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and prescient twenty-two-year-old Winston Churchill. He had it exactly right—rhetoric is a system. If you want to be persuasive, you, too, will need command of many figures of speech, not just one or two.

Conservatives have adopted messaging strategies that allowed them to succeed politically even with policies that don't have strong popular support. Indeed, that is one reason they turned the tide against President Obama in 2010—simple, relentless messaging.

Similarly, those who deny the reality of climate science have made use of the best rhetorical techniques. Those seeking to inform the public about the very real dangers of a warming climate will need to learn the lessons of the best communicators if they are to overcome the most well-funded disinformation campaign in history.

To sum up, rhetoric is the art of persuasion through the systematic use of the figures of speech. The figures are the grammar of language intelligence. They must be mastered by all who seek to be compelling speakers and writers. Here's how.

CHAPTER ONE
AN EDUCATION IN ELOQUENCE

Rhetoric is "the art of winning the soul by discourse."

—Plato

The figures of speech are the key tools for wowing people into paying attention and then winning them over once they are. That's never been more important than it is today.

Tina Brown, the editor of The Daily Beast website, and former editor of Vanity Fair and The New Yorker, described the challenge of capturing readers as she took over the ailing Newsweek magazine: "You have to basically make the assumption that they have absolutely no interest in you whatsoever. There is so little attention to spare, you have to make sure that where their window of attention is open, you're in." Getting noticed and getting "in" have been the twin tasks of rhetoric for over two thousand years.
Humans had learned effective ways to use words long before developing a codified system. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, dated from around the eighth century BC, are often labeled the earliest great examples of rhetoric, but the Five Books of Moses have at least as strong a claim. Genesis by itself is a complete rhetoric handbook, containing all the figures of speech, as we will see. The very first story of Adam and Eve reveals the dangerous power of speech. The serpent, “more subtle than any other wild creature,” beguiles Eve with deceptive language and false promises into eating from the tree of knowledge, leading to banishment from Paradise. Such are the bitter fruits of lack of language intelligence.

In perhaps the first direct account of the awesome positive power of eloquence, Homer has Odysseus speak of “a certain kind of man” with “comeliness on his words.” People who look at him “are filled with joy at the sight, and he speaks to them without faltering in winning modesty, and shines among those who are gathered, and people look on him as on a god when he walks in the city.” These are the better fruits of language intelligence.

The Greeks found the ways to teach eloquence to everyone. In ancient Athens, all citizens needed to excel at public speaking because every citizen was required by Greek law to speak in his own behalf in court. Since you were not required to write your own speech, some litigants hired a *logographos*, a speechwriter, to prepare their defense. Others studied the basics of speechmaking with a professional rhetorician.

Over time, rhetoric was turned into a set of rules by Greeks like Gorgias, the first great rhetorician, and Aristotle, who wrote *Rhetoric*, the first in-depth study of the art. Romans like Cicero built on their system. “In addition to logical argument, Gorgias recognized the persuasive force of emotion,” as one scholar explained. Gorgias “regarded an orator as a *psychagogos*, like a poet, a leader of souls through a kind of incantation,” and he analyzed the psychological effects of the figures of speech.

Today, the word *rhetoric* conjures up an overly ornate and stylized form of speech, utterly unlike the way real people speak. In short, the term has been stood on its head. The irony, to use a figure of speech, is that from the very beginning, rhetoric teachers aimed to help orators speak more naturally, in a manner that as closely as possible matched the way people actually speak. Here is Aristotle discussing the importance of matching natural speaking:

Your language will be appropriate if it expresses emotion and character. . . . To express emotion, you’ll employ the language of anger in speaking of outrage; the language of disgust and discreet reluctance to utter a word when speaking of impiety or foulness; the language of exultation for a tale of glory. . . . This aptness of language is one thing that makes people believe in the truth of your story.

---

*Joe Romm*

*An Education In Eloquence*
How does Aristotle teach us to make people trust us? "Aptness of language." He links specific figures of speech with specific emotional states. For instance, he noted that hyperbole, extravagant exaggeration, is used by angry men. Today we hear the most extreme hyperbole in the increasingly shrill political shout-fests that have spread like kudzu over cable TV, debasing the word debate.

Like all tools invented by humans, rhetoric can be used for evil purposes. Knowledge of rhetoric allows a speaker to fake every emotion and manipulate any listener. In his 1897 essay, Churchill himself candidly conceded: "The direct, though not the admitted, object which the orator has in view is to allay the commonplace influences and critical faculties of his audience, by presenting to their imaginations a series of vivid impressions which are replaced before they can be too closely examined and vanish before they can be assailed."

Let's call the dark side of rhetoric "the art of seduction." Shakespeare gave his master seducers, like Marc Antony in *Julius Caesar* and Iago in *Othello*, the fullest range of rhetorical skills, including the devious devices I am labeling the figures of seduction. Studying rhetoric helps us avoid the traps set by shrewd seducers.

The awesome power of rhetoric in turn helps explain the triumph of poetry and prose in the England of Queen Elizabeth and King James, which gave the world Shakespeare, Francis Bacon, John Donne, Ben

Johnson, and Christopher Marlowe—all born within a dozen years of each other and all heavily schooled in rhetoric, as were all the translators of the King James Bible.

Most of us today are very far from such mastery of language. How far can be seen by examining the extraordinary education of a typical middle-class Elizabethan like William Shakespeare.

**TEACHING LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE**

William was born in 1564, the third child (of eventually eight) and eldest son of John Shakespeare and Mary Arden. At the time of his birth, his father was a glover, and possibly a dealer in wool and leather, in Stratford, a town of some fifteen hundred located eighty miles northwest of London. John was socially ambitious and ultimately became mayor of Stratford.

William likely attended the town grammar school from age seven to at least age thirteen. Grammar schools got their name because they taught grammar—Latin grammar. Latin would be studied through literature, especially Roman writers like Cicero and Virgil. After learning grammar and working on Latin translation, students would write essays of their own. All facts would be repeated, memorized, recited, tested, and used over and over. The school day marched on from six in the morning to nine, then breakfast; more school nine-fifteen to eleven, then lunch; school again from
one to five, then supper; and yet one more hour, six
to seven—nearly ten hours each day of relentless rep-
etition—six days a week, thirty-six weeks a year, for up
to six years. The amount of repetition was staggering:
Every single hour of instruction required, according to
one sixteenth-century schoolmaster, six or more hours
of exercises to apply the lesson to both speaking and
writing.

Imagine the impact of such schooling on the fu-
ture writers of literature and drama. Students would
memorize huge parts of famous works, such as Ovid’s
Metamorphoses. Much of the curriculum was rhetoric
since the Elizabethans saw eloquence as the greatest
skill to be acquired and rhetoric as the key to the Bible
and literature. The teaching strategy was systematic:
“First learn the figures, secondly identify them in what-
ever you read, thirdly use them yourself.” Hour after
hour after hour, identifying every figure in Ovid or
Cicero, then creating your own versions.

Shakespeare’s artistic genius was thus rooted in an
education utterly different from ours, an education
wholly grounded in a study of rhetoric and the clas-
cics, an education he thoroughly mastered. The same
is true of the translators of the King James Bible. No
surprise, then, that they wrote their masterpiece just a
few years after Shakespeare wrote his masterpieces.

In 1604, James directed that the “the best-learned”
in Oxford and Cambridge begin a new translation from
the original Hebrew and Greek into English. Some four
dozens of varying Christian religious beliefs
were divided into six teams to translate different piec-
es of the Bible. Then twelve men, two from each sub-
group, worked on the whole final work.

That the King James Bible did become a textbook of
rhetoric will soon be evident: Many of the most famous
texts of every figure of speech can be found in its
pages. That the Bible would be a textbook of rhetoric
was ordained, since the translators were every one a
university-trained language scholar with a far more ex-
tensive formal education in rhetoric than Shakespeare,
who, after grammar school, was purely self-taught.

These were some of the most accomplished lin-
guists and rhetoricians of their time. All but one was an
ordained minister. Many were great preachers. As one
example, the head of the subgroup that translated the
first part of the Bible was Lancelot Andrewes, dean of
Westminster Abbey, who ultimately mastered an aston-
ishing fifteen languages.

One italicized line from the title page of the first
edition in 1611 provides the final clue as to why the
King James Bible became one of the greatest works of
rhetoric: Appointed to be read in churches. The Bible was
written to be read aloud. While literacy was spreading
in Renaissance England, many, perhaps most, parishion-
ers were still illiterate and were thrilled to hear the elo-
quently word of God. Thus the King James Bible, like the
works of Shakespeare, was designed to move us through
our ears, not our eyes. The ears are the kingdom of rhetoric.

**RHETORIC IN THE TIME OF LINCOLN**

Nineteenth-century America lacked the rigorous teaching of the rhetoric of Shakespeare’s day, but orators were widely admired, entertaining large audiences—and larger readerships—with speeches that lasted over two hours and that might be printed in a local newspaper, the text often filling the entire front page. This was the golden age of American oratory, the age of Daniel Webster, of Henry Clay, of Stephen Douglas, and of Abraham Lincoln.

In modern times, with multiple media with which to entertain ourselves—television, movies, radio, the Internet, video games, iPods, and iPads—we can hardly imagine what it was like to live at a time when public speeches and debates were a primary form of entertainment. One 1858 audience, after sitting through three hours of Lincoln and Douglas debating, actually went out to hear another speech. Lincoln himself, after his first debate with Douglas that year, headed off to hear another speech.¹⁸

Lincoln, a master orator, debater, and rhetorician, was the most consciously rhetorical of our presidents. He once incisively attacked an opponent for employing a particular metaphor—using a metaphor of his own: “I wish gentlemen on the other side to understand that the use of degrading figures [of speech] is a game at which they may not find themselves able to take all the winnings.”

In Lincoln’s day, aspiring preachers, lawyers, and politicians were taught some rhetoric in college, though they would have learned much just from their study of the Bible. Lincoln worked hard to teach himself elocution and grammar. He studied the great speechmakers of his time, like Daniel Webster, as well the great Elizabethan speechmaker, the Bard of Avon. At an early age, he appears to have studied William Scott’s *Lessons in Elocution*, which ends with forty-nine speeches from life and art, nineteen from Shakespeare, including a number that he memorized, such as the soliloquy by King Claudius on the guilt he feels for having murdered Hamlet’s father. At the age of twenty-three, Lincoln walked six miles to get a copy of Samuel Kirkham’s *English Grammar*, which ends with a several-page discussion of the figures of speech.¹⁹

The one figure of speech discussed in both Kirkham’s book (briefly) and Scott’s book (with three full pages of examples) is *antithesis*—placing words or ideas in contrast or opposition, such as Lord Chesterfield’s quip, “The manner of speaking is as important as the matter,” or Shakespeare’s, “Cowards die many times before their deaths, The valiant never taste of death but once.”²⁰ This became one of Lincoln’s favorite figures, in unforgettable lines such as “the world
will little note, nor long remember, what we say here, but it can never forget what they did here” and “with malice toward none, with charity for all.”

Lincoln continued his passion for poetry and Shakespeare throughout his entire life. He spent hours reading passages from Shakespeare to his personal secretary, John Hay, and the artist F. B. Carpenter. After seeing one performance of Henry IV, Part One, Lincoln debated Hay on the meaning and emphasis of a single phrase of Falstaff’s. During the painting of “Signing of the Emancipation Proclamation,” Carpenter describes Lincoln reciting Claudius’s thirty-six-line speech “from memory, with a feeling and appreciation unsurpassed by anything I ever witnessed upon the stage.”

WE NEED A RENEWED EDUCATION IN RHETORIC

Rhetoric is rarely taught anymore today, at least systematically. Middle-school students spend a few days on simple metaphors and similes like “mad as a hatter,” and high schoolers get very little more. Rhetoric is hardly taught in universities or law schools either.

Rhetoric is ignored even by language scholars. A few years ago, a number of academics wrote books to celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the King James Bible. Yet, none of them looked at the figures of speech or had a substantial discussion of rhetoric, even though the Bible may be the greatest single work of rhetoric ever written. One of them, Alister McGrath, a professor of historical theology at Oxford, actually argued that the brilliance of the Bible was “eloquence by accident,” that the translators were aiming for accuracy, but achieved literary merit “unintentionally.”

Quite the contrary. The eloquence of the King James Bible was achieved not by accident, but by rhetoric.

We should study the figures to boost our language intelligence, to become more persuasive, and to understand “Poets, Orators, or the holy Scriptures” as one Elizabethan best-selling author put it. And there is yet another reason to be re-educated in rhetoric today, equally critical. We are bombarded daily by rhetoric and the figures from those who wish to persuade us or manipulate us. It’s always a good idea to discover who’s pulling your strings and exactly how they’re doing it. Even though rhetoric isn’t formally taught, two major forces have helped bring the figures roaring back to the forefront: modern advertising and the “rhetorical presidency.”

That modern advertising should rediscover rhetoric was predictable: Rhetoric is the art of verbal persuasion, developed over twenty-five centuries. Modern corporations have spent billions trying to hone in on which words will persuade people to trust them and to purchase their products. Their expensive studies have shown that the use of certain figures “leads to more liking for the ad, a more positive brand attitude, and better recall of ad headlines.”
Advertising research also finds that for certain figures, such as puns or metaphors, the act of decoding the figure, of figuring it out, "is necessary to produce its positive incremental effects on attitudes and memory." The subtext is as important as the text.

Since the goal of the headline is to both grab attention and be memorable—two key goals of any speechmaker—the widespread use of figures is inevitable. Rhetoric makes selling compelling.

A comprehensive study of more than two thousand print ads found that three-fourths of ad headlines use figures of speech, with the most common being puns ("Nothing runs like a Deere") and figures of repetition, such as alliteration ("Intel Inside"). One study of award-winning headlines "had a panel of creative directors categorize the headlines according to their commonalities and differences." Of the seven categories derived by their judges, "only one of them (news/information) does not have its basis in figures of speech."^{24}

Since my blog, ClimateProgress.org, focuses on news and information, along with commentary, many of my top headlines do not use figures, but a disproportionately large number do. At the same time, ClimateProgress.org consistently gets its headlines retweeted as much as or more than blogs or websites with ten to fifty times the traffic. And one reason, I believe, is my use of the figures of speech.

One of the great things about blogging is the instant, quantitative feedback on what works and what doesn't.

---

I analyzed headlines from 2011 that were retweeted two hundred and fifty to one thousand times, which, by my estimate, means they were potentially seen by one hundred thousand to four hundred thousand people. A high fraction of these wowing headlines use one or more figures:

- Mother Nature Is Just Getting Warmed Up: June 2011 Heat Records Crushing Cold Records by 13 to 1 [*pun, personification*]
- "Job-Killing" EPA Regulations for Chesapeake Bay Will Create 35 Times as Many Jobs as Keystone XL Pipeline [*irony*]
- Shale Shocked: "Highly Probable" Fracking Caused U.K. Earthquakes, and It’s Linked to Oklahoma Temblors [*alliteration, pun*]
- Breaking News! Energy Efficiency Programs Are Working, Saving Consumers Millions [*sarcasm*]
- It’s Not the Heat, It’s the Stupidity: Limbaugh Calls Heat Index a Liberal Government Conspiracy [*pun*]
- Exxon Makes Billion-Dollar Bet Climate Change Is Real, Here Now and Going to Get Worse, But Keeps Funding Deniers [*irony*]
- NASA: It Rained So Hard the Oceans Fell [*metaphor*]

The key is not to have a purely figurative headline. A pun or clever turn of phrase that does not convey to the reader the essence of the article is a double mistake. First, it misses a crucial opportunity to inform those who read only the headline, a far larger number of people than those who actually read the story. Second, it is unlikely to get many clicks, since who among us has
time to waste clicking on ambiguous headlines in the hopes the story is something we will be interested in?

In a webinar for a leading online publication, the headline writer explained that only two out of ten people will click on your headline. She gave the following example of how to improve a headline to get noticed and read. The original headline was “Abbott Ditches Its Drug Business.” She changed it to “Amputation May Improve Abbott’s Prognosis.” The result of this personification (and mini-extended metaphor): In the hour before the change, the headline was clicked on 795 times; in the one hour after the headline rewrite, that more than tripled to 2995.

The winner of Twitter’s first-ever Golden Tweet for the most retweeted tweet of 2010 was humorist Stephen Colbert for his BP disaster bon mot, “In honor of oil-soaked birds, ‘tweets’ are now ‘gurgles.’” That combines a pun, sarcasm, and (one form of) personification. The second most retweeted tweet of 2010 was from the rapper Drake: “We always ignore the ones who adore us, and adore the ones who ignore us.” That’s a classic chiasmus (see Chapter Three).

To write more wowing headlines or tweets, you’ll have to use more figures. “It’s a Brand-You World,” proclaimed *Time* magazine in 2006 in a punning headline. If you want to be noticed and remembered, you’ll have to use more figures. Certainly they are key weapons in the arsenal of politicians with a winning brand, the ones whose names we remember.

**EVOLUTION OF THE RHETORICAL PRESIDENCY**

“Rhetoric may now be . . . the primary means of performing the act of presidential leadership,” explained communication professor Roderick Hart in 1987. That same year, government professor Jeffrey Tulis argued in his book, *The Rhetorical Presidency*, “Nothing could be further from the founders’ intentions than for presidential power to depend upon the interplay of orator and crowd.” Tulis shows that, in fact, starting with George Washington through almost the entire nineteenth century, presidents rarely took their case to the public on any major policy or legislative issue of the day, and the few times they did, they were widely criticized. This did not mean there was no role for presidential eloquence—we will always remember Lincoln’s words at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, in 1863—only that presidents didn’t expound on the popular issues of the day to promote their policies.

Witness Lincoln’s remarkable admission at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1861, on “the present distracted condition of the country”:

> It is naturally expected that I should say something upon this subject, but to touch upon it at all would involve an elaborate discussion of a great many questions and circumstances, would require more time than I can at present command, and would perhaps,unnecessar-
ily commit me upon matters which have not yet fully developed themselves. [Immense cheering and cries of “Good!” “That’s right!”]²⁷

Can we even imagine a modern president in perilous times making such a public statement, let alone getting cheered for it?

Beginning especially with Theodore Roosevelt, who saw the presidency as a “bully pulpit,” and Woodrow Wilson, who publicly campaigned for the League of Nations (with little success), this view of the presidency began to change. Ultimately, Tulis argues, “The modern mass media has facilitated the development of the rhetorical presidency by giving the president the means to communicate directly and instantaneously to a large national audience,” and by increasing the importance of “verbal dramatic performance.”²⁸

The importance of rhetoric to modern presidents has only increased in the last two decades. First, more and more, the techniques of modern advertising and branding are being applied to campaigns to sell candidates, legislation, even wars. In a moment of candor one expects only from people on truth serum or their death beds, White House Chief of Staff Andrew Card offered this explanation for why the president waited until after his August 2002 vacation to sell the public on war with Iraq: “From a marketing point of view, you don’t introduce new products in August.”²⁹

In 2005, Republican strategists described Bush’s messaging strategy using “marketing and public-relations gurus” and “Bush’s campaign-honed techniques of mass repetition, never deviating from the script and using the politics of the fear to build support.”³⁰ Modern marketing techniques, repetition, and emotional appeals are catnip for a modern-day logographos, a professional speechwriter, among the only people who consciously try to master rhetoric and the figures these days.

Presidential messaging has its biggest impact on elections, I believe. Its impact on legislation is far from clear.³¹ The US Senate in particular is not moved by public opinion. Thanks to the extra-constitutional, anti-democratic filibuster, a mere forty-one senators representing a small minority of the US can now effectively block almost any piece of legislation. Elections, however, are a choice between two people, a decision about whom you believe more and whom you trust more. Influencing that very decision is a major reason rhetoric was created in the first place, which is why language intelligence will always be a key element in presidential elections.

Another reason for the growing power of rhetoric in politics is the shrinking power of the mainstream media—the major TV networks and newspapers. The news media has become more and more focused on personalities and entertainment, more obsessed in presidential elections with polls than policies. At the same
time, journalists have themselves become celebrities, promoting their own books and TV specials, even showing up in the movies or on TV sitcoms and dramas playing themselves.

Just as journalism and entertainment have merged, so have journalism and politics. Former political strategists routinely appear as political pundits side by side with journalists. Former Republican consultant Roger Ailes controls an entire network, Fox News.

In 2011, the Washington Post’s Dana Milbank wrote, “Washington journalists give Americans the impression we have shed our professional detachment and are aspiring to be like the celebrities and power players we cover.” Journalists and those they cover have become almost indistinguishable, like the men and the pigs at the end of George Orwell’s Animal Farm.

Finally, we have the countless scandals that have made the media seem no more credible than the powerful politicians they presume to judge. Journalists have fabricated stories, taken money from the government to push its programs, written glowing comments about speeches they contributed ideas to, and cozied up to sources. “It’s hard to know now who, if anyone, in the ‘media’ has any credibility,” Newsweek’s Howard Fineman wrote in 2005. Whereas only 16 percent of Americans in June 1985 said they “believe little or nothing of what they read in their daily paper,” by June 2004 that figure had risen to a staggering 45 percent. By 2009, 63 percent said the news they get is frequently inaccurate.

The implications of all this for rhetoric in politics are huge. Talk radio, cable news, and the internet have given politicians opportunities to directly address huge audiences with speeches and taped messages. To paraphrase Homer, people are filled with joy to hear a politician who has mastered the art of appealing both to the heart and mind with words, who is the best at telling persuasive stories. This is the realm of rhetoric.

“Tell them a personal story from your life,” says GOP pollster and message guru Frank Luntz, advising Republicans how to address an audience on the environment. In his ironically titled 2002 memo, “Straight Talk,” he tells Republicans that “it can be helpful to think of environmental (and other) issues in terms of a ‘story.’ A compelling story, even if factually inaccurate, can be more emotionally compelling than a dry recitation of the truth.” Here, then, is another outcome of the media’s loss of credibility: If the media has no ability to cry “foul,” then even the most devious rhetorical devices can be used safely.

Memorable storytelling, whether in life or politics, is built around the same figures of speech used by the master storytellers, the ancient bards—metaphor, foreshadowing, irony, and especially extended metaphor, which is what some, like the linguist George Lakoff, call a frame.

Narratives are crucial for governing, and the lack of such a narrative is a key reason that President Obama has been far less successful at communications than
many people expected. As columnist Ruth Marcus put it in 2011, “On health care, [Obama] took on a big fight without being able to articulate a clear message.”

Rhetoric remains as potent as ever. Let us see how rhetoric is done when rhetoric is done right.

CHAPTER TWO

THE FIRST RULE: SHORT WORDS WIN

*The most ancient English words are of one syllable, so that the more monosyllables that you use, the truer Englishman you shall seem.*

—George Gascoigne

The big myth about rhetoric is that rhetoric equals big words. If I were to wish but one point to stick with you here, it would be that short words are the best words. Short words win. Short words sell. In an era of snappy sound-bites and sexy slogans, the pitch must be pithy or the channel will be changed.

“There is no more important element in the technique of rhetoric than the continual employment of the best possible word,” wrote the young Winston Churchill. With our misconceived modern notions, we dismiss rhetoric as flowery language and fifty-dollar words. But the reverse is true: “The unreflecting often imagine that the effects of oratory are produced by the
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