

Click to prove
you're human



Each of us plays a unique role in the creation of a free, fair, and prosperous society.FEE's popular digital content and in-person programs turn complex ideas into practical tools for living your best life and making the world a better place. the free encyclopedia that anyone can change. Search the 269,806 articles in the Simple English Wikipedia How to write Simple English pages · Useful pages · Simple talk · Categories · Help Schools Gateway (for users who want to make changes from a school) This is the front page of the Simple English Wikipedia. Wikipedias are places where people work together to write encyclopedias in different languages. We use Simple English words and grammar here. The Simple English Wikipedia is for everyone, such as children and adults who are learning English. There are 269,806 articles on the Simple English Wikipedia. All of the pages are free to use. They have all been published under both the Creative Commons Attribution/Share-Alike License 4.0 International License and the GNU Free Documentation License. You can help here! You may change these pages and make new pages. Read the help pages and other good pages to learn how to write pages here. If you need help, you may ask questions at Simple talk. When writing articles here: Use Basic English words and shorter sentences. This allows people to understand complex terms or phrases. Write good pages. The best encyclopedia pages have useful, well-written information. Use the pages to learn and teach. These pages can help people learn English. You can also use them to make a new Wikipedia to help other people. Simple does not mean short. Writing in Simple English means that simple words are used. It does not mean readers want basic information. Articles do not have to be short to be simple; expand articles, add details, but use basic vocabulary. Be bold! Your article does not have to be perfect, because other editors will fix it and make it better. And most importantly, do not be afraid to start and make articles better yourself. Jeff Tesreau wearing the baseball uniform of the New York Giants around 1912-18 A baseball uniform is a kind of clothing that baseball players wear. They do this to show which of the two baseball teams they play for. Most baseball uniforms have the names and uniform numbers of players who wear them on the uniform somewhere, usually on the backs of the uniforms to tell different baseball players from each other. Baseball shirts, pants, shoes, socks, caps, and gloves are parts of baseball uniforms. Most uniforms have different logos and colors to tell which team is which. Baseball uniforms were first worn by the New York Knickerbockers Baseball Club in the 1800s. Their uniforms were pants made of blue wool, white flannel shirts and straw hats. Since then, the uniforms have gone through many changes. More items, ideas, and many other improvements were done and added to baseball uniforms over the years. The style of baseball uniforms also changed, little by little over time. more... Other very good articles - Proposals - Requirements From a collection of Wikipedia's articles: ... that the bee hummingbird (pictured) from the Isle of Youth in Cuba is the smallest living bird species in the world with an average length of only 5-6 centimeters? ... that in 1924, University of Chicago law students Nathan Leopold and Richard Loeb murdered a 14-year old boy to show that they were intelligent? ... that the French word for sausage comes from Vulgar Latin *salsiccia*, which comes from *salsicus* meaning 'seasoned with salt'? ... that in 1923, Calvin Coolidge was inaugurated as President of the United States at his family farm in Vermont by his father? ... that Istanbul is the only city in the world that is on two different continents: Europe and Asia? ... that during Daniel J. Evans's campaign for Governor of Washington, serial killer Ted Bundy was a close campaign assistant of his? Archives - Start a new article - Nominate an article Applied sciencesArchitecture (building) • Communication • Electronics • Engineering • Farming • Health • Industry • Medicine • Transport • Weather People and social studiesAnthropology (study of people) • Archaeology (history of civilization) • Geography • Education • History • Language • Philosophy (abstract ideas) • Psychology • Sociology • Teaching Daily life, art and cultureAnimation • Art • Book • Cooking • Custom • Culture • Dance • Family • Games • Gardening • Leisure (free time) • Movies and films • Music • Radio • Sports • Theater • Travel • Television Natural sciences and mathsAlgebra • Astronomy (stars and space) • Biology (animals and plants) • Chemistry • Computer science • Earth science • Ecology • Geometry • Mathematics • Physics • Statistics • Zoology (study of animals) Government and lawCopyright • Defense • Economics (trade and business) • Government • Human rights • Laws • Military • Politics • Trade Religions and beliefsAtheism • Bahá'í • Buddhism • Christianity • Esotericism • Hinduism • Islam • Jainism • Judaism • Mythology • Paganism • Sect • Sikhism • Taoism • Theology Wikipedia is hosted by the Wikimedia Foundation, a non-profit organization that also hosts a range of other projects: In Simple English: WiktionaryDictionary and thesaurus CommonsFree media repository WikifunctionsFree collection of functions In Regular English: WikispeciesDirectory of species WikipediaEnglish Wikipedia WikidataFree knowledge base WikinewsFree-content news WiktionaryDictionary and thesaurus WikiquoteCollection of quotations WikibooksFree textbooks and manuals WikisourceFree-content library WikiversityFree learning resources Meta-WikiWikimedia project coordination WikivoyageFree travel guide MediaWikiWiki software development See the pages of the Wikimedia Foundation Governance wiki, too. 5,000,000 articles or more English • Cebuano (Cebuano) 1,000,000 articles or more العربية (Arabic) • مصرى (Egyptian Arabic) • Deutsch (German) • español (Spanish) • فارسی (Persian) (French) • italiano (Italian) • 日本語 (Japanese) • Nederlands (Dutch) • polski (Polish) • português (Portuguese) • русский (Russian) • svenska (Swedish) • українська (Ukrainian) • Tiếng Việt (Vietnamese) • Winaray (Waray) • 中文 (Chinese) 500,000 articles or more català (Catalan) • хохчийн (Chechen) • čeština (Czech) • suomi (Finnish) • magyar (Hungarian) • Bahasa Indonesia (Indonesian) • (Korean) • norsk (Norwegian) • română (Romanian) • српски / srpski (Serbian) • Türkçe (Turkish) • татарча / tatarça (Tatar) 100,000 articles or more Simple English • Afrikaans (Afrikaans) • asturiano (Asturian) • azərbaycanca (Azerbaijani) • ئازərbaycanca (South Azerbaijani) • беларуская (Belarusian) • български (Bulgarian) • বাংলা (Bangla) • Cymraeg (Welsh) • dansk (Danish) • Ελληνικά (Greek) • Esperanto (Esperanto) • eesti (Estonian) • euskara (Basque) • galego (Galician) • עברית (Hebrew) • हिन्दी (Hindi) • hrvatski (Croatian) • հայերէն (Armenian) • ქართული (Georgian) • қазақша (Kazakh) • Latina (Latin) • Ladin (Ladin) • lietuvių (Lithuanian) • latviešu (Latvian) • Minangkabau (Minangkabau) • македонски (Macedonian) • Bahasa Melayu (Malay) • မြန်မာဘာသာ (Burmese) • norsk nynorsk (Norwegian Nynorsk) • српскохрватски / српскохрватски (Serbo-Croatian) • slovenčina (Slovak) • slovenščina (Slovenian) • shqip (Albanian) • தமிழ் (Tamil) • తెలుగు (Telugu) • тоҷикӣ (Tajik) • ไทย (Thai) • اردو (Urdu) • oʻzbekcha / ўзбекча (Uzbek) • 粵語 (Cantonese) • 閩南語 / Bân-lâm-gú (Minnan) List of all Wikipedias - Languages working together - Start a Wikipedia for a new language Retrieved from " Freshly into his third term in office, FDR probably didn't need to worry about spending too much time convincing the public that he was a respectable guy. As a result, that "please like me" rhetorical device known as "ethos" takes a backseat to its more prominently featured brethren, pathosand logos.FDR's use of the two rhetorical devices is pretty dense here—he lays them on thick. It's like he has a squirt bottle of ketchup (pathos) in one hand and a squirt bottle of mustard (logos) in the other, and he's squeezing both as hard as he can on a Four Freedoms footlong. The speech itself starts out with a healthy dose of pathos; I address you, the members of the 77th Congress, at a moment unprecedented in the history of the Union. I use the word "unprecedented," because at no previous time has American security been as seriously threatened from without as it is today. (2-3) Emotions of alarm and grave concern might follow such a serious statement. Vocabulary like "unprecedented" and "threatened" don't exactly strike a cheery note. Instead, they set a tone of seriousness that prepares the listener for an incoming message that will likely be heavy duty. Throughout, FDR plucks the patriotic heartstrings of the American public and does a fair bit of teasing its post-World War I anxieties. For example, he says:Even when the World War broke out in 1914, it seemed to contain only small threat of danger to our own American future. But, as time went on, the American people began to visualize what the downfall of democratic nations might mean to our own democracy. (17-18)Yikes. That's anxiety producing, for sure. Another example appears later, during his thinly veiled discussion of Nazism, which once again trips the trigger of American anxiety over losing its democracy: As a nation, we may take pride in the fact that we are softhearted; but we cannot afford to be soft-headed. We must always be wary of those who with sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal preach the "ism" of appeasement. We must especially beware of that small group of selfish men who would clip the wings of the American eagle in order to feather their own nests. (34-36)Often, his arguments based in pathos are used to support follow-up arguments that are grounded in logos. In fact, FDR freshly switches back and forth. Occasionally, he'll even make a statement that hovers somewhere between the two, either to engage both the emotions and reason of his audience, or to transition from one technique to the other. Two Rhetorical Devices Are Better Than OneConsider the progression from pathos to logos in the following segments:Every realist knows that the democratic way of life is at this moment being directly assailed in every part of the world—aslled either by arms, or by secret spreading of poisonous propaganda by those who seek to destroy unity and promote discord in nations that are still at peace. (23)Here we have some straight-up pathos. The broad generalizations and vague depictions of evil portray a world engaged in a battle of dark versus light. One could even argue that FDR's words are a form of propaganda themselves, meant to elicit a reaction of fear and defensiveness among his listeners. A few lines later:Therefore, as your President, performing my constitutional duty to "give to the Congress information of the state of the Union," I find it, unhappily, necessary to report that the future and the safety of our country and of our democracy are overwhelmingly involved in events far beyond our borders. (26)This is a transitional moment when FDR switches language tactics. Think of it as a rhetorical key change. Looking at the words and phrases, what parts of this sentence use pathos, what parts use logos, and what parts use both? And the hits keep coming:Armed defense of democratic existence is now being gallantly waged in four continents. If that defense fails, all the population and all the resources of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Austral-Asia will be dominated by the conquerors. Let us remember that the total of those populations and their resources in those four continents greatly exceeds the sum total of the population and the resources of the whole of the Western Hemisphere—many times over. (27-29)This last example is a bit lengthy, but it's super important. FDR gives an example of what could happen if the Axis powers triumph—a conclusion arrived at through logical reasoning. This is a powerful and scary idea made even more potent because it follows an emotionally charged introduction. It's a perfect example of how FDR uses a pathos-logos combination to drive home a major point. Though FDR slides back and forth between pathos and logos, in the end, it's pathos that has the final word. From his listing of the Four Freedoms until the end, the speech is propelled by full-on emotional power. However, unlike the earlier instances of pathos that are intended to scare and agitate, the emotional chords of the conclusion are deeply sincere because they echo with the hope of universal freedom and dignity for all. Shh. It's okay. We all get a little misty-eyed at the end of the "Four Freedoms" speech. Blog This Week, Those Books Blog This Week, Those Books Blog This Week, Those Books The Times of India Persuasion Tamooda The New European open Democracy The Economist © 2023 Rashmee.com All Rights Reserved. | Privacy Policy Convincing an audience of 133.4 million is a daunting task, especially when they must be convinced to join a war less than thirty years after World War I. On January 6, 1941, President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave the State of the Union Address that began his third term as president. This speech, broadcast across the United States on the radio, sparked the idea to join World War II even before Pearl Harbor was attacked. In this speech, he fully supports the English against the attack of the dictators trying to extinguish democracy across the world. He proposes the four freedoms that America is invested in protecting around the world: freedom of speech and expression, freedom to worship God in any way, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. In his speech, “The Four Freedoms,” Franklin Delano Roosevelt inspires nationalism and creates fear in his audience to convince them to join the war ravaging through Europe through many forms of metaphor and repetition. Throughout his speech, Roosevelt uses themes of nationalism through his diction, repetition, and metaphor. The first example of this is in the first ten paragraphs where he compares the situation in America to their history. He makes the current situation seem very extreme and urgent which calls the citizens to act against this new threat. Throughout this, he addresses the audience as “We” clearly making them feel American. Roosevelt also used a metaphor about an eagle having its wings clipped. In this, America is represented by the eagle while the bird stealing its feathers is meant to portray the dictators in Europe. This creates nationalism because the eagle, normally the strongest bird and a common symbol of the United States, is being stolen from, and there was nothing done to stop it. He also uses forms of repetition to inspire the people to support the country. In the thirteenth paragraph, Roosevelt uses a polysyndeton by repeating the word “or” to emphasize the American ideals that peace with the Germans would not bring to the world. He does this because in 1941, most of continental Europe had fallen to the Germans and if Germany were to win this war, those countries were likely to never become democratic again. He uses the nationalism concept Share — copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format for any purpose, even commercially. Adapt — remix, transform, and build upon the material for any purpose, even commercially. The licensor cannot revoke these freedoms as long as you follow the license terms. Attribution — You must give appropriate credit , provide a link to the license, and indicate if changes were made . You may do so in any reasonable manner, but not in any way that suggests the licensor endorses you or your use. ShareAlike — If you remix, transform, or build upon the material, you must distribute your contributions under the same license as the original. No additional restrictions — You may not apply legal terms or technological measures that legally restrict others from doing anything the license permits. You do not have to comply with the license for elements of the material in the public domain or where your use is permitted by an applicable exception or limitation . No warranties are given. The license may not give you all of the permissions necessary for your intended use. For example, other rights such as publicity, privacy, or moral rights may limit how you use the material. The Four Freedoms Speech was given on January 6, 1941. Roosevelt's hope was to provide a rationale for why the United States should abandon the isolationist policies that emerged from World War I. In the future days, which we seek to make secure, we look forward to a world founded upon four essential human freedoms. What are the four basic freedoms? The four freedoms he outlined were freedom of speech, freedom of worship, freedom from want, and freedom from fear. As America became engaged in World War II, painter Norman Rockwell did a series of paintings illustrating the four freedoms as international war goals that went beyond just defeating the Axis powers. What country has the least freedom? Least free were Syria (3.79), Venezuela (3.80), and Yemen (4.30). The components on which the index is based can be divided into economic freedoms and other personal freedoms. Highest ranking in economic freedoms were Hong Kong (8.91) and Singapore (8.71). What was the debate about during World War 2? The urgency of the situation intensified the debate in the United States over whether American interests were better served by staying out or getting involved. Isolationists believed that World War II was ultimately a dispute between foreign nations and that the United States had no good reason to get involved. What was the criticism of the New Deal? Criticism of Roosevelt as a “fascist”. According to James Q. Whitman, by the late 1980s it was “almost routine” for New Deal historians to identify similarities between the New Deal and fascist economic programs. Similarities are in anti-depression policies as in totality the New Deal and fascism were very different. What was the US response to World War 2? Even as the war consumed large portions of Europe and Asia in the late 1930s and early 1940s, there was no clear consensus on how the United States should respond. How did the New Deal help the Great Depression? Although the New Deal did not ultimately succeed in lifting the United States out of the Great Depression, the United States' mobilization for World War II revived the economy during the late 1930s and 1940s. What do you think? Do you think Roosevelt's experience with polio changed his personality and politics? Fear, Speech, Want, Religion One of the most impactful speeches in American history has just passed its 80th anniversary—Franklin Roosevelt's famous 1941 “Four Freedoms” speech. The speech introduced cognitive dissonance into Americans' understanding of freedom that is still cited today as justification for expanding government power over citizens' lives. If we want to advance our “General Welfare,” as the Constitution aims for, it is particularly important that we reconsider that speech and reclaim resonance with freedom, rightly understood, rather than dissonance. On the surface, an articulation of multiple freedoms would seem to be consistent with freedom for all. But FDR's version was not.The first two of FDR's “four essential human freedoms”—“freedom of speech and expression” and “freedom of every person to worship God in his own way”—are consistent with freedom for all. Both can be enjoyed universally, because the freedom of one person to speak or worship as he or she chooses does not take away from the same freedom for others. Government need only disallow intrusions on those rights, including by government, the agency with the greatest power to invade citizens' rights.Improving our potential for mutual advancement depends on the rediscovery of a consistent understanding of freedom.In contrast, FDR's third freedom—“freedom from want”—cannot be similarly broad. It commits the government to provide some people more goods and services than arise from their voluntary arrangements with others. However, in a world of inescapably scarcity, that commitment by an agency whose only resources have to be extracted from its own citizens must necessarily constrict those others' equal freedom to enjoy the fruits of their self-ownership and productive efforts through voluntary cooperation with others. That is, such a freedom is inescapably at odds with freedom for all.Similarly, FDR's fourth freedom—“freedom from fear”—that no nation will be in a position to commit an act of physical aggression against any neighbor—seems unobjectionable on the surface. After all, protecting citizens from foreign aggression is a central role of government. However, it ignores similar abuses at the hands of their own government, which history is replete with. In particular, since FDR's third freedom requires government aggression against its citizens to get the required resources for its “benevolence,” his “freedom from fear” omits the most significant agency citizens need fear when it comes to their freedom. It also ignores very serious understanding of Constitutional restrictions, particularly the Bill of Rights, which have been called the “Thou shalt nots,” designed to disallow such violations by our government.Freedom is wonderful and inspiring, full of hope and possibilities. But the word has long been repurposed to mean something that reduces our shared freedom.FDR's “Four Freedoms” rhetoric dramatically changed the meaning of freedom into something inconsistent with freedom for all Americans. And that same distortion has continued to this day. Consequently, we must remember that the central freedom our founders sought to guarantee was, as Ludwig von Mises summarized it, “freedom from the government...the restriction of the government's interference.” It creates no positive claim on the beneficence of government (forced charity from others), but preserves everyone's freedom from government dictation, broadening the canvas for peaceful, voluntary arrangements that respect everyone's rights. Unfortunately, those on whom such burdens are imposed are simply ignored when “freedoms” that are inconsistent with general freedom are declared.Freedom is wonderful and inspiring, full of hope and possibilities. But the word has long been repurposed to mean something that reduces our shared freedom. A host of abuses have found a foothold in that cognitive dissonance, diminishing our greatest possibility for societal advancement. And more are promised. That is why improving our potential for mutual advancement depends on the rediscovery of freedom as universal freedom from government coercion, not something for nothing that promises to some that force nothing for something terms on others.—Editor's Note: This article is adapted from a chapter in Gary Galles's latest book, Pathways to Policy Failures, just published by the American Institute for Economic Research. Enlarge Photo by Alexander London on Unsplash As a dedicated listener of the Reith Lectures, the BBC's annual mind-expanding series named after the corporation's first director-general, it's hard to explain just how inadequate they were in 2022. The idea was big and overarching; the execution bitty and unsatisfying. The whole concept revolved around FDR's Four Freedoms, the fundamentals he proposed that people “everywhere in the world” ought to enjoy. These were, according to the US president: Freedom of speech Freedom of worship Freedom from want Freedom from fear FDR outlined those four freedoms in January 1941, nearly a year before the attack on Pearl Harbour and the US entry into WWII. In December 1941, the world changed for America and arguably, so did the way it addressed the four freedoms proposed by its president. Some 80 years on, what do FDR's Four Freedoms mean now? It's a valid and fascinating question, one that the Reith Lectures, unfortunately, didn't even start to answer. The first speaker, bestselling author Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie mostly delivered the goods. But the rest were patchy - their expertise failing to keep up with the sweep and arc required in so broad, free-spirited and mind-bending an investigation. The lecturers were, in order of their lecture: Ms Adich; former Archbishop of Canterbury Rowan Williams; writer and campaigner Darren McGarvey and foreign affairs expert Fiona Hill. Today, Wednesday, December 21, the last of this year's four Reith Lectures wound up and it was profoundly disappointing to hear Ms Hill hark back to familiar newsy points she (or someone else) has made over the years about Vladimir Putin, assorted “strongmen” and suchlike. Metaphorically hand in hand with Ms Hill, the listener wandered, yet again, over the flatlands of current events, greened by tufts of well-worn phrases that expressed outrage, moral repugnance, western determination to triumph and suchlike. Nowhere poked even the merest shoot of deeper thought, something that might grow into a sturdy entity that signified the necessary examination of motivation and aspiration and the cold hard limits of achievable ambition. Ms Hill was liberal and unsparing in her use of the platitudes; if there were a commonplace she could find, she did. No truism escaped notice. It wasn't a Reith Lecture, but a re-hashed op-ed, one of many written by an acknowledged Russia expert in the Trump years and after. One can but hope the BBC will return to form with a more thought-provoking Reith Lecture series next year. Also read: #ReithLectures ask if art can still get the jaded 21st century all shook up? Grayson Perry plays to the gallery at alternative Reith Lectures on art world A selfie of English, the Mother Tongue: Ceaseless change, flux forever