

their knowledge of speech communication in real world contexts. (p. 7)

Other related outcomes included being consistent with the objectives of a liberal arts education and providing forensic educators with an innovative form of teaching.

In the article by Brossman and Brossman (2011), the authors provide some insight into a service-learning project that included debaters from John Carroll University and Lakeland Community College at the Cuyahoga Hills Juvenile Correctional Facility. For the inmates, the project improved their public speaking, quality of argument, and allowed them to develop perspective-taking skills. For the forensic students, being able to teach the material improved their skills.

Similarly, Warriner's (1998) article is a case study where Central Michigan University's Speech and Debate Team established a forensic club at a local correctional facility. Students were asked to write experience summaries, and the inmates were asked to provide both verbal and written feedback about the program. The students shared in their reflections interpersonal and educational growth due to their ability to share knowledge with others.

### **Growth of the Individual**

Six articles also note the benefit of service-learning on the growth of the actual individual (Table 3). Five of the articles link this interpersonal growth to the ability to adapt and share knowledge with those they are serving. For instance, Brossman and Brossman (2011) state:

The debate tutors learn valuable lessons through their service at CHJCF. They learn about the young men in the facility and about themselves....the prospective teacher specifically ties that decision to the program, observing that the CHCJF students "have shown me that I love to teach. I really think it is great when a student who was struggling understands a concept and is able to succeed." All indicate that the program had a tremendous influence on them. (p. 52)

Walker (2011), on the other hand, notes that participation in service-learning can have some non-interpersonal related impacts like the ability to gain internship experience and the ability to use experience as evidence in speeches.

### **Real-World Impacts**

Half of the articles point to the real-world impacts of service-learning directly. The remaining articles imply a relationship without explicitly stating it. As with the benefit of adaptation of knowledge, the authors present several ideas of what constitutes real-world impacts. The common threads between them all, however, are the benefits to the community as a whole through social advocacy or community engagement. Walker (2011) in particular sought to pro-



vide tips for ways in which forensic educators can implement service activities into their team culture. The author connects Dewey's (1973) pattern of inquiry and Sigmon's (1979) four R's of service learning to show the link between curriculum and active learning.

Walker (2011) finds that service-learning has three main benefits: improvement of undergraduate education, effective preparation for participation in a democratic society, and increased readiness for the world of work. Freeman and Rogers (2013) also note that participation in forensics can provide an outlet for participants to realize real world advocacy, social volunteerism, and engagement in social advocacy. The authors argue:

In forensics, students are not only exposed to the plight of others through their participation, but they listen to speeches, cases, and pieces that focus their attention on issues and challenged with regard to race, class, socio-economic disparities, and gender issues to name but a few. This heightened awareness of the plight of others may create enough dissonance within our students to move them to act as they discover their individual and collective voice. (p. 10)

While Freeman and Rogers (2013) were not analyzing service-learning directly, the ideas of the real world impacts of participation in forensic activities and social justice are clear. The authors point to previous work by Greenstreet (1997), as well as Hinck and Hinck (1998), about how forensics teaches students through service-learning projects to be more responsible, active, informed advocates for social change. They argue that the ability to engage in this form of social advocacy "provides the potential for significant, long-term impacts, for participants and society alike" (Freeman & Rogers, 2013, p. 10).

### **Forensic Community Impacts**

Three of the eight articles point to the forensic community impacts of service-learning. Freeman and Rogers (2013) discuss the encouragement of experimental formats of debate and individual events and developmental conferences being developed. Foote and Holm (2011) argue that a public performance with reflection benefits programs themselves because it brings favorable publicity to a program and "also helps to keep us true to the mission of forensics: to create the citizen orator as Quintilian envisioned the citizen orator (the good person speaking well)" (p. 71). Hinck and Hinck (1998) contend that service-learning activities help to justify the educational value of forensic programs and brings favorable publicity to programs.

### **Campus Community Impacts**

Only one of the eight articles discussed the campus community impacts of service-learning activities. According to Foote and Holm (2011):

The student body that watches the audience debate forums and



showcases benefit in a variety of ways. One of the ways they benefit that we may not fully appreciate is by making them more aware of social issues, politics, and current events...they [also] show college students that their peers have an understanding of social and political issues and can discuss those intelligibly in an open forum. That kind of modeling of social awareness reminds students they should be cognizant of social and political issues... they show other students how research can be synthesized into cogent arguments [and] audience members get a chance to participate in public civil discourse. (p. 67-69)

Forensic teams do not exist in a vacuum and the benefits to the entire student body are worthy of note.

### **Studies' Methodological Quality**

Table 1 displays each study's methodological quality score, out of a possible maximum score of 22. Given the bias inherent in the criteria for empirical studies, the lowest ranking studies were those that were case studies or commentaries. The methodological quality scores ranged from 1-10, with an average quality rating of 3.5 (SD=2.89). Of the eight studies, only one was an empirical study (Wigert, 2011), three were case studies (Brossmann & Brossman, 2011; Foote & Holm, 2011; Warriner, 1998), and the remaining four studies (Hinck & Hinck, 1998; Freeman & Rogers, 2013; Walker, 2011; Hatfield, 1998) were either justifications for service-learning or commentaries about best practices. The one empirical study utilized the qualitative method of content analysis to better understand the learning outcomes facilitated by a service-learning requirement in a college class (Wigert, 2011).

The three case studies described programs that were being implemented on their teams and did not involve any data collection (Brossmann & Brossman, 2011; Foote & Holm, 2011; Warriner, 1998). Of the eight studies, three studies discussed a theoretical foundation (Walker, 2011; Wigert, 2011; Hinck & Hinck, 1998). The majority of the studies (5 studies) provided a global definition of service-learning (Brossman & Brossman, 2011; Hinck & Hinck, 1998; Wigert, 2011; Foote & Holm, 2011; Walker, 2011); however, only one study provided a more specific definition of service-learning (Wigert, 2011). Only two studies did not directly analyze the relationship between service-learning and forensics (Wigert, 2011; Freeman & Rogers, 2013).

## **Discussion**

### **Conceptualizing Service Learning**

Service-learning is a different type of learning that allows students to occasionally step foot outside of the classroom to learn and engage civically within their community (Britt, 2012). Service-learning is in fact so different because it allows students to partake in guided reflection and deepen their understanding of learning and to enrich com-



munities (Britt, 2012). Currently in the field of communication, there is much confusion about service-learning and how it differs from an internship (Oster-Aaland, Sellnow, Nelson, & Pearson, 2004, p. 349).

Service-learning is not to be confused with working for an organization as an intern; it is much more than that (Oster-Aaland et al., 2004). Many internships relate to commercial concerns, whereas many service learning opportunities are found within the nonprofit sector (Oster-Aaland et al., 2004). Oster-Aaland et al. (2004) suggest that service-learning is not just cognitive learning like most learning that takes place solely inside the classroom; service-learning integrates application and reflection into the learning process (p. 349).

Service-learning is also not a new invention, even though many may think it is, but rather service-learning is a pedagogical influence that appears in three different forms (Britt, 2012). The three service-learning pedagogical approaches that are deemed to be effective when educating students are listed as followed: (1) *the practice of doing: skill-set practice and reflexivity service-learning*; (2) *the practice of becoming: civic vales and critical citizenship service-learning pedagogy*; (3) *the practice of engaging in social change: social justice activism service-learning* (Britt, 2012, pp. 82-85).

The practice of doing refers to the importance of teachers allowing their students to learn by doing because, through experience, students can reflect, critically think, and address problems happening currently in the world and apply knowledge from such experience into new contexts (Dewey, 1938). The practice of becoming refers to those who encourage community service with the hope that it will strengthen civic value and citizenship (Britt, 2012). Finally, the practice of engaging in social change refers to teachers who view the classroom as a place to raise social inequities and encourage their students to explore and directly challenge their students to view social justice activism (Britt, 2012).

## Deliberative Learning

Conventional views of civic education evaluation can be diffused with interpersonal political communication to develop a type of learning application that is most effective in adolescents' civic development through group discussion; this is known as *deliberative learning* (McDevitt & Kiouisis, 2006, p. 248). Deliberative learning is another form of learning that is similar to service learning and not mentioning this type of learning in this review would be unjust. Schools serve as a venue for deliberative learning to take place and this learning is designed to enhance individuals' political and civic knowledge so they are able to share their knowledge and educate their families and peer groups in interpersonal discussions (McDevitt & Kiouisis, 2006).

Individuals can take part in deliberative learning through: (1) *peer-centered learning*, (2) *diffusion to primary groups*, (3) *cognitive competen-*



cies, (4) *opinion validation*, (5) *civility*, and (6) *political conviction* (McDevitt & Kioussis, 2006). There is also a three step process that goes along with deliberative learning, it is: (1) *peer-centered communication in school*, (2) *diffusion of discursive inclinations to families and peer groups*, (3) *and increased receptivity to future opportunities for learning via news media and primary-group discussion* (McDevitt & Kioussis, 2006).

## Benefits of Service Learning to Forensics

Service-learning can provide myriad benefits for forensic students, educators, and programs alike, from the adaptation of knowledge to the real world impacts. Examinations of the studies' quality scores, however, reveal that this body of literature is composed mainly of commentaries that rely heavily on the personal experiences of individual coaches and teams without data collection or analysis of the strength of these service-learning activities. While reflection is a valuable piece of service-learning pedagogy, this does not negate the need for empirical research. According to Butin (2003), this is an issue with service-learning literature:

[There is] limited empirical evidence for defining and articulating best practices that foster meaningful and substantive student outcomes...although researchers have begun to articulate what positive outcomes may accrue from service learning, there is almost no solid research on how such outcomes occur... Reflection, for example, is seen as a key component in service learning, yet any definition of its duration, scope, placement, mode, and structure remain frustratingly absent...there is simply no rigorous research of service-learning practice that begins to address this level of detail. (p. 1687)

Additionally, Billig and Furco (2002) assert:

We have set our goals for service-learning research too low in several ways: we have not paid enough attention to rigorous research design, we have not clearly specified our independent variables, we have not given adequate attention to defining and measuring appropriate outcomes of service-learning, we have not tested theory and rarely provided competing hypotheses. (p. 5)

While the authors are critiquing service-learning literature as a whole, the same is true for forensic scholarship about service-learning. The lack of empirical evidence makes drawing solid conclusions difficult. This points to the need for more empirical research that directly analyzes the benefits of service learning activities. While anecdotal evidence can provide rich descriptions of respondents' views and identify issues that are relevant to the research question, only one study in this sample was a formal study.

Several scholars have criticized forensic scholarship for its lack of theoretical depth, innovation in design, and rigor (Gerbensky, Kerber, & Cronn-Mills, 2005; Klumpp, 1990, Porter, 1990, Worth, 2000;



Croucher, 2006). It is paramount that future forensic research incorporate theory, pay attention to the quality of the study's design and measures, as well as strive to use valid methods and collect reliable data utilizing rigorous quantitative, qualitative, or mixed-methods approaches.

## REFERENCES

- Astin, A., Vogelgesang, L., Ikeda, E., & Yee, J. (2000). *How service learning affects students*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Batchelder, T.H. & Root, S. (1994). Effects of an undergraduate program to integrate academic learning and service: Cognitive, prosocial cognitive, and identity outcomes. *Journal of Adolescence*, 17(4), 341-355.
- Berman, S. (2006). *Service learning: A guide to planning, implementing, and assessing student projects* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Billig, S. & Furco, S. (2002). *Service-learning through a multidisciplinary lens*. Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Bringle, R.G., Hatcher, J.A., & MacIntosh, R. (2006). Analyzing Morton's typology of service paradigms and integrity. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 13(1), 5-15.
- Britt, L. L. (2012). Why we use service-learning: A report outlining a typology of three approached to this form of communication pedagogy. *Communication Education*, 61(1), 80-88.
- Brossman, B.G., & Brossman, J.E. (2011). Empowering words: A service-learning project between John Carroll University Debate and the Cuyahoga Hills Juvenile Correctional Facility. *National Forensics Journal*, 29(1), 36-60.
- Burch, S. (2013). Strategies for service-learning assessment in dental hygiene education. *The Journal of Dental Hygiene*, 87(5), 265-270.
- Butin, D. W. (2003). Of what use is it? Multiple conceptualizations of service learning within education. *Teachers College Record*, 105(9), 1674-1692.
- Cook, D. Mulrow, C., & Haynes, B. (1997). Systematic reviews: Synthesis of best evidence for clinical decisions. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 126(5), 376-380.
- Croucher, S. M. (2006). Special issue editor's introduction: Communication theory and intercollegiate forensics—addressing the research void within forensics. *National Forensics Journal*, 24, 1-6.
- Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1973). Experience and philosophic method and interest in relation to the training of the will. In J.J. McDermott (Ed.), *The philosophy of John Dewey*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Eyler, J., Giles, Jr., D.E., & Braxton, J. (1997). The impact of service-learning on college students. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 4, 5-15.
- Eyler, J. & Giles, Jr., D.E. (1999). *Where's the learning in service learning?* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Freeman, N.P., & Rogers, J.E. (2013). Fostering a climate of comprehensiveness: The pedagogical value of inclusive and service education. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 98, 1-16.
- Foote, J., & Holm, T. (2011). Forensics service-learning on campus: Serving to learn, learning to serve. *National Forensics Journal*, 29(1), 61-86.
- Garrard, J. (2010). *Health sciences literature review made easy: The matrix method*. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Barlett Publishers.
- Gerbensky-Kerber, A., & Cronn-Mills, D. (2005). The state of forensic scholarship: Analyzing individual events research in the *National Forensic Journal* from 1990-2003. *National Forensic Journal*, 23(2), 69-82.
- Grace, K. (2010). Assessment in forensics: It's a dirty job but we need to do it!. Bloomington, MN. National Developmental Conference on Individual Events.
- Grace, K. (2011). Special issue editor's introduction: Implementing service-learning into the forensics experience. *National Forensic Journal*, 29(1), 1-5.
- Greenstreet, R.W. (1997). Going Local. *The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta*, 83, 37-44.
- Hatfield, K. L. (1998). Service-learning in forensics: An undergraduate's perspective. *National Forensics Journal*, 16, 43-52.



- Hesser, G. (1995). Faculty assessment of student learning: Outcomes attributed to service-learning and evidence of changes in faculty attitudes about experiential education. *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning*, 2, 33-42.
- Hinck, E.A., & Hinck, S.S. (1998). Service-learning and forensics. *National Forensic Journal*, 16, 1-26.
- Howard, J. (1997). *Praxis I: A faculty casebook on community service learning*. Ann Arbor, MI: OCSL Press.
- Jacoby, B. (1996). Service-learning in today's higher education. In B. Jacoby and Associates (Ed.), *Service-learning in higher education: concepts and practices* (pp. 3-25). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Klump, J.F. (1990). Wading into the stream of forensics research: A view from the editorial office. *National Forensic Journal*, 8(1), 61-68.
- Kuyper, C. (2010). Justifying forensic programs to administrators using humanistic outcomes. Bloomington, MN. National Developmental Conference on Individual Events.
- Lee, K.P., Schotland, M., Bacchetti, P., & Bero, L.A. (2002). Association of journal quality indicators with methodological quality of clinical research articles. *JAMA*, 287(21), 2805-2808.
- Levesque-Bristol, C., Knapp, T.D., & Fisher, B.J. (2010). The effectiveness of service-learning: It's not always what you think. *Journal of Experiential Education*, 33(3), 208-224.
- McDevitt, M., & Kioussis, S. (2006). Deliberative Learning: An Evaluative Approach to Interactive Civic Education. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 247-264.
- McEachern, R.M. (2006). Incorporating reflection into business communication service-learning courses. *Business Communication Quarterly*, 69(3), 312-316.
- National Service-Learning Clearinghouse (2011). What is service-learning? Retrieved November 11, 2013, from <http://www.servicelearning.org/what-service-learning>.
- Oster-Aaland, L. K., Sellnow, T.L., Nelson, P. E., & Pearson, J. C. (2004). The status of service learning in departments of communication: A follow-up study. *Communication Education*, 53(4), 348-356.
- Porter, S. (1990). Forensic research: A call for action. *National Forensic Journal*, 2(1), 71-75.
- Preston, C.T. Jr., & Jensen, S.L. (1995). Community service and recruiting in intercollegiate forensics. *The Forensic*, 80, 1-9.
- Sellnow, D. (1994). Justifying forensic programs to administrators: An experiential education opportunity. *National Forensics Journal*, 11(2), 1-14.
- Sigmon, R. (1979). Service-learning: Three principles. *Synergist*, 8(1), 9-11.
- Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207-222.
- Walker, B. (2011). Developing an experiential-service learning approach in collegiate forensics. *National Forensics Journal*, 29(1), 6-33.
- Warriner, A.A. (1998). Forensics in a correctional facility. *National Forensics Journal*, 16, 27-41.
- Wigert, L. R. (2011). Engaging forensics students in service-learning and reflection: Integrating academic work and community service. *National Forensics Journal*, 29(1), 87-116.
- Worth, D.S. (2000). Exploring the forensic community: The need for stronger basic research. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED 448 481).





Missing



## **BOOK REVIEW**

Charteris-Black, I. (2011). *Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor*. 2nd ed. Hampshire, UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Reviewed by RYAN LOUIS, OTTAWA UNIVERSITY

In the second edition of his book, Charteris-Black—a rhetorical scholar at the University of the West of England, Bristol—advances his theory of critical metaphor analysis. The format and flow of the book is uncomplicated: two introductory chapters relay his methodology (shaped prominently by Lakoff & Johnson's seminal 1980 work, *Metaphors We Live By*) to be set loose on the subsequent nine case studies. Each study analyzes roughly 50,000 words from the public discourse of a prominent American or British political figure—ordered chronologically by the date of each subject's peak notoriety. Beginning with Winston Churchill and ending with Barack Obama, his examples stem mostly from the late 20th century; all but one of whom are male.

Studying metaphors, Charteris-Black asserts, involves three stages: identifying, interpreting and explaining. Through the lens of cognitive semantics, he argues that “the mind is inherently embodied, thought is mostly unconscious and abstract concepts are largely metaphorical” (45). Ergo, we can interpret only after identifying generic conceptual metaphors. An index of these metaphors (362-4) showcases recurring themes that public figures exploit to achieve their political goals (e.g., “life is a struggle for survival,” “political ideologies are enemies,” “immigration is evil,” and “terrorists are parasites”). The usefulness of this method is best epitomized by Charteris-Black's own purported goal: we must “develop a public awareness of rhetoric so that manipulation is more readily identified when it arises from metaphor. This is important because of the inherently persuasive power of the metaphor” (44). Citizens of democracies, therefore, can neither progress nor establish public trust unless the language of leadership is better understood. Though Charteris-Black's initial project is to dissect political discourse in order to observe how metaphors work, an implicit discussion about citizenship and the role of power in western democracies permeates. This is the greatest achievement of the book.

The structure of each chapter is the same: Charteris-Black provides some historical background of each public figure—justifying the importance each played in various political processes. He then engages in a broad analysis of rhetorical strategies utilized by the individual. Finally, he provides insights for how the metaphors enhance those strategies in pursuit of his/her political goals.

A course examining political rhetoric or rhetorical criticism will



discover great treasures; upper-level undergraduates will find it accessible both because of its word choice and symmetry of structure. The limitations of the scholarship, however, lie in its cultural homogeneity. Though the book contains a detailed analysis of Margaret Thatcher (the most engaging and complex chapter of the book), no other woman receives serious attention. Further, and more deeply concerning—Charteris-Black uses masculine pronouns to represent generic politicians. A footnote explains that “this is not intended to place greater emphasis on male politicians, but as all of the politicians except one are men, it is preferable to use ‘he’ and ‘his’ rather than ‘she’ and ‘her’” (5). For a scholar of metaphors, however, this justification is knotty. *Male* standing in for *politician* is a problematic and unproductive metonym to perpetuate.

Readers need also be cautious of its Anglo-Amerocentrism. The final chapter attempts to draw universal conclusions; but the lack of diversity precludes this strategy. His inclusion of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. is strange. Though poignant, it seems to be a token chapter meant to dispel the very critique I am proffering. As all the other subjects are either heads of state or legislators, the criteria for selection appears haphazard. It is somewhat problematic—again, metonymically—for Dr. King to stand in for nearly all non-white “politicians.” A third edition might gain better traction with the inclusion of influential figures such as Aung San Suu Kyi or Ellen Johnson Sirleaf.

With these cultural caveats in mind, we may still discern great lessons. In addition to the value in its methodology, the book is excellently researched. Political rhetoricians and cultural critics alike will find it useful. There is also great relevance for forensic educators. With the prevalence (hegemony?) of certain metaphors, it is important that we reflect on their rhetorical effects. Do we think of ourselves in terms of *teams* or *families*? Should I see myself as a *coach*, *mentor* or *drill instructor*? Are students on a *journey* or a *path*—to where, gaining what along the way? Metaphors impact team and community culture. They facilitate ethical and political paradigms.

The chief question of Charteris-Black’s work is: What do our metaphors say about us? The answer comes via critical evaluation of the metaphors used to shape our individual and collective understanding of identity and citizenship.





## **BOOK REVIEW**

**Johnson, M. P. (2013). *Writing the Gettysburg Address*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Press.**

Reviewed by MICHAEL BARTANEN, PACIFIC LUTHERAN UNIVERSITY

I will not bury the lede. If you are interested in Lincoln, the Gettysburg Address, the speech writing process or the rigorous study of American public address, this book should be on your shelf and in your library. Martin Johnson, a historian, has made a substantial contribution to all of these subjects and done so in a very readable fashion that is accessible to the casual reader and the serious academician.

Johnson addresses four concerns: unpacking the rhetorical situation facing Lincoln in late 1863, meticulously describing the process Lincoln used to write and revise the speech, providing insight into Lincoln's thinking about both the particular speaking occasion and the larger issues facing a divided country, and putting to rest the myths and misunderstandings which began to envelop the speech as soon as it was delivered.

Lincoln faced a unique rhetorical situation for a sitting President. He was not the featured orator for the occasion and was given a vague instruction to provide "a few appropriate remarks." There was considerably jockeying for position among politicians, inside and outside the Lincoln administration, who doubted whether Lincoln would or should be re-elected the following year. Lincoln himself needed to craft a message which not only fit the occasion but which would signal his intentions for postwar policies and the possibilities of reconciliation.

Johnson clearly traces Lincoln's speech writing process in a manner reminiscent of a good detective novel. What copy of the speech did Lincoln use as his speaking text? How did that text evolve in the weeks between Lincoln's accepting the invitation to the actual presentation? There were multiple copies of the speech which differed in subtle yet fundamentally important ways. The two most notable versions were ones associated with Lincoln's secretaries and later biographers, John Nicolay and John Hay. Johnson makes a compelling argument about how Lincoln's thinking evolved and how that was reflected in changes he made to the speech virtually until the moment when it was delivered.

Johnson brings fresh insight into Lincoln's thinking and how his beliefs and values were reflected in the language choices which are timeless in their poetry and in their importance to Lincoln's commitment to not only honoring those who died but to envision a future national reconciliation process.



The book also helps to dispel many of the myths about the speech. Johnson dismisses the claim that Lincoln dashed off the speech on the back of an envelope while riding the train. He notes that the limitations of technology led to reporting and transcription errors which contributed to confusion about both the text and Lincoln's intentions. Johnson also establishes the important point that Lincoln appreciated the importance of the occasion and the powerful impact of the speech and that those attending, notably the principal speaker of the day Edward Everett, understood immediately that the "few appropriate remarks" became the most important speech in American history.

Martin Johnson's work illustrates that there is still important research to be done in American Public Address. It would be wonderful if aspiring young scholars studied this research and committed themselves to the careful scholarship of other speeches and speakers who used the power of the spoken word to change the world.





## **BOOK REVIEW**

**Stuckey, M. E. (2013). *The Good Neighbor: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of American Power*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.**

Reviewed by DAVID BAILEY, SOUTHWEST BAPTIST UNIVERSITY

A curious divide now often exists between scholars of public address and contemporary forensic coaches. Although they often reside within the same academic departments, there is an unfortunate tendency by some scholars of public address to look down on competitive forensics. There is an equally unfortunate tendency on the part of speech and debate coaches to overlook much of the excellent scholarship currently emerging from public address—scholarship that would enhance the knowledge of forensic competitors and coaches. Mary E. Stuckey's (2013) latest book *The Good Neighbor: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of American Power* is just one example of a work that every forensic educator should encounter.

Stuckey presents a thorough examination of FDR's favorite metaphor "the good neighbor" and how it manifested itself throughout his rhetorical presidency. This project is ambitious given that many have argued that FDR had few governing principles and was simply a provisionalist—trying a variety of things until something finally worked. However Stuckey very convincingly argues that "Roosevelt did have a clear set of governing principles that informed most of his policies and programs . . . That philosophy . . . is best understood under the rubric of the 'good neighbor'" (p. 15). The six chapters of this book offer a variety of perspectives upon how Roosevelt attempted to enact his vision and create a "good neighborhood" throughout the nation and the globe.

Stuckey undertakes to define the elements of neighborliness as Roosevelt used them. For Roosevelt, neighborliness began with "'human values' [which] were grounded in the Judeo-Christian religious tradition as understood in the United States" (p. 18). Starting from this point, neighborliness also "was built upon the delineation of friends and enemies through characterization of their commitment to specific values and practices, thus constituting a particular kind of citizenry well suited to the maintenance of democracy" (p. 19) and "the establishment and development of a more level playing field upon which the game of democracy could be enacted" (p. 20). Some of Stuckey's most important contributions to our understanding of FDR include: how FDR used the metaphor as a warrant for the use of military and political power (p. 73), how he used the rhetorical ambiguities provided by the metaphor to pay lip service to racial equality while offering little in the way of rhetorical or policy action to help



achieve racial equality (pp. 86-87), and her discussion of how he used the metaphor to define what a global neighborhood should be in the wake of World War II (pp. 176-186). Stuckey's analysis of Roosevelt's famous garden hose analogy in defense of the Lend-Lease program is particularly on point. In a speech defending the Lend-Lease Act Roosevelt argued that if a neighbor's house is on fire and one has a garden hose available nearby, a good neighbor simply does not dicker over the price of the hose or the conditions of its use while the house is still burning. Stuckey explains that there were a host of political and rhetorical difficulties with the Lend-Lease policy but points out that "all of the complexities of the policy were erased by the power of the example, which seemed so clear and so clearly rooted in common sense and neighborly action" (p. 185).

Throughout the book the reader is treated to some excellent analysis. There are, however, some important places where one wishes Stuckey would simply dig in a little deeper. The most obvious example of this is that Stuckey waits until the very end—literally the last page of the book—before drawing any direct parallels between FDR and Barack Obama (see page 211). Of course, Stuckey does not set out to write a comparative analysis of their various rhetorical presidencies. Nevertheless, her claim that "Obama is no Roosevelt" in part because he "is less willing to use the range of arguments that FDR wielded" would be a much more valuable insight if it were more thoroughly attended to (p. 211). I am convinced that Stuckey is right about Obama being no Roosevelt and that, despite some similarities, they both take very different rhetorical approaches to political leadership and governance; yet, more thorough work should be done here to help us all understand the differences.

Stuckey is an excellent public address scholar with an impressive body of work. Her latest book is certainly a strong contribution to our knowledge of FDR and his rhetorical presidency. Forensic educators should take the time to read it. It is a nice example of well-executed metaphorical criticism that will deepen our understanding of the important role that compelling ideas, framed by effective words, can and do have in our lives.

#### REFERENCE

Stuckey, M. E. (2013). *The Good Neighbor: Franklin D. Roosevelt and the Rhetoric of American Power*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press.





Missing



# ***The Forensic of Pi Kappa Delta***

## **LIBRARY RECOMMENDATION FORM**

(Copy and forward to your library acquisition officer)

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Department \_\_\_\_\_

Institution \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip Code \_\_\_\_\_

Please enter a subscription to ***The Forensic*** at the subscriber rate of \$20.00 per year. Unless otherwise specified, your subscription is for a complete series, which begins July 1st of each year. At the time of subscription, you will receive all previous issues that have been published during the subscription year.

Check One:

\_\_\_\_ One Year \$20    \_\_\_\_ Two Years \$40    \_\_\_\_ Three Years \$60

On subscriptions made outside of the United States, add \$15 per year for foreign postage.

Make checks and money orders payable to Pi Kappa Delta National  
Order from your subscriptions agent or directly from:

Pi Kappa Delta National Headquarters  
125 Watson Street, P.O. Box 38  
Ripon, WI 54971

Other Pi Kappa Delta publications available through the National Headquarters:

*The History of Pi Kappa Delta*, by Larry Norton  
\_\_\_\_ copies @ \$7.50/each

*The Proceedings of the 1998 Developmental Conference*, Robert S. Littlefield, Ed.  
\_\_\_\_ copies @ \$5.00/each

*The Proceedings of the 1995 Developmental Conference*, Scott Jensen, Ed.  
\_\_\_\_ copies @ \$5.00/each

Articles from past issues of *THE FORENSIC* are available upon request.