

THE CONSERVATIVE VISION OF AMERICAN POLITICS IN THE
CAMPAIGN BIOGRAPHIES OF BARRY GOLDWATER

by

Ronnie Lynn Wagner

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the

DEPARTMENT OF SPEECH COMMUNICATION

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Graduate College

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 6

Copyright 1976 by Ronnie Lynn Wagner

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

I hereby recommend that this dissertation prepared under my
direction by Ronnie Lynn Wagner
entitled The Conservative Vision of American Politics in the
Campaign Biographies of Barry Goldwater
be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Andrew A. King
Dissertation Director

August 23, 1976
Date

As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify
that we have read this dissertation and agree that it may be
presented for final defense.

James W. Davis
J. D. Holt
Robert M. Laskey

August 27, 1976
August 30, 1976
August 30, 1976

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent
on the candidate's adequate performance and defense thereof at the
final oral examination.

© 1976

RONNIE LYNN WAGNER

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the copyright holder.

SIGNED: Ronnie Lynn Wagner

This study is dedicated to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Andrew A. King, who represents the highest in scholarship, guidance, inspiration, and understanding. He not only gave unselfishly of his time, but also of himself. He is, in my opinion, the epitome of what a good teacher and person should be.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express a sincere appreciation and gratitude to all the individuals who have assisted me in this study. Particular gratitude is expressed to Dr. Andrew King for making the writing of this dissertation a very rich and special experience. Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Dave Nott for all the times that he brought laughter and hope back into my life. Appreciation is also expressed to the other members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Robert Sankey and Dr. James Davis, for their careful reading of the study and their thoughtful comments.

The author wishes to express his sincere gratitude to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Kenneth T. Wagner. Without their support and encouragement, this study could not have been completed.

The author also wishes to thank Miss Sandy Dennis for the infinite number of hours that she read and edited the dissertation. Her assistance, devotion, and friendship will always have special significance.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT	viii
 CHAPTER	
1. THE PROBLEM AND THE PLAN OF ATTACK	1
Background of the Conservative Movement	1
The Nature of Rhetorical Vision and Statement of the Problem	3
Theory of Rhetorical Vision and Its Relationship to the Study of Movements	4
Methodology	7
Justification for the Study of Campaign Biographies	10
Materials	12
Justification of Biographies	12
Selection of Biographies	13
Summary of Previous Literature and Uniqueness of the Study	14
 2. THE EMERGENCE OF THE POST-WAR CONSERVATIVE MOVEMENT AND ITS ENTRY INTO POLITICS	 16
General	16
Historical Background	16
The Times	16
The Men	19
William F. Buckley, Jr.	21
Russell Kirk	24
Clinton Rossiter	26
Peter Viereck	28
Richard M. Weaver	29
Frank S. Meyer	31
Philosophical Consensus	33
General	33
Nature and Rights of Man	34
Nature of Society	35
The Nature and Rights of the State	35

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
The Nature of Conservatism	36
Guiding Conservative Principles	37
Audience	38
Academic Roots	38
Demographics of College Audience	40
Campus Organizations	41
Politicalization of the Movement	43
Leadership Vacuum	43
Goldwater Emergence	46
The 1960 Convention	49
The Goldwater Campaign	50
3. MYTH AND POLITICS	56
General	56
Nature of Myth	57
Why Politicians Utilize Myth	66
Summary	69
4. THE CONSERVATIVE VISION AND THE DRAMATIZATION OF CHARACTER	71
Mythic Elements in the 1964 Campaign	71
Political Biographies as Sources of Myth	73
The Biographies	74
Brief Synopsis of Biographies	75
The Problem of the Biographies	76
The Hero of the Vision	77
The Hero as Elite Savior	78
The Hero as "Regular Guy"	82
The Enemy	89
Summary and Discussion	108
5. SCENE, THEME, AND SCENARIO IN THE GOLDWATER BIOGRAPHIES	111
General	111
Scene	111
Backgrounds	112
Symbol	123
Theme	126
Scenario	136
Conclusion	138

TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
6. SUMMARY, ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSION	139
Introduction	139
Character	139
Rhetorical Effectiveness	139
Ideological Significance	144
Scene	145
Rhetorical Effectiveness	145
Ideological Significance	147
Theme	149
Rhetorical Effectiveness	149
Ideological Significance	151
Scenario	155
Rhetorical Effectiveness	155
Ideological Significance	157
Discussion	158
An Alternative Explanation	161
Conclusion	162
Suggestions for Future Research	163
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	165

ABSTRACT

The present study was concerned with the conservative vision of American politics as expressed in the campaign biographies of Barry Goldwater. The over-all objective was the systematic description of the content of the conservative vision, the identification of its rhetorical appeal, and some estimate of its significance in the present political climate of America.

The author's methodology was basically dramatistic. This method conceived politics mythically, i.e., as a drama with character, scenic background, thematic patterns and plot lines. To answer the ideological questions about the biography, the author analyzed the way in which the dramatic elements worked.

The results of this study revealed that the ideological vision of the biographies was a hybrid vision. Its dramatic elements were expressions of conservative and non-conservative ideas. Although the biographies were rhetorically effective because of their broader appeal, they were ideologically confusing. Explanations for this were of two sorts. The historical explanation argued that the confusion was inherent in the history of American conservatism. The rhetorical explanation argued that the inconsistency arose from the nature of the biographical medium, and the need for adaption to a broader audience.

CHAPTER 1

THE PROBLEM AND THE PLAN OF ATTACK

Background of the Conservative Movement

After World War II, there emerged a revival of conservatism in this country which soon developed into a full-blown movement. Its emergence is attributed to a handful of intellectuals, who are commonly identified as Peter Viereck, Russell Kirk, Clinton Rossiter, and William Buckley, Jr.¹ Together, they became the spokesmen of the conservative movement by formulating a systematic defense of the ideology.² For instance, Peter Viereck's Conservatism Revisited in 1949 is recognized as being the first book to spark the post-war revival of conservatism. Other books like Russell Kirk's The Conservative Mind followed, as well as William Buckley's National Review which quickly became a major journal of conservative opinion in America.³ This literature served as a vehicle by which renewed interest and allegiance to conservatism was created. College students began reading conservative books, organizing conservative clubs, and sponsoring conservative

1. Ronald Lora, Conservative Minds in America (Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1971), pp. 175, 178.

2. Richard J. Dandeneau, "The Rhetorical Invention of Conservatism: An Analysis of the Assumptions of Contemporary Conservative Thought," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1961, p. 21.

3. Allen Guttman, The Conservative Tradition in America (New York: Oxford University Press, 1967), pp. 159-160.

speakers. Books on conservatism were coming off the presses in a steady stream and articles on conservatism were appearing in magazines and journals of all kinds. Even lectures, speeches, and newscasts were discussing the growth of interest in this philosophy.¹ Perhaps because of this enthusiasm, the spokesmen of the conservative movement began to enter the political arena. It seemed like the obvious step for propagandizing the conservative ideology to a larger audience. By the end of the 1950's, Barry Goldwater was a leading conservative in Congress. He served as chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, which afforded him an opportunity to make contacts with influential conservatives throughout the country.² In order to publicize him as a leading Presidential contender (as well as spread the conservative ideology), the spokesmen gave credence to Goldwater's ideas by assisting in the writing of his books.³ They also supported his Presidential campaign by backing him in their own books⁴ and by participating as strategists and

1. Paul A. Sexson and Stephen B. Miles, Jr., The Challenge of Conservatism (New York: Exposition Press, Inc., 1964), pp. 129, 170.

2. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1964), p. 1576.

3. Barry Goldwater, Why Not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962), p. 18.

4. Clifton F. White and William J. Gill, Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1967), p. 20.

advisers.¹ Although Goldwater lost in his bid for the Presidency, the movement and its "vision" continued.²

The purpose of this study was to describe and evaluate the significance of that vision. The present study was concerned with the conservative vision of American politics as expressed in the campaign biographies of Barry Goldwater.

The Nature of Rhetorical Vision and Statement of the Problem

Every social or political movement has a unifying vision of its own mission and the world it wishes to transform. This vision provides an explanation for the struggles and the setbacks of the members and contains a set of attractive images of the future. It provides identity, motivation and morale. It holds the movement together. For political movements the vision must have broad appeal. It must contain images that are attractive for large numbers of people. The conservative vision that was propagandized during Goldwater's 1964 Presidential campaign was intended to appeal to a substantial rank and file. Through the medium of the campaign biography in which it was dramatized, the conservative vision was intended to become a unifying force for millions of people. Based on the sales of the biographies, it is credible to maintain that it did become the common psychic property of a certain number of people, a number that is not insubstantial. This public vision has outlasted the

1. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller, pp. 1574-1575.

2. Stanton M. Evans, The Future of Conservatism: From Taft to Reagan and Beyond (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968).

issues and even personalities of the 1964 campaign. It remains in the heads of many American voters and therefore represents a potential power base upon which a new conservative movement may be built. The objective of this study is the systematic description of the content of the conservative vision, the identification of its rhetorical appeal, and some estimate of its significance in the present political climate of America.

Theory of Rhetorical Vision and Its Relationship
to the Study of Movements

Let us consider first how a rhetorical vision fits into the framework of a rhetorical movement. Technically speaking, a rhetorical movement contains group fantasy chains, public fantasy events, and a rhetorical vision that co-exist in a set of relationships. Take for example a group of individuals who meet to discuss a common preoccupation or problem. A member dramatizes a theme that catches the attention of the group and causes it to chain out. Members grow excited, interrupt one another, and forget their self-consciousness when someone mentions what the group did in the past or what they might do in the future. The group continues to grow excited, more dramas (myths) chain out to create a common symbolic reality. Members now feel as though they have entered a new realm of reality--a world of heroes, villains, saints, and enemies--a type of drama.¹ Andrew King points out that a drama justifies the group's origin, identity, and mission. That is, it gives each

1. Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Volume LVIII (December 1972), pp. 397-399.

member (1) a way of organizing the meaning of events, (2) a systemic way of interpreting the past, and (3) a personal role, a set of motives, and a rationale for action. Drama therefore is a program by which members are able to cope with common difficulties, such as those dealing with the natural environment, the socio-political systems, or the economic structures.¹ Other writers like Virginia Kidd agree that dramas provide members with a set of motives.² For instance, if the group is motivated to "go public," they begin to create messages for the mass media; often they find themselves shaping the drama that excited them in their original discussions. These dramas become popular with the audience and they, in turn, find themselves transported to a world that seems somehow more real than the everyday one. They are psychologically taken into a psychodramatic fantasy world. Those transported take up the dramas in groups of acquaintances, and some of these dramas again chain out as fantasy themes. In short, a rhetorical vision is the composite dramas (myths) which catch up large groups of people in a symbolic reality. By spreading out to a larger public, it serves to sustain the members' sense of community, to provide them with a set of motives, and to give them a social reality filled with heroes, villains, emotions,

1. Andrew A. King, "Myth Criticism," Unpublished document in author's possession, The University of Arizona, Tucson, 1974.

2. Virginia Kidd, "Happily Ever After and Other Relationship Styles: Advice on Interpersonal Relations in Popular Magazines, 1951-1973," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, Volume LXI (February 1975), pp. 31-39.

and attitudes. A rhetorical vision therefore is propagated from one group to another until a rhetorical movement emerges.¹

Just as fantasy themes chain out in a group to form a unique group culture, so do fantasy dramas (myths) of a successful political campaign chain out in public audiences to form a rhetorical vision.²

These dramas serve as the background of any campaign and they are, as indicated by Dan Hahn and Ruth Gonchar, more important than issues.

While issues are transitory, confusing, and largely irrelevant, dramas provide intelligent and discriminating indices upon which informed votes can be based.³ In conjunction with Hahn and Gonchar's findings, it was decided that an examination of dramas within the context of the conservative vision should be undertaken. Though there are a number of diverse settings in which this might be done, in face-to-face interacting groups, in speaker-audience transactions, in viewers of television broadcasts, in listeners to radio programs, and in writer-reader transactions, only the latter will be considered. More specifically, this study is directed toward dramas within biographies with little or no interest directed toward the reader. Such an approach is taken by Ernest Bormann, who says that a critic can take the social reality contained in a rhetorical vision (which he has constructed from the dramas

1. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," pp. 398-399.

2. Ibid.

3. Dan F. Hahn and Ruth M. Gonchar, "Political Myth: The Image and the Issue," Today's Speech, Volume XX (Summer 1972), p. 57.

developed in a body of discourse) and examine the social relationships, the motives, and the impact of that symbolic world as though it were the substance of social reality for those people who participated in the vision. According to Bormann, if the critic can explain how individuals related to one another, how they arranged themselves into social hierarchies, how they acted to achieve their fantasy goals, and how they were aroused by the dramatic action and the dramatis personae, then "his insights will make a useful contribution to understanding the movement and its adherents."¹

In addition to the materials which illustrate the vital function rhetorical visions play in large and small groups, a considerable body of literature on a closely related subject, group myth, is pertinent here. For our purposes, the term myth is the literary counterpart of the political and social term, rhetorical vision. A full review of the nature of myth will be undertaken in Chapter 3.

Methodology

The purpose of this study is the description and evaluation of the public vision of the conservative movement. The author's methodology will be basically dramatistic. It will consist of a series of questions adapted from Ernest Bormann's pioneering study of fantasy in small groups. Bormann's questions were originally framed to provide a psychic diagram of the basic values, the motives for action, and collective conception for any social or cultural group. These questions have

1. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," p. 401.

been restylized to fit a political group, and they have been grouped under the basic categories of political ideology, i.e., those assumptions about the nature of man and the universe that every political group must provide answers to.¹ The following information schematizes the method.

<u>Ideological Category</u>	<u>Rhetorical Dramatistic Category</u>
I. Nature and Rights of Man	Character or Role
A. Who are heroes and who are villains?	
B. Does some abstraction personify as a character?	
C. How concrete and detailed are the characterizations?	
D. How are members of the rhetorical community characterized?	
E. Insiders are praised for what reasons?	
F. Outsiders are castigated for what reasons?	
G. What values are inherent in praiseworthy characters?	
H. What acts are performed by heroes? By enemies? By neutral people?	
I. Which acts are censored? Which are praised?	
J. To what degree do the characters foster identification?	
II. Nature of Society	Scene
A. Where are the dramas set?	
B. Where is the sacred ground? Where is the profane?	
C. What is the ideal vision of the perfect society?	

1. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," p. 401.

III. Nature and Rights Scène
of the State

- A. What is the image of moral and legitimate government?
Of immoral and illegitimate government?
- B. What is the relationship between the individual and
the state?
- C. How do individuals experience the state?
- D. How effective is the scenic element of the books?

IV. Nature of Conservatism Theme

- A. What are the ideas inherent in the dramas?
- B. How does the movement fit into the scheme of history?
- C. How artistic is the development of the themes?
 - 1. How are the ideas made visual--are they believable?
 - 2. How convincing are the problems and solutions?
- D. How capable is the drama in arousing and interpreting
emotions?

V. Working Conservative Plot or Scenario
Principles

- A. What is the conservative program's scenario?
- B. What is the mission (role) for the audience?
- C. How attractive is the program (myth) for the diverse
body of American voters?¹

This methodology provides the critic with a systematic procedure for discovering and describing the fantasy dramas that form the conservative vision. By gathering a number of dramas, one is able to reconstruct the

1. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," pp. 401-402.

vision "much as a scholar would delineate a school of drama on the basis of a number of different plays."¹

The ideological categories correspond to the dramatic categories of the New Critics. This method conceives politics mythically, i.e., as a drama with character, scenic background, thematic patterns and plot lines. Thus, to answer the ideological questions about the biography one must analyze the way in which the dramatic elements work. For example, to discuss the nature of society in the biographies it is necessary to catalog the images of contemporary America, the images of Soviet Russia, of the new American West, of the old cynical exhausted Eastern Seaboard, and even the content of Goldwater's fantasies about the future.

If nothing else, this study may shed some light on what happens when a philosophical movement sponsored by a group of academic intellectuals attempts to become the basis of an entire political party. The writer must be alert to discover what compromises (if any) are made to reach a diverse audience of voters. He must determine whether accommodations are made to more popular or to rival ideologies. Only a careful analysis of the mythic content of the biographies will answer these questions.

Justification for the Study of Campaign Biographies

Here is a brief discussion as to why campaign biographies, rather than speeches, were selected for the analysis of the conservative

1. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," p. 401.

vision. Surprisingly enough, little or no attention has been paid to the analysis of biographies while speeches have been the focus of many researchers in our field. Actually, biographies provide strong foundation for the analysis of a movement. According to Virginia Kidd, biographies reach vast numbers of readers and therefore are a primary source in the furthering of a public vision. Besides reflecting and inspiring attitudes, they are an important means for the propagandizing of ideology.¹ Leo Lowenthal agrees that biographies are in wide circulation and that they are the most popular type of literature. They serve as dramatic examples of success which the reader may imitate; this dramatic modeling facilitates the passage of sets of attitudes or ideologies from one generation to another.² The reader can become a part of its ideology as he becomes more involved in the story. Biographies also dramatize the basic values of the conservative movement. They do this in a complete system rather than in a fragmentary one. It is essential to note that biographies make abstract statements into concrete images and present them in a dramatic form. They show values in conflict and illustrate the large world view. In the final analysis, biographies of the 1964 campaign dramatize attitudes that are still powerful and potentially victorious.

1. Kidd, p. 32.

2. Leo Lowenthal, "Biographies in Popular Magazines: From Production Leaders to Consumption Idols," Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences, edited by Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964), pp. 243, 247.

The New Critics strongly support the theory that a critic may confine his attention principally to the work itself.¹ In this case, knowing the exact motivation of the authors and assessing the exact influence of the campaign biographies on their readers is almost impossible; after 11 years, it would be extremely difficult to determine such results. Though supplementary information will be obtained from various authors, a demographic analysis of the audience will not be undertaken. To do the latter, the critic would have to separate the influence of biographies from all other sources of influence. He would also have to know the extent of which the individual believes what he reads.² For the purposes of this study, such an analysis is non-feasible and unnecessary.

Materials

Justification of Biographies

The conservative vision will be studied at the time of the movement's most complete flowering to date, the campaign of 1964 when the first modern conservative politician became the standard-bearer of a major political party. The issues of this campaign, a balanced budget, federal intervention in southern integration and a host of others, have lost or are losing their saliency. Argued in dozens of campaign addresses and nicely charted in Republican party fact sheets, the issues

1. Edward P. J. Corbett, Historical Analysis of Literary Works (New York: Oxford University Press, 1969), p. xv.

2. Kidd, p. 38.

retain little more than antiquarian interest. But the basic conservative vision remains. It endures while issues fade. As a mythic expression of fundamental values, it outlasts campaigns and even generations of statesmen. Although it provided the perspective out of which the Goldwater speeches and the Republican fact sheets grew, the vision had its most complete expression in artistic and dramatic form, i.e., in the campaign biographies of Goldwater. It is in the campaign biographies that the ideas of conservatives, so sloganized and threadbare when uttered in their speeches, became clothed with symbolic power. It is here that the literary intellectuals, who played such a unique part in the popularizing of conservatism, were able to transform ideological slogans into a lifestyle, a political creed that could be lived by rank and file. In the biographies Goldwater was presented as a hero to follow, a model to imitate, a realization of the conservative ideal.

Selection of Biographies

Although numerous biographies and anti-biographies are available, six have been selected. They are: (1) The Conscience of a Conservative by Barry Goldwater; (2) The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater by Rob Wood and Dean Smith; (3) Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater by Jack Bell; (4) Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan by Stephen Shadegg; (5) Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate by James M. Perry; and (6) Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan by Edwin McDowell. The major criterion for selection is that they offer complete dramas (myths) of the conservative vision. They also have a common origin, focus, time, and definition. That is, books

originating in favor of conservatism and Goldwater were written by conservatives. Goldwater is the focus or central character in each book. All books were published within the time span of 1960-1964. And they satisfy the definition of a book as specified by the United States Postal Service: ". . . 24 pages or more, at least 22 of which are printed, consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books."¹

Summary of Previous Literature and Uniqueness of the Study

The critic has relied heavily on the works of Ernest Bormann, Waldo W. Braden, and A. J. M. Sykes.² They, more than anyone, provided the grounds upon which the study was based. Other sources in anthropology, philosophy, religion, literature, and history have been drawn on

1. United States Postal Service, Postal Service Manual (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974), Sec. 135.214d.

2. In-formulating my ideas about myth and in gathering material for this paper, I was heavily indebted to the following works: Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality," pp. 396-407; Waldo W. Braden, "Myths in a Rhetorical Context," The Southern Speech Communication Journal, XL (Winter 1975), pp. 113-126; A. J. M. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," The Journal of Communication, XX (March 1970), pp. 17-31. Credit should also be given to other works in speech communication: King, "Myth Criticism," 1974; Walter R. Fisher, "Reaffirmation and Subversion of the American Dream," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIX (April 1973), pp. 160-167; Hahn and Gonchar, pp. 57-63; Robert Veninga, "The Functions of Symbols in Legend Construction . . . Some Exploratory Comments," Central States Speech Journal, XXII (Fall 1971), pp. 161-170.

as will be apparent in the extended discussion in Chapter 3.¹ The pioneering work in myth was done in literature and the social sciences. In those disciplines an extensive literature exists dating from the publication of Frazer's Golden Bough early in this century.²

In communications, however, the work is still in its infancy. Concepts from other disciplines are still being adapted to a communications point of view, definitions are being recast, and there is much theory but very little application. The literature in communication on myth is largely an affair of speculation and suggestions for future research. In applying some of the conceptualizations about myth, this study is offered as a beginning of systematic research in the area of political communication. Probably the most important contribution this study might make to the field of rhetoric and public address is the description and analysis of myth making in a political campaign.

1. Sources contributing significantly to the development of theory, definitions, and examples of myth are: Henry Nash Smith, Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973); Walter Lippman, Public Opinion (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1922); Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955); Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden (New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1964); William R. Taylor, Cavalier and Yankee (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1961).

2. James George Frazer, The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922).

CHAPTER 2

THE EMERGENCE OF THE POST-WAR CONSERVATIVE MOVEMENT AND ITS ENTRY INTO POLITICS

General

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the rise of the conservative movement. The chapter will describe the historical climate to which the movement was a response. It will enumerate and discuss the founding fathers of the movement, their key texts and the common philosophical position that bound them together. Further, the chapter will detail the media through which they attempted to propagate their ideology, and the audiences that proved to be most receptive. Finally the author will attempt to describe the role of the core audience as the movement passed from a cultural phenomenon to a political organization. The bulk of the section dealing with the political organization of the movement will deal with selection, campaign, and defeat of its leader, Senator Barry Morris Goldwater of Arizona.

Historical Background

The Times

It would be tempting to describe the conservative movement solely in terms of its objectively verifiable artifacts: the men who created it, the volumes of its liturgy, and the catalog of the organizations

and candidates it sponsored. Yet it is a truism that ideology does not grow in a vacuum. It emerges as a systematic answer to the conditions of its time. Therefore, before the hard organizational evidence of the movement can be examined, it is necessary to say something about the historical climate in which it flowered.

There has been a large mass of speculation about the origin of post-war conservatism. To excerpt from this mass of speculation would not be very useful. It is of unequal quality, much is impressionistic in the extreme. Much is journalistic or marred by diatribe. However, within this mass of writing, a few explanations continually recur.

First, there is a general agreement that the revival of conservatism is a recurring phenomenon in America. The conservatives of the 1950's had predecessors and they will have intellectual descendants. Second, there is widespread agreement that the rebirth of conservatism was related to the general desire for a rational world order against the background of chaos that followed World War II. Third, one often meets the explanation that the new conservatism was a reaction against the liberalism that had triumphed in the decade of the 1930's. There are, as one might expect, numerous minor idiosyncratic explanations of the rise of conservatism, but most explanations are variants of these three.

The post-war conservatives were part of a revival of a philosophy that had deep roots. They acknowledged that conservatism had its origin in the revolutionary events of the 18th century, and they built on an intellectual tradition that was begun by Edmund Burke.¹ The writings

1. Lora, pp. 8-9.

of the post-war conservatives drew on a whole constellation of earlier American writers. They had assimilated the thought of George Santayana, T. S. Eliot, H. L. Mencken, Walter Lippmann, and the Southern Agrarians.¹ It may be said that they merely formalized a loose collection of prior thought into a formal self-conscious system of thought.

The rebirth of conservatism was part of a general desire for world order. Chapman's assessment was typical:

The march of events since the end of World War II had prepared well for the favorable reception of a conservative approach to politics. The refusal of the Soviet Union to permit an enduring peace settlement, the disasters in Eastern Europe, the "anti-Communist" hysteria, and the inability of certain intellectuals to recognize the tyrannical nature of Stalin's Russia, coinciding with the decline of New and Fair Deal enthusiasm, had all contributed to an atmosphere in which a fundamental turn to the right appeared to be a real possibility. The outbreak of war in Korea and then the Eisenhower victory in 1952 served to intensify the belief of many that the American mind had reached crossroads, had lost patience with "native liberalism," and that a slow, ponderous and epoch-making change of course was in the offing.²

In addition, a substantial number of writers pointed to the movement as, in part, a reaction against liberalism. The triumph of mass society, epitomized by the New Deal, was repugnant to them.³ Hitler and Mussolini had exposed the fragile nature of world order and conservatives asked for a "return to fundamental law" and a rejection of the "assumptions of cultural relativism."⁴

1. Phillip C. Chapman, "The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism v. Political Philosophy," Political Science Quarterly, LXXXV (March, 1960), pp. 17-34.

2. Ibid., pp. 18-19.

3. Ibid., p. 22.

4. Lora, p. 176.

The Men

The revival of conservatism that developed in America between 1948 and 1964 was primarily the work of a small group of literary intellectuals. By setting forth a systematic defense of conservatism, they attracted a broad and sympathetic audience. Although there has always been a conservative philosophy, it was not until the publication of Richard Weaver's Ideas Have Consequences (1948) and Peter Viereck's Conservatism Revisited (1949) that a self-conscious conservative movement began to take form.¹ The appearance of these two works marked the beginning of a resurgence of conservative literature.

Nineteen hundred and fifty-one saw publication of Russell Kirk's Randolph of Roanoke² and William Buckley's God and Man at Yale.³ They

1. There is a difference of opinion over the date when the first significant work of the movement appeared. Phillip C. Chapman says that the post-war revival of conservatism may be dated from Peter Viereck's Conservatism Revisited: The Revolt against Revolt 1815-1949 (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949). See Chapman, p. 17. Allen Guttman feels that although it might be dated from Peter Viereck's Conservatism Revisited: . . . 1819-1949, or from Richard M. Weaver's Ideas Have Consequences (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948), the decisive date is Russell Kirk's The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953). See Guttman, p. 159. Since other conservative works appeared after 1949 and before 1953, the writer chose Weaver's and Viereck's books as marking the beginning of the conservative movement.

2. Russell Kirk, Randolph of Roanoke; A Study in Conservative Thought (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951).

3. William F. Buckley, Jr., God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of Academic Freedom (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951).

were followed in 1953 by Kirk's The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana,¹ along with Richard Weaver's The Ethics of Rhetoric.² Then in 1955, two conservative magazines were founded: Russell Kirk's quarterly Modern Age and William Buckley's weekly National Review. The latter's circulation rose from 20,000 in 1956 to 90,000 in 1964,³ helping to make it "the major journal of conservative opinion in America."⁴ More books developed, many of them generated from the intellectual ferment created by the magazines. Buckley's Up from Liberalism as well as Rumbles Left and Right, Meyer's In Defense of Freedom, and Kirk's A Program for Conservatives were such quasi-journalistic works.⁵ Also in 1955, another major contribution to the movement was Clinton Rossiter's Conservatism in America.⁶ Polemical and popular, Viereck's The Unadjusted Man⁷ and Conservatism: From John Adams to Churchill were published in 1956.⁸

1. Kirk, The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana.

2. Richard M. Weaver, The Ethics of Rhetoric (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953).

3. Jeffrey Hart, The American Dissent: A Decade of Modern Conservatism (New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966), p. 31.

4. Lora, p. 195.

5. Hart, p. 31.

6. Clinton Rossiter, Conservatism in America: The Thankless Persuasion, 2nd ed. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962).

7. Peter Viereck, The Unadjusted Man: A New Hero for Americans, Reflections on the Distinction Between Conforming and Conserving (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1956).

8. Peter Viereck, Conservatism: From John Adams to Churchill (Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1956).

Rossiter's book was labeled as "the best book on the history of American conservatism" by Ronald Lora.¹ The conservative ideas of Weaver and Meyer were further developed in Visions of Order² and What is Conservatism? respectively in 1964.³ While this survey includes only the most influential journals and books of the post-war conservative movement, a vast secondary and popular literature exists. As this study's concern is only with the mainstream, it will not serve its purpose to attempt a review of this secondary literature.

The men who wrote the early works that began the post-war surge of interest in conservatism continued to be active in the movement for many years. It was they who were the founding fathers of conservatism in a very real sense. It was they who brought about the intellectual ferment from which the movement grew. It was they who wrote for and published the books and journals that propagated the message of conservatism. Because of their importance, it may be useful to consider each intellectuals' contribution in synoptic form.

William F. Buckley, Jr.

William F. Buckley, Jr., was born on November 24, 1925. He attended St. Thomas More School and St. John's in England before completing his secondary education at Millbrook School in New York. After

1. Lora, p. 254.

2. Richard M. Weaver, Visions of Order: The Cultural Crisis of Our Time (Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1964).

3. Frank S. Meyer, ed., What is Conservatism? (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964).

spending two years in the Army, he entered Yale University and graduated with honors.¹ He distinguished himself as a member of the debating team and served as chairman of the Yale Daily News.²

Buckley's career as a conservative spokesman began with the publication of God and Man at Yale (1951).³ He attacked Yale for what he felt to be its neglect of religion, its discredit of economic individualism, and its liberal use of academic freedom.⁴ Regarded as an indictment of all liberal education, his book was widely read.⁵ Other books include McCarthy and His Enemies (with L. Brent Bozell),⁶ Up from Liberalism,⁷ and Rumbles Left and Right.⁸ Buckley hosts his own television show, "Firing Line," and is the author of a syndicated column, "On the Right."⁹ The latter originated in 1962 and enlarged his audience to seven million readers.¹⁰

1. Lora, p. 196.

2. Charles Moritz, ed., "Buckley, William F(rank), Jr.," Current Biography Yearbook, Twenty-third Annual Cumulation (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1962), p. 58.

3. Ibid.

4. Edward Cain, They'd Rather Be Right: Youth and the Conservative Movement (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1963), p. 53.

5. Moritz, "Buckley, William F(rank), Jr.," p. 58.

6. William F. Buckley, Jr., and L. Brent Bozell, McCarthy and His Enemies (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954).

7. William F. Buckley, Jr., Up from Liberalism (New York: McDowell, Obolensky, Inc., 1959).

8. William F. Buckley, Jr., Rumbles Left and Right: A Book About Troublesome People and Ideas (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1963).

9. Lora, p. 196.

10. Moritz, "Buckley, William F(rank), Jr.," p. 58.

Today, Buckley is the Editor-in-Chief of National Review.¹

Founded in 1955, it "soon emerged as the major journal of conservative opinion in America."² Listing such well-known conservatives as Russell Kirk and Frank S. Meyer, it seeks to spread the conservative doctrine. It also seeks to marshall influence in national politics, as indicated by its endorsement of Goldwater in the 1964 Presidential campaign.³

Called "one of conservatism's most stimulating and articulate spokesmen,"⁴ Buckley subscribes to the philosophy that conservatism is addressed to shaping a paradigmatic society. He finds the 20th century to be a science-centered age with a passion for equality that corrupts the ideal society.⁵ To him, our greatest crisis is the conflict between the social engineers and the disciples of truth. Fabian reformers are attempting to dominate both political parties.⁶ Through his lecturing and writing, Buckley has gained recognition for the conservative movement and was one of the major forces in its emergence into politics.

1. William F. Buckley, Jr., Did You Ever See a Dream Walking? American Conservative Thought in the Twentieth Century (New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970), p. x.

2. Lora, p. 195.

3. Ibid., pp. 195, 208, 210.

4. Moritz, "Buckley, William F(rank), Jr.," p. 58.

5. Buckley, Did You Ever . . . Twentieth Century, p. xi.

6. Cain, p. 61.

Russell Kirk

Russell Kirk was born in Plymouth, Michigan, on October 19, 1918. He attended Plymouth High School where he participated in debate and oratory. Graduating from high school in 1936, Kirk entered Michigan State College. He was on the debate team and won prizes in oratory and extemporaneous speaking as well as in writing. After taking his B.A. degree in history, he enrolled at Duke University. He received his M.A. degree in 1941, after having completed a study of John Randolph of Roanoke. In 1951, the study was published in book-form under the title of Randolph of Roanoke; A Study in Conservative Thought.¹ Both he and the book received praise as is indicated by Samuel Flagg Bemis in the Yale Review: "Never has an historian of politics done a better job of this kind."² After four years in the Army, he accepted a teaching position in 1946 at Michigan State College. Two years later, he went to St. Andrews, Scotland, to write a book on the heritage of conservative thought in Great Britain and America. The completed book fulfilled the dissertation requirement and he received his Ph.D. from St. Andrews University in 1952. His book was published in 1953 under the title of The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana. Since its publication, Kirk has come to be regarded widely as one of the chief philosophers of

1. Charles Moritz, ed., "Kirk, Russell (Amos)," Current Biography Yearbook, Twenty-third Annual Cumulation (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1962), pp. 236-237.

2. Ibid., p. 237.

the conservative movement.¹ According to Ronald Lora, he is the "most important figure of contemporary Conservatism" in America.²

Besides being the founder of the quarterly Modern Age: A Conservative Review, Russell Kirk is a lecturer, educator, philosopher, and author.³ He has written such books as Beyond the Dreams of Avarice: Essays of a Social Critic,⁴ A Program for Conservatives,⁵ Enemies of the Permanent Things,⁶ and Edmund Burke: A Genius Reconsidered.⁷ He has also contributed hundreds of essays and short stories to some of the leading magazines in this country.⁸ Among his many writings, The Conservative Mind stands as a major work of contemporary conservatism. It is here that Kirk identifies the following six canons of conservative thought: (1) belief that a divine intent rules society; (2) love of variety and tradition; (3) conviction that a civilized society needs orders and classes; (4) belief that freedom and property are

1. Moritz, "Kirk, Russell (Amos)," p. 237.

2. Lora, p. 179.

3. Moritz, "Kirk, Russell (Amos)," pp. 236, 238.

4. Russell Kirk, Beyond the Dreams of Avarice; Essays of a Social Critic (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956).

5. Russell Kirk, A Program for Conservatives (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954).

6. Russell Kirk, Enemies of the Permanent Things (New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1969).

7. Russell Kirk, Edmund Burke: A Genius Reconsidered (New York: Arlington House, 1967).

8. Moritz, "Kirk, Russell (Amos)," p. 238.

inseparably connected; (5) faith in prescription; and (6) recognition of the necessity of slow, conserving, organic change. In many ways, Kirk reiterated for the fifties what Edmund Burke had said more than a century ago.¹ These canons and others soon became the ideology upon which the conservative movement was built.

Clinton Rossiter

Clinton Rossiter, III, was born in Philadelphia on September 18, 1917. He grew up in Bronxville, New York, and attended Cornell University. Aided by a Dubois Junior Fellowship and a Sanway Fellowship, Rossiter went to Princeton University for graduate work. He received his M.A. degree in 1941 and his Ph.D. in 1942. After serving in the Navy, Rossiter joined the faculty of Cornell University in 1946. Since 1959, he has occupied an endowed chair as John L. Senior Professor of American Institutions.²

Clinton Rossiter is described by D. W. Brogan in the Saturday Review (1956) as "that very rare bird in America, a true conservative."³ His books have won several literary awards. Before publication, the manuscript of his Conservatism in America: The Thankless Persuasion (1955) received the Charles Austin Board Memorial Prize. In it, Rossiter discussed the conservative tradition in England and traced

1. Lora, p. 179.

2. Charles Moritz, ed., "Rossiter, Clinton (Lawrence, 3d)," Current Biography Yearbook, Twenty-eighth Annual Cumulation (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1967), p. 352.

3. Ibid., p. 354.

American conservatism from colonial times to the present. Rejecting some concepts of traditional conservatism, he proposed a conservative theory and a conservative program.¹ Seven years later, his second edition appeared. Ronald Lora called it "the best book on the history of American conservatism."² Other works include "The Legacy of John Adams,"³ and "Towards an American Conservatism."⁴

Rossiter is identified with Edmund Burke and with such contemporary writers as Peter Viereck.⁵ He has an interest in political and economic reform,⁶ and is recognized for his "Twenty-one Points of Conservatism." In general, they take into account the need for a ruling and serving aristocracy, the potential tyranny of majority rule, the duties of man, and the primacy of community with its "divinely ordered union of lands, laws, and customs."⁷

1. Moritz, "Rossiter, Clinton (Lawrence, 3d)," pp. 352-353.

2. Lora, p. 254.

3. Clinton Rossiter, "The Legacy of John Adams," Yale Review, XLVI (June, 1957), pp. 528-550.

4. Clinton Rossiter, "Towards an American Conservatism," Yale Review, XLIV (Spring, 1955), pp. 354-372.

5. Moritz, "Rossiter, Clinton (Lawrence, 3d)," p. 354.

6. Lora, p. 178.

7. Cain, They'd Rather Be Right, p. 127.

Peter Viereck

Peter Viereck was born in 1916 in New York City. He earned his undergraduate and graduate degrees at Harvard, receiving the Guggenheim Fellowships in history and literature.¹ The recipient of many awards, he won the Bowdoin Prize Medal for best prose, the Garrison Prize Medal for best poetry,² and years later, the Pulitzer Prize for poetry.³ In 1940, he published "But--I'm a Conservative!" which appeared in the "Under Thirty" section of Atlantic Monthly.⁴ This was the first sample of his political prose to be published in a magazine of wide circulation.⁵

Since 1948, Viereck has been a professor of history and literature at Mount Holyoke College and has written a variety of articles and books on conservatism. His Conservatism Revisited (1949) is considered to be the "first book" to explicitly call for a new conservatism⁶ and is partly responsible for the post-war revival of conservatism in America.⁷

1. Lora, p. 185.

2. Maxine Block, ed., "Viereck, Peter (Robert Edwin)," Current Biography: Who's News and Why, Fourth Annual Cumulation (New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1943), p. 792.

3. Lora, p. 185.

4. Peter Viereck, "But--I'm a Conservative," Atlantic Monthly (April, 1940), pp. 538-543.

5. Block, "Viereck, Peter (Robert Edwin)," p. 792.

6. Lora, p. 185.

7. Guttman, p. 159.

His other books include Shame and Glory of the Intellectuals,¹ Conservatism: From John Adams to Churchill,² and The Unadjusted Man.³

In his works, Viereck stresses faith in reason as the "disciplining agent which reconciles freedom and order."⁴ He also believes in the reaffirmation of values, which stands as his "major contribution" to the conservative ideology.⁵ The conservative movement's attack on liberalism, in terms of ethical relativism, "owes much of its sting to Peter Viereck."⁶

Richard M. Weaver

Richard M. Weaver was born in Weaverville, North Carolina, in 1910.⁷ He grew up in Kentucky and graduated from The University of Kentucky in 1932. Later he did graduate work at Vanderbilt and Louisiana

1. Peter Viereck, Shame and Glory of the Intellectuals: Babbit Jr. vs. the Rediscovery of Values (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953).

2. Viereck, Conservatism: From John Adams to Churchill.

3. Viereck, The Unadjusted Man: A New Hero for Americans, Reflections on the Distinction Between Conforming and Conserving.

4. Lora, p. 187.

5. Ibid.

6. Rossiter, Conservatism in America: The Thankless Persuasion, p. 223.

7. Russell Kirk, "Richard Weaver, RIP," National Review (April 23, 1963), p. 308.

State Universities.¹ Until his death in 1963, Weaver was an English professor at The University of Chicago. There he taught for nearly two decades, winning the award for the ablest teacher on the college's staff.²

Dr. Weaver was a student of the relationships between language, culture, and political systems. A Platonist, he theorized that the form of a particular argument dictates its ideological content. In The Ethics of Rhetoric, he included a number of studies that illustrated the characteristic liberal and conservative selections of various lines of argument.³ In Ideas Have Consequences, Weaver argued that truth exists outside history and immediate human perception. He warned that if men ignored this higher truth and base their actions on a calculation of their immediate circumstances, they can expect only evil consequences. If they base their actions on a knowledge of the true definitions of things, they may avoid the consequences of a materialistic civilization and achieve "a superior philosophic resignation to the order of things."⁴ Published in 1948, Russell Kirk has called it one of the "first" works in the revival of conservatism and one of the "first" to find a wide and

1. Louis Rubin and Robert Jacobs, Southern Renaissance: The Literature of the Modern South (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1953), p. 441.

2. Kirk, "Richard Weaver, RIP," p. 308.

3. Weaver, The Ethics of Rhetoric.

4. Weaver, Ideas Have Consequences, p. 174.

devoted audience.¹ It is evident, therefore, that Richard Weaver was both pioneer and protagonist in the development of conservative thought.

Frank S. Meyer

Frank S. Meyer was born in 1909 and died in 1972 at the age of 63.² He was the Senior Editor of National Review and Editorial Advisor of Modern Age.³ He authored several books setting forth the conservative philosophy, such as The Conservative Mainstream,⁴ and In Defense of Freedom: A Conservative Credo.⁵ He also edited a book entitled What is Conservatism?⁶ Out of these, Peter P. Witonski identified In Defense of Freedom as "his most important."⁷ In it, Meyer presented his fusionist thesis⁸ which calls for a blending of conservatism's two intellectual

-
1. Kirk, "Richard Weaver, RIP," p. 308.
 2. Special Book Offer 74-1, ISI Pamphlet, Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Intercollegiate Institute, Inc., n.d.
 3. Meyer, What is Conservatism?, p. 242.
 4. Frank S. Meyer, The Conservative Mainstream (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1969).
 5. Frank S. Meyer, In Defense of Freedom: A Conservative Credo (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1962).
 6. Meyer, What is Conservatism?
 7. Special Book Offer 74-1.
 8. Ibid.

trends, libertarianism and traditionalism.¹ M. Stanton Evans believes that Meyer will best be remembered for his efforts to point the connection between these supposedly divided schools.²

Meyer is recognized for his principles of conservatism, which to him represent a common consensus of the American conservative movement. He asserted that conservatism assumes the existence of an objective moral order based upon ontological foundations, that the primary reference of conservative thought and action is to the individual person, that the cast of conservative thought is anti-utopian, that conservatism believes in a limitation of the power of government, and that it is opposed to state control of the economy. Therefore, it is not surprising that conservatism views government by planning as a threat to the existence of Western civilization and the United States.³ Because of the scope and influence of his work, Frank Meyer has been called the "most versatile intelligence yet to emerge from the American conservative movement."⁴

1. The traditionalist draws heavily on Burke and is concerned with the primacy of value, virtue, and order. He finds freedom by adhering to social customs and religious truths. The libertarian draws heavily on John Stuart Mill and places great reliance on individual freedom and the innate importance of the individual. He finds freedom by adhering to reason. Both are believers in conservatism, although there is a difference of opinion about whether reason or tradition should take priority. See Lora, pp. 199-200.

2. Special Book Offer 74-1.

3. Buckley, Did You Ever See a Dream Walking? American Conservative Thought in the Twentieth Century, pp. 80-83.

4. Special Book Offer 74-1.

Philosophical Consensus

General

Even this synoptical review of the founding intellectuals of the movement suggests that they had a common stock of ideas and a similar moral and philosophical view of the world. This similarity is not merely the impressionistic view of the author. It is documented. In his 1961 doctoral dissertation, Richard Dandeneau¹ isolated and compared the assumptions of most of the major post-war conservatives and their common ideological ancestor, Edmund Burke, and found a thorough-going and fundamental similarity.

Dandeneau found a consensus on a very large number of assumptions. Serving as the guiding principles for the definition of conservatism, they were grouped into the following categories: (1) nature and rights of man; (2) nature of society; (3) nature and rights of the state; (4) nature of conservatism; and (5) guiding conservative principles.

Dandeneau indicated that every ideologist must answer certain fundamental

1. For the purpose of this paper, the definition of conservatism was derived from Richard Dandeneau's dissertation, "The Rhetorical Invention of Conservatism: An Analysis of the Assumptions of Contemporary Conservative Thought." In it, he collected and classified the assumptions of conservatism from the works of Edmund Burke, Peter Viereck, Russell Kirk, Clinton Rossiter, and Barry Goldwater. He also attempted to discover which of these were commonly held among these theorists. He accomplished this by combining similar concepts, avoiding duplications, and eliminating assumptions on which no consensus could be found. See Richard J. Dandeneau, "The Rhetorical Invention of Conservatism: An Analysis of the Assumptions of Contemporary Conservative Thought" (unpublished dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1961), p. 161.

questions if he is to set forth a complete system of thought. In sequence, the ideologist must begin with a view of the nature of man. Next he must expound a view of the nature of society. Against this background, the ideologist develops a concept of the state. Once these aspects of a world view have been accepted by the audience, he then gives the basic concepts of the ideology. He finally exposes his audience to the theoretical principles they should follow to achieve the benefits of this world view.¹ It is also significant to note that as is characteristic of ideological systems, it will be impossible to discuss each category as an isolated entity. Because all the categories are parts of a related vision, many of the descriptive terms will overlap.

Nature and Rights of Man

The theorists presented a statement of the conservative position with regard to the nature and rights of man. They agreed that man is a composite of good and evil and that he is not perfectible. Man is unequal in all qualities of mind, body, and spirit, and he can never be equal in these areas. Man is a religious animal, with his moral-religious and social nature taking precedent over his economic nature. Man desires and strives for peace, stability, and order. Man receives an education for the purpose of shaping him into a civilized human being and to teach him the wisdom of his ancestors. Man has a right and a responsibility to do for himself anything that he can do without

1. Dandeneau, pp. 54, 176, 177.

trespassing on others; he has the right to the fruits of his labor, his ancestral inheritance, and his own material possessions.¹

Nature of Society

Having set forth assumptions about the nature and rights of man, the theorists identified those relative to the nature of society. Specifically, they pointed out that a good society must have the following characteristics: order, evolutionary change, balance, authority, security, and individual freedom under law. Society must have private ownership of wealth, together with orders, classes, and hierarchies of people. It must reject all forms of egalitarianism and collectivism. Society must change in an evolutionary fashion, with the new being built on the best of the old. Society must have a system of fairminded, abstract law and justice to which all men give their obedience. Society must have an educational system that is basically nonutilitarian, emphasizing the classics, literature, and the study of history.²

The Nature and Rights of the State

An important part of the fabric of the conservative ideology is its set of assumptions pertaining to the nature of the individual state, the rights of the state, and the function of government in general. Below are five assumptions on which consensus was found. Government, or the state, is subordinate to the individual and its purpose is to serve

1. Dandeneau, pp. 166-168.

2. Ibid., pp. 168-170.

his needs. A constitutional republic, with its system of checks and balances, is the only workable form of government. In the past, government has been the chief instrument for thwarting liberty; therefore, governmental power and money must be diffused and balanced. Government is entitled to money from the governed for its support, but it has a right to only an equal percentage of each man's wealth. Any form of collectivism is rejected, since it leads to crime, corruption, and decay of morality.¹

The Nature of Conservatism

The following is a survey of the fundamental nature of conservatism. Central to the concept of conservatism is its reverence for the dignity of the individual soul; individual liberty is to be preferred to equality. Most intellectuals believe that there is room in conservatism for many different varieties and degrees of religious belief, but there is no room for atheism. Religion is an absolute necessity if civilization based on individual freedom is to prevail in the world. Conservatism denies that pure human reason is capable of solving all of man's problems; for this reason, the conservative is almost always skeptical of abstract theory or pure reason. History is the conservative's special preserve. The conservative believes that he must sell the notion that the slowness and sluggishness of constitutional government, with its checks, balances, and divisions of power, contain the seeds of its staying power and its ability to protect individual freedom from the

1. Dandeneau, pp. 170-173.

concentration of power and wealth in the hands of a small group or a single ruler.¹

Guiding Conservative Principles

Dandeneau felt that the guiding principles of conservatism could be reduced to ten. To begin, there is no security for man, society, or the state when courses of action which have been prescribed by history are shaken or destroyed. The conservative must reaffirm the moral nature of society; he must remind men of their weaknesses, their propensity for sin, and their imperfections. The conservative resists the temptation to engage in abstract political theorizing and does not contemplate a utopia. The conservative asserts that all social, political, and economic action in society must be predicated on universal, rather than relative, moral principles and value systems. An aristocracy of talent and virtue is necessary to provide a country with the leadership it needs; the ability to govern comes from training and experience in government, it is not a birthright of every citizen regardless of talent, training, or experience. An aristocracy of talent and virtue can be developed only by an educational system which is nonutilitarian and is based upon the classics, history, and literature. In his everyday behavior, the conservative practices self-restraint and opposes all forms of materialism and pragmatism. The conservative believes that the right of private ownership and freedom are inseparable. The conservative believes that the unjust imposition of taxes, such as a graduated income

1. Dandeneau, pp. 173-176.

tax, causes people to feel cheated and oppressed so that they lose their incentive to be productive. The conservative believes that his mission is to save civilization from all radical programs, stemming either from the right or left.¹ Because of their universality and high level of abstraction, these principles were thought to have potential application to any concrete moral, educational, or political situation.

Audience

Academic Roots

The intellectuals found a natural constituency on the college campus. Three reasons, in particular, accounted for this. Most of the intellectuals were academicians or were associated in some way with the campus. College enrollment was increasing rapidly and a large number of these students came from conservative backgrounds. Particularly on the east coast, students proved receptive. A large number of campus organizations and publications were founded along the Atlantic seaboard. Lastly, the success in establishing a campus base gave conservatism a staging area from which to move to a national political audience.

The intellectuals were all associated with the campus in some way. Of the six, Richard Weaver,² Clinton Rossiter,³ Peter Viereck,⁴

1. Dandeneau, pp. 177-181.

2. Kirk, "Richard Weaver, RIP," p. 308.

3. Moritz, "Rossiter, Clinton (Lawrence, 3d)," p. 352.

4. Rossiter, Conservatism in America: The Thankless Persuasion, p. 222.

and Russell Kirk¹ served as members of college faculties. The others were editors and wrote regularly for the National Review.² Although William Buckley was not a professor, Jeffrey Hart remarked that he "has always been associated in one way or another with the academy."³ His first book was an examination of the Yale curriculum. For a long time Buckley wrote a column entitled "The Ivory Tower," in which he discussed academic matters. And for a decade or more, he has toured campuses making speeches and defending the conservative ideology.⁴ His academic concern extended to the National Review, which was notable for its heavy representation of professors and ex-professors. Among them were Russell Kirk⁵ and Richard Weaver.⁶ Also associated with the National Review was Frank Meyer. He too was not a professor. Called by Stanton Evans as "the most versatile intelligence yet to emerge from the American conservative movement,"⁷ he frequently spoke on college campuses. Throughout the country, he participated in lectures and seminars along with other "noted conservative scholars."⁸ It was logical that all these

1. Moritz, "Kirk, Russell (Amos)," p. 238.

2. Meyer, What is Conservatism?, pp. 241-242.

3. Hart, The American Dissent: A Decade of Modern Conservatism, p. 170.

4. Ibid.

5. Lora, Conservative Minds in America, p. 195.

6. Richard M. Weaver, "Roots of the Liberal Complacency," National Review, June 8, 1957, pp. 541-543.

7. Special Book Offer 74-1.

8. M. Stanton Evans, Revolt on the Campus (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1961), p. 67.

efforts should be aimed toward a college audience. Easy access, student enthusiasm, and personal involvement provided the ingredients for a natural constituency.

Demographics of College Audience

A large number of students came from conservative backgrounds. This was partially attributable to the growth of the middle class.¹ Since World War II, there was an impressive upward shift of families along the income scale. During the years between 1959 and 1967, the number of families earning less than \$5,000 decreased by four million, while families with incomes of above \$10,000 more than doubled. Raymond Moley noted in 1964 that ten years before, "the bulk of our voting population and the center of political power were families with incomes ranging between \$2,000 and \$5,000." But as early as 1960, the middle income group "centered between \$4,000 and \$10,000, constituting 50 percent of the nation's families."² These figures indicated a substantial increase in the number of people who might be sensitive to conservatism and accessible to its appeal.³ In a survey taken at the end of the decade of the decade of the 1950's, Stanton Evans discovered

1. In most parts of the country, the growth of the middle class also meant the growth of conservative sentiment. Generally, the middle class was distinguished by high educational levels, high incomes, good housing, and good jobs. They were property owners and were concerned about schools, roads, and law-enforcement rather than welfare programs, medicare, and the war on poverty. See M. Stanton Evans, The Future of Conservatism: From Taft to Reagan and Beyond (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968), p. 46.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 47.

that the average young conservative came from a middle class background: his family's annual income was around \$5,000, he held a job while in college, and was likely to have received some kind of financial aid. The typical conservative emerging from Evans' survey was quite faithful to the values of his parents¹ and tended to be more articulate than they in defending them.² Although the population Evans sampled may have been atypical, it is interesting to note that the young conservatives polled were not members of an economic elite or a deprived group. They were rather conventional members of the broad economic middle.

Campus Organizations

Students proved receptive, as demonstrated by the numerous campus publications and organizations that were founded. According to Russell Kirk, some of the chief journals that existed by 1964 were: Insight and Outlook (University of Wisconsin); New Individualist Review (University of Chicago); Analysis (Philadelphia colleges); The Liberator (six Louisiana universities and colleges); The Southern Conservative (Washington and Lee); Politeria (New Jersey colleges); and The Harvard

1. Stanton Evans' questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of the ISI (Intercollegiate Society of Individualists) list. The returns suggested that a student's parents influenced his beliefs considerably. Of 121 replies to the question, "Do you believe your parents have influenced your political beliefs?" 78 respondents said "yes," 43 said "no." That answer was supported by the fact that the majority of the students identified their parents as both Republicans (76 father, 78 mother) and conservatives (81). Evans concluded that the conservative beliefs of the parents were indeed transmitted to the students. See Evans, Revolt on the Campus, pp. 48-49.

2. Ibid., p. 54.

Conservative (Harvard-Radcliffe). Others included the Foundation (Columbia University), Man and State (California universities and colleges), Libertas (Villanova University), Comment and Outlook (Brown University), and The Conservative Review (New York City colleges).

There also existed national journals written chiefly by, or intended for, conservative students or recent graduates. One was The New Guard, the magazine of Young Americans for Freedom, and another was Campus Report, the bulletin of the Intercollegiate Society of Individualists.¹

In addition to publications, there was a growth of conservative organizations on most college campuses. At Yale, the conservative group was known as the Calliopean Society; at Harvard, the Athenaeum; at Princeton, the Cliosophic Party; at The University of Pennsylvania, the Eleutherian Society; at Purdue, the Society for Individual Insight; at Pitt, the Society for Conservative Studies; at Stanford, the Western Society; at Queens, the Robert A. Taft Club; and at Ohio State, the Whiggamores.² Likewise, similar organizations appeared elsewhere.³ Since they often focused on national topics, the rise of conservative clubs was instrumental in rejuvenating political thinking on college campuses.⁴

1. Russell Kirk, "The Campus Conservative Journals," National Review (June 2, 1964), p. 449.

2. Evans, Revolt on the Campus, pp. 33, 71.

3. There were conservative clubs at William and Mary, Rutgers, Minnesota, Rollins, Washington, Maryland, USC, Holy Cross, Rosary, Detroit, Iowa, Wabash, Kansas, Indiana, Miami, Wisconsin, and Michigan State. See Evans, Revolt on the Campus, pp. 32, 71.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 31.

The success on campus gave conservatism a basis from which to move to a national political audience. During the years since the middle 1950's, students had been calling themselves "Young Conservatives," reading conservative books, organizing conservative clubs, publishing conservative magazines, and sponsoring conservative speakers. Within the academic year of 1960 alone, 216 conservatively oriented clubs were founded.¹ The sheer volume of clubs, publications, and visiting speakers seemed to indicate that a dedicated core constituency had been established on campus. It was this core with additions from other groups that came to full maturity with the nomination of Goldwater.

Politicalization of the Movement

Leadership Vacuum

The post-war years produced three nationally known standard-bearers for conservatism. They were Robert Taft, Joseph McCarthy, and Barry Goldwater. Taft was a central figure in conservatism during the 1940's and early 1950's. Although McCarthy attracted attention for several years, he was discredited for his tactics. Goldwater emerged later in the decade. His increasing popularity with the founding intellectuals and the students established him as the single political spokesman.

Robert Taft, the representative of "Old Guard" conservatism, was respected by intellectuals and students alike. They particularly

1. Cain, They'd Rather be Right, p. 256.

admired his keen intelligence, skill in debate,¹ and conservative philosophy.² Although Taft labored long and hard for the Republican party, he was unable to win its nomination for the Presidency. Three times he had sought the nomination and three times he had been rejected.³ His final defeat came in 1952 when he was beaten on the first ballot by General Dwight D. Eisenhower, a newcomer to Republican politics.⁴ It was indeed a stunning setback for conservatives since they had for the past 12 years supported his candidacy. Carrying the title "Mr. Republican,"⁵ Taft's leadership was suddenly brought to an end when he died of cancer on July 31, 1953.⁶

1. Evans, The Future of Conservatism: From Taft to Reagan and Beyond, p. 257.

2. For 15 years, Taft spoke for constitution, self-government, private rights, the rule of law, security, peace, community, economic stability, and the fabric of civilization. See Russell Kirk and James McClellan, The Political Principles of Robert A. Taft (New York: Fleet Press Corporation, 1967), p. 194.

3. Ibid., p. 192.

4. Stanton Evans attributed Taft's third loss to his inability to cope with television and the image-makers. His balding head, wire-framed glasses, and midwestern twang were not the ingredients of which dreams are made. Neither were they merchandisable enough to attract a political movement. See Evans, The Future of Conservatism: From Taft to Reagan and Beyond, pp. 257-259.

5. Bernard Cosman and J. Robert Huckshorn (eds.), Republican Politics: The 1964 Campaign and Its Aftermath for the Party (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968), p. 4.

6. Kirk and McClellan, The Political Principles of Robert A. Taft, p. 192.

Joseph McCarthy attracted attention for several years, but was criticized for his methods. Capitalizing on his accusations of Communist subversion, the Wisconsin Senator gained national notoriety in the early 1950's. He quickly drew the support of a sizable minority of the general population as well as many conservatives.¹ However, it was not long before McCarthy's bareknuckled attacks produced small results and his abrasive style alienated his colleagues in the Senate.² His support continued to rise in the country generally up to the time of the Army-McCarthy hearings which led finally to his censure by the Senate on December 2, 1954.³ By the close of the hearings, McCarthy was being attacked by major religious leaders and the leadership of his own party. No longer a man to be taken seriously by right or left, he passed rapidly into obscurity and died three years later.⁴

1. Allen Matusow concluded that the traditional right wing of the midwestern Republican Party supported McCarthy's actions. In the beginning, they felt that he could return national power to the GOP, and thus provide a means by which to counter what they perceived as the major national problems: internal Communist subversion, centralized government, left-wing intellectuals, and the negative influences of a cosmopolitan society. In addition, groups ranging from Catholic Democratic workers to conservative southern senators gave McCarthy support. See Allen J. Matusow, ed., Great Lives Observed: Joseph R. McCarthy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), pp. 167-171.

2. Robert Griffith, The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate (Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970), pp. 315-316.

3. Congressional Quarterly Background, Politics in America 1945-1966: The Politics and Issues of the Postwar Years (2nd edition; Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967), p. 20.

4. Griffith, The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate, pp. 315-319.

Goldwater Emergence

With the passing of Taft and the decline of McCarthy, conservatives were left without a national leader. Despite the continued ferment on campus, the political vacuum lasted until late in the decade. It was not until the very end of the decade that Barry Goldwater began to attract any considerable support as a potential conservative standard-bearer. Gradually he became identified with the conservative philosophy¹ and by 1958, many people looked upon him as the natural successor to the late Senator Taft. Meanwhile, Goldwater was becoming the hero of thousands of young people who heard him speak on college campuses.² In the academic year of 1960 alone, he spoke to 55 college groups.³ He also was attracting the attention of an expanding group of intellectuals, including William Buckley, Jr., Russell Kirk, and Frank Meyer. They helped give currency to Goldwater's ideas by way of their lectures, articles, and books⁴ and later endorsed his bid for the Presidency in

1. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller (Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1964), p. 1576.

2. F. Clifton White and J. William Gill, Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement (New Rochelle, N.Y.: Arlington House, 1967), p. 20.

3. Evans, Revolt on the Campus, p. 106.

4. White and Gill, Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement, p. 20.

1964.¹ Representative of this endorsement was Meyer's statement that "he deserves the wholehearted and energetic support of conservatives no matter how much they may disagree with his pronouncements on this or that peripheral issue or his proposals for the practical implementation of basic principles."²

By means of his books, Goldwater gained an increasing popularity on college campuses. Among his writings were The Conscience of a Conservative (1960)³ and Why Not Victory (1962).⁴ The first was a statement of his political philosophy.⁵ It quickly became a best seller,⁶ making Goldwater one of the best-known conservatives on campus. In a 1960 survey, when asked to name individuals or publications that had been most effective in formulating their views, Stanton Evans indicated

1. Ronald Lora indicated that National Review urged a Goldwater candidacy in 1964. See Lora, Conservative Minds in America, p. 210. Likewise, Russell Kirk was a supporter of Goldwater. See Guttman, The Conservative Tradition in America, p. 167.

2. Frank S. Meyer, "Conservatism and the Goldwater Consensus," National Review (November 5, 1963), p. 386.

3. Barry Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative (Shepherdsville, Kentucky: Victor Publishing Company, Inc., 1960).

4. Barry Goldwater, Why Not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1962).

5. "Goldwater, Barry Morris," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973, Volume X, p. 549.

6. White and Gill, Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement, p. 21.

that students often pointed to Goldwater and his book.¹ By 1961, he was in constant demand as a speaker and drew crowds of unusual size at almost every college where he appeared.²

Following close on the heels of his first book, Goldwater's Why Not Victory was an exposition of his views on foreign policy.³ This publication too was popular among students and sold into the millions.⁴ In it, Goldwater warmly acknowledged the support of William Buckley, Jr., and Russell Kirk, two of the founding intellectuals of the movement.⁵

Organized political activity for Goldwater began in early 1960 and continued with gradually increasing momentum for more than four years. In April, 1960, the Midwestern Federation of College Young Republican Clubs met in a convention and adopted a motion urging Goldwater to seek the party's Vice-Presidential nomination. This was the first organizational expression of Goldwater sentiment in the national GOP.⁶ A month later, the first national Youth for Goldwater organization was

1. Evans, Revolt on the Campus, p. 54.

2. "Conservatives on the Campus," Newsweek (April 10, 1961), p. 35.

3. "Goldwater, Barry Morris," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973, Volume X, p. 549.

4. James M. Perry, "Goldwater, Barry," The Encyclopedia Americana, Volume XIII (1975), p. 38.

5. Goldwater, Why Not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy, p. 18.

6. Evans, The Future of Conservatism: From Taft to Reagan and Beyond, p. 112.

formed on May 12, 1960. In subsequent weeks, the Goldwater effort picked up numerous endorsements.¹ As they accumulated, Youth for Goldwater quickened the pace of its organizational activities. The group could announce "active Youth for Goldwater groups in 32 states and in the District of Columbia," with chapters representing 64 college and university campuses by early July.²

The 1960 Convention

During 1960 the surge on campus was matched by a surge of popularity in the country at large. By the time of the Republican National Convention in July, the Goldwater phenomenon was too large to be ignored. The Arizona Senator came to Chicago with Presidential pledges from his home state and from South Carolina. Wyoming, Mississippi, and Texas were committed to him for the Vice-Presidency. No less than four Goldwater committees were represented in Chicago, including Americans for Goldwater, Youth for Goldwater, Goldwater Coordinating Committee, and Goldwater for President. The latter paraded a mass of petitions containing 50,000 signatures, urging Goldwater for the Presidency. Everywhere there seemed to be support and a horde of Goldwater sympathizers with banners, posters, horns, and other paraphernalia.³ Philip Schaefer

1. Among the endorsements were: the Young Republicans of Cook County, Illinois, the largest Young Republican group in the nation; the Republican Party of Wyoming; the Republican Party of Arizona, of Mississippi, and South Carolina; the Young Republicans of Idaho and Wisconsin, and the College Young Republicans of the District of Columbia. See Evans, Revolt on the Campus, pp. 89-90.

2. Ibid., p. 91.

3. Ibid., pp. 92-100.

indicated that "if the pay-off was in the zeal of a man's supporters, instead of delegate votes, Senator Barry Goldwater of Arizona would be a shoo-in for the Republican Presidential nomination."¹ These supporters felt the climactic moment of the convention had arrived when Goldwater stood before the Republican National Convention and withdrew his name from nomination in favor of Richard Nixon. For the right wing of the Republican party, Goldwater seemed to fill a void. Aiming his remarks at the hard core of conservatives who had exerted a strong effort in his behalf, he said:

We are conservatives. This great Republican Party is our historic house. This is our home We have lost election after election in this country in the last several years because conservative Republicans get mad and stay home. Now I implore you. Forget it! We've had our chance, and I think the conservatives have made a splendid showing at this convention. . . . Let's grow up conservatives. Let's if we want to take this party back--and I think we can someday--let's get to work.²

This speech and the reception accorded him by the convention won for Goldwater the title of "Mr. Conservative."³

The Goldwater Campaign

Determined not to let the campus conservative momentum die, young conservatives sponsored a new organization in September, 1960. Issuing a call for a national convention, representatives from 44

1. Evans, Revolt on the Campus, p. 95.

2. Paul I. Rosenthal, "The Republican National Convention," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (December, 1964), p. 394.

3. Ernest J. Wrage, "The Little World of Barry Goldwater," Journal of the Western Speech Association, XXVII (Fall, 1963), p. 210.

colleges assembled in Sharon, Connecticut, at the family home of William Buckley, Jr. After a three-day convention, the group emerged with a new organization called Young Americans for Freedom. A major purpose of YAF was to mobilize support among American youth for conservative political candidates,¹ the most notable being Barry Goldwater. In March, 1961, YAF held a huge rally in New York's Manhattan Center. Thousands of students from Hunter College, Fordham University, Convent of the Sacred Heart, and Harvard waved aloft immense portraits of Goldwater, giving the Center the look of a convention hall.²

During 1961 and 1962, Goldwater was discussed with increasing frequency as a possible 1964 Presidential candidate.³ "He, himself, acknowledged that he might seek the Republican nomination, but discouraged as premature the development of 'draft' movements on his behalf."⁴ In December, 1962, a group of Republicans met in Chicago to create an organization that would mobilize the tremendous enthusiasm for Goldwater that was sweeping the country. This group provided the initial blueprint for the Draft Goldwater Committee.⁵ Other events also contributed to

1. Evans, Revolt on the Campus, pp. 108-110.

2. William Dunphy, "The YAF's are Coming," The Commonweal (April 14, 1961), p. 74.

3. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller, pp. 1576-1577.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 1577.

5. James M. Perry, Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate, Newsbook (Silver Spring, Md.: The National Observer, 1964), pp. 75-76.

Goldwater's nomination. In 1962, Nixon lost his bid for the California governorship and declared his retirement from political life. Nelson Rockefeller was a likely GOP choice until his 1962 divorce, followed by his remarriage in 1963. This handicap practically removed him from serious consideration.¹

In the midst of these events, the Goldwater nomination campaign began to take form. During April of 1963, the National Draft Goldwater for President Committee was established in Washington, D.C., and Goldwater backers spread throughout the nation drumming up support for their candidate. Two months later, they issued an election strategy map showing that Goldwater could beat President John F. Kennedy without the support of the three largest states. By the autumn of 1963, Goldwater supporters held key positions in the Republican National Committee and in the Senatorial and Congressional Campaign committees--exercising control over major party decisions.² Their labors finally came to fruition on July 15, 1964, when the Senator again stood before the Republican National Convention. This time he accepted the party's nomination for the Presidency.³

The Goldwater campaign was affected profoundly by the political circumstances of late 1963 and 1964. Four, in particular, played a

1. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller, p. 1577.

2. Ibid.

3. Rosenthal, "The Republican National Convention," p. 394.

major role: (1) the assassination of President John F. Kennedy; (2) Goldwater's emergence as the leading Republican contender, winning a majority of the primaries; (3) the inability of Republican moderates to halt his campaign; and (4) Goldwater's refusal at the convention to alter his viewpoints to accommodate the moderates.

In the opinion of some observers, the assassination of President John F. Kennedy helped to reduce Goldwater's chances for the nomination. For instance, the interpretation offered by Politics in America 1945-1966 hypothesized that though the man accused of the assassination was a Marxist, the event seemed to create a national sense of hatred against extremists of the right as well as those of the left. Much of this hatred may have been directed toward Goldwater, since he was often identified with radical right elements.¹ The assassination also led to the succession of Lyndon B. Johnson. As the first southern President in nearly a hundred years, Johnson was expected to carry the south; previously, Goldwater had counted on this region as an essential base of his constituency.² Clifton White and William Gill concluded that

1. Goldwater seemed to suffer from guilt by previous association with radical right elements whose support he had not renounced. He refused, for instance, to repudiate support from members of the John Birch Society. See Congressional Quarterly Background, Politics in America 1945-1966: The Politics and Issues of the Postwar Years, p. 54.

2. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller, p. 1577.

the impact of the Kennedy assassination "upon both the electorate and the Republican candidate cannot be overestimated."¹

Goldwater emerged as the leading Republican contender after winning a majority of the primaries. On January 3, 1964, the Senator formally announced that he was a candidate for the Republican nomination for President. Of the seven primaries in which he allowed his name to be entered, Goldwater won five--Indiana, Illinois, Nebraska, Texas, and California. His victory in the latter on June 2, all but eliminated Rockefeller from the convention race and virtually delivered to Goldwater the Republican nomination.²

The Republican moderates were unable to halt Goldwater's campaign. After the California primary, many of them rallied behind Governor Scranton of Pennsylvania.³ On June 12, he announced his candidacy and plunged into a national campaign. Many rank and file Republicans seemed to respond to Scranton's appeal. But any last hopes were erased on June 30 when Senate Minority Leader Dirksen joined the majority of Illinois delegates in backing Goldwater. Dirksen also agreed to place Goldwater's name in nomination before the San Francisco convention.⁴

1. White and Gill, Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement, p. 410.

2. "Goldwater, Barry Morris," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973, Volume X, p. 549.

3. Perry, "Goldwater, Barry," The Encyclopedia Americana, Volume XIII (1975), p. 38.

4. Congressional Quarterly Background, Politics in America 1945-1966: The Politics and Issues of the Postwar Years, pp. 54-55

On July 15, the Arizona Senator was nominated on the first ballot at the Republican convention in San Francisco.¹ The results of the first ballot gave Goldwater 883 votes to 241 for his closest rival, Governor Scranton. When the roll call ended, the nomination became unanimous upon Scranton's recommendation.²

In his acceptance speech, Goldwater offered little hope to his own party's moderates that he would seek to accommodate them. He said:

Any who join in all sincerity, we welcome. Those who do not care for our cause we do not expect to enter our ranks in any case. And let our Republicanism, so focused and so dedicated, not be made fuzzy and futile by unthinking and stupid labels. I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice. And let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue.³

The results of the 1964 election revealed that Goldwater suffered one of the worst defeats ever experienced by any candidate of a major political party. He received nearly 16,000,000 popular votes less than his democratic opponent. Goldwater carried six states and 52 of 538 electoral votes. Except for his home state of Arizona, all of them were in the South.⁴

1. "Goldwater, Barry Morris," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1973, Volume X, p. 549.

2. Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller, p. 1578.

3. Ibid.

4. White and Gill, Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement, p. 409.

CHAPTER 3

MYTH AND POLITICS

General

The Goldwater defeat was decisive. Precisely how and why the disaster at the polls occurred has occupied political theorists and students of communication for more than a decade. The author has no wish to add to this huge body of literature. It is beyond the scope of this study. For the author, the conservative movement and the fortunes of Barry Goldwater are not intrinsically interesting. The preceding chapter's accounts of the founders, their philosophy, and the movement they developed are important in that these elements provided the ideological framework and the political vehicle in which the great fantasies of the 1964 campaign were developed. The main purpose of the study and its principal focus of interest lie in the description of how a rather abstract and perhaps archaic political philosophy was transformed into a modern social myth. How an elite political philosophy was propagandized through crudely written, mass-circulation campaign biographies is a matter of some fascination to a rhetorician. The mythic rendering of abstract principles to foster wide public circulation is a process that has intrigued thinkers from St. Augustine to McLuhan. It may be said to lie at the heart of political rhetoric. The imaging of abstract political doctrines into public dramas, complete with protagonists and

symbols that large masses of the electorate become caught up in, is one of the central realities of our time.

Before the author can proceed to a description and analysis of rhetorical myth in the 1964 campaign biographies, this brief chapter must deal with two general preliminary questions: (1) What is the nature of myth? and (2) How does myth function in politics?

Nature of Myth

In order to understand the conservative vision of American politics, it is necessary first to define the concept of myth as it will be employed throughout this paper. Though writers on the subject have difficulty in arriving at a precise definition, they agree that myth is illusive and nebulous and that it depends for its force upon its loose structure.¹ With this difficulty in mind, it is hoped that by reviewing some of their writings, an acceptable definition may be obtained. Leo Marx, writing in The Machine in the Garden, thinks myth is difficult to define because it is an expression more of feeling than of thought. An obvious example is man's search for a more natural environment which can be seen in his devotion to camping, hunting, gardening, and in his escape to the suburbs. This ill-defined quest for nature is commonly known as the agrarian myth.² Joseph Campbell says myth is a public dream. As public dreams myths provide roles for a variety of actors.

1. Waldo W. Braden, "Myths in a Rhetorical Context," The Southern Speech Communication Journal, XL (Winter, 1975), p. 115.

2. Leo Marx, The Machine in the Garden (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), pp. 5-7.

To believe in the reality of a particular myth is to endorse a particular role and a program of action. Sometimes an imaginative public figure may use one or more popular myths to further legislation or may himself come to be seen as mythic. Fisher cites Abraham Lincoln as a man who embodied both myths of the American dream: the materialistic myth of individual success and the egalitarian moralistic myth of brotherhood.¹ Lincoln's association with these two myths illustrates the enormous power of myth for mass emotional identification. Today Lincoln is a great unifying figure, despite the fact that he presided over the most divisive conflict in the nation's history.

According to Henry Nash Smith, myth is a collective intellectual construction that incorporates concept and emotion into an image whose roots are public and historical.² Individuals may exploit myth, but they do not fashion it. Marx agrees that myth is the product of the collective imagination.³ In "The Functions of Symbols in Legend Construction . . . Some Exploratory Comments," Robert Veninga states that myth is a story which has come down from the past.⁴ Though there is a degree of historical authenticity, the power of the myth is not in its historicity,

1. Walter R. Fisher, "Reaffirmation and Subversion of the American Dream," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIX (April, 1973), pp. 160-161.

2. Henry Nash Smith, Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973), p. xi.

3. Marx, p. 4.

4. Robert Veninga, "The Functions of Symbols in Legend Construction . . . Some Exploratory Comments," Central States Speech Journal, XXII (Fall, 1971), p. 161.

but in its ability to assist people in ordering and structuring their understanding of human existence. To illustrate how myth gives people a sense of meaning, a sense of wholeness and order, Veninga cites the community myth of hope as seen in the celebration of Easter and the myth of pride as seen in the celebration of a patriotic day.¹ Walter Lippmann thinks that a distinguishing aspect of myth is that truth, fable, and fantasy are all on the same level of credibility. The myth itself does not contain any critical standard by which a reader could separate its truths from its errors.² Its truths are aesthetically and psychologically rather than logically validated. In short, these sources give reference to a common definition. They suggest that myth is a story that "draws upon memory and imagination, that it results from a collective effort over a considerable period of time, that it represents an oversimplification of events, persons, and relationships,"³ that its content is emotional and logical, and that it includes both realism and fantasy.

One of the most complete definitions is that of A. J. M. Sykes:

The term myth . . . means the expression of abstract ideas in a concrete form. . . . (It) takes the form of a story that embodies certain ideas and at the same time offers a justification of those ideas. If the myth is to be effective it must be so constructed as to appeal to the emotions and enlist sympathy

1. Veninga, "The Functions of Symbols in Legend Construction . . . Some Exploratory Comments," p. 161.

2. Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922), p. 123.

3. Braden, p. 116.

for the ideas expressed, and, at the same time, the subject-matter of the story must offer an acceptable justification of these ideas. The actual truth or falsity of the story is irrelevant; what is important is that the story and the ideas it embodies are accepted and believed to be true.¹

An effort will be made to identify major characteristics of myth and to see how, in practice, they contribute to the over-all effect. For the purposes of analysis, the concept of myth may be said to exhibit the following:

- (1) Myth is a story about a particular incident which is presented as containing or suggesting some general truth.
- (2) Myth conveys the perception of a whole, or a complete entity.
- (3) Myth is a concise way of conveying a perception.
- (5) Myth, although a generalization, is concrete and particular in its treatment.
- (6) Myth is imprecise and often presents perceptions that are both loose and fluid.
- (7) Myth is used, consciously and deliberately, to arouse emotional responses.²

At the onset, myth is a story about a particular incident which is presented as containing or suggesting some general truth. If the story is acknowledged as being generally true then it becomes a myth. If it is accepted only as a story describing a particular incident, but not of general application, then it remains an illustrative anecdote.³ Waldo Braden refers to a speech given by Henry W. Grady at the Augusta Exposition in 1887 as an example of myth:

1. A. J. M. Sykes, "Myth and Attitude Change," Human Relations, XVIII (November, 1965), p. 323.

2. A. J. M. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," The Journal of Communication, XX (March, 1970), pp. 17-20.

3. Ibid., pp. 17-18.

Had Uncle Tom's Cabin portrayed the habit rather than the exception of slavery, the return of the Confederate armies could not have stayed the horrors of arson and murder their departure would have invited. Instead of that, witness the miracle of the slave in loyalty closing the fetters about his own limbs--maintaining the families of those who fought against his freedom--and at night on the far-off battlefield searching among the carnage for his young master, that he might lift the dying head to his humble breast and with rough hands wipe the blood away, and bend his tender ear to catch the last words for the old ones at home, wrestling meanwhile in agony and love, that in vicarious sacrifice he would have laid down his life in his master's stead.¹

Into these sentences are woven a single incident concerning a slave and master. Since the story is accepted as being generally true and since it is used to convey a perception of the general situation regarding a perception of relations between slaves and masters, it is therefore a myth rather than an anecdote.

Myth conveys the perception of a whole, of a complete entity. While most people are able to perceive an entity when it is presented in the form of a myth, they are not trained to reconstruct an entity from an analytical presentation of its parts. Furthermore, an analytical presentation can proceed only by describing the parts that make up the entity, and the sum of these parts will not necessarily convey a perception of the whole. Therefore, myth is the more effective form.²

Myth is a concise way of conveying a perception. Within the form of a short story, it can convey a perception of the situation and the attitudes, beliefs, and values that structured that situation.³

1. From a speech delivered Thanksgiving Day, 1887, at the Augusta Exposition, found in The Complete Orations and Speeches of Henry W. Grady, edited by Edwin DuBois Shurter (New York: Hinds, Noble and Eldredge, 1910), pp. 65-97.

2. Ibid., p. 18.

3. Ibid.

The fables of Aesop, the charming animal tales that propagandized the values of thrift, prudence, justice, and humility, are mythic short stories. In his Cross of Gold speech, William Jennings Bryan bolstered an argument by alluding to a myth:

You come to us and tell us that the great cities are in favor of the gold standard; we reply that the great cities rest upon our broad and fertile prairies. Burn down your cities and leave our farms, and your cities will spring up again as if by magic; but destroy our farms and the grass will grow in the streets of every city in the country.¹

To convey the importance of agriculture in the national development, by means of an analytical presentation, might have proved too lengthy and too difficult for his populist constituency. Bryan chose myth because it produced a simple yet vivid image that dramatized several ideas at once.

Myth is easily and universally understood. Few people are trained to interpret an analytical presentation of an involved situation, but most can understand myths and use them as a means of conveying their perceptions of situations to others.² For instance, in the evolving myth of the West, think how readily one can recall stories dealing with John Henry, Paul Bunyan, Mike Fink, Jesse James, Belle Starr, and Davy Crockett. There are also stories dealing with other sections of the country, such as the legendary southern gentleman who possesses honor and integrity, indifference to money and business, a concern for the amenities, and a high sense of civic and social responsibility.³ Little

1. Braden, pp. 123-124.

2. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," p. 18.

3. William R. Taylor, Cavalier and Yankee (New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1961), p. 96.

need to multiply examples, since anyone who knows America will think of many others.

Myth, although a generalization, is concrete and particular. What this means is that myth can be readily understood by people who are used to thinking in terms of concrete situations and who have developed the skill of dealing with abstract ideas in a limited way. Because it deals with a particular individual or individuals in a specific situation, it thereby allows the reader an opportunity to identify with these individuals and to respond emotionally to them. In fact, if a myth is to be accepted as such, it must be presented in a way that will cause identification and will arouse an emotional response.¹ Waldo Braden indicates that a number of modern advertisers play upon identification by relating their products to myth. For instance, recently an arms manufacturer displayed an advertisement that was based upon the Western myth:

Wrap your hand around the grips and put yourself right back through history when Colt's fabled Single Acting Army became man's constant companion on the trail and by lonely campsites. You'll feel the same confidence, the same pride of possession as did these early pioneers.²

It seems evident that myth is an excellent device for establishing identification. When the writer refers to the myth, the reader develops feelings of consubstantiality or psychic unity with him. A single phrase or picture may stimulate a variety of emotional responses, dependent

1. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," p. 19.

2. Braden, pp. 118-119.

upon the reader's imagination and background. The reader is thereby transported from his present world of complexities to one that is less confusing; fantasy sometimes replaces reality. As a result, when the identification is strong, the writer gains great control over his audience which is why myth is so important to the student of persuasion.¹

Myth is imprecise and often presents perceptions that are both loose and fluid. Because of this, myth has distinct advantages. It is appropriate since many situations are fluid. They cannot be structured precisely owing to the large number of variables.² Richard Hofstadter has pointed out that 19th century Americans interpreted their daily experiences within the framework of the agrarian myth. It alone could communicate man's sentimental attachment to rural living and his series of notions about rural people and rural life. In his Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R., Hofstadter identified some of the variables that the agrarian myth tries to explain:

Its hero was the yeoman farmer, its central conception the notion that he is the ideal man and the ideal citizen. . . . Because he lived in close communion with the beneficent nature, his life was believed to have a wholesomeness and integrity impossible for the depraved populations of cities. His well-being was not merely physical, it was moral; it was not merely personal, it was the central source of civic virtue; it was not merely secular but religious, for God had made the land and called man to cultivate it.³

1. Braden, p. 121.

2. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," p. 19.

3. Richard Hofstadter, The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955), pp. 24-25.

The variables in the situation above exemplify the appropriateness of myth in communicating a perception. Impreciseness also allows for modification of situations. This can be made easily and subtly. Without modification, perceptions would soon become outdated.¹ Even today, the agrarian myth is relevant to the needs of Americans living in the cities. Just like their early ancestors, who longed for a simpler life beyond the Alleghenies, they seek solace in simpler settings in the suburbs away from overcrowding and traffic. Impreciseness permits flexibility, a vital element of myth. Consider for a moment some of the popular myths of the Old South: the white-columned mansion, the loyal slave, the flirting belle, the genteel master, and the cavalier.² Because these perceptions were loosely structured, they could be widely accepted; a flexible perception is acceptable to many, while a precisely defined one is acceptable to only a few. In brief, the looseness and fluidity of myth extends the range of material and the number of readers to whom it can communicate.³

Myth is used, consciously and deliberately, to arouse emotional responses.⁴ This is accomplished through amplification, the principal means of myth development. The writer and the political propagandist utilize analogy, repetition, maxims, commonplaces, slogans, and figurative

1. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," p. 19.

2. Braden, p. 118.

3. Sykes, "Myth in Communication," p. 20.

4. Ibid.

language. They are likely to argue in terms of more or less, or great or small. Furthermore, a single word may function as a shorthand argument.¹ Whenever a commercial product, for example, is recommended as being "new," a single word is being used to evoke the myth of progress. As can be seen, the myth user consciously applies all of the elements of language to arouse emotional responses within his readers. He does this in order to persuade them to follow a course of action which may have nothing to do with the content of the myth.

Why Politicians Utilize Myth

The use of myth in American politics is widespread. Politicians find myth useful for a variety of reasons. Because modern politics are made of complex issues, myth allows people to retreat into simplified stereotyped images of the situation. Kenneth Boulding indicates that "the human imagination can only bear a certain degree of complexity. When the complexity becomes intolerable, it retreats into symbolic images."² It may well be easier and more emotionally satisfying to assess rival politicians like Ford and Reagan on the basis of simplified media images than to make a decision based upon close comparisons of detailed policy statements. Detailed analysis may even breed a kind of detachment and objectivity among the voters that is subversive of the feeling of wholeness and mass commitment the contemporary media politician attempts to foster. On the other hand, myth is an ideal vehicle

1. Braden, pp. 125-126.

2. Kenneth E. Boulding, The Image (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1956), p. 111.

for the sort of uncritical enthusiasm and illusory involvement of the contemporary campaign.

A myth offers a ready-made structure for events, which allows the candidates themselves to redefine problems so that they do not have to be solved. An example is the use of a scapegoat or villain which the politician may blame. He does this so that attention can be deflected away from problems he cannot solve. Familiar to most is Adolph Hitler, who placed the blame for social unrest in post-World War I Germany upon the "Jew."¹ A far more positive but naive use of scapegoating is that of the politician who proclaims that with the removal of Richard Nixon from power, the problem of corruption in the Republican Party has been eliminated. Nixon himself mounted a campaign against "radical-liberals" during the 1970 Congressional election. This group was blamed for the alarming persistence of most of the problems Nixon could not solve.²

Politicians can identify and exploit dramatic (mythic) roles which the electorate has previously found attractive. Waldo Braden points out that General John B. Gordon capitalized on the use of myth with his repeated lecture on "the last days of the Confederacy." Telling stories of the Lost Cause and the Old South, he would cast favor on anyone he endorsed and disfavor on those he opposed. The very personification of the southern gentleman and confederate hero, he fascinated his

1. Dan D. Nimmo, Popular Images of Politics: A Taxonomy (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974), p. 145.

2. Andrew A. King and D. Floyd Anderson, "Nixon, Agnew, and the 'Silent Majority': A Case Study in the Rhetoric of Polarization," Western Speech, XXXV (Fall, 1971), p. 250.

listeners with accounts of bravery, self-sacrifice, chivalry, and patriotism.¹ He soon emerged as a popular idol in the south and the incarnation of the Lost Cause in the north. He became governor of Georgia and served as a member of the United States Senate.² Like so many southern politicians, he frequently turned to myth for achieving political purposes.

Firm identification with a powerful myth may eventually make a politician almost invulnerable to criticism. Once achieving the status of a man with a mission, there is generally little demand for the politician to continually engage in public justification for his actions. For instance, Hitler convinced the German populace that they were superior. In gaining their allegiance, he exploited the myth of the super-race. An American example of the shielding power of myth may be seen in the famous Chappaquiddick incident. Perceived as a martyred savior in the model of Lincoln, Senator Ted Kennedy is somewhat protected from the criticism arising from the death of Mary Jo Kopechne.

Myth allows people emotional identification with abstract political institutions. Beginning early in life, most children learn loyalty to their political community long before they are able to differentiate their country from that of others. They place trust in the President and such local figures as policemen, firemen, and doctors before truly understanding what these officials do. They tend to accept

1. Braden, p. 113.

2. C. Vann Woodward, Origins of the New South: 1877-1913, Vol. IX: A History of the South (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951), pp. 15, 17.

the political party of their parents without realizing how the party stands on basic issues. As adults, people usually hold political opinions that are founded on limited amounts of information. They respond to the personal appeal of the candidate rather than to his political qualifications. They rely more on their emotions than logic to evaluate people and policies.¹ In discussing the relationship between cognitive and emotional elements of myth, Dan Nimmo concluded that "all of that is not to say people don't respond to facts. They do. However, they are the facts as they imagine them. People perceive and interpret facts in accordance with their images and as those facts are presented through symbols."² Thus, the rather limited act of voting every two or four years can be so clothed with drama as to foster the illusory sense of participating in a great crusade in the electorate. Thus, myth is not only useful to a particular candidate during a particular election--it may also be an important means of preventing alienation through the fostering of illusory participation in the electorate.

Summary

This chapter has argued myth is a persuasive device that derives its power from placing small events in a large dramatic framework. It has further suggested that because of myth's utility for mass politics and because of its ability to bring power to its user, politicians have

1. Nimmo, p. 143.

2. Ibid., p. 142.

repeatedly employed this device. The next chapter will describe the particular myths of the 1964 campaign and their use in some of the Goldwater campaign literature.

CHAPTER 4

THE CONSERVATIVE VISION AND THE DRAMATIZATION OF CHARACTER

Mythic Elements in the 1964 Campaign

The Presidential nominees of the 1964 campaign frequently used myth to influence the electorate. Although a large number of examples could be cited, the following four are characteristic. President Johnson relied heavily upon what is commonly called the "uncle" myth. He was avuncular in the manner in which he showed courage and reassurance at the Kennedy funeral, the manner in which he continued with the programs of John F. Kennedy, and the manner in which he had articulated a soothing concern for his fellow Americans. H. F. Harding, a scholar who identified this pattern as a very effective one in American culture, indicated that the "uncle" myth was much like the "father" image that helped Eisenhower in 1952 and 1956.¹

In addition to this familial role, Johnson also cast himself in the role of the people's politician, the agent of the populist myth. He assumed this role in his acceptance speech at the Democratic National Convention, in which he said:

1. H. F. Harding, "The Democratic Nominee: Lyndon B. Johnson," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (December, 1964), p. 410.

Most Americans want medical care for older citizens, and so do I.

Most Americans want fair and stable prices and decent income for our farmers, and so do I.

Most Americans want a decent home in a decent neighborhood for all, and so do I.

Most Americans want an education for every child to the limit of his ability, and so do I.

Most Americans want a job for every man who wants to work, and so do I.

Most Americans want victory in our war against poverty, and so do I.

Most Americans want continually expanding and growing prosperity, and so do I.¹

While the voters did not admire everything about Johnson, they did respect him as a responsible, people's politician firmly rooted in the progressive tradition.

Johnson's 1964 opponent, Barry Goldwater, used other strands of the American experience. Goldwater reinforced his political message through the repeated use of the myth of the frontiersman. Personifying self-reliance and bravery, he told audiences of his frontier heritage and how his ancestors fought Indians while helping to civilize the southwest. He spoke of his own adventurous life on a more modern frontier: "As an officer in the Air Force Reserve, I often fly the immense jet bombers of the Strategic Air Command."² Goldwater also described his experiences as an explorer, sportscar driver, college football player, and outdoor photographer. He pictured himself, for

1. Lyndon B. Johnson, "The Democratic National Convention: Acceptance Speech," Vital Speeches of the Day, XXX (September, 1964), p. 709.

2. U. S. Congress, Senate, 87th Cong., 1st sess., May 9, 1961, Congressional Record, 107, 7594.

instance, as sitting in a jetplane cockpit, performing an Indian ceremonial dance, or returning from a camping trip. These and other accounts of Goldwater's life and those of his ancestors contributed to the creation of the frontiersman image.

Goldwater also cast himself as a crusader recruiting others for a great battle. In his acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, he announced that "Anyone who joins us in all sincerity, we welcome. Those, those who do not care for our cause, we don't expect to enter our ranks in any case."¹ George Dell felt that Goldwater's language cast the cause in terms of a holy war. It was a holy war against the Democratic administration, much like the religious crusades of the past.²

Political Biographies as Sources of Myth

If myth is frequently employed as a device in political speeches, it is also widely used in political campaign literature. The campaign biography is a literary form ideally suited for the propagation of political candidates through mythic presentation. There are several reasons for this. Campaign biography is popular; it reaches vast numbers of the electorate. Biographies can be presumed both to reflect and inspire attitudes in their readers. They may be seen as an indication of the popular mood. They provide a more in-depth picture of the candidate

1. Barry Goldwater, "The Republican National Convention: Acceptance Speech," Vital Speeches of the Day, XXX (August, 1964), p. 644.

2. George W. Dell, "The Republican Nominee: Barry M. Goldwater," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, L (December, 1964), pp. 401-402.

than other media. For instance, John Hammerback indicated that voters more often learned the details of Goldwater's life and political philosophy by reading biographies of him than through exposure to other sources.¹

Biography encourages readers to identify with attractively presented models of political behavior. It shares with advertising the faculty of fostering modeling behavior. Abstract political ideas can be dramatized within the story of a character or characters in whose destiny the reader becomes caught up. Just as in the theatre, ideas come through character portrayal more often than in an explicit form. It is more powerful to show Goldwater flying GI's home for Christmas in his private plane than to argue in the abstract that Republicans often behave generously.

In general, biography is a literary form with a particular emphasis on struggle. Political biography is a literary genre that portrays an unfinished struggle. The purpose of a political biography is to generate a tension in the reader to participate in an ongoing struggle and see it to its conclusion (i.e., by working or voting for the candidate).

The Biographies

Although numerous biographies and anti-biographies are available, six have been selected. They are: (1) The Conscience of a

1. John C. Hammerback, "Barry Goldwater's Rhetoric of Rugged Individualism," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVIII (April, 1972), p. 181.

Conservative by Barry Goldwater; (2) The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater by Rob Wood and Dean Smith; (3) Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater by Jack Bell; (4) Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan by Stephen Shadegg; (5) Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate by James M. Perry; and (6) Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan by Edwin McDowell. The major criterion for selection is that they offer complete dramas (myths) of the conservative vision. They also have a common origin, focus, time, and definition. That is, books originating in favor of conservatism and Goldwater were written by conservatives. In addition, Goldwater is the focus or central character in each book. Further, all books were published within the time span of 1960-1964. And they satisfy the definition of a book as specified in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. Others written by or on Barry Goldwater, that do not meet these criteria, will provide supplementary information in Chapter 6.

Brief Synopsis of Biographies

This section will provide a synopsis of the campaign biographies. Only the most recurring topics used to develop the Goldwater image are included. In general, all of the biographies depict Goldwater's political philosophy in action and trace the development of his ideas. Most cover a variety of issues, one being almost exclusively concerned with his stand on foreign policy. All but one make a strong case for Goldwater as a serious contender for the Presidential nomination in 1964; here, that one biography is his own and the Senator makes no direct reference to the matter. Most of the

biographies deal extensively with his family, his frontier heritage, and his career as a businessman. They also trace the stages of Goldwater's association with the military, his political career, and his accession to conservative leadership. One includes a large amount of information on the primaries, particularly his relationship with Rockefeller, Lodge, and Scranton. Most contain indices of his statements, addresses, and speeches. Two devote attention to Goldwater's experiences with Hoffa and Reuther, including his views toward labor. One biography allocates two chapters to his association with Eisenhower and Kennedy, while the rest simply mention it. Altogether the biographies portray the image of a rugged westerner who helped build a successful business, entered politics because of a public spirited concern, and gradually developed into a vigorous folk hero of a significant number of politically concerned Americans. The general features of the image are plainly visible in each one of the biographies and details that cannot be reconciled across the biographies are exceedingly few.

The Problem of the Biographies

While the new conservatives were acutely self-conscious about being graceful and literate, the 1964 campaign biographies tended to be journalistic, even crudely sensational. Like Buckley, Kirk, and Rossiter, the authors of the biographies used their books to defend free enterprise, private property, God, and patriotism. Unlike Buckley, Kirk, and Rossiter, the biographers had to deal with the actual power base of conservatism in America, the business and banking communities. While the new conservatives had never squared Edmund Burke's philosophy with

the business ethic of corporate capitalism, the biographers could not neglect this link without ignoring the technological and scientific atmosphere in which the modern electorate lives. An analysis of the conservative vision of the biographies will demonstrate its aesthetic attractiveness, but will also document its tension and incoherence. However, that is the business of Chapter 6. The rest of this chapter will simply report the personification and concretion of ideology within the campaign biographies of Barry Goldwater.

The Hero of the Vision

The basic figure of western myth has been the questing hero. The hero serves as the personification of our highest values. He is the bearer of a new idea, the champion of a people, the agent of a great movement. War-like people have military heroes, religious people dream of spiritual heroes, and democratic peoples often seek political heroes. The hero of the six major campaign biographies was Senator Goldwater, a man bidding for the leadership of the mightiest nation on earth. On the surface his ambition is high, his position exalted, and his mission is significant. A close examination of the biographies, however, reveals a hero with two faces. His heroic qualities are an uneasy mixture of the elitism of the aristocratic minded new conservatives and the crude bumptious regular guy so dear to the business-oriented Republican electorate. These contrasting faces of the hero occur in all the biographies.

The Hero as Elite Savior

The biographies are filled with descriptions of Goldwater that use the imagery of the high priest or savior. A typical description is the one by Shadegg: "Goldwater, who stands so tall before his fellow man, kneels before his God asking for the wisdom and the strength to serve in this painful pilgrimage to achieve God's intention. . . ." ¹ Similarly, McDowell says that Goldwater "breathed new life" into conservatism's "moribund body." ² In the biographies there are also selected quotations of Goldwater's colleagues that reinforce the annointed savior image. Governor Fannin referred to Goldwater's emergence as divinely appointed by saying, "there is a destiny in the affairs of men and of nations. There are moments in history when power is given to a man to do what is right for his fellowmen, when Divine Providence intervenes, that God's plans for his creation may be carried out." ³ The descriptions of Goldwater suggest that he is far more than just another politician. He is described as having "his eyes on the future of the nation" ⁴ and as wearing "the mantle which had slipped from the shoulders of the dying Senator Robert A. Taft seven years before." ⁵ Rather than the usual

1. Stephen Shadegg, Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan (New York: Fleet Publishing Corporation, 1962), p. 288.

2. Edwin McDowell, Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan (Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964), p. 5.

3. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 268.

4. Ibid., p. 269.

5. Rob Wood and Dean Smith, The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater (New York: Avon Book Division, 1961), p. 7.

career of law school and ward politics, Goldwater was mystically called to his station. "Kit Carson and Geronimo spoke to Goldwater out of the past."¹ The Senator is never described as having anything so mundane as a program. He has a "cause" or a "crusade."² Those who aid him are more than partisans, they are "recruits for his cause."³ His platform consists of "the old truths of the constitution" burnished into "shiny tools for his crusade" and of the "fundamentals he preached."⁴

Information about Goldwater's past fits into the grand pattern. From his ancestors, the Senator became the "inheritor of a great legacy of unshakeable faith in God and country."⁵ Filled with courage and a belief in individual freedom, Goldwater set forth on a "course of service in support of those beliefs which created this Republic."⁶ His mission to lead the free world is of such significance that it must be undertaken "even if this means world holocaust."⁷ Like a religious leader he is adored by a vast multitude: "Millions of plain Americans express gratitude for the life of this man."⁸ Elsewhere we are told that

1. Jack Bell, Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962), p. 45.

2. Ibid., p. 83.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. xv.

6. Ibid.

7. J. Bell, p. 62.

8. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 21.

"few have been so worshipped or so hated."¹ Despite the fact that most of Goldwater's rhetoric consisted of tired cliches, the biographers' practice seems to have been to select those remarks which reinforce the Senator's hero-savior image. In his 1964 acceptance speech, Goldwater declared that "Our Republican cause is to free our people and light the way for liberty throughout the world."² He warned his audience that "The tide has been running against freedom. Our people have followed false prophets. . . . We must and we shall set the tides running again in the cause of freedom."³ The Arizona statesman even felt that somehow "Providence" has bestowed upon the American people "the task of leading the free world's fight to stay free."⁴ The quotes from Goldwater's public speeches suggest a deep attachment to the gunpowder gospel, the doctrine of Beveridge and Teddy Roosevelt.

If Goldwater's speech is in the pompous style of the king-warrior-priest-savior, his physical attractiveness and vitality are shown to be nearly supernatural. Wood and Smith describe Goldwater as a "rugged physical specimen" who maintains a "man-killing schedule."⁵ When he is completely exhausted, "a 15-minute nap and a shave have him looking fresh again."⁶ Words like "Spectacular, unusual, bold, daring" suggest

1. Wood and Smith, p. 11.

2. James M. Perry, Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate (Silver Spring, Md.: The National Observer, 1964), p. 144.

3. Ibid., p. 140.

4. Ibid., p. 53.

5. Wood and Smith, p. 127.

6. Ibid.

that Goldwater stands above his fellow man.¹ Projecting "immense energy,"² and fierce vitality with his "desert-burned face and flashing white teeth,"³ Goldwater radiates a type of mystical presence.

Perhaps the most constant pattern of imagery is that of Goldwater as warrior. Throughout the biographies he is a man of action with an attraction to mayhem on a colossal scale. Not content to be a spectator, Goldwater must "become a participant regardless of the effort or personal sacrifice involved."⁴ It is in his "nature to fight," in spite of the "odds."⁵ But Goldwater does more than fight, he challenges "any opponent to a war to the multimillionth death."⁶ By means of "cold steel"⁷ and "unfaltering fight,"⁸ Goldwater earned his "shoulder bars as the captain of conservatives."⁹ Only individuals with "guts to die for freedom" have an invited place alongside of him.¹⁰

-
1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 157.
 2. Wood and Smith, p. 17.
 3. J. Bell, p. 199.
 4. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 180.
 5. J. Bell, p. 21.
 6. Ibid., p. 16.
 7. Ibid., p. 241.
 8. Ibid., p. 90.
 9. Ibid., p. 12.
 10. Ibid., p. 241.

The Hero as "Regular Guy"

The other face of the hero is less grand. It is the face of the All-American regular guy. If Goldwater is portrayed as the puritan warrior, he is also shown to be a flashily attractive, hard-driving salesman who speaks in the cliches of Elbert Hubbard and J. Walter Thompson. A bumptious booster of America's greatness, he exudes energy and appetite. If the heroic puritan face of Goldwater symbolizes the spiritual side of conservatism, the vulgar backslapping salesman celebrates its materialistic component.

Readers are told that Goldwater's constituency has "affectionately" called him "Barry" from the very beginning of his senatorial career.¹ In Wood and Smith's book he is referred to as "the salesman of conservatism" who merchandises the conservative doctrine like a businessman "pushing his wares."² Readers are assured that even in college Goldwater displayed business acumen. Spearheading the student drive to raise funds for a new football stadium, the young Goldwater showed the ability to "coax acorns from a starving squirrel."³

Even the lavish praise of his integrity, the stock-and-trade of every campaign biography since Washington, is couched in regular guy terms. Goldwater is described as a man who "puts all his cards on top of the table" and is consistently "blunt and unequivocal."⁴ He

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 22.

2. Wood and Smith, p. 18.

3. Ibid., p. 47.

4. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 213.

characteristically produces "straight-forward messages."¹ He fights by the "code"² and has a reputation for blunt honesty.³ It is difficult to imagine the honesty of the aristocratic Washington or Thomas Jefferson described in this way. Like "Dick," "Ike," and "Jerry," Barry is a thoroughly modern democratic politician. In challenging the Russians he may be an austere puritan warrior, but before the National Association of Manufacturers, Goldwater is the great commoner. He is a "man's man"⁴ after all, the ego-ideal of the American businessman. He is the man who built a fortune and two successful careers while "flying airplanes, exploring canyons, photographing Indians"⁵ and educating himself by private study of Edmund Burke and John Locke.⁶

The biographies avow that Goldwater is like any other American guy. In Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the author describes the Senator as a "fellow" who enjoys wearing a "sloppy shirt, baggy pants," and having a "camera or monkey wrench" in his hand.⁷ He is described

-
1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 213.
 2. J. Bell, p. 63.
 3. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 43.
 4. J. Bell, p. 63.
 5. Wood and Smith, p. 16.
 6. McDowell, p. 66.
 7. J. Bell, p.49.

as a "gadget man of the thirty-third degree," and a man who likes to "fish, shoot, and hunt."¹ No different from anyone else, he is the "kind of fellow who sings as loud as you do after the bourbon begins to flow and who will lend you fifty bucks when you have lost your wad at the crap table."² Goldwater is even a clothes tosser. Readers are assured that "like a great many husbands, the Senator doesn't like to hang up his pants."³ Examples of the regular guy image can also be found in the business setting. McDowell cites Mrs. Sugar Burlingham, a Goldwater employee for almost 40 years, as saying: "He was always one of us; you'd never know he was the boss's son."⁴

Goldwater's attractiveness and energy are expressed in crude movie star images. His attractiveness is flashy and vulgar. We are told that in college, Goldwater was a "social lion" and that "coeds clustered around him like pigeons at feeding time."⁵ Three decades later on the political scene, he "ignites sparks" as few others have been able to do, and that he exudes "virility and dynamism."⁶ For example, Bell in Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater says that "the tanned, handsome, smiling senator burst upon his T.V. audience" in his 1958 campaign for

-
1. J. Bell, pp. 49-51.
 2. Ibid., p. 63.
 3. Ibid., p. 48.
 4. McDowell, p. 58.
 5. Wood and Smith, p. 47.
 6. J. Bell, p. 62.

re-election to the Senate.¹ Readers are also reminded in The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater that his appearance on the 1960 convention scene had the "same effect on many delegates as does a thunderstorm on a herd of maverick cattle."² Examples of his attractiveness and energy abound. In Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan, Goldwater is pictured at the 1963 Chavez Ravine rally as "the trim, silver-haired, jet-age Senator from America's true frontierland."³ He is also pictured in Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater as projecting a "man's man figure with his curly, gray hair, desert-burned face, and flashing white teeth."⁴ Throughout the biographies, readers are constantly reminded that Goldwater has "political sex appeal"⁵ and that he "melts the ladies."⁶ For instance, in 1961 when he spoke before the annual Republican Women's Conference in Washington, "the program went to pot for more than thirty minutes after his talk while excited members swarmed about him."⁷ Regardless of size, shape, or age, women want to "kiss him, touch him, or at least shake his hand."⁸ Bell, in particular, points out that Goldwater's florid masculinity was an important gift. He wrote that the

1. J. Bell, p. 132.

2. Wood and Smith, p. 9.

3. McDowell, p. 4.

4. J. Bell, p. 199.

5. Ibid., p. 61.

6. Ibid., p. 204.

7. Ibid.

8. Ibid.

ability to be a "'man's man and to give the women an emotional, if vicarious, quiver is a political asset."¹ In short, Wood and Smith in The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater acclaim that "no figure on the political scene in decades has had so much appeal for women."²

Goldwater is pictured as a man of raw energy and great appetite. In The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the author affirms that the Senator is "blessed with the energy of a perpetual motion machine" and that he "tackles all challenges with one primary aim--to conquer."³ Readers are reminded that as a boy, Goldwater exhibited signs of raw energy. In Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate, Harry Rosenzweig is quoted as saying: Mr. Goldwater was a "normal, average, red-blooded American boy, full of the devil and the outdoors."⁴ For instance, he would occasionally emerge on a Sunday morning with a 10-gauge shotgun mounted on wheels, and then "yank the trigger" during the middle of the Central Methodist Church service.⁵ Even in middle age, Perry maintains that Goldwater has a cannon and that he "touches it off" every New Year's Eve.⁶ Many of the human interest accounts of Goldwater's career seem to confirm the statement

1. J. Bell, p. 63.

2. Wood and Smith, p. 12.

3. Ibid., p. 56.

4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 23.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

that "There is in this man a lot of the boy."¹ Even the wartime demands of the Army Air Corps were never able to "submerge" Goldwater's energy.² In Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the Senator is pictured as a "young fellow on the loose, looking for adventure."³ For instance, sitting in the cockpit of his P-47, Captain Goldwater "gambled his life" on the navigation instruments in his efforts to ferry the pursuit planes across the Atlantic.⁴ And if he could not find adventure, Goldwater was "ready at times to settle for a bit of hell-raising."⁵ Bell relates a typical incident in Calcutta where Goldwater decided that "things were just too quiet."⁶ "Bursting out of a bar," he and Major Crosswell engaged in a "ricksha race down the main stem."⁷

Not only does Goldwater seek adventure and excitement, but he apparently is sought out by "trouble."⁸ In the 1930's, the reader is told that the Senator was watching a professional wrestling match in Phoenix Madison Square Garden. Suddenly, an irate fan threw a stool off target that "smashed into Goldwater's forehead and sent a stream of

-
1. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 23.
 2. J. Bell, p. 54.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 56.
 5. J. Bell, p. 54.
 6. Ibid.
 7. Ibid.
 8. Wood and Smith, p. 61.

blood flowing down his face."¹ Even today, "Something is always happening at Goldwater appearances."² Either a "waiter drops a tray of dishes, the lights go out, or the loudspeaker fails."³ The flamboyant Goldwater is portrayed as getting a "bang out of interruptions."⁴

Goldwater's raw energy and great appetite for excitement are expressed in a variety of activities. In the biographies Goldwater is depicted as "restless" and as "uncontented with his businessman's role."⁵ He is depicted as a man of "action"⁶ and as a man with an "adventurous streak"⁷ in him. In his efforts to release some of this energy, Goldwater throws himself into a great variety of activities. For instance, he is pictured as a "Colorado River explorer, photographer, jet pilot, radio ham."⁸ He is also pictured climbing into his specially-designed 1955 Thunderbird, in which he is shown consulting the "aircraft instruments installed on the panel" and tooling "down the street with the sounds of the airport tower and the voices of the pilots drowning out the traffic noises."⁹

-
1. Wood and Smith, pp. 61-62.
 2. J. Bell, p. 200.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Ibid., p. 52.
 6. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 48.
 7. J. Bell, p. 33.
 8. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 48.
 9. J. Bell, p. 48.

The reckless masculinity and simple-minded vulgarity of these images are reminiscent of Theodore Roosevelt. Goldwater emerges as a man enamored of action. In the world of men, he has a relentless need to prove himself--however cautious he may be in the world of fiscal and governmental policy.

The Enemy

The Barry Goldwater of the campaign biographies is a man who deals with issues on the level of melodrama. Problems are not presented in terms of their legal or technical complexities, but as manifestations of evil. Evil is made concrete. It is personalized. For instance, free enterprise is threatened by Walter Reuther and Nikita Khrushchev rather than by changes in markets, technology, or production. The reader is hardly made aware that Goldwater ever engages in analysis of issues. The Arizona Senator already knows all the answers and the answers are simple and yield to bold action.

The enemies in the biographies are of two types. Foremost is an external enemy called International Communism. It is the great enemy and the chief antagonist. In The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, we are told that one of his often repeated slogans is "Victory over Communism is the dominant, proximate goal of American foreign policy."¹ In Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the Senator is portrayed as a man whose life is dedicated to crushing the Communist

1. Wood and Smith, p. 103.

menace. The author cites Goldwater with approval as saying: "I believe our Republic of 50 United States must win a smashing victory against the forces of communism and that this necessity transcends all other considerations."¹ There is no sacrifice too great for Goldwater. He is willing to "die for freedom" in a "life-and-death struggle with Communist imperialism."²

The other antagonist is a lesser enemy, the internal enemy, represented by organized labor and paternalistic government. Organized labor and paternalistic government appear as two aspects of the same power that threatens individual liberty. A large amount of criticism is directed against these two antagonists. The books remind readers that as early as 1955, Goldwater was delivering speeches denouncing "Big Government" and "Big Labor."³ In an unheralded speech before the Republican National Committee School, he established himself as the "implacable foe" of big labor.⁴ Wood and Smith in The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater salute the speech as the "first probing tracer bullet in the massive barrage he was to aim at the leaders of organized labor in the years to come."⁵ In the biographies Goldwater does not work to reform his enemies--he must destroy them. He consistently maintains that "The enemy of freedom is unrestrained power,

1. J. Bell, p. 17.

2. Ibid., p. 241.

3. Wood and Smith, p. 96.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

and the champions of freedom will fight against the concentration of power wherever they find it."¹ Thus, Goldwater is more than defender of the existing order who merely objects to the way in which certain people are running it; he is actually a radical foe of basic institutions. An attempt to explain this seeming discrepancy will be made in Chapter 6.

Throughout the biographies, Communism is cast in an image familiar to American audiences who had grown up watching gangster movies and reading cheap detective stories. This was the image of the criminal. Communism (and to a lesser extent organized labor and big government) is a kind of gangland mob. For instance, readers are told in Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan that the leaders of Communism are "Red bosses"² and that there are "Communist-led mobs"³ operating throughout the world. In his 1964 acceptance speech, Goldwater announces that Americans must not "cringe before the bullying of communism"⁴ and indeed must "brand communism as the principle disturber of peace in the world today."⁵ Even in his own book, The Conscience of a Conservative, Goldwater maintains that the "Communist movement" is an "outlaw in the community of civilized nations."⁶ It is in his fear

1. McDowell, p. 140.

2. Ibid., p. 245.

3. Ibid., p. 244.

4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 140.

5. Ibid., p. 142.

6. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 120.

of criminal conspiracy among the people that the Senator comes closest to classic conservatives like Edmund Burke, Alexander Hamilton, and Fisher Ames; they, like Goldwater, feared the uprising of the organized mob.

The biographies emphasize Communism as exhibiting the basic characteristic of the criminal--being outside; alien. Like the criminal operating outside society, Communism is powerfully evil and clandestine in its operations. In Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan, Goldwater is cited from a 1964 article in Life magazine in which he maintains that "Communism" has always been "freedom's archenemy."¹ He also says in The Conscience of a Conservative that we are "in clear and imminent danger of being overwhelmed by alien forces."² Refusing to fight fairly, Communists battle only in out-of-the-way places, in "backwoods guerilla skirmishes" and in "clandestine meetings of undercover conspirators."³

Communism is described in the same disease imagery, which American politicians traditionally favor when denouncing crime. Communism is a "malignant growth"⁴ and a "menace."⁵ Wood and Smith cite Goldwater as saying that the "plague of Communism"⁶ is knocking at our door.

1. McDowell, p. 246.

2. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 67.

3. J. Bell, p. 248.

4. Wood and Smith, p. 103.

5. Ibid., p. 102.

6. Ibid., p. 161.

Just 90 miles south of the continental United States is Castro. His dictatorship is a "Communist cancer"¹ that attempts to "subvert and sabotage the governments" of this hemisphere.² Other references to Communism as a disease can be found in his 1964 acceptance speech, where Goldwater states: Communism is made up of "suffering" and it boasts that it will "bury us."³ Readers are also reminded in Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan that the Senator is disillusioned over the U.N. and its failure to reduce the amount of "suffering" that exists "under Communist tyranny."⁴ And in The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, there is mention of Goldwater's criticism that the United States is "failing in its effort to wipe out the malignant growth of world communism."⁵

Communism is powerfully evil. In all the biographies, images of Communist power are nearly always coupled with images of evil. For instance, Goldwater states that Communism is an "evil" that "threatens the world."⁶ Throughout the biographies, Goldwater describes Communism as an active force, a violent juggernaut. "Since 1945, more than one billion people have fallen victim to Communist conquest and live now

-
1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 280.
 2. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 158.
 3. Ibid., p. 142.
 4. McDowell, p. 236.
 5. Wood and Smith, p. 103.
 6. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 278.

in submission behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains."¹ Not content with these conquests, Communism has turned its attention to America. The Senator is shown harranging the 1960 platform committee about the great danger from an ideology determined to "destroy our ideals and our ideas."² Bell quotes from A Conservative's Creed, a position paper that is the fullest statement of the American-right-wing's conspiracy theory of history. Here and elsewhere, Goldwater tells us that the 20th century expression of the worldwide "Communist conspiracy"³ comes in the form of "Communist aggression"⁴ that is "wholly dedicated to our annihilation."⁵ Particularly in his book, Why Not Victory? the Senator is constantly exhorting his countrymen that "We are at war. Not a cold war but a real war."⁶ He believes in nothing less than total dedication since this war is of a "more deadly nature than we have fought before."⁷ In Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan, readers are informed that the Senator over the past few years has had a kind of Lincoln-Douglas debate with J. William Fulbright, an advocate of pro-Communist relations. Goldwater is reputed to have said that "Victory" is only

1. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 151.

2. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 279.

3. J. Bell, p. 311.

4. Ibid., p. 247.

5. McDowell, p. 224.

6. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 54.

7. Ibid.

possible if "America makes use of her entire economic, political, military, and psychological warfare powers."¹

Obsessed with the evils of Communism, Goldwater finds many platforms from which to attack it. He is portrayed denouncing Communism in such mighty settings as on the floor of the Senate² and at the Republican National Convention.³ He is also depicted denouncing Communism in certain influential scenes with the national press and top military leaders. For instance, Perry in Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate describes the Senator making a statement to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington, D.C., on April 18, 1964. In this statement, Goldwater sets forth one of his many hard-line positions against Communism by asserting that "The supplies of the Communist invaders [in Vietnam] have got to be shut off."⁴ Similarly, Wood and Smith in The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater direct our attention to an address delivered at Maxwell Air Force Base on November 14, 1960. Here again taking a hard-line position, the Senator vehemently exclaims: "We should . . . make it clear in the most explicit terms that Communist governments are not tolerated in this hemisphere--and that the Castro regime, being such a government, will be eliminated."⁵

1. McDowell, p. 226.

2. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 154.

3. Ibid., p. 140.

4. Ibid., p. 157.

5. Wood and Smith, p. 158.

Communism is portrayed as an enemy with a face. Communism is personalized. If its ideology is shadowy and abstract, its consequences are cruel and concrete. Two faces constantly haunt Goldwater, Fidel Castro and Nikita Khrushchev. In Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan, the Senator is shown denouncing the "imperialistic, rocket-rattling politics of Khrushchev."¹ In Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan, he refers to Khrushchev's associates as his "murderous clique."² He also indicates that these elite leaders are holding "Communist-enslaved peoples" in the "immense concentration camp of the Soviet Empire," and that it should not be recognized as the "legitimate ruler of the Russian people or of any other people."³ In Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate, Goldwater remarks to the U.S. Senate that the American people must remember that every day of their lives, the "time bomb of Communist treachery ticks closer to detonation."⁴ Because of this treachery, he argues, America can no longer acquiesce to the "gruff, freedom-killing demands"⁵ of the world.⁶ The Soviet "dictators" are "vigorously prosecuting a war against the people of the free world by economic, military and political

-
1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 278,
 2. McDowell, p. 245.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 156.
 5. J. Bell, p. 254.
 6. McDowell, p. 227.

and psychological means."¹ Equally abhorrent Goldwater writes in his book, Why Not Victory?, is a "Communist-oriented and Communist-directed upstart like Castro."² Castro's triumph is an "ugly phenomenon" which is "shaking its fist throughout every nation of Central and South America."³ In fact, Goldwater believes that the Cuban's triumph "can well be the [Communist's] key to encirclement of the United States and the cutting off of the Latin American countries from us."⁴

Communism is clandestine. It operates out of sight like gangsters in rundown hideaways of the old Hollywood movies. As opposed to the open free spirit of American democracy, it gains its power by subversion and secrecy. Bell reminds us that less than one week after the 1960 Democratic Convention, Goldwater attacked the nation's ideological softness with a major article in Human Events. In Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the Senator argued that the American people can "never again temporize with the communist conspiracy." And that includes "Communist rioters right here in this country as well as subversion abroad."⁵ The biographies make clear that Goldwater waxed most eloquent about Russian guile during question and answer periods. In crowd

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, pp. 295-296.

2. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 54.

3. J. Bell, p. 248.

4. Ibid., p. 254.

5. Ibid., p. 17.

situations, Goldwater's stock-in-trade lay in accusing the Russians of political subversion in their dealings with the free-world nations. Like a tribune of the people, Goldwater thundered: "The Russians have broken all but two of some fifty-odd agreements negotiated between the Communist bloc and the free-world nations since the end of World War I."¹ He warned in an article on foreign policy in the January 17, 1964 issue of Life magazine that "negotiations are simply an instrument of political warfare" and "Summit meetings are equally dangerous."² Goldwater also escalated his attacks in the United States Senate. In The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the Senator is shown lecturing the Senate about "another weapon in Communist political warfare" the exchange program.³ The image of Goldwater, a man set apart from others by his recognition of hidden Communism, is heightened by the events of the biographies. Again and again, in lonely grandeur we see him attack a cherished program or institution as Communist directed or subverted. Typical is the then seemingly outrageous attack against the United Nations. Standing before the Senate on the afternoon of March 15, 1960, he denounced the latter as "manned by hundreds of Communists agents who are frequently in a position to sabotage those few UN policies that are contrary to Communist interests."⁴ In these

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 279.

2. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 55.

3. Wood and Smith, p. 104.

4. Ibid.

lonely contexts, the authors make clear the contrast between clandestine groups and the lone warrior who stands outside institutions.

An internal enemy is organized labor. No organization man, Goldwater is pictured as a lone tribune for the true worker. Organized labor is scored for being power hungry and corrupt. Its high priest is Walter Reuther, who sums up the essential characteristics of big labor in his character. It is asserted in The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater that the Senator considers this man to be his "arch-foe."¹ In speech after speech Goldwater lambasts Reuther. For instance, he thundered that the United Auto Workers President is "the most dangerous man in America,"² and a "greater menace than the Communist threat."³ At a dinner in Detroit in 1957, Goldwater went so far as to sound the alarm that "Mr. Reuther and his union" are "a more dangerous menace than the Sputniks or anything else Russia might do."⁴ The Senator's condemnations of Reuther were also heard in the Senate. In The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the reader is told of the gripping debate on a proposal to ban compulsory union membership as a prerequisite for employment. At a climactic moment in the debate, Goldwater challenged the opposition with the query: "In the name of freedom, does Reuther have to wreck a company to satisfy his lust for power?"⁵ Like

1. Wood and Smith, p. 98.

2. Ibid.

3. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 205.

4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 66.

5. Wood and Smith, p. 98.

a crusading politician of an old movie, Goldwater took a dramatic vow to continue "fighting the racketeers and gangsters and the power-mad bosses who virtually hold the power of life and death over individuals in the labor movement."¹

Besides being power hungry, the biographies portray labor as corrupt. For instance, readers are reminded by Goldwater in The Conscience of a Conservative that labor is full of "graft and corruption."² They are told in Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan that "tyranny" abounds everywhere, which is demonstrated by the thousands of letters that had been sent to the McClellan Committee. Goldwater's campaign manager recounts the sins of "union bosses who looted union treasuries, arbitrary imposition of union dues, favoritism on job assignments, rigged strike elections."³ Corruption is described as so horrible that "Working men begged for the right to criticize union affairs without risking death at the hands of hoodlums on the payrolls of union bosses."⁴ Not content to remain in the industrial area, corruption has moved into politics. Goldwater is cited as saying before a Republican National Committee campaign school that "the use of violence and coercion by union leaders . . . has now been transferred from the area of industrial disputes and brought boldly into political matters."⁵

-
1. J. Bell, p. 131.
 2. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 45.
 3. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 25.
 4. Ibid.
 5. J. Bell, p. 129.

Before a Republican National Committee campaign school, Goldwater announced that C.I.O. goon squads "carrying pistols and clubs" had taken over Wayne County district conventions on September 19, 1950.¹

During the 1958 campaign Goldwater thundered: "The issue in this campaign is not whether Barry Goldwater is a Republican or a Democrat. It is whether a United States Senator must be completely subservient to labor bosses and, because of political fear, accede to their every demand."² In Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the Senator strongly remarks to Dave Beck of the Teamsters' union that labor's entry into politics represents more than corruption, it is a "pattern of political conquest."³

Throughout the biographies, big government is described as corrupt. It is sneaky and often resorts to blackmail and bribery. It is reckless and predisposed to political folly. Perry's images of Goldwater as the voice of an outraged mass of ordinary Americans are perhaps the most striking. He shows the tall, broad-shouldered man commanding his delegates at the 1964 convention. Setting himself against the hosts of bureaucracy, Goldwater charged "corruption in our highest offices"⁴ as the crowd roared its approval. "Absolute power does corrupt. And those who seek it must be suspect and must be opposed,"⁵ says Goldwater

1. J. Bell, p. 129.

2. McDowell, p. 133.

3. J. Bell, p. 131.

4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 141.

5. Ibid.

waxing eloquent. Using a Roman motif, the Senator states: "Rather than moral leadership," Americans "have been given bread and circuses, spectacle, and even scandal."¹ Readers are supplied with many examples and specimens of Goldwater's attitude toward big government's power hunger are numerous. In Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate, Perry quotes Goldwater as saying at the 1964 Republican Convention: "Those who seek absolute power . . . are simply demanding the right to enforce their version of heaven on earth. They are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyrannies."² Also in his own book, the Senator warns that "Big Government" and its "piling sands of absolutism" is fast destroying our individual freedom.³ Out of statements like these, a fundamental question arises. In an interview with Goldwater just a few days before his nomination, Perry cites him as asking: do the American people "want a centralized government that can eventually wind up only in a dictatorship, or do they want the continuation of the separation of powers with the President making an actual effort to get the states to take those powers back that we have taken from them?"⁴ Perry leaves no doubt as to which alternative Goldwater supports.

Big government is cast as power-hungry. It resorts to compulsion and invariably produces the most hellish tyrannies. It attempts to play dictator or what some might refer to as God. For instance, Shadegg

1. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 141.

2. Ibid.

3. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 25.

4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 133.

in Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan shows Goldwater in 1952 speaking to an audience composed almost entirely of members of the Democratic party in Douglas, Arizona. Here the Senator raises the following question: What is the avowed objective of all the planners of the super-state?"¹ In his response, Goldwater argues that "They cry out against all the abuses of the past and they say--give us the power over your lives and we will correct these abuses by compulsion."² Nor has Goldwater come to this attitude late. As early as 1957 before a Republican group in Arizona, the Senator launched his attack by warning that "The enemy of freedom is compulsion"³ and the "compulsion of big government expresses its influence on the lives of every individual."⁴ Readers are reminded that there are a number of ways in which the power of big government can be measured. One is the scope of its activities. In The Conscience of a Conservative, a study conducted by the Chicago Tribune showed that the federal government is now the "biggest land owner, property manager, renter, mover and hauler, medical clinician, lender, insurer, mortgage broker, employer, debtor, taxpayer and spender in all history."⁵ Another is the extent of big government interference in the daily lives of individuals. Goldwater adamantly contends that "The

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 190.

2. Ibid.

3. Ibid., p. 236.

4. Ibid., p. 237.

5. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 20.

farmer is told how much wheat he can grow."¹ He also maintains that "The wage earner is at the mercy of national union leaders whose great power is a direct consequence of federal labor legislation."² Even "The businessman is hampered by a maze of government regulations."³ Writing in The Conscience of a Conservative, Goldwater strongly argues that the American people have often been "swindled."⁴ For example, all too often "we have elevated men and political parties to power that promised to restore limited government and then proceeded, after their election, to expand the activities of government."⁵ Americans therefore "have taken the bait, preferring to put off to another day the recapture of freedom and the restoration of our constitutional system."⁶ A typical example of the corruption image is the federal grants-in-aid program. Goldwater upholds that these "grants are, in effect, a mixture of blackmail and bribery. The States are told to go along with the program 'or else'."⁷ Readers are constantly reminded that big government is reckless. In a speech delivered on April 8, 1957, before the Senate, Goldwater is quoted by Wood and Smith as saying: "Big Government . . .

1. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 20.

2. Ibid., pp. 20-21.

3. Ibid., p. 21.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid., p. 26.

always has been and always will be reckless with public funds."¹ Likewise, in a speech before the 1960 Republican Convention, the Senator is cited by Shadegg as saying: "Now we need Republicans in the Congress to protect this nation against the reckless spenders."² These and other actions of big government are described as political foolishness. In The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, the Senator is pictured speaking before The American National Cattlemen's Association in 1960. Here Goldwater maintains that "we have compelled the taxpayer to pay the bill for political folly."³

Throughout the biographies, big government is characterized as authoritarian. It is all-powerful and often creates a dependent society. It is merciless and frequently produces a sea of victims. For instance, readers are reminded in Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan that in 1963 the Senator's denunciations of big government produced the liveliest Republican rally in southern California political history. Standing before an applauding and lustily cheering crowd of 42,317 in Chavez Ravine and peering out into the blaze of lights from television cameras, Goldwater barked that Americans want "Not promises, but performances. Not handouts, but jobs. Not government that takes and takes, but a government that works and works--with the people, not over the people. We consent to be governed in this great nation. We do not

-
1. Wood and Smith, p. 142.
 2. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 258.
 3. Wood and Smith, p. 145.

elect to be ruled."¹ According to McDowell, the crowd signalled its approval by interrupting Goldwater with applause 48 times.² To counter lingering criticism that Goldwater was originally a liberal Eisenhower Republican who had come to his anti-authoritarian government position only recently, the biographers supply a number of earlier examples of Goldwater attacking paternalism before diverse audiences. In The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater, readers are shown Goldwater drawing a powerful response from The American National Cattlemen's Association in Dallas, Texas, in 1960. Arguing that "Big government" is the major catalyst for creating a "soft and weak people,"³ Goldwater refused to pull any punches. McDowell suggests that Goldwater's surprisingly warm reception at the 1960 Republican Convention in Chicago was evidence of the growing groundswell of anti-big government sentiment among the grass-roots. Here, before the Republican Platform Committee, Goldwater boldly contended: "We believe any society which proposes to relieve its citizens of all responsibility--and thus condemn them to a state of perpetual childhood--is acting contrary to the best purposes for mankind."⁴ McDowell reports that reaction to Goldwater's anti-government ethos was unmistakable eight days later when his name is placed in nomination for the Presidency. For the next 11 minutes the convention hall became a bedlam of Goldwater banners, of earsplitting

1. McDowell, p. 3.

2. Ibid., p. 4.

3. Wood and Smith, p. 147.

4. McDowell, p. 25.

shouts, and of electrifying cheers for the Arizonan.¹ Shadegg argues that as far back as 1957 Goldwater had emerged as a foe of big government. For example, in a speech before a Republican group in Arizona, the Senator condemned "These self-appointed architects of our future would create a spoon-fed society--a society of neither height nor depth, but only breath."² Shadegg narrates that prior to 1958 Goldwater had received a steady stream of invitations to express his ideas to conservative groups in America. This stream suddenly became a "deluge" in 1959, and no longer emanated strictly from organizations and sponsors classified as conservative.³ The climax of this citizens' revolt against authoritarian government came with its champion's full commitment to it. The biographers picture it as the moment Goldwater announced his decision to seek the Republican Presidential nomination at his home outside Phoenix on January 3, 1964. Promising "a real dog fight"⁴ as he stood unflinchingly with his right foot in a cast, Goldwater courageously professed that "I believe we must make a choice in this land and not continue drifting endlessly down and down toward a time when all of us, our lives, our property, our hopes, and even our prayers will become just cogs in a vast government machine."⁵ Nowhere does Goldwater provide a reasoned critique of governmental power. The questions he raises are purely

1. McDowell, p. 22.

2. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 236.

3. Ibid., p. 234.

4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 94.

5. Ibid., p. 95.

rhetorical. "How did it happen? How did our national government grow from a servant with sharply limited powers into a master with virtually unlimited power?"¹ A typically emotional and highly generalized question is the one Goldwater asked at the 1960 Republican Convention: "Shall mankind be condemned to exist as dependent servants of an all-powerful central government?"² Apparently his followers were not in the mood for intellectual analysis, for as Shadegg recounts, the delegates seized their banners and paraded up and down the aisles in a demonstration of great enthusiasm. This lasted for a full eight minutes, which is clear testimony to his popularity.³ Furthermore, at the conclusion of Goldwater's speech, as television cameras darted around the room to settle on each candidate in turn, the delegates cheered wildly, voicing "their unlimited endorsement of that concept of government outlined" by the Senator from Arizona.⁴

Summary and Discussion

In this chapter, character was considered apart from scene, plot, and purpose, as if it were truly separate. Actually character and plot are like the ends of a seesaw, they are parts of the same substance, and there can be no movement in one without movement in the other.

-
1. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 21.
 2. Shadegg, Barry Plan, p. 257.
 3. Ibid., p. 255.
 4. Ibid., p. 260.

An author may present his characters either directly or indirectly. In direct presentation he tells us without any beating around the bush what a character is like, or he has someone else in the story make direct appraisals of the character. In indirect presentation the author shows us the character in action and we must draw inferences about what the character is like from what he thinks or says or does. Despite the biographers' strong prose, there is very little real political action in the Goldwater biographies. The reader is shown Goldwater striking attitudes and making pronouncements, but the Senator almost never is shown carrying out policy or performing politically meaningful action. Goldwater's enemies also are flat rather than round characters. The Senator's enemies are said to be diabolical, but the authors never get down to giving out the emotionally convincing details.

It is an old axiom of fiction, that characters must act, if there is to be a story. Goldwater, and his enemies do not often act and the biographies sometimes approach the condition of an essay. Only in the area of Goldwater's personal life is the reader shown a round character--a character that is actually dramatized rather than merely being described. The full implications of the heavy reliance on the direct presentation of character, and the use of flat (stereotyped) rather than rounded complex characters will be discussed in Chapter 6.

Scene, a clearly related dramatic element, will be discussed next. Scene is the arena in which characters operate. Its impact on character is powerful. A changing scene often produces dynamic or dramatic change in the characters of a story. Long an important element

in literary criticism, it has received increasing attention in modern rhetorical analysis through the works of Kenneth Burke and Lloyd Bitzer.

CHAPTER 5

SCENE, THEME, AND SCENARIO IN THE GOLDWATER BIOGRAPHIES

General

The other elements of dramatic form are scene, theme, and scenario. Perhaps the most important element of these is scene.

Scene

Most successful stories are characterized by compression. The writer's aim is to say as much as possible as briefly as possible. The writer achieves compression by exercising selectivity. He chooses the background elements and symbolic details that will most powerfully contribute to a unified impression. He omits those details whose usefulness is minimal. As far as possible a writer chooses details that are multi-valued. That is to say, he chooses details that serve more than one purpose. A scenic detail that pushes the plot forward, expresses a powerful idea, and helps illuminate an important character is more useful than a scenic detail that only performs one of these functions. The road, highway 66, in John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath, is a multi-purpose scenic detail. Highway 66 provides the basic structure for the novel since most of the events of the story happen along its length; it functions as a symbol of an American frontier that has come to an end. The obstacles the highway presents provoke a variety of reactions in

the characters thus illuminating them as complex human beings. The road brings out fear and hate in some, love and cooperation in others.

This section will discuss the two main scenic resources used by the biographers. These resources are called background and symbol. The background of a biography is the series of visual settings in which the successive scenes are played. At the very least, the background sets the mood of a scene; occasionally a background may become so oppressive that it becomes the main element--more dominant than any of the characters. Symbol is something that has significance beyond its immediate appearance. It is a scenic element--an object, a person, a stock situation--that has a literal meaning in the story, but suggests or represents other meanings as well. Very simple illustrations may be found in name symbolism. In the popular three volume novel, The Forsyte Saga, John Galsworthy chose the family name "Forsyte" as the family name of his principal character to illustrate their foresightedness. In the Scarlet Letter, by Nathaniel Hawthorne, the A is the outward sign of Hester's sin. In James Fennimore Cooper's Pioneers, the setting sun is used to symbolize the death of the hero, the end of the pioneering era, and the passing of a way of life.

Backgrounds

The biographers' view of society is reflected in the scenic backgrounds of the biographies. Modern American society as seen through the eyes of the biographers is a place of power, glamor, and danger. These qualities are rhetorically useful. They heighten the reader's

sense of the significance of Goldwater's election and they create a feeling of crisis and insecurity. The argument runs that desperate situations can only be solved by powerful and unusually glamorous people. The descriptions of Goldwater's native Arizona capture the special glamor of the American west.

The Arizona scene is described as a land of danger, excitement, and adventure. Readers are told of how Goldwater and his "adventurers sidestepped menace after menace" as they were "Rolling down the wild river through the Grand Canyon."¹ Over and over again, "They winked at danger . . . in the Unkar Rapids and the dreaded Hance Rapids."² The Canyon itself "cuts a swathe across northern Arizona, 200 miles long, 10 miles wide and a mile deep. Within its depths rise towering mesas, unexplored canyons and a veil of the unknown."³ Goldwater writes that "There must be many places here still unexplored by man, such as that cool, quiet place high up in a side canyon of Nankoweap, where Bob [Gilbreath] and I sat in peace and saw the bridge for the first time."⁴

Arizona is shown to be a land of beauty and contrasts, where a man can walk in the constant presence of God. It is "a state whose rugged beauty and sharp contrasts, whose desert and majestic Grand Canyon, have enthralled visitor and native alike."⁵ Goldwater himself

1. Wood and Smith, p. 57.

2. Ibid., p. 56.

3. Ibid., p. 57.

4. McDowell, p. 86.

5. Ibid.

says that "It is a land of never-ending wonder and beauty."¹ "More of us should seek the hallowed, untainted grandeur which God has tucked away beyond the sunswept highways of our beautiful State."² Readers are told that many years after Goldwater's childhood days were over, he wrote the following passage to his son:

Yes, Barry, I miss the days and the nights in the deserts, forests, and canyons. What I told you once about learning more from nature than from school still holds. There is more strength and decency in one pine tree than there is in many people. There is cleanliness and good in the wind and the rain. There is in nature the constant presence of God. It's one reason I walk in the hills, for there one walks with Him and to Him one can impart one's troubles.³

The Arizona scene is used to lend an air of prophetic drama to the Senator's saga:

Much of Arizona is a sizzling furnace in summertime. The normal temperature in the central valleys ranges between 105 and 115. Each afternoon summer cumulus build their white towers over the mountains, provocatively suggesting the promise of rain, shaking the sky with thunder and stabbing at the earth below with swords of lightning.⁴

This description might have been written by Plutarch describing the dramatic birth-lands of great heroes. This sort of landscape is a favorite of biographers. The "promise of rain" and the swords of lightning⁵ lend an air of dramatic expectancy and the promise of sweeping change.

1. McDowell, p. 86.

2. Ibid.

3. Wood and Smith, p. 40.

4. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 133.

5. Ibid.

The national scene, on the other hand, is described in gloomy terms. The reader is told that in America people live under a "leviathan, a vast national authority out of touch with the people" and "out of their control."¹ America has become a place where "The farmer is told how much wheat he can grow."² It is a place where "The wage earner is at the mercy of national union leaders"³ and where the businessman is at the mercy of "a maze of government regulations."⁴

It is a country full of danger. There are the enemies of freedom who range "from liberal-minded college professors, who long to build heaven-on-earth for man, to tough-minded, power-seeking labor union bosses"⁵ to those who run the Super State.⁶ Merely to survive one must battle "the Communist-inclined sympathizers and Communist-inclined policy-makers and their companion wishful thinkers."⁷

There is an air of national crisis throughout the biographies. It is strongly suggested that the 1960 Republican National Convention was rigged and that the American people were hoodwinked out of decent government. The chairman of the South Carolina delegation is quoted as saying:

-
1. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 20.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.
 4. Ibid., p. 21.
 5. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 277.
 6. Ibid., p. 187.
 7. Ibid.

The delegates might just as well have sent their votes to Chicago by carrier pigeon, for all the good it did us to be there. The nomination was greased, the acceptance of the platform was oiled, the delegates came--not to deliberate, but to acquiesce. . . . The stockyards was an appropriate setting--we were the prize cattle.¹

National politics and national politicians' are generally seen as corrupt and conspiratorial. The scenes of national politics contrast strongly to the innocent, open simplicity of the Goldwater campaigns:

Three hundred folding chairs were set up on a concrete apron in front of the main steps on the Gurley Street side. The area was lighted with a few bare bulbs. At the top of the steps there was an improvised podium. The crowd gathered early; there were not nearly enough chairs to go around. Lean-faced cow-boys stood comfortably on the grass.²

Goldwater's fundamental doctrine stands in strong contrast to the usual political scene when a numerous group of "ambitious politicians" arise who "appear determined to separate and divide the American people--to set the young against the aged, to pit the farmer against the consumer, to array the union member against the non-union member."³

The world is constantly shown to be a dangerous and very much flawed place. The description of the background of Goldwater's formative years finds little to praise and much to condemn in the environment:

In this period, bright young men dedicated their energies to nonsense. It was fashionable to be skeptical. Old established values were no longer cherished. The ugly realities of the greed and hate of the old world had cast their shadow on the life of the new continent. Young America chose the scoffer's seat. . . . In this period, Barry Goldwater's failure to

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 265.

2. Ibid., p. 149.

3. Ibid., pp. 293-294.

complete successfully the required courses in his freshman year in high school was something to laugh and joke about.¹

Goldwater succinctly sums up the gloomy situation by saying the following:

In the past thirty bitter years the operations of the federal government have increased with geometrical proportions until today the compulsion of big government expresses its influence on the lives of every individual, until today the federal tax claims, before we receive it, more than thirty percent of all our labor.

Compulsion in big labor extorts a tribute from every working man, and devotes the fruits of his muscles and brain to the service of causes and programs which are offensive to the very individual who is compelled to support them with money.

The hands of big business are stained with past offenses--the employment of compulsion to create unconscionable advantage in trade and commerce.²

The reader is made to feel that evil is everywhere and so overwhelming that it has gotten beyond the control of the average citizen. No ordinary politician will suffice in these desperate times. The extremity of the evil calls for desperate and unusual measures--the election of a powerful leader who will not be afraid to undertake sweeping and unpopular changes.

Power is usually described in a negative way except when it is ascribed as a force possessed by Senator Goldwater. Descriptions of Washington, D.C., are only positive when they show Barry Goldwater at home in the very seat of power. The following lengthy passage shows Goldwater surrounded by power and very much at ease in it:

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, pp. 93-94.

2. Ibid., pp. 236-237.

Barry Goldwater eased his rangy frame gently into the presidential rocking chair and contemplated the momentary serenity of the President's office. As he well knew, it was a serenity that descended only when the President was not there, drumming his fingers on the desk, flicking at his sleeve, or upending a pencil to signify irritation with the slow progress of the conversation in which he was engaged.

Goldwater had received on this shining day of April 21, 1961 a call that "the President wants to see you." He had arrived at the appointed hour of 3:20 in the afternoon, when the sun was casting the shortened shadow of the Washington Monument to the northeast. Ushered into the presidential sanctum, Goldwater had found it temporarily deserted. As he walked about and looked out of the rounded windows to the south, he could see the Ellipse around the Washington Monument filled with early spring's amateur baseball enthusiasts.¹

Walking into the office with a thin cigar in his mouth and "Seeing his erstwhile Senate colleague and political critic ensconced in his favorite chair," Kennedy smiled and said: "Hey, you look fine there. How would you like to have this damned job of mine?"²

But the normal condition in America is one in which power is arrayed against the citizen. It is most often seen as an attribute of organized political conspiracy. The scene at the 1960 Republican National Convention is described as explosive, filled with deceit and back-room shady deals. A closed circuit camera shot of the crowd readily reveals this:

The bomb which burst on Republican Chicago was the first wire service story reporting Nixon's unscheduled visit to Rockefeller in New York. Many delegates, who until that moment had displayed some semblance of enthusiasm, exploded in anger. The undercover contest between the social welfare proposals

1. J. Bell, p. 174.

2. Ibid., p. 175.

of Nelson Rockefeller and basic Republican conservatism was exposed. The corpse everyone had pretended was buried came to life.¹

The political scene is full of corruption. During the 1958 senatorial race in Arizona, Goldwater became the victim of an outrageous smear campaign. Wood and Smith report a particularly vivid example:

A Phoenix couple returned to their car parked in a northwest shopping center. In the front seat was a leaflet. "Another one of those campaign things," the man said.

A businessman in Yuma left his office en route to a luncheon engagement. Stuffed under the windshield wiper was a copy of the same leaflet.

After he had settled down in the front seat, the Phoenix husband picked up the campaign literature and gave it a quick glance. He read it again and flipped it over to his wife. They called the Phoenix newspapers to report the discovery.

The leaflet featured a cartoon of Joseph Stalin, giving a knowing wink and suggesting, "Why Not Vote for Goldwater?"

Republican state headquarters wasted no time in demanding a complete investigation of the matter. The Democrats at once denied any connection with the leaflets. Thousands of Arizona voters were enraged that anyone should suggest even a remote connection between Stalin and the dedicated conservative Barry Goldwater.

For a week preceding the election, the controversial leaflet occupied most of the newspaper space and television time.

Eventually, thousands of the cartoons were found dumped in the desert near the community of Avondale.

The Republicans accused out-of-state labor leaders for the smear cartoon. Some of the Democrats blamed the GOP for printing and distributing the literature in an effort to salvage a losing cause.²

A particularly vicious smear campaign was instigated years later by Governor Rockefeller in the 1964 California primary. Readers are told that in those last few days before the voters went to the polls,

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, pp. 252-253.

2. Wood and Smith, pp. 120-121.

. . . every Republican household in California received a campaign brochure from the Rockefeller organization. On its cover were the words: "Whom do you want in the room with the H-bomb button?" Inside it asked: "This Man?" showing a photograph of Mr. Rockefeller, or "This Man?" with a photograph of Mr. Goldwater.¹

The brochure immediately touched off a series of phone calls to the Rockefeller headquarters, in which there were "bomb threats" and even a threat "to assassinate the governor."² Readers are also reminded that the brochure "carried photographs of Governors Scranton and Romney and former Vice President Nixon, and the text implied that all these men supported moderate Republicanism and therefore were opposed to Mr. Goldwater."³

However, Goldwater is shown to have a magic about him. He is untouched by smears, by deals, or by consideration of popularity. Nor is he intimidated by the scheming titular head of the Republicans, Richard Nixon.

Barry Goldwater, refreshingly naive at this point, pushed open the glass-paneled mahogany doors to the Vice President's sanctum and walked boldly in. Behind the broad, double-size flat-top mahogany desk sat the Vice President, a scowl on his dark-visaged face. He was reading in the light of the sparkling, ornate Czechoslovakian chandelier that hung resplendently from the ceiling. The heavy, rectangular clock that stood beside the door of the office's private washroom tick-tocked the only break in the silence.

To the Vice President's left, as he sat momentarily immobile, busts of Lafayette S. Foster and Henry Wilson looked coldly and impersonally down from niches in the wall on a scene that was to add a footnote to history.

-
1. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 102.
 2. Ibid.
 3. Ibid.

The bust of Wilson, a Vice President under U. S. Grant, had a historical reason for its placement on the wall. The unlucky fellow had died in this very room on November 22, 1875. But nobody knows just why Foster continues to stare down rather beligerently on succeeding Vice Presidents.¹

Danger and corruption in domestic politics is matched by the danger and corruption of our foreign policy. Standing boldly before his senate colleagues, Goldwater launched an aggressive attack against the inadequacies of our foreign policy.²

Involvement in the United Nations may be leading to an unconstitutional surrender of American sovereignty. The UN is, in part, a Communist organization. The Communists have at least one seat in the Security Council and a sizeable membership in the General Assembly. The UN's working staff is manned by hundreds of Communist agents who are frequently in a position to sabotage those few UN policies which are contrary to Communist interests. Withdrawal from the UN is probably not the answer, but the U.S. should make sure that the nature of our commitment will advance American interests.³

A more complete description of the United Nations is provided by Goldwater in his own book, The Conscience of a Conservative. Here again, he earnestly proclaims:

Unlike America, the Communists do not respect the UN and do not permit their policies to be affected by it. If the "opinion of mankind," as reflected by a UN resolution, goes against them, they--in effect--tell mankind to go fly a kite. Not so with us; we would rather be approved than succeed, and so are likely to adjust our own views to conform with a United Nations majority. This is not the way to win the Cold War. I repeat: Communism will not be beaten by a policy that is the common denominator of the foreign policies of 80-odd nations, some of which are our enemies, nearly all of which are less determined than we to save the world from Communist domination

. . . .

-
1. J. Bell, pp. 71-72.
 2. Smith and Wood, p. 103.
 3. Ibid., p. 104.

I am troubled by several other aspects of our UN commitment. First--and here again our Cold War interests are damaged--the United Nations provides a unique forum for Communist propaganda. We too, of course, can voice our views at the UN; but the Communists' special advantage is that their lies and misrepresentations are elevated to the level of serious international debate. By recognizing the right of Communist regimes to participate in the UN as equals, and by officially acknowledging them as "peace-loving," we grant Communist propaganda a presumption of reasonableness and plausibility it otherwise would not have.¹

Abroad the United States faces increasing encirclement. Crisis follows crisis and the danger increases every hour.

Failures cement the wall of shame in Berlin. Failures blot the sands of shame at the Bay of Pigs. Failures mark the slow death of freedom in Laos. Failures infest the jungles of Vietnam. Failures haunt the houses of our once great alliances, and undermine the greatest bulwark ever erected by free nations: The NATO community.²

Every aspect of the world of Barry Goldwater is a dangerous one. Danger is abroad; it lurks at home, and even the most ordinary scenes are full of danger. For instance, readers are provided a thrilling vicarious experience when told of how Goldwater risked his life flying across Arizona's hazardous skies during the 1950 gubernatorial campaign. The following is typical:

During the summer months prior to that September primary date, the red, white and blue Bonanza 767-Bravo, with Barry at the controls, carried the two campaigners into every corner of the state. They dodged summer thunderstorms, flew on instruments in bad weather, touched down on metropolitan runways, and slipped into high altitude and hastily-dragged dirt strips of the more remote sections.³

-
1. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 113.
 2. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 140.
 3. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 140.

Throughout the biographies, the reader is given a sense of the risks that must be taken. The very man who is to deliver the nation from its enemies seems to have escaped death by the merest accident. Readers are often reminded of how Goldwater "ferried airplanes to the fighting fronts" back in 1942 and 1943. Here, he bravely participated "in the first flight of P-47 fighters to Europe, and later flew planes and supplies to the new B-29 bases in India."¹ On one of his six-day cargo hauls, Goldwater danced with death:

Goldwater brought the plane in for a landing at Imphal, not far from Burma, in a blinding rainstorm. It was raining so hard the ground crew refused to come out to unload the ship.

"I didn't like sitting on the ground there, the Japs were too close around for comfort," Goldwater said, "so I told the boys to open the hatches and dump the stuff out on the ramp. I'll never forget the sound as those thirteen kegs of gold clunked on the deck. We just left them there and got out as fast as we could."²

The hero has been spared the dangers of war, business, aviation, and power politics in order to save his country from the evils that beset it.

Symbol

The ability to recognize and identify symbols requires perception and tact. A symbol is a shorthand. It is a handy way of giving details, persons, or actions a meaning beyond their literal significance. In the biographies the huge majority of details are wholly literal.

The student of political literature must exercise extreme care. The story itself must furnish a clue that a particular detail is to be taken symbolically. Usually, symbols are singled out for attention and

1. Wood and Smith, p. 71.

2. J. Bell, pp. 55-56.

referred to again and again in a piece of fiction. Symbols nearly always force themselves upon our attention by emphasis, special position, or repetition.

Political literature at first glance seems to swarm with symbols. Air Force One is always described in stereotyped images of power and authority. The gadgetry in Goldwater's home is astonishingly complex and magical. Goldwater himself is a powerful, rugged man. These obvious symbols are almost on a level with biographical fact. To say that Goldwater is shown as a representative of a class of fighting senators is to say no more than that the biographies employ stereotypes. Every story suggests a generalization about life; it is more than the recounting of things that happen to specific individuals. From a literary standpoint, there is little insight gained in calling Goldwater's home gadgets a symbol of advanced technology, or Goldwater a symbol of a fighting senator. Goldwater is a fighting senator and the gadgets are complex. However, politics is a matter of using general stereotypes in particular contexts. The biographies employ the most obvious and unmistakable symbols.

The major symbol in most political biographies, and these are no exception, is the people. In the Goldwater biographies the people are of two sorts. They appear as good people in the spontaneous gathering of supporters or as individuals in small town crowds. These are the purposeful, elite crowds who stand in strong contrast to the shapeless masses, the "victims" who are in "bondage" to large institutions.¹ The good people are the "one hundred of the communities most

1. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, pp. 70-71.

influential citizens" who waited so long to hear Goldwater in the city hall of a little Arizona town.¹ Or the visit to a single constituent that kept those one hundred people waiting for hours:

Two-thirds of the way into town Barry, who was driving, suddenly turned off on a side street and parked in front of a very modest bungalow. He recognized the disapproval on my face and tried to counter it: "I know we're late, but they will wait a few minutes longer. This will take only a minute. Come on in." He bounded up the steps, knocked on the door, pushed it open, entered and began addressing the unseen occupant in warm and friendly terms.

A voice responded from the rear of the house. In a few minutes a pale, slender, middle-aged woman in a dressing gown appeared in the hallway.

Barry embraced her. He sat down in the living room with the detached deliberation of a man who had nothing else on the schedule for that day. Barry commenced with inquiries about the woman's health, her children, their activity and their whereabouts. Together they recalled a hundred memories of childhood. They relived exploration of Indian ruins and student dances. When we finally left at the end of more than thirty minutes, my temper was at the breaking point. For this we had kept a hundred people waiting; for this we had risked alienating a solid segment of support we desperately needed.

There was a boulevard stop a quarter of a block away, and when we reached it and the car was halted, Barry turned to me and said, "I know we're late, Steve, but I had to do this. She is dying of cancer, and I could not be in this town without stopping, without letting her know that I hadn't forgotten. There aren't many left who care what happens to her, and I want her to know I care."²

Goldwater's constituents are perceived as unique individuals.

Goldwater's supporters are often carefully described and are said to be spontaneous in their support. Goldwater has been made a candidate by

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 239.

2. Ibid.

the support of "unofficial"¹ committees, of Aubrey Barker, a "political idealist," of people like Kent Courtney and his wife Phoebe, "publishers of the Independent American" in New Orleans.² Thus, when the 1960 convention was lifted from its initial individualized, atomized, and disorganized state by the Nixon-Rockefeller agreement, Goldwater characteristically denounced the process as an "American Munich."³ Throughout the biographies the individual and the mob wear many guises, but they are always in tension one with the other. The individual is that "dignified, industrious, self-reliant spiritual being" who after his seduction by "The Welfare State" becomes mass-man, "a dependent animal creature."⁴

Theme

The theme of a piece of fiction is its controlling idea or its major insight. It is the most important generalization about life stated or implied by the story. The hallmark of a theme is unity; it pulls a story together. To discover the theme of any book, it is first necessary to ask what its central purpose is.

Not all stories have a theme. The purpose of a cheap sex novel may be merely to excite the reader, of a mystery thriller to scare the reader, of a sophmoric adventure story to let the reader participate

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 249.

2. Ibid., p. 250.

3. Ibid., p. 253.

4. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 73.

vicariously in a series of rather silly escapades. According to conventional neo-Aristotelian theory, theme exists only when an author has made a serious attempt to imitate life accurately and to reveal some truth about it, or when an author has deliberately introduced some theory of life into a story and uses it as the unifying element that his story is meant to illustrate. Thus theme exists in interpretative fiction; it is the purpose of the story.

A powerful story may provide readers with a good many deep insights into the meaning of life, the relation of man to the universe, or the worth of a particular creed for living. In any story, at all complex, a one-sentence summation of the central insight may be pitifully inadequate. The theme of Macbeth may be expressed as "Ambition without restraint is evil." The theme of Oedipus Rex may be "No man should try to rival God in knowing everything." These subject-predicate summations do not do justice to the complexity and greatness of these two works. It must be remembered that it is not the purpose of a story simply to illustrate a theme. The theme is for the story and not the story for the theme. In the crude polemical biographies with which this thesis deals, however, the problem of identifying and exploring the workings of theme is much reduced. The political themes of these works are crudely expressed and crudely illustrated.

The most common themes of the biographies can be stated as propositions:

1. Man is not totally perfectable.
2. Government power must be decentralized.

3. Total war is justified in defending liberty.
4. All political action should be rooted in experience.
5. Opportunities for individual material reward are necessary for a progressive society.

Man is not totally perfectable: Goldwater rails against those who "attract your sympathy and support by voicing their devotion to the improvement of man's lot in this imperfect world."¹ The world is not perfect and it is no use pretending that it can be made so. Man is innately flawed:

If all men were law-abiding, society would require no police force. If all men were committed to peace, nations would require no armies. If all men were unselfish, much of the misery of this world would disappear overnight. But men are not all law-abiding, men are not all peaceful, men are not all unselfish.²

Furthermore, Goldwater is said to endorse John Adams' view of human nature. The Adams' view is quoted at length in the biography by Bell. It was that "to teach that all men are born with equal powers and facilities, to equal influence in society, to equal property advantages through life is as gross a fraud, as glaringly an imposition on the credulity of the people as was ever practiced."³

Liberals suffer from a view of man that is "a fundamentally and absolutely wrong view of man, his nature, and his destiny."⁴

-
1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 190.
 2. J. Bell, pp. 206-207.
 3. Ibid., p. 292.
 4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 141.

Furthermore, the liberal view of man as perfectable is against nature. Pursued as a matter of policy, utopian schemes bring about "a world in which earthly power can be substituted for divine will."¹

Modern liberals have departed from the wisdom of the founders who "knew that rules of government, however brilliantly calculated to cope with the imperfect nature of man, however carefully designed to avoid the pitfalls of power, would be no match for men who were determined to disregard them."²

Government power must be decentralized: The biographies are full of explicit references to the necessity for decentralization:

The Republican Party I salute holds the concept that there was created on this continent a decentralized republic with a representative form of government, dedicated to the concept of limited central authority, maximum individual opportunity, and equality and freedom for all men.³

But centralization of power in America is growing and must be resisted:

We hold that freedom will be most surely safeguarded if the responsibility for making decisions is held close to the people. We deplore the trend to thrust all responsibility on a federal bureaucracy in Washington--and thus create a super-state.⁴

The consequences of further centralization is to "condemn to a perpetual state of childhood," a result that is "contrary to the best

1. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 141.

2. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 19.

3. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 236.

4. Ibid., p. 296.

purposes of mankind."¹ Readers are told that Goldwater has spoken of the evil consequences of centralization so often that he has become "somewhat lyrical"² about his subject:

The one lesson to be learned from the total experience of mankind . . . is the folly of believing that government, given excessive power, will long remain benevolent. Our defenses against the accumulation of unlimited power in Washington are in poor shape.

. . . We ask more money for less work. We are weaklings who want the government to take care of us when we should be taking care of ourselves. We pamper criminals and subversives when we should punish them. And we condemn those among us with the traits of their forefathers as reactionaries.³

Goldwater's opposition to centralized government is unqualified. He believes that its evil has been demonstrated in all times and all places:

Throughout history, government has proved to be the chief instrument for thwarting man's liberty. Government represents power in the hands of some men to control and regulate the lives of other men. And power, as Lord Acton said, corrupts men. "Absolute power," he added, "corrupts absolutely."⁴

The remedy is clear:

There is nothing that could advance the cause of individual freedom more than for the people to take back to themselves locally the responsibility for governing themselves, to disengage themselves as much as practically possible from the tentacles of an overpowering government in Washington.⁵

1. J. Bell, p. 21.

2. Ibid., p. 221.

3. Ibid.

4. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 16-17.

5. J. Bell, p. 310.

Total war is justified in defending liberty: Statements about war are so numerous that it is easy to see how Goldwater's image as a war monger in the 1964 campaign came about. The following is a typical statement of the necessity for defending the nation:

We declare it is our intention to keep the defensive and offensive military forces of this nation superior to the attacking power of any potential aggressor or aggressors, regardless of the cost in dollars and manpower, to the end that liberty and freedom may be maintained.

In this regard, we recognize that the dictators of atheistic Communism are vigorously prosecuting a war against the people of the free world by economic, military and political and psychological means. We intend to respond to these assaults with all the resources at our command and we propose to defeat these forces arrayed against us. We reject the notion that a stalemate satisfies our commitment to the cause of freedom. We must proclaim for victory in the cold war.

We denounce and condemn those who would, by practicing appeasement, lead us to piecemeal surrender of the rights and the dignity of free men. Victory must be our goal.¹

Those who do not agree with his politics are denounced as cowards:

There are among us too many who so completely fear strong answers and actions that they would prefer to crawl to Moscow on all fours, rather than risk a showdown. Too many of us place comforts of life and the ease of our modern living ahead of the freedoms with which we have been endowed by our Creator.²

In Bell readers are shown the depth of Goldwater's sincerity in a personal visit with the President of the United States.

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, pp. 295-296.

2. J. Bell, p. 246.

Goldwater called on Kennedy to "declare officially that it is our purpose to win the cold war, not merely wage it in the hope of attaining a standoff." He said later:

"I would like to hear President Kennedy just say to the American people, 'we are going to win over Communism. We don't care what it costs, how long it takes or what it takes, we are going to win.'"¹

There are no half measures for Goldwater. "I feel compelled to ask, what are we engaged in, anyway--a popularity contest or a struggle to the death between freedom and slavery?"² He states flatly that "the Castro regime . . . will be eliminated."³

The biographies record that so well established was Goldwater's view that total violence might be an acceptable solution, that it became a feature of campaign literature. During the 1964 California primary

. . . every Republican household in California received a campaign brochure from the Rockefeller organization. On its cover were the words: "Whom do you want in the room with the H-bomb button?" Inside it asked: "This Man?" showing a photograph of Mr. Rockefeller, or "This Man?" with a photograph of Mr. Goldwater.⁴

Even Goldwater's humor often revolved about total victory: "As a military man," he added with a grin, "when I push the red button I want to know I can hit the men's room in the Kremlin."⁵

All political action should be rooted in experience: Goldwater constantly assures audiences that to lose "reverence for the wisdom of

-
1. J. Bell, p. 242.
 2. Ibid., p. 258.
 3. Ibid., p. 254.
 4. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 102.
 5. J. Bell, p. 252.

tradition is to court disaster."¹ This axiom is so basic to Goldwater that it appears wherever he is shown defining conservatism in the biographies. A question about the basic idea of conservatism produced this answer during the 1960 campaign:

In my judgment it is that we look to the past for the answers of today and tomorrow, that human nature had never changed, that history repeats itself over and over again, and that, until human nature changes, the answers to the problems we have today will be the same as the answers to the problems that were exactly like we had yesterday.

And we don't want to make the mistakes of yesterday. We don't want to use socialism because it has never worked.²

A self-educated statesman, Goldwater is described as having gone "straight to the roots of American political thought for his source material, spending many hours reading such works as the Federalist Papers and the writings of Locke, Jefferson, and Edmund Burke."³ Readers are assured that "To him, these writings proved excitingly fresh and applicable to the problems of modern America."⁴ Goldwater describes himself as a man "not too proud to learn from the great minds of the past."⁵

Goldwater's own actions are said to be rooted in history. He is often shown attempting to reverse new trends and restore old beliefs in the biographies. But he is also occasionally a defender of the status quo. During the 1952 election Goldwater defended the New Deal:

-
1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 299.
 2. J. Bell, p. 291.
 3. Wood and Smith, p. 17.
 4. Ibid.
 5. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 11.

Let me speak directly . . . to all sincere men and women who are concerned with retaining the social gains which have been made in the past 20 years.

This nation along with the rest of the world went through a depression 20 years ago. You haven't forgotten it, I haven't forgotten it, and every New Deal spokesman reminds us of it in every Fair Deal speech. Out of the struggle and misery of those years we found an answer to certain problems.¹

Thus, even Goldwater accepts some of the results of the New Deal because he felt that it was an idea that had worked.

Opportunities for individual material reward are necessary for a progressive society: For Goldwater free enterprise is "our faith" and "the best possible instrument for providing and distributing material needs and material benefits to all citizens."² Those systems which are oriented to collective welfare rather than individual reward are denounced as being "guilty of opposing God's will."³ Clearly, in Goldwater's doctrine material reward is elevated to the status of religion. The spiritual aspects of individual reward are alluded to frequently, but are never spelled out in detail. Goldwater's elevation of individual reward as the mechanism for achieving the best social order explains his opposition to taxation. Too much taxation is evil. "Government does not have an unlimited claim on the earnings of individuals," and an attack on earnings or "property rights is actually an attack on freedom."⁴

1. Perry, Barry . . . Candidate, p. 46.

2. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 298.

3. Ibid.

4. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 59.

Goldwater comes close to saying that control of one's money is the essence of freedom.

Societal growth, clearly an element of the progressive society of the 1950's, was a good that could only be achieved by individual initiative and not by government planning.

Now I know there are those who suggest that the way to get greater production in America is for the federal government to move in with massive spending programs here, there, and everywhere else. But let me tell you this: the reason that we have become the most prosperous nation in the world is not what government has done but . . . because of what 180 million free American people have been stimulated to do by the government and by their own activities. And we shall move forward, we shall move to the greatest heights America has experienced, but we shall move forward only if we stay true to the principles that have made America great.¹

When asked what rights have been lost in modern America, Goldwater is said to have answered on the floor of the Senate:

Let me name one right we have lost. We have lost the right to decide for ourselves how to spend about 30 per cent of our income, because that is about what is going into taxes today. Thirty per cent of the income of the people is regulated by the federal government. We have lost the right to decide for ourselves where we are going to spend it.²

Finally, economic freedom is the fundamental freedom, the source from which all other freedoms flow. For example, man's political and other freedoms are said to be "illusory if he is dependent for his economic needs on the State."³

1. J. Bell, pp. 281-282.

2. McDowell, p. 144.

3. Goldwater, The Conscience of a Conservative, p. 12.

Scenario

The final element of drama is scenario. It is more than plot. It is a blueprint upon which readers may model their lives. The fantasy scenario of each story is a problem-solution fantasy. The Goldwater scenario is as old as history: A man emerges as a tribune of the people. He is the product of everything that is most characteristic of his people. Because he has grown up in the harsh testing ground of his society, he respects the ancient political and moral creeds of his people and knows how to adapt them to modern conditions. Cities and states cry out to him. Organizations form spontaneously around him. Finally his movement crystallizes as the nation approaches a watershed election. The ancient faith of the republic (What Goldwater calls "the philosophy of the whole man") is in sharp conflict with a welfare state philosophy that Goldwater calls "the philosophy of the stomach."¹

The solution to the problem is quite clear. Goldwater and his organization are "the front line troops to represent your ideas, your principles. Their victories in November will be your victory. Through them you will shape destiny for your children."² The republic will be saved and restored to its ancient faith and American democracy and free enterprise will triumph over the collectivists (in their many guises as big labor, Communism, Socialism, big government, big education, big health, and bossism).

1. Shadegg, Barry . . . Plan, p. 259.

2. Ibid.

The basic scenario of the biographies is an echo of an ancient folk pattern. A hero will arise to restore the old ways and bring them to a greater perfection than before. Even if he is crushed, his example will inspire others to carry out his work. The ancient folk pattern of restoration includes the Elder and Younger Cato of Roman times, the myth of the return of King Arthur to save Britain, the protest of Lincoln that his only desire was to restore the constitution, El Cid bringing the ancient Christians back to their old homes in Spain, Martin Luther carrying out his mission of restoring German-speaking lands to the historic "Catholic" faith.

Goldwater's scenario was the restoration of America's ancient freedoms. In the biographies, there is a heavy emphasis on economic freedom which Goldwater "maintains is the freedom most often exercised in today's industrial society."¹

Throughout the biographies freedom is a synonym for economic choice. The essence of liberty is purchasing power. Thus, the reader is assured that Goldwater would carry out the restoration of the pre-1929 free market despite the fact that "Some sections of the economy might at first stagger."² In The Conscience of a Conservative, Goldwater recites the problem of farmers, laborers, and the educational system with a reasonable degree of sophistication. The problems are multiple and complex. But his solution for all these ills is simple--restore the free market and subject all problems to it.

1. McDowell, p. 147.

2. Wood and Smith, p. 134.

Goldwater's political mission is to save free enterprise. The reader's mission is to work for Goldwater's election. The stakes are high. They are the continuation of the ideal way of life that is so fully illustrated by Goldwater himself.

Conclusion

The past two chapters have examined the biographies in terms of four basic dramatic elements: role (character), scene (situation), theme (topoi) and scenario (psychological structure). These elements are the means by which the writers have dramatized the ideological message of the 1964 campaign. The next chapter will attempt to answer two crucial questions. The first question pertains to the nature of the message. What message was expressed, and what was its ideological content? The second question concerns the persuasive potential of the biographies. How effectively did they express the message?

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY, ADDITIONAL ANALYSIS, AND CONCLUSION

Introduction

First, Chapter 6 will summarize the vision of the biographies in terms of its dramatic components: character, scene, theme and scenario. Next, it will make a judgment of the rhetorical effectiveness of the biographies according to the basic neo-Aristotelian standards formulated during the 1940's at the University of Chicago and Vanderbilt University. Third, it will analyze the ideological meaning of the vision in the biographies. Fourth, the chapter will compare the ideological content of the biographies with that of the neo-conservative founding fathers. And finally, it will discuss differences and similarities in light of the historical circumstances of American conservatism. As the writer will be summarizing and synthesizing information already established in the last two chapters, quotations will be kept to bare minimum.

Character

Rhetorical Effectiveness

An author may present his characters in two ways: directly or indirectly. In direct presentation he tells the reader what a character is like by means of straight exposition. In indirect presentation

the author shows the character in action and makes the readers draw their own conclusions.

The method of character presentation in the biographies is mainly direct. Readers are told about Goldwater's characteristics rather than being shown actions and sights from which they can draw inferences. Almost everything is straight exposition and almost everything is merely named rather than depicted in action. Typical might be the fighting warrior image in which Goldwater is described as a formidable fighter but is very seldom actually shown fighting. Instead, the reader is made aware of his violence via verbal deeds. Goldwater is always threatening to smash someone, but somehow never quite gets around to doing it. This direct approach seems to prevail with few exceptions. A significant exception is the treatment of Goldwater's ancestors and of his own personal life. Here there is actually a drama, one in which the reader is able to see the characters in action. Goldwater is shown acting out the part of a regular guy as he plays pranks, wisecracks, slaps cronies on the back, tosses down bourbon, and seeks out thrills.

A reader must be shown as well as told if he is to achieve maximum identification with the character. A story will be successful only when the characters are dramatized--shown speaking and acting, as in a drama. If we are really to believe in the diabolical qualities of big labor leaders we must see Walter Reuther specifically engaged in diabolical acts. But Walter Reuther remains a shadowy figure whose deeds are only hinted at. Goldwater calls big labor many vile names but seldom recognizes any obligation to prove that his insults are justified.

According to basic neo-Aristotelian standards, the biographers were unwise in their heavy reliance on direct presentation.

To be convincing and to foster identification, characterization must also observe three other principles. First, the characters must be consistent in their behavior: they must not behave one way on one occasion and a different way on another unless the author is able to demonstrate sufficient reason to change. In all of the biographies, the characters exhibit a high degree of consistency. They do not alter in their behaviors. Goldwater, for instance, never ceases to attack Communism, big labor, and big government. The seeds of his opposition are present in his early childhood penchant for violence and antipathy to any restrictions on his personal freedom.

Second, characterization is effective only when characters are provided with apparent motivation for their behaviors. The reader ought to be able to gain some emotional understanding of why the characters do things. He ought also to be able to understand changes in behavior, if there are any. If he does not understand the reasons for behavior immediately, he should at least be able to grasp them by the end of the story. In the biographies motivation is seldom apparent to the reader. For instance, we are never told why Communism, big labor, and big government take the stands that they do. Apparently, it is just their nature to be corrupt. They do not respond to various circumstances or situations, but out of some innately evil identity. There is simply little explanation provided whereby the reader can adequately understand the emotional reasons for each subsequent behavior. Often on a single

page, we see Goldwater lashing out against a variety of enemies in a variety of different settings. Seldom do we know the why's of his actions. The basic impression is one of a rigid personality struggling against fundamentally hostile forces.

Third, effective characters must appear plausible or life-like. They should not be pillars of virtue or monsters of evil. Nor should they be impossible combinations of contradictory traits. Readers are told that big government, big labor, and Communism are all monsters. They represent the extreme in philosophy and action. Goldwater himself is a series of stereotypes. He is described as a savior, warrior, and regular guy. Thus, Goldwater's enemies are so consistent that they are wooden and not true to life. Goldwater, on the other hand, is an absurd mixture of nobility and low vulgarity.

Scholars have characterized roles as either flat or round. The round character is complex and many-sided. The flat character is characterized by one or two traits. He can be summed up in a sentence. A judgment on the heavy use of the stock character is not an easy one to make. Rounded characters are necessary for the full emotional identification of the reader. However, politics is a business of using well-established stock characters for an audience that is presumed to understand only simplified black and white images. The political biography itself is a mixture of literature (a form that seems to demand round characters) and politics (a form that uses simplified stock roles).

Because of the hybrid nature of the political biography, the heavy reliance on blunt name calling of Goldwater's enemies and straight

exposition might not be so unskillful as it first appears. On the other hand, other media existed during the campaign for the propagation of stock images. A large budget was available for television commercials, pamphlets, posters, short films, and speeches. The biographies represented a media opportunity for dramatization and strong identification that the other media could not duplicate. Therefore, this scholar must conclude that the heavy use of stock characters probably represents a failure to use the dramatic potential of the medium.

A famous writer and student of political biography, James MacGregor Burns, recently attempted to account for the unartistic talkiness and lack of action that is evident in these and other campaign biographies.¹ He pointed out that campaign biographies are often written in the middle of the statesman's career and that they most necessarily place a heavy emphasis on future rather than past action. Burns' analysis suffers, however, when it is noted that all of his examples are drawn from J.F.K., R.F.K. and Goldwater, politicians who had far skimpier records than most politicians who had aspired to high office. The author can only refer the reader to the numerous biographies of Eisenhower, Nixon, Johnson, and McGovern that show these Presidential aspirants engaged in numerous dramatic actions.

1. James MacGregor Burns, "Biography as a Political Act," The New Republic (June 26, 1976), pp. 7-8.

Ideological Significance

Through the device of character, the biographers have dramatized an ideological conception of the nature and rights of man. What was that view of the nature of man and his fundamental rights? Was the ideological view conservative in the sense that the modern conservatives who championed Goldwater have defined it? If there are differences, how might they have arisen? The following discussion is an attempt to answer these questions.

According to conservatives man is a limited creature, a mixture of good and evil; he is far from being totally perfectable. The best education has but a limited impact upon him. The primacy of this concept is not apparent in the biographies. There is plenty of evil but it seems to proceed from mass victimization by abstract principles and ideologies. Masses of Americans are the dupes of labor unions and millions of people are enslaved by Communism (an economic arrangement) or have their incentive destroyed by the welfare state. Great emphasis is placed on environment and on the malleability of large populations. Goldwater denounces social engineering precisely because he believes in its effectiveness. In believing in the power of environment and system over individual will, Goldwater seems far more liberal than conservative.

The concept of limited perfection has never done well in America outside of early New England. The American concept of man that began with an act of separation from the Old World is evident in the biographies. The message of Goldwater is liberation, liberation from restraint, but also liberation from the Western cultural heritage. Most

of the evil men in the biographies are foreigners, old Puritan Anglo-Saxons in the east, the eastern king makers, and labor bosses who play Old World ethnic politics.

The old sense of puritan restraint has little scope in the biographies. The basic message is mainstream America--expansion, liberation, and progress.

Conservatives have always granted man the basic right to property and the right to live in an enduring stable society in which his values would not suddenly become obsolete. Goldwater has little to say about order--he is a violent, impatient man who enjoys strife. The right to property is much in evidence. Goldwater hates taxes, land-use laws and all restraint on ownership. Thus, only one half of the Protestant ethic remains in the biographies. The emphasis is on the peoples' right to gain purchasing power, freedom, and material rewards. The restraint, community service, and good order of the early Protestant ethic are hardly mentioned.

Scene

Rhetorical Effectiveness

While Aristotle says nothing about scene, the interest in scene in drama, literature, and poetry is as old as landscape painting. Sometimes scene is such a powerful element that background becomes foreground. In novels about outer space travel or the arctic, scene may be more important than character. In the political biographies of Goldwater the scene provided an image of a dangerous and unstable

world--a rhetorical situation that would, if acceptable to the reader as a valid picture of society and the world, justify Goldwater's violent posture and drastic rhetoric. He is a warrior in a world on the brink of war.

It is a commonplace in rhetorical criticism that a successful scene must meet two criteria: (1) it must be relevant, and (2) it must be realistic.

A relevant scene is one that fits the other elements in a drama. It justifies the responses of the characters (i.e., provides a rhetorical situation in which their responses seem convincing), and it creates an image of the world that is concrete.

The scene in the biographies is relevant to the other elements of character, action, and theme. It sets an atmosphere in which Goldwater's actions make sense. For instance, readers are told of the perilous and terrifying evils that exist in the world. No one is safe or immune. Whether on the home front or abroad, there is always the threat of danger, corruption, and holocaust. Only someone cast in the powerful image of Goldwater can rid the scene of its evils. It therefore seems reasonable to conclude that scene and character are in agreement with one another; the two elements are in harmony.

A realistic scene is one that is concrete, detailed, and orderly. It persuades readers of its "reality" by virtue of its sheer fullness and completeness. It "sets the image before our eyes" as Aristotle says, by detailed description.

In the biographies the scene is realistic. It is abundant in its detail. For instance, descriptions of Arizona's skies and rugged mountains, the national convention with its stone-faced old pros, and Washington, D.C., with its national shrines and its gorgeous monuments to the power of the state, give the reader a sense of an America that is concrete and familiar. It is an America that is both beloved and terrifying. The authors seem to emphasize the loved symbols of childhood and the terrors of the new cold war world. Readers are introduced to friendly, open westerners. But they are also taken behind closed doors to glimpse the scheming of the wily Nelson Rockefeller, who performs his machinations in princely surroundings at a time when honest men sleep. Methodically and vividly displayed, the scenes of the biographies are fully in the realistic tradition of the novel. It is a complete and full picture rather than a sketchy one.

Ideological Significance

Although the scene works well from a rhetorical point of view, its ideological dimension is confusing. Modern conservatives look backward to an idyllic past, a vision of pre-civil war America complete with rural virtue, a strong sense of community, respect for authority, and a small free economy tempered by a tradition of service. Conservatives believe that these factors are essential to the good society. Thus, they labor for the restoration of stability, order, hierarchy, and a strong tradition of service to the community. The community for which Goldwater fights appears in many ways a near opposite of the loving, stable, reverent, ordered society talked about by conservatives from Edmund Burke

to Richard Weaver. It is a place where Goldwater battles against one set of social engineers in favor of another. He battles big labor, Communists, and bureaucrats (the planners) on behalf of the bastions of free enterprise, the technocracy, and the military. Of course, there is a widespread belief that Goldwater's own clients have done the most to subvert the society, a belief that the academic conservative does not choose to notice. It may be argued that the technocrat, the great industrialist, big business and the military have displaced whole populations, threatened the stability of the family, destroyed ancient landmarks, and shaken the old society to its foundations. These people and their works seem anything but conservative; their America is dynamic, activist, and constantly geared to new enterprise (change).

This alliance between the ideology of Edmund Burke and modern industrial America points up the missed connection in American conservatism. Its political expression and its philosophical thought are in opposition. Goldwater is a brash technocrat whose highest praise is for new bombers and larger (bigger than the Russian's) industries. To Goldwater his own state of Arizona is less a place to live than a great potential recreational area. He would conserve nothing. He would improve everything.

Goldwater exhibits the tension of modern conservatism very well. While giving lip service to the traditional values of the small shop economy and family solidarity, he openly celebrates economic individualism and encourages "free" movement of labor--things that strike at the very heart of the existence of the family and easy entry into the market.

Conservatism had its origins in 18th century England. Edmund Burke's conservatism was a product of its time and place. Thus even as a philosophical position in the 1950's, modern conservatism was in tension with its surroundings. America had no past to conserve and the conservatives allied with businessmen, the most change-oriented group in America. The conservative intellectuals could ignore this tension. They served a movement only. As agents of a political party, the biographers could not deal only with pure philosophy. Thus they fashioned an image of a man who said one thing and did the opposite, did one thing and said the opposite.

Theme

Rhetorical Effectiveness

In Chapter 5 it was noted that the theme of a work of fiction is its controlling idea or major insight. It was also stated that a theme or a set of themes hold a story together. Further, it was posited that in biographical literature themes tend to be obvious, baldly stated, and constantly in evidence. The theme of original sin (i.e., that man is not totally perfectable and contains a strong measure of evil) is dramatized through characters such as corrupt labor leaders and cruel Communists who cynically promise utopia. The theme can be derived from the scene of the biographies themselves--that of a dangerous and very much flawed world in which nothing is certain. The theme of innate depravity is dramatized in the reiteration of failed utopian schemes. The recognition of evil is touted as a kind of special realism and good

sense whenever the authors turn to descriptions of the battle of political ideas. Readers cannot miss the theme; it appears so constantly that they cannot fail to identify it as one of the basic premises of conservatism. Indeed, if one were to think of the biographies as a series of enthymemes, the five themes discussed in Chapter 5 would appear again and again as premises or assumptions.

In Chapter 5, it was established that the themes of the biographies conformed to the basic rules of effectiveness. They met the definitional requirements of themes. That is, they each had a subject and a predicate, they embodied a generalization about life or society, and they provided unity for large masses of details. However, to achieve genuine effectiveness a theme must be consistent, and it must be exhaustive. The sheer repetition of themes argues that they are exhaustive. Thus, the bulk of the discussion will center on what must be judged an aesthetic and an ideological failing--thematic contradictions.

A theme is consistent when it is not contradicted by any detail of the story. In the biographies, the theme that man is not totally perfectable is selectively applied. For instance, the glorification of the individual and the sheer optimism for Goldwater's new administration is a contradiction to the often gloomy view of mankind. Another contradiction of the biographies is that original sin is more evident in foreigners and liberals than in Goldwater and in westerners. Even the people living on the eastern seaboard are identified as being more evil than individuals living in the western states.

Ideological Significance

Here again is the special blindness of American conservatism. It sees no tension between America's rejection of European limitations and the European heritage and the tenants of Edmund Burke's conservatism. It merely applies the themes of depravity selectively. Evil is everywhere in the biographies, but there is a strong hint that Americans are a special people with a special destiny. Goldwater and Americans, particularly westerners, are portrayed as blunt, honest, innocent human beings who will triumph over wily, evil Communists, labor bosses, and corrupt bureaucrats. Despite their lack of cleverness, these innocent blunt heroes will win because they are the true Americans and thus have a special role to play.

In the biographies, the theme that government power must be decentralized shows the same selectivity of application. The reader is told that centralization is an evil condition--except, of course, when it is necessary. For instance, government power is described as the chief instrument for thwarting man's liberty. It is the means by which some men can control and regulate the lives of others. Frequent references are given to the farmer, wage earner, and businessman; they are all at the mercy of government interference. Only decentralization of government power and a transfer of this power back to the states and the people can eliminate the problem. However, there are two glaring exceptions. They are the military establishment and large corporations. Goldwater argues that the nation must determinedly maintain the most powerful military power in the world. He is also blind to the

centralization of power in corporations and speaks of them fondly in terms of consumer benefits. Thus he ignores the evils of centralization among his traditionally Republican boosters, business and the military. He finds the same centralization shocking in government agencies and labor unions--traditional supporters of the opposite party. Partisanship appears to be more important than principle.

It is not that the themes are qualified or too subtly stated. Indeed, all of the classic conservative themes are either fully dramatized or steadily repeated. The trouble is that they are contradicted. From a rhetorical standpoint, it is probably self-defeating to make an endorsement of decentralization on one page and affirm the virtues of centralized military and industrial power on another. Not only does this seem rhetorically ineffective, but it is ideologically ineffective too. Ideology is nothing if it is not orderly, coherent, and systematic.

All political action should be rooted in experience is another theme that is contradicted. Seldom does Goldwater ever make an attempt to research the problems that beset the daily lives of the people. He is not in touch with real life nor with real problems. Instead, Goldwater lapses into abstract ideology. This theme is not dramatized, only stated in the biographies. The reader does not see Goldwater using his experience. The opposite is true. The reader sees Goldwater spouting ideology about the general wisdom and experience of mankind and then having gut reactions of rage against labor leaders and Communists. The authors talk about Goldwater's commitment to individual resourcefulness and competition, but this commitment is not scenically dramatized

by showing Goldwater visiting small towns and voting against high tariffs. Instead, readers see Goldwater voting for protective tariff legislation without a word said about the contradictions inherent in such an action.

The theme that opportunities for individual material reward are necessary for a progressive society is consistent but very elastic in its modern political application. Throughout the biographies, there is an emphasis on man's freedom to enjoy the material needs and material benefits of the free enterprise system. Each man is entitled to recognition and reward by virtue of his energy, ability, and willingness to work. At no time should man be reduced to a common standard of achievement by penalizing ability, initiative, and thrift. In fact, this theme is emphasized in a way that mocks Goldwater's other values of individualism and decentralization. Like many conservative Republicans, Goldwater emphasizes the material benefits of progress while giving mere lip service to the freedom that economic choice brings. He talks more of consumption than production. The old theme of working and being rewarded has been transformed in its American interpretation. It is now consumer-oriented. Liberty has been interpreted as purchasing power.

A theme is said to be exhaustive when it is not merely imposed on the facts of the story, but arises out of the data of the story itself. It not only plays through the story, but it provides a point of view, a way of interpreting the details of the story. It is a frame, an ideological looking glass. Given this criterion, a basic question might be raised: Are the themes stuck on or are they skillfully woven into the

story? It is the judgment of this author that all except theme number four are woven into the action of the story. For instance, the theme that all political action should be rooted in experience is simply stated rather than being illustrated. The reader therefore would never draw such a lesson about the importance of experience from the dramatized portions of the biographies alone. The idea is there only because Goldwater keeps saying it out loud.

Significance is rhetorical. A significant action is one that is perceived to be significant by the reader in terms of his life, goals, and purposes. Throughout the biographies, this scholar feels that Goldwater performs an action that most readers would call significant. For instance, the action of the story is that Goldwater is running for the Presidency. The follow-up action of the story is that the reader is asked to vote for Goldwater. Here, the significant action is clearly demonstrated by the Senator when he acclaims:

My candidacy is pledged to a victory for principle and to presenting an opportunity for the American people to choose. Let there be a choice--right now and in clear, understandable terms. And I ask all those who feel and believe as I do to join with me in assuring both the choice and the victory.¹

In every one of the books the reader is reminded of the uniqueness of Goldwater's candidacy and of the importance of his own vote in the 1964 election.

1. McDowell, p. 249.

Scenario

Rhetorical Effectiveness

A narrative is organized so that its key elements of character, scene, theme (thought) and action (plot) have been brought together into a dramatic synthesis. The scenario corresponds to the action of a story in both its psychological and physical sense. It is the spine of the story, the imaginative arrangement that puts characters in various confrontations and connects events over time and space into a psychologically meaningful whole.

Physical action by itself is, after all, meaningless. In a good story a minimum of physical action may be used to yield a maximum of insight. Every story must have some action, but to be a worthwhile story it must contain a significant action. For a discerning reader there may be as much significant action in the way the hero kisses his wife as in how he handles a sword during a tremendous battle running over fifty pages. Do the Goldwater biographies contain significant action?

Conceivably a plot might consist merely of a sequence of related actions. Usually, however, both the adventure demanded by the beginning reader and the meaningfulness desired by the mature reader arise out of some sort of conflict. Conflict in fiction usually arises out of a clash of actions, ideas, desires, or wills. The main character may be pitted against another person or group of persons. He may be in conflict with some wild external force--physical nature, society or fate. He may be in conflict with some powerful element of his own soul or

personality--man against himself. Thus, conflict may be physical, mental, emotional, or moral.

There are two major conflicts in the biographies. They are the struggles against the eastern establishment and organized labor. Goldwater courageously takes on both of them. For instance, the eastern establishment is seen as an evil faction that is determined to fight his candidacy. Men such as Rockefeller and Scranton are the key villains. They resort to slander, deception, and other fraudulent tactics. But no power or foe is too terrible for Goldwater. He somehow manages to defeat his enemies in spite of the overpowering odds.

The other conflict is the struggle against organized labor, whose diabolical leader is Walter Reuther. He is corrupt; he holds illegitimate power, and he is the dictator of power-mad union bosses. A man long experienced in the political industrial warfare game, he soon becomes Goldwater's archenemy. The two collide frequently. They clash in corridors of the Senate, on the campaign trail, and in the media. Reuther must be stopped, and only the Senator from Arizona can bring him down.

Unfortunately, the conflicts are described in a patchwork fashion. They lack drama. The conflicts are not consistently sustained. But this is just one side of the coin. The other is more positive. For instance, the reader is invited to participate in the conflicts. He is asked to vote for Goldwater, and thus share in the promised outcome. Simply by electing him as the next President of the United States, the

evils of the world can be kept from destroying America. This is the voter's opportunity and the bait for the reader.

Ideological Significance

Does the action taken by Goldwater and the action recommended by the reader involve working conservative principles? Neo-conservative intellectuals had affirmed that it was the mission of conservatism to save civilization from all radical programs, stemming either from the right or the left. They further believed that a conservative electorate must work to elect those who are fitted by long experience, training, virtue, and a broadly based classical education to hold positions of authority. These men were to hold limited power for limited aims. They would serve as public watchdogs against taxation, centralization or power, social dislocation, and the spread of utopian dogmas. Is this the Goldwater scenario? It is not. Lip service is paid to non-utilitarian education and low taxes, but the Horatio-Alger myth has been stripped of its earlier commitments to service and sharing. The individual achievement and competitive parts of the myth have been maximized and the Christian service role nearly forgotten.

Goldwater's background is not one of the traditional struggle from poverty. The biographers admit that he was born to defend the prosperity and individualism of the Great West. He is mystically called to his state, and his mission is to lead the free world against a diabolically evil foe. The mission justified in the name of the economic arrangement of the free world must be carried out even if it means world

holocaust. The old Alger myth has been altered. Its individualism is not for everyone. Individualism is concentrated in a few great figures like Barry Goldwater and Douglas MacArthur. The readers are told that in a dangerous world they have no choice but to endure under the banners of free enterprise and to make sacrifices for the assembling of a giant war machine, an adequate airborne fighting force. It is the old argument that the world is imperfect. Because of the modern circumstances of cold war, many traditional conservative principles are subverted. Collectivism rather than individualism is the virtue that the biographies really propagandize. There are many references to nationalism, Americanism, and patriotism.

Goldwater gives lip service to liberal education, but his admired friends are technicians, hard headed businessmen, and practical professionals. They are, after all, the men needed to help him achieve victory in a dangerous, complex, and highly specialized world. The myth of the Goldwater biographies is not really Horatio Alger. It is Faust, a technocrat striving to surpass all competitors and physical limitations.

Discussion

It has been said that man's love of myth grows out of his terror of history. Surely the Goldwater myth is one that ignores the nature of American experiences and the American political system. The special American myth is that America is constantly fashioned anew by a dialectic, a forensic drama. The results of that drama are tested at the polls and in the crucible of American experience. There is no place in that myth for dogmatic, absolute, quasi-religious saviors. The old

conservative charge that liberals consult ideological abstractions rather than the politics of experience could be levelled at Goldwater-- at least Goldwater as he appears in the biographies.

This chapter has detailed many departures by the biographers from the purity of the ideology of Edmund Burke and the conservative intellectuals. Rhetorically, the biographers managed to produce political dramatizations that may be judged reasonably effective. They follow time-honored aesthetic and rhetorical principles. But they are not ideologically conservative. Why is this so? Perhaps the answer can be found in the history of American conservatism itself.

Chronologically, conservatism first began as a philosophy of life and politics in 18th century England. It grew up as a reaction to the French Revolution and vividly came to life at the hands of Edmund Burke. By setting down a statement of conservative principles in his Reflections on the Revolution in France,¹ Burke laid the groundwork for a clearly distinguishable school of political thought. The result was a political faith dedicated specifically to stability and tradition.

For the sake of the main line of argument, let us find out why conservatism worked in England. The following explanation provides some of the reasons. For instance, conservatives in England looked back to an ordered, hierarchical, culturally unified society. It was the oldest continuing society in the world without a distinguishing break since the 11th century centralization of the government by conquering Norman

1. Edmund Burke, Reflections on the Revolution in France (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1955).

families. In Britain there was a clear social order, an aristocracy, a state church, and a monarch. Having gone through a bloodless revolution in 1688, Englishmen felt that change could be accomplished on an evolutionary rather than a revolutionary basis. Conservatives especially chose to assimilate change within the basic framework of the past. They chose to accept and defend most of the institutions and values of England. This they did by using Burke as their model. Ideologically, his conservative doctrine served as a tool for keeping all of the new changes brought on by the industrial revolution and the upsurge of rationalism in balance with the old.

Conservatism in post-civil war America was of a different breed. It was not conservative in the classical sense. For instance, Americans had no Middle Ages and no conservative model. They looked back to a pre-civil war period in which there were no feudal tenures, centralized government, national church, aristocracy, and hereditary stratification. Instead of being enamored with the past, Americans were future oriented. Everything stressed progress, change, liberty, equality, democracy, and individualism. This inevitably produced a society that was more open and more independent than anything Europeans would know for generations to come. It also produced a political tradition that was more liberal than conservative. In desperation, conservatives looked to England. They adopted Burke's doctrine and superimposed it on the American scene. Other men, calling themselves conservatives, adopted the pre-civil war free economy, believing that it was uniquely American. However, the people who gave the strongest support to conserving the free economy

were corporate capitalists and military men. Despite their lip service to the family, religion, and order, it might well be argued that they were the most change oriented people in the society and they served an economic system that believed in mobility of labor, atomistic individualism, and a single standard of profit that liquidated all other values. They were the men who uprooted populations, chopped down whole forests, and smashed mountains and polluted rivers in search of coal. Thus, philosophical conservatives formed an alliance with a business community who subverted all of their basic values. This missed connection is still the dilemma of modern conservatives.

Even today, philosophical conservatives have not done any better than their predecessors. They still continue to hold Burkean principles, but they ignore the differences between themselves and those Americans who make up the mass constituency of any political movement calling itself conservative. These political conservatives, the "Goldwater Conservatives" have almost nothing in common with the philosophical conservatives who sponsored the revival of the movement. American politics has probably never seen stranger bedfellows than Richard Weaver, the threadbare scholar, and Benjamin Fairless, head of U. S. Steel. The label "Conservative" was surely the only thing the two held in common.

An Alternative Explanation

In addition to the historical explanation of ideological inconsistencies in the biographies, there is a rhetorical explanation.

Ideologies tend to focus on large clear choices. By their nature they reject most goals and values in favor of a select few. They are characterized by rejection.

The rhetoric of American politics as presented through mass medium (biography) is a rhetoric of inclusion not exclusion. Its goal is to get a candidate elected by rallying mass support. In a diverse nation, this is done by blurring choices and putting together coalitions of people with diverse outlooks. It may be that in the desire to get one's candidate elected the rhetorical considerations of blending a mass constituency won over the considerations of private ideological orthodoxy of the authors. In pluralistic America, ideological purity seems only to attract minorities. In the absence of a strong unifying value system, it is probably necessary to make coalitions if one is to win mass support. Thus the character is broadened in his appeal, the scene loses its conservative focus, themes are fudged, and the myth of the heroic quest takes on pork barrel trappings and a more moderate tone.

Conclusion

The ideological vision of the biographies is a hybrid vision. Its dramatic elements are informed by conservative and non-conservative ideas. If it is rhetorically effective because of its broader appeal, it is ideologically confusing. Explanations for this were of two sorts. The historical explanation argued that the contradiction was inherent in the history of American conservatism. The rhetorical explanation argued that the inconsistency arose from the nature of the medium, and the need for adaption to a broader audience.

Suggestions for Future Research

One task remains. It is the conventional obligation to suggest ideas for future research that may be fruitful for other scholars. The author wishes to make a slight departure from that tradition. At many steps in his research he was appalled at the slender body of information available on many subjects.

There is very little work on the rhetoric of the biography, although since the early 19th century this art form has largely replaced the public eulogy and the oral folk legend. Far more work has been done on the persuasive effects of the television commercial, and the soap opera than on the biography. There is no formal work available on its role in multi-media political campaigns. Anyone seeking to understand the nature of the biographic medium ought to begin by interviewing the many living campaign biographers, who, like Steve Shadegg performed numerous political tasks and coordinated whole media campaigns. Then, too, the body of work on the very fashionable subject of myth grows by leaps and bounds, but most of it is impressionistic.

Myth has no stable terminology and it has not developed a methodology suitable for other than pure works of art. This researcher had to fall back on the old dramatistic criteria developed by Wayne Booth, Richard McKeon, Kenneth Burke, and John Crowe Ranson in the early 1940's. Their critical terms were developed for the rhetorical analysis of literary works and for mythic treatments of events through literary formats. Thus the mythic insights of Chapter 3 are chiefly valuable for reader orientation and seem to promise more than they eventually

contribute to the study of politics. They enrich the scholar's understanding, but they do not extend the power of his old tools, the neo-Aristotelian criteria for effective character, scene, theme, and plot.

Finally, had this scholar another year to devote to this work, he would study the counter-point to the biographies--the several biographies of Lyndon Johnson, biographies that embodied myths, perhaps ones with greater salience for contemporary America. Then too, it might be interesting to note the variety of ways in which the Johnson biographies (works that emerged late in the 1964 campaign) exploited the weaknesses in the Goldwater myth. But time is a great limiter. Others must do these things.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bell, Daniel (ed.). The New American Right. New York: Criterion Books, Inc., 1955.
- Bell, Jack. Mr. Conservative: Barry Goldwater. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1962.
- Benson, Thomas W. "Rhetoric and Autobiography: The Case of Malcolm X." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LX:1-13, February 1974.
- Block, Maxine (ed.). "Viereck, Peter (Robert Edwin)." Current Biography: Who's News and Why. Fourth Annual Cumulation. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1943, pp. 791-793.
- Bormann, Ernest G. "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVIII:396-407, December 1972.
- Bormann, Ernest G. "The Eagleton Affair: A Fantasy Theme Analysis." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIX:143-159, April 1973.
- Boulding, Kenneth E. The Image. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1956.
- Braden, Waldo W. "Myths in a Rhetorical Context." The Southern Speech Communication Journal, XL:113-126, Winter 1975.
- Brustein, Robert S. "America's New Culture Hero." Commentary, XXV: 123-129, February 1958.
- Buckley, William F., Jr. Did You Ever See a Dream Walking? American Conservative Thought in the Twentieth Century. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1970.
- Buckley, William F., Jr. God and Man at Yale: The Superstitions of Academic Freedom. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1951.
- Buckley, William F., Jr. Rumbles Left and Right: A Book About Troublesome People and Ideas. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1963.
- Buckley, William F., Jr. Up from Liberalism. New York: McDowell, Obolensky, Inc., 1959.

- Buckley, William F., Jr., and Brent L. Bozell. McCarthy and His Enemies. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954.
- Burke, Edmund. Reflections on the Revolution in France. New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1955.
- Burke, Kenneth. The Philosophy of Literary Form: Studies in Symbolic Action. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1941.
- Burns, James MacGregor. "Biography as a Political Act." The New Republic, n.v.:7-8, June 26, 1976.
- Cain, Edward. They'd Rather Be Right: Youth and the Conservative Movement. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1963.
- Campbell, Joseph. The Hero with a Thousand Faces. Bollingen Series XVII. New York: Pantheon Books, 1949.
- Cassirer, Ernst. The Myth of the State. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1946.
- Chapman, Phillip C. "The New Conservatism: Cultural Criticism v. Political Philosophy." Political Science Quarterly, LXXV:17-34, March 1960.
- Chase, Richard. Quest for Myth. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1949.
- Clark, Thomas. "Rhetorical Image-Making: A Case Study of the Thomas Paine-William Smith Propaganda Debates." The Southern Speech Communication Journal, XL:248-261, Spring 1975.
- Congressional Quarterly Background, Politics in America 1945-1966: The Politics and Issues of the Postwar Years. 2nd edition. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1967, pp. 1-124.
- Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Record of Barry Goldwater. 2nd edition. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1963, pp. 1-33.
- Congressional Quarterly Special Report, The Public Records of Barry M. Goldwater and William E. Miller. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Service, 1964, pp. 1571-1631.
- "Conservatism on the Campus." Newsweek, April 10, 1961, p. 35.
- Conville, Richard. "Northrop Frye and Speech Criticism: An Introduction." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVI:417-425, December 1970.

- Cook, Fred J. Barry Goldwater: Extremist of the Right. Evergreen Black Cat Book. New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964.
- Corbett, Edward P. J. Rhetorical Analysis of Literary Works. New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.
- Corkill, Marjorie. Secretary for Republican Headquarters, Tucson, Arizona. Personal Interview, April 10, 1975.
- Cosman, Bernard and Robert J. Huckshorn (eds.). Republican Politics: The 1964 Campaign and Its Aftermath for the Party. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1968.
- Dandeneau, Richard J. "The Rhetorical Invention of Conservatism: An Analysis of the Assumptions of Contemporary Conservative Thought." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, 1961.
- Dell, George W. "The Republican Nominee: Barry M. Goldwater." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, L:399-404, December 1964.
- De Toledano, Ralph. The Winning Side: The Case for Goldwater Republicanism. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1963.
- Dillon, Michael. "Symbolization and the Search for Order." The Intercollegiate Review, XI:103-111, Winter-Spring 1976.
- Donovan, Frank R. The Americanism of Barry Goldwater. New York: MacFadden Books, MacFadden-Fartell Corporation, 1964.
- Dunphy, William. "The YAF's are Coming." The Commonweal, April 14, 1961, pp. 74-76.
- Eliade, Mircea. The Myth of the Eternal Return. Translated by Willard R. Trask. New York: Pantheon Books, 1954.
- Erikson, Erik H. Childhood and Society. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1950.
- Evans, Stanton M. The Future of Conservatism: From Taft to Reagan and Beyond. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.
- Evans, Stanton M. Revolt on the Campus. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1961.
- Fisher, Walter R. "Reaffirmation and Subversion of the American Dream." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LIX:160-167, April 1973.

- Frazer, James George. The Golden Bough: A Study in Magic and Religion. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1922.
- Fromm, Erich. The Forgotten Language, An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1951.
- Frommer, Arthur (ed.). Goldwater from A to Z: A Critical Handbook. Pocket Books. New York: The Frommer/Pasmanier Publishing Corporation, 1964.
- Glad, Paul W. McKinley, Bryan, and the People. New York: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1964.
- Goldwater, Barry. The Conscience of a Conservative. Sheperdsville, Kentucky: Victor Publishing Company, Inc., 1960.
- Goldwater, Barry. The Conscience of a Majority. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Goldwater, Barry. "The Republican National Convention: Acceptance Speech." Vital Speeches of the Day, XXX:642-644, August 1964.
- Goldwater, Barry. Where I Stand. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.
- Goldwater, Barry. Why Not Victory? A Fresh Look at American Foreign Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.
- "Goldwater, Barry Morris." Encyclopaedia Britannica, X:549, 1973.
- Griffith, Robert. The Politics of Fear: Joseph R. McCarthy and the Senate. Lexington, Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky, 1970.
- Guttman, Allen. The Conservative Tradition in America. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Hahn, Dan F. and Ruth M. Gonchar. "Political Myth: The Image and the Issue." Today's Speech, XX:57-63, Summer 1972.
- Hammerback, John C. "Barry Goldwater's Rhetoric of Rugged Individualism." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LVIII:175-183, April 1972.
- Harding, H. F. "The Democratic Nominee: Lyndon B. Johnson." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, L:409-414, December 1964.
- Hart, Jeffrey. The American Dissent: A Decade of Modern Conservatism. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966.

- Heinsohn, A. G., Jr. (ed.). Anthology of Conservative Writing in the United States 1932-1960. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1962.
- Hershberger, Winifred. Personal Secretary to Barry Goldwater, Tucson, Arizona. Personal Interview, April 11, 1975.
- Hofstadter, Richard. The Age of Reform: From Bryan to F.D.R. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1955.
- Howell, Millard L. An Answer to Goldwater. New York: Vantage Press, 1961.
- Johnson, Lyndon B. "The Democratic National Convention: Acceptance Speech." Vital Speeches of the Day, XXX:708-710, September 1964.
- Kessel, John H. The Goldwater Coalition: Republican Strategies in 1964. New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc., 1968.
- Kidd, Virginia. "Happily Ever After and Other Relationship Styles: Advice on Interpersonal Relations in Popular Magazines, 1951-1973." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LXI:31-39, February 1975.
- King, Andrew A. "Booker T. Washington and the Myth of Heroic Materialism." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LX:323-327, October 1974.
- King, Andrew A. "Myth Criticism." Unpublished document in author's possession, The University of Arizona, Tucson, 1974.
- King, Andrew A. "The Rhetoric of Power Maintenance: Elites at the Precipice." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, LXII:127-134, April 1976.
- King, Andrew A. and Floyd D. Anderson. "Nixon, Agnew, and the 'Silent Majority': A Case Study in the Rhetoric of Polarization." Western Speech, XXXV:243-255, Fall 1971.
- Kirk, Russell. A Program for Conservatives. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1954.
- Kirk, Russell. Beyond the Dreams of Avarice; Essays of a Social Critic. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1956.
- Kirk, Russell. Edmund Burke: A Genius Reconsidered. New York: Arlington House, 1967.
- Kirk, Russell. Enemies of the Permanent Things. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1969.
- Kirk, Russell. Randolph of Roanoke; A Study in Conservative Thought. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1951.

- Kirk, Russell. "Richard Weaver, RIP." National Review, April 23, 1963, p. 308.
- Kirk, Russell. "The Campus Conservative Journals." National Review, June 2, 1964, p. 449.
- Kirk, Russell. The Conservative Mind: From Burke to Santayana. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.
- Kirk, Russell and James McClellan. The Political Principles of Robert A. Taft. New York: Fleet Press Corporation, 1967.
- Lewis, R. W. B. The American Adam: Innocence, Tragedy and Tradition in the Nineteenth Century. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Lippmann, Walter. Public Opinion. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc., 1922.
- Lora, Ronald. Conservative Minds in America. The Rand McNally Series on the History of American Thought and Culture. Edited by David D. Van Tassel. Chicago: Rand McNally and Company, 1971.
- Lowenthal, Leo. "Biographies in Popular Magazines: From Production Leaders to Consumption Idols." In Amitai Etzioni and Eva Etzioni (eds.) Social Change: Sources, Patterns, and Consequences. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1964, pp. 243-250.
- Mandel, Jerry E. "The Presentation of Image in Charles H. Percy's Whistle-Stop Tour of 1966." Central States Speech Journal, XXI: 209-216, Winter 1970.
- Marx, Leo. The Machine in the Garden. New York: Oxford University Press, Inc., 1964.
- Matusow, Allen J. (ed.). Great Lives Observed: Joseph R. McCarthy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.
- Mattar, Edward P., III. Barry Goldwater: A Political Indictment. Riverdale, Md.: Century Twenty-One Limited, 1964.
- McDowell, Edwin. Barry Goldwater: Portrait of an Arizonan. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1964.
- Meyer, Frank S. "Conservatism and the Goldwater Consensus." National Review, November 5, 1963, pp. 386, 413.
- Meyer, Frank S. In Defense of Freedom: A Conservative Credo. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1962.

- Meyer, Frank S. The Conservative Mainstream. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1969.
- Meyer, Frank S. (ed.). What is Conservatism? New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964.
- Morgan, Thomas (ed.). Goldwater Either/Or a Self-Portrait Based Upon His Own Words. Washington, D.C.: Public Affairs Press, 1964.
- Moritz, Charles (ed.). "Buckley, William F(rank), Jr." Current Biography Yearbook. Twenty-third Annual Cumulation. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1962, pp. 57-60.
- Moritz, Charles (ed.). "Kirk, Russell (Amos)." Current Biography Yearbook. Twenty-third Annual Cumulation. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1962, pp. 36-39.
- Moritz, Charles (ed.). "Rossiter, Clinton (Lawrence, 3d)." Current Biography Yearbook. Twenty-eighth Annual Cumulation. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1967, pp. 351-354.
- Morrison, Matthew C. "The Role of the Political Cartoonist in Image Making." Central States Speech Journal, XX:252-260, Winter 1969.
- Murray, Henry A. (ed.). Myth and Mythmaking. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1960.
- Newman, William J. The Futilitarian Society. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1961.
- Nimmo, Dan D. Popular Images of Politics: A Taxonomy. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Novak, Robert D. The Agony of the G.O.P. 1964. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1965.
- Perrine, Laurence. Story and Structure. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1959.
- Perry, James M. Barry Goldwater: A New Look at a Presidential Candidate. Newsbook. Silver Spring, Md.: The National Observer, 1964.
- Perry, James M. "Goldwater, Barry." The Encyclopedia Americana, XIII: 38, 1975.
- Rank, Otto. The Myth of the Birth of the Hero, A Psychological Interpretation of Mythology. Translated by F. Robbins and S. E. Jelliffe. New York: Robert Brunner, 1952.

- Rosenthal, Paul I. "The Republican National Convention." The Quarterly Journal of Speech, L:394-399, December 1964.
- Rossiter, Clinton. Conservatism in America: The Thankless Persuasion. 2nd edition. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1962.
- Rossiter, Clinton. "The Legacy of John Adams." Yale Review, XLVI: 528-550, June 1957.
- Rossiter, Clinton. "Towards an American Conservatism." Yale Review, XLIV:354-372, Spring 1955.
- Rovere, Richard H. The Goldwater Caper. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965.
- Rubin, Louis and Robert Jacobs. Southern Renaissance: The Literature of the Modern South. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1953.
- Savage, Henry, Jr. Seeds of Time: The Background of Southern Thinking. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1959.
- Schoenberger, Robert A. (ed.). The American Right Wing: Readings in Political Behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Sexson, Paul A. and Stephen B. Miles, Jr. The Challenge of Conservatism. New York: Exposition Press, Inc., 1964.
- Shadegg, Stephen. Barry Goldwater: Freedom is His Flight Plan. New York: Fleet Publishing Corporation, 1962.
- Shadegg, Stephen. What Happened to Goldwater? The Inside Story of the 1964 Republican Campaign. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1965.
- Shirey, Keith. The Case against Barry Goldwater. Glendale, California: Harlequin Press, 1964.
- Shurter, Edwin DuBois (ed.). The Complete Orations and Speeches of Henry W. Grady. New York: Hinds, Noble and Eldredge, 1910.
- Smith, Henry Nash. Virgin Land: The American West as Symbol and Myth. Harvard Paperback. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. Social and Cultural Dynamics. Vol. 1. New York: American Book Co., 1937.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. Social and Cultural Dynamics. Vol. 2. New York: American Book Co., 1938.

- Sorokin, Pitirim A. Social and Cultural Dynamics. Vol. 3. New York: American Book Co., 1939.
- Sorokin, Pitirim A. Social and Cultural Dynamics. Vol. 4. New York: American Book Co., 1940.
- Special Book Offer 74-1. ISI Pamphlet. Bryn Mawr, Pa.: Intercollegiate Institute, Inc., n.d.
- Stevick, Philip. The Theory of the Novel. New York: Free Press, 1967.
- Sykes, A. J. M. "Myth and Attitude Change." Human Relations, XVIII: 323-336, November 1965.
- Sykes, A. J. M. "Myth in Communication." The Journal of Communication, XX:17-31, March 1970.
- Taylor, William R. Cavalier and Yankee. New York: George Braziller, Inc., 1961.
- Thompson, Stith. "Myths and Folktales." Journal of American Folklore, LXVIII:482-488, 1955.
- U. S. Congress. Senate. 87th Cong., 1st sess., May 9, 1961. Congressional Record, 107, 7594.
- U. S. Postal Service. Postal Service Manual. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1974, Section 135, 214d.
- Veninga, Robert. "The Functions of Symbols in Legend Construction . . . Some Exploratory Comments." Central States Speech Journal, XXII:161-170, Fall 1971.
- Vickery, John B. Myth and Literature: Contemporary Theory and Practice. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.
- Viereck, Peter. "But--I'm a Conservative." Atlantic Monthly, April 1940, pp. 538-543.
- Viereck, Peter. Conservatism: From John Adams to Churchill. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1956.
- Viereck, Peter. Conservatism Revisited: The Revolt against Revolt 1815-1949. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.
- Viereck, Peter. Shame and Glory of the Intellectuals: Babbit Jr. vs. the Rediscovery of Values. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1953.
- Viereck, Peter. The Unadjusted Man: A New Hero for Americans, Reflections on the Distinction Between Conforming and Conserving. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1956.

- Weaver, Richard M. Ideas Have Consequences. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1948.
- Weaver, Richard M. "Roots of the Liberal Complacency." National Review, June 8, 1957, pp. 541-543.
- Weaver, Richard M. The Ethics of Rhetoric. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1953.
- Weaver, Richard M. Visions of Order: The Cultural Crisis of Our Time. Baton Rouge, La.: Louisiana State University Press, 1964.
- Wellek, Rene and Austin Warren. Theory of Literature. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1942.
- White, Clifton F. and William J. Gill. Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement. New Rochelle, New York: Arlington House, 1967.
- Wood, Rob and Dean Smith. The Biography of a Conservative: Barry Goldwater. New York: Avon Books, Avon Book Division, 1961.
- Woodward, C. Vann. Origins of the New South: 1877-1913. Vol. IX: A History of the South. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1951.
- Wrage, Ernest J. "The Little World of Barry Goldwater." Western Speech, XXVII:207-215, Fall 1963.

Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page.