She then relates the events of the past to this election. She says that when she and Walter Mondale win the election, "that historic moment will be a victory for the men and women who fought the battles of the past to ensure the opportunities of today."

Although the situation has changed and she is campaigning for a different candidate, Ferraro perpetuates the message that all Americans must unite and fight for equal opportunity in her speech for Daschle. She begins by saying that

It was Tom Daschle who taught me the things that a worker in Queens, New York, has in common with a farmer outside of Sioux City. New York may seem a continent away, but the fact is, we are all in this together.
Ferraro says that "we get used to concentrating on our own little picture, and forgetting how closely it is linked with other people's well being." Ferraro strives to enlighten her audience by telling them that "that 'little picture thinking' hurts America. The narrow view held in parts of Washington over the last few years is why the people of South Dakota are where you are in 1985." Ferraro suggests that the "wrong" in this lesson is the selfish tendency to think of one's own situation with no consideration to the effect it has on another's. Ferraro implies that Tom Daschle is on the "right" side of this issue because he links the people in New York with those in South Dakota.

She extends this lesson by asking her audience to listen to and vote for Tom Daschle because "he's working to educate people to look at the long term." When referring to the international trade problem and Daschle's efforts to improve it, Ferraro reiterates the message about economic freedom by saying that "we need to keep our markets free and fair, so we can keep our people working." Ferraro concludes this portion of the lesson by stating that Tom Daschle knows that we live in the real world, a world where governments, like the European Common Market countries, subsidize their exports and where we must compete. In 1985, we need a hard-nosed trade policy that invites fair and open trade, but fights fire with fire when our partners refuse to trade fairly.
According to Ferraro, the Reagan administration is morally wrong when it makes decisions based on short term solutions. Tom Daschle, on the other hand, represents decisions that are morally right. Ferraro assigns her audience the task of carrying out their responsibility as Americans by voting for Tom Daschle. By so doing, they will ensure the return to economic fairness for everyone in America.

It is apparent that Ferraro's abstractions are employed in an attempt to teach a moral lesson. All of the speeches contain a message that indicates the necessity for Americans to take the initiative in promoting change. The changes that Ferraro advocates range from economic fairness for women, to an administration that represents all Americans, to a government that promotes the opportunity of fair prices in an international market. The moral lesson taught by Ferraro is the need to restore the principles on which this country was founded--all men and women were created equal and everyone should be allowed to seek whatever career they desire. Ferraro also argues that it is the moral responsibility of those in governing positions to protect and preserve these rights. It is her contention that the Reagan administration is not representing all Americans on an equal basis.
Audience Stimulation

If the rhetoric of Geraldine Ferraro is truly a moral drama, it must contain stylistic devices that motivate her audience to reenact the drama she has presented in her discourse. Ferraro often uses literal language to impress the point she is trying to make. Her use of literal language was demonstrated earlier in this chapter with references to the use of statistical proof to substantiate her arguments. The following analysis focuses on the use of emotive language and methods employed by Ferraro to motivate her audiences.

When expressing the importance of pension reform to the Social Security Administration, Ferraro alleges that

The Social Security system or, for that matter, private pension plans, don't try to be unfair to women. But they don't try very hard to recognize the reality of women's lives. They punish women for working part-time. They punish women for becoming widows too early. They punish women for taking a few years off to have children.

The use of the word "punish" indicates severe injustice to these women. A different word could have been used, such as "penalized," but it would not have the same impact. Punishment refers to a criminal act and suggests that women have been imprisoned in a world of financial insecurity simply because they are women. Here Ferraro is attempting to motivate her audience into action.
She repeatedly uses punishment to stimulate their sense of responsibility to these women. It is, after all, the members of this audience that administer these unfair policies.

As cited earlier, Ferraro considered economic fairness for women an issue of major importance. In an attempt to arouse the members of the Social Security Administration, Ferraro uses this illustrative example:

She says that when talking about job opportunity,

We are talking about a mother who took a temporary filing job 15 years ago when her kids needed shoes to go back to school. Now her family depends on that income and she's still here, with little hope of promotion or higher pay.

In this example, Ferraro uses words like "temporary," "depends," "stuck," and "hope" to illustrate the bleak situation that many women face today. She continues by saying that "Women are overwhelmingly concentrated in jobs that just don't pay very well." The word "overwhelmingly" implies that women are engulfed in a hopeless situation.

Ferraro extends her indictment of unfair labor practices in her address to the National Association of Women Judges when she states:

Look at the facts. More women than men are poor and it is harder for them to escape poverty. Indeed, more and more women are struggling to support children alone, earning 59 cents for each dollar a man earns and lower pay translates into smaller pensions or checks from Social Security in old age. As
a result, more and more women are sinking deeper and deeper into poverty.

In this passage, Ferraro again uses language to create a visual image of women imprisoned with the use of the word "escape." The word "struggle" implies the strain involved with single parenting. The hopelessness of the situation is emphasized with the phrase, "sinking deeper and deeper."

Later, Ferraro uses literal language to establish the fact that more women than men live in poverty. She states,

There are nine million families in the United States where a woman, not a man is the bread-winner . . . . Women and children are 75 percent of all Americans living in poverty. This situation is dramatized when Ferraro asks, "What can women do when their government and, I admit, that includes Congress, takes a meat ax to the programs they depend on so heavily?" The dilemma is perpetuated in her next statement

Yet--this Administration has persistently tried to abolish this source of legal hope and help by eliminating funding. So far Congress has refused to go along.

Cuts to Legal Services becomes a double-edged sword for women.

Emotive words such as "meat ax," "abolish," "hope," and "double-edged sword," were used in an effort to enhance Ferraro's arguments.
In the conclusion of this speech, Ferraro uses emotive language to motivate women in the legal profession. She declares:

As women we are a majority but as judges and legislators we are still an all-too-small minority in America. As a minority, our responsibilities—to our sex, our professions, and our nation—are heavy ones. A majority may have the luxury of being a "silent majority." A minority in defense of its rights must speak up.

Ferraro contends that the members of this minority have a responsibility to all women. She says, "As a minority, we bear the burden of expressing the minority viewpoint and keeping it ever before the American public." It is Ferraro's goal to activate these women to aggressively enter the fight for economic fairness for women. As a minority who has won the opportunity to hold positions with some power, it is their responsibility to speak for the less powerful majority. The motivational words used here were "heavy" responsibilities, "defense of its rights," and "bear the burden."

Ferraro does not limit her challenge to professional women. Evidence of this is apparent in her campaign speech to the women at Valley College. She sets the stage for the confrontation by pronouncing that the fight has just begun. Ferraro contends that this is just the "dawn of equal opportunity" indicating the women are in the early stages of reform. She claims
that the "tyranny of expectations has ended,"121 and women want "to be judged by the quality of our products."122 But, according to Ferraro, the Reagan administration has never accepted this progress and they confirm their position when they

weaken support for our families while professing to strengthen them. They have condemned millions to poverty. They would intrude in our personal lives.123

In this passage, Ferraro uses several emotive words to arouse her listeners. They suggest several emotional reactions. From "tyranny" to "weaken" to "condemn" and "intrude," these words enable the audience to visualize and experience the situation that Ferraro is describing.

This speech is filled with sensory words. When referring to economic inequality, Ferraro states:

I'm not speaking just to women. You don't have to be a woman to be offended by discrimination. Most men are too. You don't have to be poor to hate poverty. You don't have to be black, Hispanic, or Asian to loathe bigotry. Every American should, and most Americans do.124

It appears that Ferraro uses the words "offended," "hate," and "loathe" that signify negative reactions in an effort to induce the audience to act. She continues by declaring that

Every father is diminished when his daughter is denied a fair chance. Every son is a victim when his mother is denied fair pay. And when we lower barriers, open doors, and free women to reach wherever their dreams will take them--our
talents are multiplied, and our country is stronger.

Now that she has attempted to elevate her audience's emotions with words like "diminished," "victim," "denied," "barriers," and "free," Ferraro offers her listeners the opportunity to react to this dilemma. She states,

These are the concerns we have as women. And this election is our crossroads. In this contest, we're doing more than changing administrations. We're choosing between justice and injustice for American women. With so much at stake, pick a leader who will fight by our side.

"Crossroads" signifies a major turning point and Ferraro contends that it is up to these women to choose between "justice" (right) and "injustice" (wrong). With their whole futures "at stake," it is their responsibility to learn from the injustices of the past and make the right decision when determining their futures.

Ferraro persists in activating this audience by expressing her conviction that the fight that Walter Mondale "has waged in his public life, every American can also wage in his or her own private life. The fight for equal opportunity never ends." She offers support for those who find it difficult to articulate their feelings by saying that,

When you move ahead in your lives, you must have the courage to speak up against discrimination.
When you are fighting to reach the top, you must have the commitment to help others starting at the bottom.
It is essential to Ferraro that these women continue to wage the battle against female suppression.

In her acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention, Ferraro employs sensory images to create the image of the "evil" Reagan administration. She says that "Our parents left us a growing economy. The rules say: We must not leave our kids a mountain of debt." The image of a mountain enables the audience to visualize a significant problem with the National deficit. She extends her charge against Reagan by referring to the cuts in Federal aid to education with this statement:

To an Administration that would savage student loans and education at the dawn of a new technological age, we say: You fit the classic definition of a cynic; you know the price of everything, but the value of nothing.

In this excerpt, Ferraro establishes this administration as a cruel entity with the use of the word "savage." She insinuates that that by savaging educational aid, Reagan is undermining this country's future at the "dawn of a new" age.

Ferraro continues by stating that a victory for the Democratic party will be a victory for all of America. She begins her offense by stating,

By choosing a woman to run for our nation's second highest office, you sent a powerful signal to all Americans. There are no doors we cannot unlock. We will place no limits on achievement.
Ferraro is suggesting here that the election of a Democratic president will insure that the "powerful signal" sent by Americans will "unlock" doors that have been closed by the Reagan administration.

When defending the Democrat's position on a nuclear arms freeze, Ferraro uses figurative language to clarify their stand. She states,

A nuclear freeze is not a slogan: It is a tool for survival in the nuclear age. If we leave our children nothing else, let us leave them this Earth as we found it—whole and green and full of life.

The use of the phrase "a tool for survival" enables the audience to grasp the concept that the Democrats are trying to propose. And Ferraro suggests that by continuing nuclear escalation, our children will not have a world "whole and green and full of life" to live in.

The attempted stimulation of the audience's senses facilitates Ferraro's goal of activating the audience. She concludes this speech with the use of two emotive passages that challenge her audience to act. In the first, she quotes an old proverb:

"Every one of us is given the gift of life, and what a strange gift it is. If it is preserved jealously and selfishly, it impoverishes and saddens. But if it is spent for others, it enriches and beautifies."

Ferraro utilizes this quotation that contains several emotional words very effectively. When we are given
the "gift of life," we must not preserve it "jealously and selfishly," rather, we must spend it for others so it "enriches and beautifies" itself. The use of this dramatic visualization of life sets the stage for Ferraro's final challenge to the people of America.

She closes by declaring:

   My fellow Americans: We can debate policies and programs. But in the end what separates the two parties in this election campaign is whether we use the gift of life--for others or only ourselves.  

Once again Ferraro contends that the Reagan administration represents the wrong side of the moral fence and the Democrats represent what is right--using the "gift of life" for others. It is Ferraro's opinion that it is the right and responsibility of the American people to vote for the party that will fight to preserve the principles that this country was founded on.

In her speech to Daschle supporters in South Dakota, Ferraro recalls her first visit to South Dakota. She was very skeptical about flying in a small airplane and was hesitant to get in it. "But I have to admit, that lesson came in handy last fall--there are some times when you just have to hold on and ride for dear life."  

Ferraro is referring to her experience in the vice-presidential campaign. She learned that one must accept the challenge, no matter how difficult,
and "hold on and ride for dear life." This is one of the lessons that she has been trying to teach all of her audiences—if a goal is worth attaining, one must be willing to pay the necessary price in order to achieve it.

In this speech, Ferraro establishes the link between South Dakotans and New Yorkers. She points out that just as New Yorkers rely on the people of South Dakota to grow the food they eat, South Dakotans rely on New Yorkers to provide a market for that food. She states, "The subway system which seems irrelevant in Sioux Falls is critical for New Yorkers to get to work, so they can afford to buy your food." The use of "irrelevant" and "critical" impresses the point by implying that the link between the two sets of people is very serious.

But, according to Ferraro, there are those in Washington who have forgotten this important link. Rather, they wait until you are "down in the trenches" before they listen. Ferraro is referring to the current farm crisis in America and saying that if the administration had listened to those who were signaling the beginning of this problem several years ago, there would not be a farm crisis today. But they waited until American farmers were "down in the trenches" before they attempted to do anything. Ferraro states,
For months, the head of the Farm Credit system, Donald Wilkinson, has maintained that the system was doing well and needed no help. But two days ago, he laid it on the line: our farm credit system is on the verge of collapse.

They not only waited until farmers were down in the trenches, but waited until they were "on the verge of collapse" before addressing the issue. Ferraro quotes The Wall Street Journal which says, "They signal the failure of the system's belated and often ill conceived efforts to pull itself out of the unparalleled morass of bad loans and lax procedures." In other words, it is Ferraro's opinion that the Farm Credit system made "belated" and "ill-conceived" attempts to "pull itself out of the unparalleled morass" of unpayable loans and "lax" procedures. And it is now signaling the "failure" of the system.

Ferraro has painted a very depressing picture of her audience's situation and the administration's role in it. Her use of emotive words is an attempt to capture their attention before she makes an appeal to change the present situation.

It was noted earlier in this chapter that Ferraro holds Reagan responsible for many of the financial problems that this country is facing. She says that Mr. Reagan's economic policies "short change the future of our country." "Short change" suggests stealing and Ferraro
indicates that it is "bad medicine for our country." Medicine is supposed to facilitate healing, not promote growth of a disease. Ferraro implies that Reagan is prolonging the disease rather than trying to cure it.

When discussing the international trade problem, Ferraro tells her audience,

You feel it when you can't sell grains and commodities abroad because our dollar is so distorted. You feel it when you can't compete with imports flooding our domestic market.

Words like "distorted" and "flooding" give one the feeling of vertigo. Although the two words are unrelated, the use of the two of them together creates the sensation of irrational movement. Ferraro comments on Daschle's view of the administration's approach to foreign trade. She says, "He knows that protectionism is a slippery slope, because it can lead to retaliation against our products in foreign markets." Ferraro uses "protectionism," "slippery slope," and "retaliation" to form the mental image of America fighting an uphill battle.

In this speech, Ferraro has utilized many emotive words in an effort to motivate the audience, but she fails to offer them a way in which to reenact the drama in a highly emotive fashion. She closes with this statement:

Where farmers are in 1985 is proof of the fact that our work is far from over. As Democrats, we have a lot of work ahead. And I, for one, am
glad we have people like Tom Daschle helping us do it. But we also have a lot of new doors to open. With your help, I know we'll go through them together.

She does, however, use figurative language to motivate them. Ferraro implies that the government has closed many doors for Americans and it is up to the people to open them again.

In summary, the use of sensory images is present in these Ferraro speeches. She uses them in an attempt to motivate her audience to reenact the drama. It is her belief that women can no longer wait for others to fight their battles for them. In three of the speeches, she educates her audiences on the events of the past that have contributed to change in economic fairness for women and alleges the presence of evil forces in the Reagan administration that are stifling that progress. Suppression versus Tyranny becomes the abstract conflict in these speeches. "Women" emerges as the protagonist and "Society" as the antagonist. Ferraro uses the messages above as a moral lesson to teach her audience right from wrong and emotive language to arouse her audience in an effort to stimulate their desire to relive this drama and act upon the injustices in American society.

The other two speeches establish Good versus Evil as the abstract conflict and the "good" Democratic party is the protagonist and the "evil" Reagan
administration is the antagonist. Once again, Ferraro relates events of the past to establish the values of right and wrong and create a moral lesson. She uses emotive language in both speeches, but in the Daschle speech she fails to use it in a manner which offers the audience an opportunity to relive the drama.

Recurring Themes in Ferraro's Rhetoric

Richard Weaver points out that rhetoric depends upon history. All questions that are susceptible to rhetorical treatment arise out of history, and it is to history that the rhetorician turns for his means of persuasion.

Geraldine Ferraro follows this precept of rhetoric and turns to events in her own life and those of others to enhance persuasion.

Ferraro refers to history when discussing the fight for the passage of the nineteenth amendment to the Constitution in her speech to the Social Security Administration and her campaign speech at Van Nuys, California. The women in that struggle that she mentions specifically are Abigail Adams, Harriet Tubman, Susan B. Anthony, and Eleanor Roosevelt. In her speech to the National Association of Women Judges she refers to the Carter Administration. Carter's accomplishments are also mentioned in her acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention. In that speech, Ferraro also speaks
of Martin Luther King, Jr. and former president John F. Kennedy.

Many of the events cited in Chapter II are also present in Ferraro's rhetoric. Ferraro often refers to her experiences in being accepted into law school and her attempt to get a job as a lawyer after graduation. References to this experience are made in the speech to the Social Security Administration, the National Association of Women Judges, and her campaign speech at Van Nuys, California.

Ferraro relates her mother's struggle to provide a good education for her daughter and Ferraro's own experiences in attaining that education in her acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention and at Van Nuys.

References to her Congressional experiences are mentioned in all five speeches. She discusses her own problems as a female Representative, such as her inability to obtain credit cards in her own name. She also refers to some of the legislation that she has sponsored and supported during her terms in Congress.

In all of the speeches except the one to Daschle supporters, Ferraro notes her involvement in the fight to make the Equal Rights Amendment a part of our Constitution.
Four additional recurring themes from her life appear in the rhetoric. They are her exposure to discrimination as a working mother, the cases she handled as an assistant district attorney, events in her Congressional campaigns and her campaign for vice-president.

Moral Drama as a Stylistic Tool in Ferraro's Rhetoric

Based on the questions established in Chapter III, does Ferraro develop moral drama in her rhetoric? The first question asked concerns the use of allegory. It is apparent that Ferraro develops concrete representations of conflicting forces in these speeches. The two conflicts noted were Suppression versus Tyranny and Good versus Evil. It was also noted that personified abstractions were not specifically created; rather, Ferraro developed dramatic individuals capable of generalized application.

Ferraro often uses emotive language in her discourse. Although figurative language is used occasionally, emotive or sensory words are employed most frequently. Ferraro uses emotive language in an attempt to arouse her audiences and provide opportunities for them to identify themselves with the protagonist in the dramas and to reenact the dramas.

It is apparent that Ferraro has tried to develop moral lessons from which the audience can ascertain
the differences between right and wrong. In addition, agents of good and evil are present in the discourse. Suppressed women and the Democratic party become the agents of good and a society dominated by males and the Reagan administration are established as the agents of evil.

**Conclusion**

In this chapter, I have established the reasons for selecting five speeches of Geraldine Ferraro and related the circumstances surrounding them. Application of the elements of moral drama was utilized in the analysis of Ferraro's rhetoric and recurring themes present in the discourse were noted.

Based on these findings, it is my opinion that Ferraro has developed moral drama as a stylistic tool in her discourse. All of the components of moral drama are present in her rhetoric with some consistency. The only exception is the absence of emotive language to activate the audience to reenact the drama in her speech to Daschle supporters.

Style is a rhetorician's use of language to relay an intended message and moral drama is a stylistic devise that can be employed to develop that message. With the preceding analysis as a basis, it is my
contention that many elements of moral drama are present in Geraldine Ferraro's rhetoric.
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CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine Geraldine Ferraro's discourse for elements of moral drama. The study was conducted in the following manner. After a survey of literature revealed no previous studies on the rhetoric of Ferraro, five speeches were selected for examination. A critical tool was developed by combining the elements of rhetorical style and medieval England's morality plays. The remainder of the study consisted of a review of Ferraro's life and career and an analysis of her rhetoric.

While researchig Ferraro's life, it was discovered that Ferraro was raised by her widowed mother who struggled to provide for her two youngest children. Antonetta Ferraro's major goal was to give her daughter, Geraldine, a good education. Mrs. Ferraro had been forced to realize the importance of an education and the difficulty of earning a stable income without education. Geraldine Ferraro worked her way through college and then earned a law degree at night while teaching grade school during the day. After marrying
John Zaccaro, Ferraro spent fourteen years as a full time homemaker.

When she reentered the work force, Ferraro experienced the frustrations of being away from her profession for so many years. Initially she worked as an assistant district attorney in Queens, New York. In this job, she handled all of the sex crimes that were brought to the district attorney's office. Ferraro became frustrated with the fact that she was powerless to change the situations of these victims. This frustration motivated her to run for Congress in 1978. She won the election.

As the representative from Queens, New York, it was her goal to represent all of her constituents and address as many of the issues as possible in her committee work in Congress. She was also aware of the fact that as a woman, she represented over half of the population of the United States. This fact, the events in her mother's life, her own struggle to obtain a law degree and to be hired as an attorney rather than a legal secretary, and the cases she handled in the DA's office, inspired Ferraro to focus her legislative efforts on economic fairness for women. She sponsored many pieces of legislation that addressed flextime, pension reform, improved standards for day care, and aid for education.
Ferraro also devoted a great deal of time to the Democratic party and served on many committees. In 1984, she was chosen as Platform Chair for the Democratic National Convention. This position and other events led to a revelation in American history. On July 19, 1984, Geraldine Ferraro accepted the nomination for vice-president of the United States. Ferraro was the first woman to be nominated for this office by a major political party. Her campaign was controversial and drew attention from the media and many special interest groups. Although she did not win the election, her nomination was considered by many to be a breakthrough for women in America.

Chapter III of this study was devoted to establishing moral drama as a stylistic tool. Rhetorical style was examined and defined as word use. It was noted that a rhetorician's capability to combine different types of language use often determines the effectiveness of the rhetoric.

The morality plays of medieval England were examined and the common elements were established. They are as follows: the use of allegory, or concrete representation of abstractions; the development of abstracted conflicts; the implementation of dramatic individuals capable of generalized application; and the utilization of a message that contains a moral lesson.
and language designed to motivate the audience to reenact the drama. In addition, Kurt Ritter's application of moral drama to the rhetoric of the Boston Massacre was examined. Based on the preceding factors, moral drama was developed as a stylistic tool.

The final facet of the study consisted of analysis of the selected Ferraro speeches. The rhetoric was examined for elements of moral drama and recurring themes derived from Ferraro's life and career and from events in history.

Conclusions

The analysis of the rhetoric revealed that all of the elements of moral drama were present in varying degrees in Ferraro's discourse. The two abstractions of conflict that she created were Suppression versus Tyranny and Good versus Evil. The dramatic individuals capable of generalized application were suppressed Women in a tyrannical Society dominated by males and the "good" Democratic party struggling to overcome the injustices of the "evil" Reagan administration. Ferraro develops several moral lessons in an attempt to teach her concepts of right and wrong and uses emotive language to motivate her audiences to reenact the drama. It was noted that in only one speech did Ferraro fail to use highly emotive
language to activate the audience, rather figurative language was used.

Many recurring themes appear in Ferraro's rhetoric. Some stem from history. She refers to events and many of the people involved in the struggle for passage of the nineteenth amendment that granted women the right to vote. She also mentions previous Democratic administrations. It is apparent that many events in her own life influenced the issues that Ferraro addresses in her rhetoric. She often relates her acceptance into law school, the inequities she discovered in the work force, and Congressional experiences.

The appearance of these recurring themes substantiates Weaver's contention that a rhetorician must turn to history as a means of persuasion. Based on the preceding findings, it was concluded that Geraldine Ferraro does use moral drama as a stylistic tool.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

Women have been actively involved in addressing the issues confronting America since its settlement. The issues and people range from Anne Hutchinson who challenged the accepted ideas of the Puritan church to Sojourner Truth who not only fought for abolition but questioned the right of men to suppress women. They also include Lucretia Mott and Elizabeth Cady Stanton
who triggered the fight for equal rights for all men and women, and the hundreds of women who have strived to improve life for all in the United States. The rhetoric of these women is as massive as that of their male counterparts and deserves examination. It was noted in Chapter I that some studies have been done on general themes, but more attention needs to be directed to individual women who created the rhetoric.

In addition, moral drama could be used to comparatively analyze the rhetoric of male and female orators. It is also possible that fruitful study may be done by analyzing speakers from different cultures.

It has been established that moral drama is a credible tool for analysis, but it is not the only method available. Critics have been analyzing rhetoric for centuries using Aristotle's canons of rhetoric. Other analytical methods that have been developed include Edmund Burke's dramatistic perspective, Richard Weaver's arguments from circumstance and principle, and Ernest Bormann's "fantasy theme analysis." Regardless of the method used, it is my desire that more attention will be devoted to the rhetoric of female orators.
APPENDIX A

"Economic Fairness for Women"

August 26, 1982

I am delighted to be here today, addressing the troops. You people, not some TV-actor mailman, are the front line in our battle to keep Social Security solvent, to save it from political attacks, and to make sure it keeps its promise of fairness and financial security for all Americans.

I want to thank Martin Taffet, Robert Marinaro and Joanne Foulke for having me here on this important day. It's Women's Equality Day, of course, but it is also my birthday. I am pleased to report that I am much younger than the 19th Amendment.

As vital as Social Security is to all of us, I am here to talk about another issue of major importance--economic fairness for women.

Sixty-two years ago today, women won the right to vote. I say we won that right because it was surely not handed to us. Our foremothers, and some of our enlightened forefathers, fought for more than a generation to achieve the 19th Amendment.

We now know that winning the right to vote was just the first step for American women. The effort to win passage of a 27th Amendment to our Constitution--the Equal Rights Amendment--goes on. We have already invested 10 years in this effort. We will spend as many more years as it takes to make the ERA part of our Constitution.

The ERA would not solve all the problems which women, or men, face in our society. But it would create a climate of fairness to women in all aspects of our lives.

Some people feel the ERA has failed so far because those of us who support it have not been able to convince a lot of women that there is something in it for them.
Let me give you three reasons why I support the ERA. Those reasons are job opportunity, equal pay and fair retirement.

All women are working women. If we are not working in our homes, raising children and making life possible for our families, we are working outside the home in paid jobs. More and more of us are trying to do both of these things at the same time.

Two-thirds of all the women who work do it because they are single, widowed, divorced or because their husbands simply do not earn enough money to support the family alone.

Almost half of all the women who work are mothers with pre-school children.

When we talk about job opportunity we are not just talking about career fulfillment for a college-educated young woman or something to do for a wealthy suburban wife.

We are talking about a mother who took a temporary filing job 15 years ago when her kids needed shoes to go back to school. Now her family depends on that income and she's still here, stuck with little hope of promotion or higher pay.

And when we talk about job opportunity we are also talking about the opportunity to leave home each morning, confident that our children are well taken care of.

I am a working mother. That is why I have fought to set up and preserve the federal flextime program which lets you adjust your hours so you can be with the children when they need you. I am happy to say we have saved this program.

Job opportunity goes hand in hand with equal pay. Women who do the same jobs men do still do not always get paid the same salary.

For instance, in 1981 a male accountant was making $433 a week on the average. A woman accountant was making $308.

There is an even bigger problem. Women are overwhelmingly concentrated in jobs that just don't pay very well. Women are nurses, secretaries, bookkeepers,
waitresses. Men are doctors, administrators, accountants, restaurant managers.

A woman with a four-year college degree can expect to make the same amount that a man makes—a man, that is, with an eighth-grade education.

All this leads us to retirement. That's when women really get poor. You see it everyday in your work. There are two-and-a-half times as many poor elderly women as there are poor elderly men. And it is not only because women tend to live longer.

The Social Security system or, for that matter, private pension plans, don't try to be unfair to women. But they don't try very hard to recognize the reality of women's lives. They punish women for working part-time. They punish women for becoming widows too early. They punish women for taking a few years off to have children.

Back in the early 70s, I was a middle-class lady from Queens with a beautiful house, three lovely kids and a wonderful husband. I didn't think about the ERA a lot and when I did I figured it was a nice idea but not very important.

I still have the wonderful husband and kids and house. But I got to thinking about being in law school in 1960 when there was only one other woman in my class. I thought about the law firm that offered me the position of legal secretary instead of attorney.

I remembered running for Congress when I had trouble getting a bank loan without my husband's signature even though I was working as an assistant district attorney. I got elected but couldn't get an airline credit card. And I started wondering what opportunities my two daughters would have as adults.

So I support the ERA as part of a host of things that need to be done to assure fairness for women. I support it when I am on the floor of the House, speaking out for flextime and pension reform and I support it when I am in my kitchen making blueberry jam. I support it when I am doing the laundry and I support it when I am chairing a hearing on the transport of hazardous wastes through Queens.

What's in it for us? "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men—and women—are created
equal and are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." I welcome your questions.
"Who Will Fight for the Worth of Women's Work?"

October 9, 1982

When I was an assistant district attorney in Queens it used to make me terribly nervous to get up and argue a motion in front of one judge. So you can imagine how I feel standing up here in front of hundreds of judges.

Of course, I am not here today to argue. But I am here to plead a case. My case is that women in leadership positions make a real difference in the way our society works. And I believe that women like us must continue to make that difference.

All of our futures, and our daughters' futures, are at stake. I am talking about the future of every woman, from the migrant farm worker or ghetto mother to United States Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, a founder of this organization and your honoree earlier today.

I speak to you as a Member of Congress who has not forgotten that she is a lawyer who never forgets she is a woman. How could I?

I was one of just two women in my law class at Fordham in the late 50s. In 1960, five job interviews at one of our prestigious New York law firms culminated with a "you're terrific . . . but we're not hiring any women this year." As a bureau chief in the DA's office many years later, I learned that I was being paid less than men with similar responsibilities. When I asked why, I was told "you don't really need the money, Gerry, you've got a husband."

Getting to Congress wasn't easy either. The biggest problem in running as a woman, if by some quirk you get the organization endorsement, is raising money. I remember going from bank to bank in 1978 for a campaign loan and being told that my husband had to cosign. Forget that I was a lawyer with a good deal of trial
experience. Just remember that even if I wanted my husband to sign, I couldn't because I would be in violation of FEC laws. Once elected, I applied to Eastern Airlines for a Wings card to make billing for the shuttle flights to Washington a bit easier. Despite the fact I was a member of the Aviation Subcommittee of the House Public Works and Transportation Committee, I was turned down. It was only after I mentioned it, to everyone's embarrassment, at an ERA luncheon with an Eastern Airlines lobbyist present, that I received my card. I know what the law is, and so do you. But that doesn't mean it is observed.

Four months ago, I applied to Citibank for a VISA card, listing my salary, American Express, and Eastern Airlines as credit references, my savings banks, and my employer. Again, I was turned down. It was only after I commented to a friend of mine who is a Vice President of Citibank that I was going to write to inquire the basis on which my credit had been disapproved, that I received a note from the Credit Department, along with my card, welcoming me into the fold. There was no reason to turn me down other than I am a woman. Fortunately for me, I am a woman with clout. But what about the woman who is not a member of Congress?

As recently as two weeks ago, Capitol Hill police stopped me at four different locations, the last when I entered the House for a roll call vote, and demanded identification. For years I've been walking in and out of those hallowed halls. Clearly, they found it more difficult to recognize me--one of just 20 women in the House--than any of the 415 men.

Yes, the Old Boy Network is alive and well and living in our courthouses and our legislatures and our boardrooms. As women, we still have to be better than men at most of the things we do, we have to work harder and we have to prove our worth over and over and over again.

It is not just those of us who have reached the top who are fighting this daily battle. It is a fight in which all of us--rich and poor, career and home-oriented, young and old--participate, simply because we are women.

Look at the facts. More women than men are poor and it is harder for them to escape poverty. Indeed, more and more women are struggling to support children alone, earning 59 cents for each dollar a man earns and lower pay translates into smaller pensions or checks.
from Social Security in old age. As a result, more and more women are sinking deeper and deeper into poverty. In our wealthy society, poverty is becoming a women's issue. Cuts in domestic programs, seemingly gender-neutral, actually hit women and children twice as hard as they do men because women are the greater number of recipients. Ninety-two percent of the participants in Aid for Dependent Children are women and children. Sixty-six percent of the recipients of subsidized housing are women. Sixty-nine percent of Food Stamp recipients are women. Sixty-one percent of Medicaid recipients are women. And why are women dependent on federal help? It is not because they are lazier than men or less moral than men. Or less intelligent.

Women are in greater need because they often have less education. They are the ones who must care for the children. They must work part-time or in menial jobs and they get paid less for the work that they do. After a lifetime of work, in or outside their homes, they often enter old age dependent solely on Social Security benefits.

There are nine million families in the United States where a woman, not a man, is the breadwinner. Fully a third of these families are welfare cases. Still more of them require other federal aid—food stamps, Medicaid, public housing. Women and children are 75 percent of all Americans living in poverty. And by the year 2000 that figure will rise to 100 percent.

What can women do when their government and, I admit, that includes Congress, takes a meat ax to the programs they depend on so heavily? They can, and do, turn to the Legal Services Corporation when the welfare office stops the food stamps, the landlord shuts off the water, the ex-husband forgets the child support check, or the Social Security Administration cuts their benefits. Yet—this Administration has persistently tried to abolish this source of legal hope and help by eliminating funding. So far Congress has refused to go along.

Cuts to Legal Services becomes a double-edged sword for women. Not only are women 67 percent of the Legal Services clients, but this public benefit agency has served as an important training ground for women attorneys. It has provided jobs for well-qualified lawyers who still find the doors of many rich corporate law firms open to "old boys" but closed to young women.
At a time when 29 percent of law school graduates are women--an amazing development in itself--almost 36 percent of Legal Services 5,678 lawyers are women.

And what about the working women? Is it any better for them? Our society has changed over the past thirty-five years--but our attitudes have not.

More and more women are working outside the home. Many work for personal satisfaction and achievement like many of us here. But most--two-thirds--work to support themselves and their children and husbands who cannot earn enough alone to keep the family above the poverty line. There are now 43 million women in the workforce, triple the number just prior to World War II. Sixty percent of all women between the ages of eighteen and sixty-four are workers, with eighty percent of all women who work concentrated in so-called "pink collar" jobs--jobs dominated by females and dominated by low salaries.

A woman with a college education can expect lifetime earnings equal to those paid to a man who never finished eighth grade. Groundkeepers are paid more than experienced secretaries. We entrust our children--our most precious resource--to teachers who frequently earn less than truck drivers.

Who will fight for the worth of women's work? A series of hearings I conducted recently in Washington with two other Congresswomen provided some interesting answers.

We found that the fight for equity in the workforce is in full swing. But it is not happening in the marble halls of Washington. It is happening in the statehouses, the union offices, and the courts.

More than twenty-five states and local governments have launched studies of the comparative value of the work their male and female employees do. Spurred on by public employee unions, they are beginning to question the assumption that a tree trimmer should be paid more than an intensive care nurse.

In 1981, Minnesota became the first state to pass a law establishing a state commitment to comparable worth and earmarked budget funds for pay adjustments that might result.
Unions in the private sector have also brought successful pressure to bear on companies like AT&T. Non-union groups like 9 to 5--The National Association of Working Women--have embarrassed companies like John Hancock Insurance into granting raises for clerical workers.

In the courts, 1981 saw the crucial decision of Gunther vs. Washington which explicitly links the Civil Rights Act to the issue of wage discrimination against women whose jobs are similar, but not identical, to those performed by men.

At a time when the federal government seems to lack the funds, or the staff, or the will to vigorously enforce laws which promote fairness in the workplace, it is only before judges such as yourselves that these vital issues can, literally, have their day in court.

So what does this all mean to us? I did a little research the other day. I wanted to find out how many women in America earn more than $60,000 a year. I picked that number, frankly, because that is what I, as a member of Congress, earn. I learned that there are only 18,000 women in the entire United States, working full-time who earn more than $60,000. We represent just one-tenth of one percent of all the women who work full-time in America. By contrast, 885,000 men, 2.1 percent of full-time male workers, are in the $60,000-plus bracket.

It would be easy to say "gee, it's great to be part of such a tiny minority." It would be easy to say, "I'm all right, Jack--or Jill" and leave it at that. But that would be denying the real role we can--and must--play as female legislators and judges.

I said earlier that I believe women in leadership make a real difference in our society.

Now, there are really two reasons why there needs to be more women in leadership--more than the bare five percent of Congress, more than the eight percent of the federal judiciary. More than the six hundred women in state court systems.

The first reason could be called the "Me-First" reason. We are smart, we worked hard, we deserve this job, we are entitled to it and we will do anything necessary to get and keep it. Women of merit do indeed deserve their fair share of society's rewards--a share previously denied to us only because we were women.
The second reason, though, is more important. Women leaders are different. Despite our frequent political and philosophical differences, there are certain generalizations that can be made about women judges and women legislators. We care more about women. We show more concern for children. We try to resolve controversies by cooperation, rather than conflict.

Harvard University Professor Carol Gilligan has written a book entitled In a Different Voice in which she discusses how men and women make decisions. Women, she suggests, are more likely to think about human relationships when they make decisions. They think about what the impact of their decision will be on the people it will affect. Men, on the other hand, are more likely to follow a set of rules and procedures to a conclusion. Women worry more about the effect of their decisions. Men worry more about making the decisions the right way. In short, men often worry more about rules and processes. Women often worry more about outcomes.

We have an obligation to use our unique perspective when we make the laws, as I do, and interpret the laws, as you do.

Your distinguished honoree, Justice O'Connor, has made this kind of difference on the Supreme Court even though I am sure we would all agree that she is neither a professional feminist nor, certainly, a liberal Democrat.

In fact, if I may be so bold as to characterize Justice O'Connor's first year, she has shown herself a staunch supporter of states' rights and a reduced court presence in legislative affairs.

Yet, in at least one opinion, pitting a male nurse against a Mississippi nursing college for women only, Justice O'Connor focused the arguments against sex discrimination in a way which may not have occurred, had our highest court still been an all-male enclave.

Let me quote her opinion: "Rather than compensate for discriminatory barriers faced by women, Mississippi University for Women's policy of excluding males tends to perpetuate the stereotyped view of nursing as an exclusively women's job.

Justice O'Connor went further. She added a footnote citing evidence, that the small number of men in
nursing keeps nursing wages down. So, the Justice argued, keeping men out of an all-women's nursing school actually punishes women, rather than helps them.

I am not here to give you a campaign speech. You know that I am a Democrat and you know that, with the exception of the appointment of Sandra Day O'Connor, I have not had very many good things to say about President Reagan.

But I do not think that you have to look at the world through Democratic spectacles to see that women judges made greater strides under President Carter than in any other period of our history.

Sixteen percent of Carter's appointments to the federal bench were women. Forty-one women out of 260. More than all of his predecessors combined. Not enough, after years of exclusion, but a good start compared to Reagan's percentage of four percent.

Four percent. At a time when our federal judiciary is eight percent female, the Reagan Administration is not even keeping up.

The President's record of female appointment to other top jobs is also poor. U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick is the only woman of Cabinet rank—but she is not a member of the Cabinet. Given a chance to name the highly qualified Republican Betty Southard Murphy as Secretary of Labor, Reagan instead chose Raymond Donovan. Need I say more?

What the President does—especially in the area of minority and women's rights—creates a national climate. That climate can be a climate of fairness for women in our society. Or it can be a climate of regression. It can be a return to an era when women were not vital participants in public policy-making.

I have long supported the Equal Rights Amendment—and have sponsored its reintroduction—because I see how government can lose the will to protect the rights of all citizens without the Constitutional imperative.

When women are named to federal courts, there is pressure to name them to state and municipal benches as well. Significantly, it was not until 1979, during the Carter Administration, that every one of our states could finally say it had a woman in its judiciary system.
When women become judges, when more and more women graduate from law school, not only government, but private enterprise, has to realize that women are a force to be dealt with and treated with respect.

On the other hand, the sight of top Administration officials capering at Bohemian Grove, that sexist California summer camp for overgrown boys, probably made it easier this past summer for the American Bar Association to undo a progressive new policy. That policy would have put the ABA on record against private clubs which refuse to admit women.

It is not my place, as a maker of laws, to tell you how to do your job of interpreting that law. I am a firm believer in the system of checks and balances established by our Constitution. I am strongly opposed to the efforts that are being made by some members of Congress to strip our courts of their proper jurisdiction.

Yet I do not think it is presumptuous of me to remind you that the courts in this country are in every sense courts of last resort for the poor and the powerless.

Increasingly, those poor and powerless are women and children. If we, as women, don't look out for other women, who will? If we as women don't care what happens to women it will not just be the waitress or the welfare mother who loses. It will be every one of us. Every one of us who thought when we made it, all women had it made. Or who thought "if I make it, it doesn't matter who else makes it."

It is too easy to divide the world into "us" and "them." And it is far too easy for us--secure, successful, well-off--to become them. A simple thing--an illness, a divorce, widowhood, alcoholism, economic depression--could turn any of our hard-won gains into a struggle for mere existence.

I didn't go to Washington to represent the women of this nation. But if I don't, who will? I ran, and was elected, not as a feminist, but as a lawyer. And as a lawyer I can argue more effectively for equity and fairness for all Americans.

As I was preparing for this speech tonight I was reminded by one of your publicity aids that "judges are people too."
Women judges are women, too. Congresswomen are women in Congress. As each of us devotes energy, talent, and time to the "man's" work we are doing, we owe it to our nation to remember that we are in the same boat with more than half of all Americans. As women, as judges, as lawyers—we must make a difference.

As women we are a majority but as judges and legislators we are still in an all-too-small minority in America. As a minority, our responsibilities—to our sex, our professions, and our nation—are heavy ones.

A majority may have the luxury of being a "silent majority." A minority in defense of its rights must speak up.

As members of a minority we have a responsibility to be role-models for all women. As a minority, we bear the burden of expressing the minority viewpoint and keeping it ever before the American public.

Our responsibilities are heavy but they are not oppressive. We have an opportunity as well as an obligation—an opportunity to help create a better society for all Americans, men and women.

Madam Justices, I rest my case. The verdict is yours.
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Ladies and gentlemen of the convention: My name Geraldine Ferraro. I stand before you to proclaim tonight: America is the land where dreams can come true for all of us.

As I stand before the American people and think of the honor this great convention has bestowed upon me, I recall the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who made America stronger by making America more free.

He said: "Occasionally in life there are moments which cannot be completely explained by words. Their meaning can only be articulated by the inaudible language of the heart."

Tonight is such a moment for me.

My heart is filled with pride.

My fellow citizens, I proudly accept your nomination for vice president of the United States.

And I am proud to run with a man who will be one of the great presidents of this century, Walter F. Mondale.

Tonight, the daughter of a woman whose highest goal was a future for her children talks to our nation's oldest party about a future for us all.

Tonight, the daughter of working Americans tells all Americans that the future is within our reach—if we're willing to reach for it.

Tonight, the daughter of an immigrant from Italy has been chosen to run for [vice] president in the new land my father came to love.

Our faith that we can shape a better future is what the American dream is all about. The promise of
our country is that the rules are fair. If you work hard and play by the rules, you can earn your share of America's blessings.

Those are the beliefs I learned from my parents. And those are the values I taught my students as a teacher in the public schools of New York City.

At night, I went to law school. I became an assistant district attorney, and I put my share of criminals behind bars. I believe: If you obey the law, you should be protected. But if you break the law, you should pay for your crime.

When I first ran for Congress, all the political experts said a Democrat could not win in my home district of Queens. But I put my faith in the people and the values that we shared. And together, we proved the political experts wrong.

In this campaign, Fritz Mondale and I have put our faith in the people. And we are going to prove the experts wrong again.

We are going to win, because Americans across this country believe in the same basic dream.

Last week, I visited Elmore, Minn., the small town where Fritz Mondale was raised. And soon Fritz and Joan will visit our family in Queens.

Nine hundred people live in Elmore. In Queens, there are 2,000 people on one block. You would think we would be different, but we're not.

Children walk to school in Elmore past grain elevators; in Queens, they pass by subway stops. But, no matter where they live, their future depends on education—and their parents are willing to do their part to make those schools as good as they can be.

In Elmore, there are family farms; in Queens, small businesses. But the men and women who run them all take pride in supporting their families through hard work and initiatives.

On the Fourth of July in Elmore, they hang flags out on Main Street; in Queens, they fly them over Grand Avenue. But all of us love our country, and stand ready to defend the freedom that it represents.
Americans want to live by the same set of rules. But under this administration, the rules are rigged against too many of our people.

It isn't right that every year, the share of taxes paid by individual citizens is going up, while the share paid by large corporations is getting smaller and smaller. The rules say: Everyone in our society should contribute their fair share.

It isn't right that this year Ronald Reagan will hand the American people a bill for interest on the national debt larger than the entire cost of the federal government under John F. Kennedy.

Our parents left us a growing economy. The rules say: We must not leave our kids a mountain of debt.

It isn't right that a woman should get paid 59 cents on the dollar for the same work as a man. If you play by the rules, you deserve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

It isn't right that--that if trends continue--by the year 2000 nearly all of the poor people in America will be women and children. The rules of a decent society say, when you distribute sacrifice in times of austerity, you don't put women and children first.

It isn't right that young people today fear they won't get the Social Security they paid for, and that older Americans fear that they will lose what they have already earned. Social Security is a contract between the last generation and the next, and the rules say: You don't break contracts. We're going to keep faith with older Americans.

We hammered out a fair compromise in the Congress to save Social Security. Every group sacrificed to keep the system sound. It is time Ronald Reagan stopped scaring our senior citizens.

It isn't right that young couples question whether to bring children into a world of 50,000 nuclear warheads.

That isn't the vision for which Americans have struggled for more than two centuries. And our future doesn't have to be that way.
Change is in the air, just as surely as when John Kennedy beckoned America to a new frontier, when Sally Ride rocketed into space and when Rev. Jesse Jackson ran for the office of president of the United States.

By choosing a woman to run for our nation's second highest office, you sent a powerful signal to all Americans. There are no doors we cannot unlock. We will place no limits on achievement.

If we can do this, we can do anything.

Tonight, we reclaim our dream. We're going to make the rules of American life work fairly for all Americans again.

To an Administration that would have us debate all over again whether the Voting Rights Act should be renewed and whether segregated schools should be tax exempt, we say, Mr. President: Those debates are over.

On the issue of civil, voting rights and affirmative action for minorities, we must not go backwards. We must—and we will—move forward to open the doors of opportunity.

To those who understand that our country cannot prosper unless we draw on the talents of all Americans, we say: We will pass the Equal Rights Amendment. The issue is not what America can do for women, but what women can do for America.

To the Americans who will lead our country into the 21st century, we say: We will not have a Supreme Court that turns the clock back to the 19th century.

To those concerned about this strength of American family values, as I am I say: We are going to restore those values—love, caring, partnership—by including, and not excluding, those whose beliefs differ from our own. Because our own faith is strong, we will fight to preserve the freedom of faith for others.

To those working Americans who fear that banks, utilities, and large special interests have a lock on the White House, we say: Join us; let's elect a people's president; and let's have government by and for the American people again.
To an Administration that would savage student loans and education at the dawn of a new technological age, we say: You fit the classic definition of a cynic; you know the price of everything, but the value of nothing.

To our students and their parents, we say: We will insist on the highest standards of excellence because the jobs of the future require skilled minds.

To young Americans who may be called to our country's service, we say: We know your generation of Americans will proudly answer our country's call, as each generation before us.

This past year, we remembered the bravery and sacrifice of Americans at Normandy. And we finally paid tribute—as we should have done years ago—to that unknown soldier who represents all the brave young Americans who died in Vietnam.

Let no one doubt, we will defend America's security and the cause of freedom around the world. But we want a president who tells us what America is fighting for, not just what we are fighting against. We want a president who will defend human rights—not just where it is convenient—but wherever freedom is at risk—from Chile to Afghanistan, from Poland to South Africa.

To those who have watched this administration's confusion in the Middle East, as it has tilted first toward one and then another of Israel's long-time enemies and wondered, "Will America stand by her friends and sister democracy?" We say: America knows who her friends are in the Middle East and around the world.

America will stand for Israel always.

Finally, we want a President who will keep America strong, but use that strength to keep America and the world at peace. A nuclear freeze is not a slogan: It is a tool for survival in the nuclear age. If we leave our children nothing else, let us leave them this Earth as we found it—whole and green and full of life.

I know in my heart that Walter Mondale will be that president.

A wise man once said, "Every one of us is given the gift of life, and what a strange gift it is. If
it is preserved jealously and selfishly, it improves and saddens. But if it is spent for others, it enriches and beautifies."

My fellow Americans: We can debate policies and programs. But in the end what separates the two parties in this election campaign is whether we use the gift of life—for others or only ourselves.

Tonight, my husband, John, and our three children are in this hall with me. To my daughters, Donna and Laura, and my son, John Jr., I say: My mother did not break faith with me . . . and I will not break faith with you. To all the children of America. I say: The generation before ours kept faith with us, and like them, we will pass on to you a stronger, more just America.

Thank you.
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Thank you, Laura, for that very kind and unique introduction.

In the course of this campaign, many people have paid me compliments. But the highest praise I have received comes from my family. I could not have run this race without the love and support of my three children and my husband. And I will always be grateful to them.

Four days from now, we hold an election that will decide our future not only for the next four years, but for the rest of this century and beyond.

In four days, we will decide whether this nation will honor its commitment to the elderly, our own parents and grandparents.

We will decide what kind of Supreme Court will interpret our Constitutional rights.

We will decide whether our children will breathe clean air and play in backyards free from poisons.

In four days, in perhaps the most important decisions in our lifetimes, we will decide whether we will finally step out of the shadow of nuclear fear.

In four days, we will decide all these things and more. I ask you to pull the lever for peace. Vote for freedom. Vote for our parents and our children. Stand up in this fight of the century, and vote for a better future with Walter Mondale.

One part of that better future will be justice for women. And that's what I want to talk about today.

I am sure we're going to win this election. Even more important, I am confident that Walter Mondale and I will faithfully serve all the American people--because
when I take my oath of office, I won't be up there all by myself. Standing right beside me, I will have the support, the encouragement, and the wisdom of women all over America.

That historic moment will be a victory for the men and women who fought the battles of the past to ensure the opportunities of today.

From Abigail Adams to the women of Seneca Falls, this moment is a triumph for all those who stood up for the cause of equality through the years.

From Harriet Tubman and the abolitionists of the Underground Railroad to the Suffragists, this campaign proves what Susan B. Anthony always knew: because our cause is just, we cannot fail.

Let me tell you what that cause is.

The issue is not only equality. It's also choice.

I don't want anyone, especially not Ronald Reagan, to make my most important, personal choices. I want to make those choices for myself. That's why I want Walter Mondale to pick the next Supreme Court, not Jerry Falwell.

And I don't want people to make the other important choices in my life. Look through the ages of history, and whatever women were doing, too often it was not their choice to do it.

In some periods, women stayed at home, not because they wanted to, but because that was where they were told they belonged.

In other times, they worked in factories and fields, not because they wanted to, but because professions were not open to them.

Now, with the dawn of equal opportunity, there's some confusion about women's proper roles in society. Let me clear up that confusion. What we're saying is, there is no single proper role for American women. We can do anything.

We can win Olympic gold medals and coach our daughters' soccer teams.
We can walk in space and help our children take their first steps.

We can negotiate trade agreements and manage family budgets.

We can be corporate executives and also wives and mothers.

We can be doctors and also bake cookies with our six-year-old future scientists.

The choices are unlimited. We can be all these things, but we don't have to be any of them.

We don't have to be superwomen. For the first 14 years of my married life, I worked at home as a mother and wife. That was a fine profession. Then I decided to work outside the home, and that was also the right decision for me. Not every woman would agree with the decisions I have made. But the point is, you can make your own decisions.

Women can take pride in whatever they do, whether they work in the home or in a factory or in an office. Or if they don't like any of the options on earth, they can go to work in outer space, and take pride in that, too.

The point is, the tyranny of expectations has ended, and we can be whatever we want to be.

And whatever that choice is, we want to be judged by the quality of our products. We aren't women doing men's jobs. We're women doing work.

When I started my campaign Walter Mondale said: "Gerry, just be yourself." He has never asked me to change my style. And, thank goodness, he didn't ask me to be like George Bush.

It's a new world for American women. And it took hard work to get here.

When we go to the polls next Tuesday, remember that Eleanor Roosevelt was 36 before she was allowed to cast her first vote. What a waste. She should never have been barred from choosing public officials. She should have been one.
When you collect your next—or your first—paycheck, remember that only twenty years ago equal pay for equal work was not even the law of the land.

When we cheer Olympic champions Joan Benoit and Valerie Briscoe Hooks, remember that 12 years ago, there was no law guaranteeing women's right to compete.

And when you buy a car or the next time you use a credit card, remember that only 10 years ago, you were not entitled to credit in your own name.

My own life has been shaped by this progress. When I was about to go to college, my uncle—with the best intentions—said to my mother: "Don't bother, Antonetta, she's pretty, she'll get married."

Then when I applied to law school, a university official asked if I was serious because, after all, I was taking a man's place.

How I'd like to see his face today—I know he'd be proud of me. He would also know that this country has changed. And we're better for it.

But in the past four years, those who never accepted that progress have come to power. They dispute our right to equal educational opportunity and ridicule our quest for comparable pay. They weaken support for our families while professing to strengthen them. They have condemned millions to poverty. They would intrude in our personal lives. And they have reversed forty years of Republican support for the Equal Rights Amendment.

I say: we already made our commitment to equal opportunity in this country. And we're not going to go back on it. We've chosen the path to equality. Don't let them turn us around.

We cannot go backwards, especially when there's so much more to be done. In Congressional hearings I co-chaired two years ago, we learned that tree trimmers in Denver were paid more than emergency room nurses, and dog pound attendants were paid more than child care workers. Now, I'm not running down any worker, but the fact is, women are paid less because they are women. And that's wrong.

And I believe most men agree. I'm not speaking just to women. You don't have to be a woman to be offended
by discrimination. Most men are too. You don't have to be poor to hate poverty. You don't have to be black, Hispanic, or Asian to loathe bigotry. Every American should, and most Americans do.

Every father is diminished when his daughter is denied a fair chance. Every son is a victim when his mother is denied fair pay. And when we lower barriers, open doors, and free women to reach wherever their dreams will take them--our talents are multiplied, and our country is stronger.

That's why I always say, women's issues are America's issues. And as American women, the issue we care most about is peace. Today there are two overriding obstacles to preserving the peace. First, we must stop this insane arms race. And second, we need a President who knows what he's doing.

Like every mother, I did not raise my son or daughter to die in an undeclared war, against an unnamed enemy, for an uncertain cause.

These are the concerns we have as women. And this election is our crossroads. In this contest, we're doing more than changing administrations. We're choosing between justice and injustice for American women. With so much at stake, pick a leader who will fight by our side.

That's the kind of leader Fritz Mondale will be. You know where he's going because you've seen where he's been. Name a decent cause in the last twenty years and he was there, leading the fight. He was the author of the Fair Housing Act of 1968. He wrote the landmark child care act in the early 1970s. He stood up for migrant workers. He led the fight for legal services for the poor.

So when Walter Mondale says, "The cause of America's women is the cause of America itself, and it is my cause as well,"--he means it. He's proved it. He's with us.

And don't forget, when he asked me to be his running mate, he did more for equal opportunity in a single day than Ronald Reagan has done in four long years.
The fight he has waged in his public life, every American can also wage in his or her own private life. The fight for equal opportunity never ends.

When you move ahead in your lives, you must have the courage to speak up against discrimination.

When you are fighting to reach the top, you must have the commitment to help others starting at the bottom.

I think you will, and let me tell you why.

Since I was nominated, what I have seen and heard as I travel across America moves me deeply.

When I have seen the proud faces of fathers holding their daughters high above the crowd, I know they have begun to dream the same dream for their daughters that they have for their sons.

When I see waitresses who have never before contributed to a political campaign give $65, which they can't really afford, to Mondale-Ferraro, I know that people have found new hope in the possibility of change.

An 80-year-old woman came up to me not long ago and said, "I never thought I'd live to see this day."

A few days later, after I told that story at a fundraiser in St. Paul, an elderly woman with a walker motioned me over, and said, "Do you know that story about the 80-year-old woman? Well, I'm 91, and I never thought I'd live to see this day either."

A young mother of twins wrote me a letter when she heard the news that I was chosen to be the nominee. I'd like to read part of it to you. Here's what she wrote: "I ran into the bedroom to see if they were still awake so I could tell them. They are four years old and took the news casually, since they don't know yet that this is an historic first. It means more to me than I can ever express that the childhood lessons they learn will include your name."

What these people are telling me is that my candidacy is not just for me. It's for everyone. It's not just a symbol: it's a breakthrough. It's not just a statement: it's a bond between women all over America.
And I think it's even more than that. It's about opportunity. It's about a little black girl I met at a Cleveland day care center. I said to her, "Guess what? Someday you can be President of the United States."

And you know what? Now she can.

Above all, my candidacy says, America believes in equality, and the time for equality is now.

We're going to win this election, and with that victory, we're going to prove that Americans are not a selfish people. We are a fair people. We cherish opportunity. We're going to prove that this country belongs to all of us.

And we're going to prove one more thing: the polls are wrong.

Some people say this election cannot be won. I say, for the cause of justice, it must be won. With your hard work, it can be won. And on next Tuesday, I say it will be won.

Thank you very much.
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Thank you very much, Tom, for that great introduction. I am very glad to be back here with my friends in South Dakota. I want to explain for a moment the role that South Dakota has played in my own political development. I learned things during my first visit here in 1981 that I will never forget.

For instance, I don't know how many of you have ever flown with Tom Daschle in a 4-seater Cessna airplane. That's not an experience you ever forget: I know--I've tried. On my trip here in 1981, we were leaving Brookings to go to Aberdeen. Being from New York, I assumed we'd get there some normal way--you know, grab a cab, or take the subway. But I soon learned that you do things differently out here.

The first clue came when I asked who would be going with us to Aberdeen. Greg Billings, Tom's aide said "Oh, it'll be just Tom, and you, and me . . . and the pilot." Right then, I knew we weren't in New York any more. And when there are only four people in your plane it's a good tip off you're not taking any 747. I had never been in a small plane before and I guess it must have showed, because right then Greg said something friendly, like: "Don't worry, Tom's a good pilot--why, he's even still taking lessons!" That was my first brush with your great South Dakota sense of humor. It took them five minutes to convince me that we really did have a pilot, before I would get in. But I have to admit, that lesson came in handy last fall--there are some times when you just have to hold on and ride for dear life.

But more important, I learned some other things here during my 1981 visit. It was Tom Daschle who taught me the things that a worker in Queens, New York, has in common with a farmer outside of Sioux City. New York may seem a continent away, but the fact is, we are all in this together.
Just as New Yorkers rely on the people of South Dakota to provide food, the farmers here need the people back there to provide a market for products. And the subway system which seems irrelevant in Sioux Falls is critical for New Yorkers to get to work, so they can afford to buy your food.

The point is, we get too used to thinking of rural vs. urban, and Sunbelt vs. Snowbelt. We get used to concentrating on our own little picture, and forgetting how closely it is linked with other people's well being.

Well, that "little picture thinking" hurts America. The narrow view held in parts of Washington over the last few years is why the people of South Dakota are where you are in 1985. In that city, it is not enough to be "down in the trenches." You need to keep a high profile in Washington to get people to listen to you. Believe, me that's how you get things done in that town.

For months, the head of the Farm Credit System, Donald Wilkinson, has maintained that the system was doing well and needed no help. But two days ago, he laid it on the line: our farm credit system is on the verge of collapse. It has $11 billion in uncollectible loans. Its banks are poor in capital and overwhelmed by problem loans. That message is very clear. On Wednesday, The Wall Street Journal wrote: "They signal the failure of the system's belated and often ill conceived efforts to pull itself out of the unparalleled morass of bad loans and lax procedures."

Mr. Reagan has already made it very clear how he feels about federal assistance for our nation's farmers. Not six months ago, we saw him veto Tom Daschle's emergency farm credit bill. Now I know Tom worked hard on that legislation, and it was a strong plan: it would have taken the administration's plan for Farmer's Home guarantees—which is poorly thought out and unworkable—and made it work. It would have provided reasonable, fair credit, at reasonable, fair rates. Tom and others did a terrific amount of legwork: the bill passed three to one in the House. I can tell you, that's a credit to a job well done. In my eyes, it was a bill to support, not to sabotage.

Mr. Reagan didn't agree. He took a quick-fix, short-term view. He portrayed it as some kind of hand-out program. Now, maybe my ears need checking, but I never once heard the people of South Dakota asking for
a hand out. In the days I spent here, I never heard one single farmer say, "I want a subsidy," or "I need a bail-out." What I heard when I was here is very different: people said time and time again, "You can forget the loans and credits, the payments and subsidies—if you just give us a fair market price." If our market were balanced and equitable, I don't know a farmer in this state who would ask for a loan next year.

But Mr. Reagan could only see the price of the proposed bill. When he talked to the American people, he sold them on the idea that we had to cut costs above all else. I say, cost cutting that undermines America's heartland farmers is bad business. Food and agriculture accounts for twenty cents out of every dollar in our Gross National Product—it employs one worker out of four. I say, a nation with no food on the table and whole counties out of work is in trouble. Mr. Reagan's economic policies are not just short-sighted solutions for the short-term—they also short-change the future of our country.

What I saw when Tom Daschle brought me here four years ago is exactly what too many people in our nation's capital seem to forget. I saw that we are all one United Nation, and we can only have economic prosperity if we can all pull together. After all, that's what America has always been about—helping each other out.

That's the fight I know Tom is leading in Washington. He's working to educate people to look at the long term. He helped me make connections between a grocery shopper in Queens, and a farmer in Rapid City.

Together, we are saying what we were saying a year ago. During the election, everywhere I went I spoke with farmers. I was surprised then that so many of those people I spoke with were voting for Ronald Reagan. It seemed strange because, if anybody should have been worried about his economic plans for this country, it was our small farmers. What we pointed out then is only clearer and more certain today: that the Reagan-Block-Stockman economic formula doesn't work. It is bad medicine for our country.

You understand this only too well. You feel it when you can't sell grains and commodities abroad because our dollar is so distorted. You feel it when you can't compete with imports flooding our domestic market.
I feel the other side of that in New York. When I go to the store, I try to buy Ronzoni Pasta, because it is made in my district. But imported Italian Pasta is half the price. I want to buy American lamb, but New Zealand lamb is cheaper. Now, Gerry Ferraro may be able to afford that extra cost, and it is worth it to me to pay extra. But I ask you, what is the average consumer, with a tight budget and two kids, supposed to do? He or she buys imports—and you lose a customer.

Our international trade imbalance is getting way out of line. When I was invited to speak in Japan five weeks ago, I addressed this problem. I told them that last year alone, we imported $33 billion more from that nation than we sold to them. When AT&T broke up, the Japanese gained $1.5 billion in our telecommunications market share. But when the Japanese phone system joined the private sector recently, Americans got only $140 million of that market—one-tenth as much.

You don't have to be a Washington economist to read those numbers. Anybody who can balance a checkbook—and those of us who can't—know we cannot continue that imbalance.

The same principle applies if we're talking about hi-tech phones or Canadian hogs—we need to keep our markets free and fair, so we can keep our people working.

Again, I see Tom Daschle taking the leadership on trade. He knows that protectionism is a slippery slope, because it can lead to retaliation against our products in foreign markets. But he also knows that we live in the real world, a world where governments, like the European Common Market countries, subsidize their exports and where we must compete. In 1985, we need a hard-nosed trade policy that invites fair and open trade, but fights fire with fire when our partners refuse to trade fairly.

You know, I can't stand up here without just a word about what I was doing at this time last year. And you thought I'd forgotten . . .

I want to talk to you about what the election meant for me in personal terms, to tell you what Gerry Ferraro learned in 1984. There were so many dramatic moments—sitting with my staff in my hotel suite when the phone rang and Fritz Mondale asked me to be his running mate; making my acceptance speech in San Francisco
and seeing even the most hard-bitten reporters with tears in their eyes; walking onstage in Philadelphia to face George Bush in the debate--those were the moments everybody knows about.

But not everybody knows about the quieter moments, what it was like being there in my hotel room that night. The call came from Walter Mondale, and I went to take it alone in my bedroom. After we talked, I called my family in Queens. My youngest daughter, Laura, answered the phone. "Guess What? I got it."

"You mean maybe?" she asked.

"No, I got it."

"You mean possibly?" her voice squeaked up a notch.

"No, Honey, I have it."

"No, really??" The next thing I heard was a war whoop on the other end of the line. Immediately my family started packing to come meet me, but they had to move around in the house without turning any lights on--so as not to alert the reporters who were waiting outside, watching my house to see if I had been picked. Laura said later in a diary that she understood, at least in a small way, how Anne Frank had felt.

Meanwhile, across the country in San Francisco, I was being taken on a wild cops and robbers chase. To avoid the press, I was put into a unmarked car. We stopped once, picking up someone I didn't know. Then we raced to the airport, where a private plane had been sent to meet us. It was all very cloak and dagger--there I met Tom Rosenberg, a lawyer from Chicago, who said to me: "Congratulations--even I didn't know when we left Chicago who I was picking up. I called Fritz in mid-flight and asked, 'Is it the blond or the brunette?'" We flew directly to a tiny airfield near North Oaks, Minnesota. It was the dead of a dark night when we landed, and I was rushed into another unmarked car waiting at the edge of the airstrip. There we were, making history, and it felt like a James Bond movie.

And then there was the debate. Millions of Americans saw it. But not the preparations. We worked for days getting ready, refining answers on the issues, practicing debate techniques--and let me say right now,
I agree, I should have kept my head up more. Of course, we even argued about vital matters, like what suit I should wear.

We discussed debate tactics. Someone suggested that I do something in the course of the debate to surprise George Bush, to throw him off his stride. Walter Mondale, for instance, had addressed Ronald Reagan directly during their debate, and that had a way of unsteadying him. I thought that made sense, so I told my staff that when Bush and I first greeted each other, I planned to kiss him right on the lips. They were not amused.

I will always remember the ride with my husband on our way to the debate. We were in a limousine being driven by the Secret Service—if you want to know what I miss from the campaign, that's it—and John asked: "Are you nervous?". I paused for a while and said, "No, John, it reminds me of how I felt when you were driving me to the hospital to have Donna. I remember thinking to myself, how did I ever get myself into this, and knowing I have no choice but to go in there and deliver."

But when I walked on stage in Philadelphia that night, I knew I had 90 minutes to prove myself to 80 million viewers. No matter what, I had resolved to prove that in a national forum a woman could conduct herself with dignity and substance, no matter how formidable the challenger.

But the best part of the campaign was having the chance to meet so many Americans face-to-face. I had the rare privilege of criss-crossing this great country, meeting people as they led their lives: going to their homes, talking with fathers and daughters, farmers and financiers, listening to them talk about what's important to them. It was an opportunity every American should have—to see our country in all its breadth, to experience first-hand the terrific people, the richness and diversity that makes America special.

I was amazed by the enthusiasm that our campaign inspired all over this country. People came to rallies by the thousands, letters came in by the tens of thousands, and women came up to me to express the most intense enthusiasm, the most emotional support, I have ever seen. I wish you could have seen, as I did, the faces of women across the country. Time after time, when I shook a woman's hand she'd burst into tears. One thing I want to be clear about, however, is that they were touched,
not so much by Geraldine Ferraro, but because my candidacy was a breakthrough. I was fortunate enough to be able to stand in for the millions of women of this country.

I think the race was best summed up in a letter I got from a woman in Illinois. "I'm sitting here this morning with my coffee and this week's Time magazine with you on the cover. As I began to read, I found myself in tears. Tears of joy, of relief, of saying at last, I don't have to feel second class anymore." She was, by the way, a Republican. That woman ended her letter, "You have changed my life--maybe even my vote." Given the results, I'm not so sure.

And that is why, whatever else happened in 1984, I will never regret the campaign. It was a gain, not only for women--it was a plus for our country. When we can reach out to a broader universe of individuals to choose from for our national leadership, the competition becomes greater, and the breadth of talent becomes larger--and that can only make our nation stronger.

In closing, let me say that it means more to me than I can ever express that my party nominated me as its vice presidential candidate. I will always be grateful to have played a role in that very special campaign and proud that we opened a door for the future of this nation.

Where farmers are in 1985 is proof of the fact that our work is far from over. As Democrats, we have a lot of work ahead. And I, for one, am glad we have people like Tom Daschle helping us do it. But we also have a lot of new doors to open. With your help, I know we'll go through them together. Thank you.
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