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PREFACE

An advertisement for Channel Five news on WMAQ-TV in Chicago features what appear to be "ordinary" people stopped at random on the streets and asked their opinion of the newscast. Of course, the people always say they like (or even "love") Channel Five news because the reporters and anchors are "objective." At the end of the commercial a deep, authoritative male voice proclaims, "Channel Five - we give it to you straight." Although I understand the nature and purpose of commercial advertisements, I cannot help but believe that if Channel Five really "gave it to me straight", I might hear some of those "ordinary" people say that the newscast could use a few improvements. Personally, I would suggest that the broadcast's anchors cease their seemingly innocuous banter between certain stories - banter which, ironically, often reveals a lack of objectivity.

A lack of objectivity is not limited to news reporters and anchors. Indeed, rhetorician Karlyn Kohrs Campbell has noted that, "Concealed within what are described as the purposes of rhetoric and its criticism may be assumptions..."
which bind us to a given culture, ideology, or moral viewpoint."\(^1\) In a Central States forum on "Political Reality and Rhetorical Criticism," Dan F. Hahn and Ruth M. Gonchar bluntly stated, "...the idea that any criticism can be objective must tickle the funny bone of a dozen contemporary philosophers."\(^2\) Moreover, Hahn and Gonchar maintained that several communication journals require critics to "write as though they were objective" which results in the following situation:

Accordingly, (1) everybody realizes that no one can be objective, yet (2) critics are not allowed to state their prejudices so that the reader may understand through what emotional filters the rhetorical criticisms have passed, thus (3) critics are not allowed to make value judgments unless they are cloaked in neutral words. It is unacceptable to say that a political candidate lied; the critic must say that he "seems to be dissembling" or he was "less than candid." The result often is that rhetorical criticisms are less than candid - and boring ....\(^3\)

The purpose of this preface is to explain my "emotional filters." I shall be candid in this discussion as in the ensuing thesis. However, I shall make no promises regarding
the liveliness of the discussion.

In 1985 I took a course at the Ohio State University titled "The Rhetoric of Social Movements." Naturally, one of the requirements of the class was to write a research paper about the rhetoric of a social movement. I chose to write about the Charismatic Renewal Movement.

My interest in the Charismatic Renewal Movement stemmed from my experience as a third generation Pentecostal. I attended a Pentecostal church, First Assembly of God, from the age of two weeks until I was eighteen years old. (I am presently attending another Assembly of God church.) However, I was introduced to other churches on family vacations and when visiting my father's relatives, most of whom were Methodists. I quickly learned that First Assembly of God was distinctly different from other churches.

At the "other churches," people were given a program which told them exactly which songs were going to be sung, which Bible verses would be read, how they should respond to those verses, and when they should stand up and sit down. To me, a person permeated by Pentecostalism, the atmosphere of these churches was best described by the oxymoron of
"reverent indifference" toward God.

At First Assembly the services usually followed a particular order, but there was always an air of expectancy that the "Spirit might move" and the service would take an unexpected turn. Specifically, there might be one or two messages in tongues (glossolalia), a prophecy, a faith healing service segment, testimonies, or just singing choruses with words taken from the Bible as opposed to singing traditional hymns. In short, the "other churches" were boring and yet comforting in their predictability while First Assembly was exciting and yet unsettling in its lack of predictability.

Despite these early observations, I basically took my religious background for granted until I entered college in 1980. While in college, I met and heard about Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Catholic students who were "filled with the Holy Spirit" in the Pentecostal sense. Further investigation revealed that these students were representative of a widespread phenomenon - the Charismatic Renewal Movement - which is said to have actually begun in 1955 or 1956 when Pentecostalism first had a "profound
effect on churches which historically, doctrinally, and liturgically were the furthest removed from Pentecostalism: Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Lutherans."\(^4\)

Although I believed (and still believe) that the Charismatic Renewal Movement is essentially a spiritual phenomenon, I recognized that sociological and communication factors also played a key role in the inception, growth, and maintenance of the movement. Moreover, I realized that religious movements have social implications. Indeed, in their highly acclaimed book *The Emerging Order*, Jeremy Rifkin and Ted Howard stated:

> The Charismatics are providing the kind of liberating energy that is essential for any full-scale assault on the authority of the existing economic (and political) order. Their success in marshaling all forms of communications - both mass and interpersonal - attests to their potential power as a mobilizing medium for a new movement.\(^5\)

According to a 1987 Gallup poll, 19 percent of Americans say they are Pentecostal or Charismatic, as are 256 million people around the world.\(^6\) Obviously, "mobilizing" efforts have been successful.
Nevertheless, the Charismatic Renewal is a grassroots movement with most of its leadership at the local level. However, the movement does have "a few visible national leaders." These leaders include Oral Roberts, Pat Robertson, Jim Bakker, and Jimmy Swaggart. Due to my personal interest in the Charismatic Renewal which was fueled by a previously mentioned course about the rhetoric of social movements, I watched the television broadcasts of Bakker, Swaggart, and Robertson for several months in 1985. Robertson's "The 700 Club" program was clearly the most sophisticated and the most politically-oriented.

Despite my awareness of the sometimes subtle, but always present political overtones of "The 700 Club", I was surprised when I heard rumors in late 1985 that Robertson might enter the 1988 Presidential race. Initially, the thought of Reverend Robertson becoming President Pat Robertson pleased me. My reaction was basically an emotional response to Robertson as a Charismatic. I identified with him because of my Pentecostal background. Furthermore, I hoped that Robertson, who seemed to be articulate, reasonable, and intelligent, could eradicate the
anti-intellectual, overly-emotional image of Pentecostals projected by Swaggart and Bakker.

I was wrong. Even before Robertson formally announced his candidacy, his religious beliefs and practices were mocked. Of course, those people who criticized Robertson's religious beliefs of speaking in tongues, word of knowledge, and miracles, chose their words carefully so that they would not appear to be intolerant. The ridicule Robertson received, whether subtle or blatant, bothered me. After all, from a religious standpoint I knew "where Robertson was coming from."

However, from a political perspective I was not sure where Robertson was going. For example, in a 1985 broadcast of "The 700 Club", Robertson stated that only Jews and Christians are qualified to hold office. Robertson has made other disturbing statements linking his religious views with political positions. Consequently, after analyzing Robertson's rhetoric I could no longer support his Presidential candidacy.

Although I could not support Robertson's bid for the Presidency, I believe that he had every right to enter the
Presidential race. As Patricia Jefferson explained in her dissertation regarding the New Religious-Political Right:

When America's founding fathers separated church from state, they sought to prohibit the establishment of a national religion where one denomination received governmental preference over another. Their aim was not to deny persons of the cloth their right to participate in the political process.11

Yet persons of the cloth, like all citizens, are expected to work within the boundaries of the political process. Even candidates who claim to hear directly from God must remember the distinctions between and implications of a theocracy versus a democracy.
Notes for Preface


3 Ibid., p.107.


7 Rifkin with Howard, p.181.

8 There are other leaders such as David Wilkerson who wrote The Cross and The Switchblade and Demos Shakarian who is the founder of the Full Gospel Business Men's Fellowship International. However, the four men named are more visible because of their national television programs.

9 I was unable to watch Robert's program due to time constraints.


CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

In a 1980 article in Harper's magazine, writer Dick Dabney questioned Marion Gordon (Pat) Robertson about the possibility of using the Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN) to run for political office. Robertson replied to Dabney's query by stating, "Let's put it this way. In the event of a major breakdown, the country might turn to us."\(^1\) According to a 1985 article in The Saturday Evening Post entitled "CBN's Pat Robertson: White House Next?", many people would be happy to turn to Robertson in 1988 for President of the United States. The article featured the comments of distinguished people such as John Exter, a professor of economics at Harvard and a former vice president of the Federal Reserve, who said he would vote for Robertson whom he deemed an "extraordinary man." No less glowing in his praise of Robertson was the prominent Bert Lance who was quoted as saying, "I think he's [Robertson's] a fine, fine individual."\(^2\)

Nevertheless, Robertson has also received cutting criticism. In his book Salvation for Sale, Gerard Straub, a former producer of "The 700 Club," portrays Robertson as a
deceitful demagogue.\textsuperscript{3} At a gathering of more than 700 members of the women's division of the Jewish United Fund in 1986, Geraldine Ferraro declared, "They're [Robertson, Swaggart, and Falwell] going to tell us what to think, what to read and where to worship. As an American of faith that scares me."\textsuperscript{4}

Ferraro must have been terrified on October 1, 1987 when Robertson announced his candidacy for the Republican Presidential nomination. His announcement was a study in contrasts. Robertson, the son of an United States Senator, stood in front of the dreary brownstone in a very poor section of Brooklyn where he and his family had lived for a short time in 1959. Gathered around Robertson were born-again Christians, rabbis from a group called "Jews for Morality," and militant homosexuals from a group called "Act Up".\textsuperscript{5} The crowd was cheering and jeering Robertson.

According to one account, "When Robertson stood to make his prepared address, a wave of chanting protests drowned out his attempts. He asked for - but did not receive - a 'right to be heard.'"\textsuperscript{6} The man who had been heard by 28 million people a month through his television program, "The 700 Club,"\textsuperscript{7} had been silenced in a matter of minutes by a handful of hecklers.
However, Robertson recovered. His voice was heard loudly and clearly in the Iowa caucuses with his "stunning second-place showing."\(^8\) Robertson's success in February's Iowa caucuses is less shocking when one considers that he won the Republican Iowa straw poll held in September, 1987. Furthermore, in late October, 1987, Robertson had won a straw poll in southern Illinois and in early November, 1987 he had won a straw poll in Maine.\(^9\) In short, Robertson's campaign seemed to be progressing fairly well.

Nevertheless, one month after his Iowa victory Robertson developed a serious case of "laryngitis" during the Super Tuesday primaries from which he never completely recovered. The magnitude of Robertson's Super Tuesday defeat was best exemplified by his third place finish even in his home state of Virginia.\(^10\) Realizing the futility of his efforts, Robertson announced on May 16, 1988 that he would formally forsake his campaign for President and support George Bush.

Thus far, Robertson's vocal cords still seem to be in pain when it comes to backing Bush, but Robertson has begun to speak in hoarse tones about his own revival - a political revival in 1992. If Robertson hopes to succeed in his bid for the Presidency in 1992, he will have to do a better job of handling "the most pressing task" of his 1988 campaign.
which was finding a way "to shake the negative connotations
that go with the label, 'television evangelist.'"¹¹ These
negative connotations are succinctly explained by a voter
from Macon, Georgia, Sharon White, who describes herself as
a "very religious Baptist." In an interview with reporters
from Time magazine, White stated why she opposed Robertson's
campaign. White said, "First, because I don't believe in
mixing religion and politics. Second, because he smiles and
giggles too much. I can't trust that."¹²

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to conduct a scholarly
analysis of the rhetoric of Pat Robertson in order to
understand him better as a Charismatic television evangelist
and as a Presidential candidate. The major question this
study seeks to address asks: "What does Robertson's
rhetoric reveal regarding his conception of the proper role
of religion in politics?" The significance of this question
is best understood in relation to the cherished principle of
separation of church and state.

In answering the major question, several other key
issues must be addressed including Robertson's
interpretation of the Constitution based upon his analysis
of American history and his opinion of the Supreme Court in
conjunction with his expansionary view of Presidential power. Furthermore, this thesis will explore Robertson's rhetoric in light of his different audiences as well as assessing his uses of the media.

**Terminology**

The general purpose of this thesis and the specific major question which it seeks to answer have been described in terms of studying Robertson's "rhetoric." Hence, the word "rhetoric" should be defined.

Aristotle, the revered, classical Greek philosopher who has been deemed the "Father of Science," delineated the foundational definition of rhetoric upon which other definitions have been built. According to Aristotle, rhetoric is "the faculty of discovering in a particular case what are the available means of persuasion."¹³ Persuasion is the key element in rhetoric. The concept of persuasion, whether plainly stated or just subtly implied, is inherent in all definitions of rhetoric.

Kenneth Burke, "the foremost rhetorician in the twentieth century,"¹⁴ defines the function of rhetoric as "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents."¹⁵ John J. Makay asserts that, "Rhetoric may be thought of as the process of
human communication in which a speaker sorts, selects, and sends symbols for the specific purpose of evoking a precise response from the receivers." 16 Richard Crable contends that rhetoric is "symbolic interaction aimed at mediation." Hence, rhetoric deals with how human beings "make 'their world' more the way they want it to be." 17

Unfortunately, the "popular" concept of rhetoric is based upon the dubious oral and written verbal efforts of people trying to cover-up reality rather than explaining it or trying to mediate change. Consequently, rhetoric is commonly thought of as simply flowery language, style devoid of content, and/or deceitful communication. From this perspective rhetoric is perhaps not worthy of scholarly analysis. However, Chaim Perelman explains the true nature of rhetoric. Perelman proclaims that the goal of rhetoric "is to intensify an adherence to values, to create a disposition to act, and finally to bring people to act. Seen in such a perspective, rhetoric becomes a subject of great philosophic interest." 18

Rhetoric's goal is to bridge the gap between a particular situation or "what is" and what could or ought to be. The rhetorical process leading to the action necessary to create the desired state of affairs usually includes not only personal and pathetic proof, but also logical proof or
reasoning. As in the case of personal and pathetic proof, logical proof must be used to form an argument for specific listeners which will challenge them to reorder or choose among their values. If the rhetorical process is successful and people are moved to take action, then change will take place. Hence, rather than being divorced from reality, rhetoric is intimately involved with it.

Given the importance of rhetoric, rhetorical criticism merits equal attention. Concerning criticism in general, Edwin Black explains that, "Criticism is a discipline that, through the investigation and appraisal of the activities and products of men, seeks as its end the understanding of man himself."\(^{19}\) Specifically, with regard to rhetorical criticism, both Black and Kenneth Hance claim that rhetorical criticism is "the description, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of persuasive uses of languages."\(^{20}\) With regard to these four aspects of rhetorical criticism, Hance simply says that:

1. 'Description' means an attempt to get at this kind of question: what happened, what was said, what went on?
2. 'Analysis': why did this happen -- trying to find reasons.
3. 'Interpretation': what is the meaning of what happened -- what trends, tendencies, categories, and so forth, do we find there?
4. 'Evaluation': how good is that which happened?\(^{21}\)
Black explains that descriptive analysis (first stage) is based only on the content of the discourse itself. The second stage of rhetorical criticism is concerned with the extrinsic elements of discourse. Black's third stage, interpretative analysis, "focuses on the critic, reflecting his interests and biases." As Sonja Foss points out, "The critic cannot be objective, impartial and removed from the data because he or she only can know the world through his or her interpretations of it." Despite being subjective, the critic is supposed to evaluate the data. Indeed, Barbara and Henry Ewbank contend that, "...until one renders his judgment he has not yet arrived at criticism." Wayne Brockriede takes this idea a step further by claiming that, "...useful rhetorical criticism, whatever else it may be, must function as an argument."  

This thesis advances several arguments based upon the description, analysis, and interpretation of Robertson's rhetoric. The materials that were studied are listed in the following section.

Collection of Data

Review of Academic Literature: A thorough search of the Comprehensive Dissertation Index 1861-1972 (and its supplements for subsequent years), which is said to list
"virtually every doctoral dissertation awarded since American doctoral programs began,"^26 yielded no dissertations regarding rhetorical studies of Pat Robertson. However, two qualifying points must be made. First, master's theses are not necessarily recorded in the Comprehensive Dissertation Index, so it is possible that Robertson has been the subject of a graduate-level paper. Second, the 1987 and 1988 supplements were unavailable during the two-month time period when the search was conducted. Consequently, the 1987 edition of the Dissertation Abstracts International index was consulted. (The 1988 supplement had not yet been published). No rhetorical studies of Robertson were cited.

However, both the Comprehensive Dissertation Index and the Dissertation Abstracts International listed several dissertations dealing with similar and pertinent subjects. For example, there have been several dissertations written about the rhetoric of Jerry Falwell stressing the implications of politicizing the pulpit. Much broader in scope, but essentially still dealing with the same subject, are the dissertations which analyze the rhetoric of the "New Religious-Political Right." These dissertations only mentioned Pat Robertson in passing.
A review of the leading Communication journals revealed that there were no articles dealing with Pat Robertson exclusively and only two articles that mentioned him. The journals reviewed include Central States Speech Journal, Philosophy and Rhetoric, Quarterly Journal of Speech, Communication Monographs (formerly Speech Monographs), The Southern Speech Communication Journal, Communication Education (formerly Speech Teacher), Communication Quarterly (formerly Today's Speech), The Western Journal of Speech Communication (formerly Western Speech), Rhetoric Review, and Rhetoric Society Quarterly.27

The Southern Speech Communication Journal article which mentioned Robertson was titled, "A Rhetoric Of Public Theology: The Religious Rhetor And Public Policy." The article's author, Steve Goldzwig, argues that "a rhetoric of public theology differs markedly from that of civil religion...." In order to prove his point, Goldzwig focuses on the rhetoric of the Archbishop Oscar Romero and on the Rhetoric of Jerry Falwell. Robertson merited only two sentences in the article.28

Robertson's rhetoric did receive more attention in an article titled, "Resolving the Paradox in Politicized Christian Fundamentalism." This article asks the question, "How can the movement [fundamentalism] embrace an
apocalyptic religious doctrine while advocating an optimistic political agenda?" The question's answer is sought through examining the rhetoric of Jerry Falwell, Tim LaHaye, Francis Schaffer, and Pat Robertson in terms of Hofstadter's hypothesis of political paranoia.29

Articles in Communication Quarterly and in The Western Journal Of Speech Communication have dealt with the issue of religion in politics by analyzing the rhetoric of Jimmy Carter. Finally, a few articles in various Communication journals have examined the impact of Fundamentalism and the "Christian Right" on the political process. In short, the question of proper boundaries between church and state which Robertson's Presidential campaign brings to mind has been of interest to Communication scholars even though Robertson has not received much individual attention from the scholars. Nevertheless, a great deal of literature exists which lends insight to Robertson's beliefs.

Primary Sources: Robertson has written six books which explain his religious beliefs and which sometimes venture into the political realm. Robertson's first book, Shout It From The Housetops, tells his life story. The book is filled with interesting and even bizarre accounts of Robertson's efforts to find and follow God's will for his life.30 Robertson's second book, My Prayer For You, is long
on sentiment and short on substance. However, the book does contain a useful chapter entitled, "Charter for Divine Guidance," in which Robertson explains the basic principles of understanding God's guidance.  

In his third book The Secret Kingdom, which became a national bestseller, Robertson delineates eight "laws" of the kingdom of God that he believes must be followed in order to achieve "unbounded success in business and family life." Robertson explains the complete significance of these "laws" by stating, "They, and they alone, can alter the world's slide into anarchy or dictatorship. They offer a third choice."  

One of the "laws" Robertson talks about in The Secret Kingdom is the "law of miracles." Robertson's fifth book, Beyond Reason, is devoted entirely to the subject of miracles. The book contains dozens of sensational accounts of miracles such as a beauty queen being healed of lupus, a severely mentally retarded teenager who suddenly was able to play complex classical music on the piano, and a husband who forgave his wife's rapist. With regard to this thesis, the most important chapter of Beyond Reason is a chapter entitled "The Master Keys to Miracles." This chapter includes an interesting discussion of the concept of "power."
Robertson's fourth book is titled, *Answers To 200 Of Life's Most Probing Questions*. The questions Robertson chooses to address - in and of themselves without even considering his answers to them - lend insight to his mindset. Robertson tackles everything from "Why is there suffering in the world?" to "What do you think of long hair for a man?" Interestingly enough, whether Robertson is dealing with human suffering or human hair, he is able to answer most of the 200 probing questions in two pages or less. Nevertheless, the book does contain an important section entitled, "Christians and Government," which asks questions such as "What duty do I owe the government, and what duty do I owe God?"[^34]

*America's Dates With Destiny* is Robertson's final book. The book is divided into three sections. The first section, "Beginning Our Journey," describes eleven key events in America's history from 1607 through 1886 which laid the foundation for religious, spiritual, and political freedom. The second section is called "Losing Our Way" and describes nine events from 1917 through 1975 which Robertson believes undermined everything from "Old World dreams and values" to "the will to win." In the third section, "Finding Our Way Again," Robertson describes the forthcoming Election Day, 1988 as "a mandate to take our place as responsible citizens
in every level of government."\textsuperscript{35} Bill Kling, who reviewed the book in 1986 for \textit{The Washington Times}, writes "America's Dates With Destiny is an election campaign document - Christian broadcaster Pat Robertson's book on why he wants to be president, combined with an impassioned call for Christian political activity and tips on political organizing."\textsuperscript{36} Given the duality of religious and political themes in America's Dates With Destiny, it is an important primary source.

Another important primary source is a newsletter Robertson wrote for members of "The 700 Club." The newsletter was entitled \textit{Pat Robertson's Perspective} and its purpose according to Robertson was to comment "from a Biblical perspective on the course of economics, geopolitics, and the Christian reaction to things that were happening in our society."\textsuperscript{37} Robertson wrote his Perspective from February of 1977 through part of 1982. Unfortunately, the author of this thesis could not obtain the 1977 and 1978 editions.\textsuperscript{38} Furthermore, it is difficult to determine whether all of the 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982 editions have been obtained because of an inconsistent dating system. For example, some of the Perspectives are dated "Fall 1982," "May 1981," "January/February 1981," and "Mid-July 1979."
In addition to Robertson's books and his newsletter, transcripts of "The 700 Club" are a valuable source. Representatives of People For The American Way monitored "The 700 Club" in 1987 while Robertson was still acting as the host of the television show. Excerpts from the show have been printed by People For The American Way. These excerpts elucidate Robertson's views on various topics including the Supreme Court, the 1987 Fair Housing Act, education, and religious freedom.

Robertson has also delivered a few speeches which provide significant source material for this thesis. Among these speeches is his "A New Vision For America" speech which was delivered on September 17, 1986 and which outlined the conditions that had to be met in order for him to run for President. Robertson's formal declaration of his Presidential candidacy summarized his main concerns regarding America's "quest for greatness." Several of these concerns resurfaced in two speeches recorded on cassette tapes and distributed by Americans For Robertson.

In addition to the aforementioned sources, Robertson's sixteen position papers provide important material for analysis. The position papers cover the following topics: strengthening the American family, national defense, reducing the federal budget deficit, welfare, environmental
defense initiative, child care, the economy, world trade, and industry, energy independence, securing the rights and dignity of our older citizens, the AIDS epidemic, abortion and euthanasia, hunger and homelessness, farm issues, restoring excellence in education, tort liability reform, and foreign policy. Other sources include campaign pamphlets and numerous press releases from Americans For Robertson which quote Robertson extensively.

Secondary Sources: Although Pat Robertson has been hosting the internationally syndicated program "The 700 Club" - which reportedly reaches millions of viewers every week - for several years, he has only recently become the subject of biographies. One of the first biographies about Robertson, appropriately titled Pat Robertson: A Biography, was written by Neil Eskelin who was one of the first employees at CBN. Even though Eskelin devotes a few pages to Robertson's wild ways and partying days during his youth, this book is a completely favorable account of Robertson's life. 39

Naturally, Robertson also fares well in Pat Robertson: The Authorized Biography by John B. Donovan. Donovan's account of Robertson's life is based mainly on the over forty-five hours of interviews he conducted with Robertson, Robertson's wife, Dede, and many of Robertson's close
personal and business friends. Even though Donovan's book simply describes Robertson's life rather than analyzing it, this biography provides helpful information for this thesis.

However, the most valuable biography is David Edwin Harrell, Jr's. book, *Pat Robertson: A Personal, Political and Religious Portrait*. Harrell is the chairman of the Department of History at the University of Alabama in Birmingham and has written several books. In this book, Harrell poses questions such as, "What does a charismatic mean when he says 'God told me'?," "What are the foreign policy implications of dispensational premillennialism?," and "What is the proper relationship between religion and politics in America?" Harrell addresses these questions in terms of Robertson's views. Although it is not classified as a biography, Hubert Morken's book, *Pat Robertson: Where He Stands*, raises some of the same questions as Harrell's book. *Pat Robertson: Where He Stands* is a significant secondary source because it is based on transcripts of numerous speeches and interviews given by Robertson and because Morken has an extensive background in political science and government.

Another important source is Gerard Thomas Straub's book, *Salvation For Sale: An Insider's View of Pat Robertson*. Straub is the former producer of "The 700 Club."
He was fired from CBN for sexual misconduct. Straub's book fires back at Robertson by portraying him as power-hungry and prideful. At the other end of the spectrum is Dede Robertson's book, *My God Will Supply*. Dede Robertson writes about her husband with tremendous love and respect despite including a few stories in her book which demonstrate that Pat Robertson fell far short from being a perfect husband and father early in their marriage.

Pat Robertson has not only been the subject of several books, he has also been the subject of hundreds of articles in newspapers and magazines. While it would be cumbersome to mention each article here, special note should be given to those publications which were especially useful. These newspapers and magazines include *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Time*, *Newsweek*, *Christianity Today*, and *Charisma* which calls itself, "The magazine about Spirit-led living".

In order to gain a better understanding of the role religion plays in politics, several books have been consulted. Among these are: *The New Religious Political Right In America*, by Hill and Owen; *One Nation Under God?*, by Noll; *Holy Terror*, by Conway and Siegelman; *Born-Again Politics*, by Zwier; *The Bible Vote*, by Shriver; *The Religious Right and Christian Faith*, by
Packre\textsuperscript{50}; and The Naked Public Square, by Neuhaus.\textsuperscript{51} The authors of these books come from diverse backgrounds including theology, communication, philosophy, and political science.

\textit{Organization of the Study}

The most important task of this first chapter was to explain the purpose of the study. Information regarding rhetorical criticism was included in conjunction with the explanation. However, no mention was made of the method that is used to study Robertson's rhetoric. Chapter two is devoted to delineating the methodology. Specifically, the second chapter will highlight the key ideas of Kenneth Burke. These key ideas are described in terms of Burke's philosophy of rhetoric as well as in terms of the techniques of dramatistic criticism.

Chapter three seeks to answer the question, "Who is Pat Robertson?" In order to address this question, Robertson's family, education, religious influences, careers, and political evolution are discussed. Chapter four focuses on the socio-political milieu which gave rise to Robertson's political activity. This chapter reviews the role that organizations such as the Moral Majority, Christian Voice, and Religious Roundtable played in the inception and growth
of the New Religious Political Right of which Robertson is a part.

Chapters five, six, and seven constitute the "meat" of the thesis. Chapter five analyzes Robertson's pre-campaign rhetoric. Chapter six analyzes his campaign rhetoric and also compares it to his earlier communication. The final chapter -chapter seven- states the main findings of the study as well as explaining the significance of these findings.
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CHAPTER II
BURKE'S DRAMATISTIC APPROACH TO RHETORIC

The primary purpose of this chapter is to summarize Kenneth Burke's philosophy of rhetoric and to briefly explain the techniques of Burkeian criticism. However, before turning to the primary purpose, a compendious discussion will address the question of why Burke's theories were chosen to analyze Robertson's rhetoric.

In *The Philosophy Of Literary Form*, Burke stated that the critic should "use all that is there to use."\(^1\) Although one scholar has pointed out that extolling Burke for this observation is like "praising a genius for his weaknesses,"\(^2\) Burke's remark is in keeping with his own experience. Burke was a poet, novelist, music and literary critic, semanticist, social psychologist, translator, philosopher and rhetorician.\(^3\) Burke's dramaturgical theory was developed because of-not in spite of-his broad background. The interdisciplinary nature of Burke's works represent an integration of knowledge which is vital to understanding complex human relations.

Yet, even though Burke "defies identification with any single discipline,"\(^4\) Marie Hochmuth Nichols has declared
that he "deserves to be related to the great tradition of rhetoric." Indeed, Golden, Berquist, and Coleman have noted that Burke "argues that because language is symbolic action rhetorical analysis can throw light upon human relations and motives generally, while rhetoric as a social force arising out of an atmosphere of divisiveness can promote consubstantiality and peace through the process of identification." The forthcoming chapters will explore Robertson's motives and manner of achieving identification with various groups of people. Hence, Burke's fundamental assumptions regarding rhetoric will now be addressed in preparation for a critical analysis of Robertson's rhetoric.

**Burke's Philosophy of Rhetoric**

The function of rhetoric is the first point to be discussed. In his *Attitudes Toward History*, Burke asserts that:

Be he poet or scientist, one defines the "human situation" as amply as his imagination permits; then, with this ample definition in mind, he singles out certain functions or relationships as either friendly or unfriendly. If they are deemed friendly, he prepares himself to welcome them; if they are deemed unfriendly, he weighs objective resistances against his own resources, to decide how far he can effectively go in combatting them.
Essentially, Burke is saying that a person selects strategies for coping with the "human situation." These strategies are symbols that reflect attitudes. Language is the symbol. According to communication theorist Stephen Littlejohn, language reflects attitudes because it is emotionally loaded with no word being affectively neutral.

By starting with the human as (s)he reacts symbolically to his/her environment, Burke arrives at the function of rhetoric. This function is "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents." Evolving from this function are two major concepts. The first of these is the idea that verbal symbols are meaningful acts in response to situations from which motives can be derived. In this sense, motives may be defined as "labels for completed action." When discussing the relationship between symbols and action, Burke maintains that, "We must name the friendly or unfriendly functions and relationships in such a way that we are able to do something about them." He goes on to explain that in naming them, one communicates an attitude that is a cue for the behavior of others. Also, one's motives are revealed in one's choice of words.

The second concept rising from the function of rhetoric is the idea that society is dramatistic in nature. Burke
contends that humans tend toward action and because action is the "primary qualitative part of drama," society may be viewed as a dramatistic process. This dramatistic process includes the elements of hierarchy, acceptance and rejection, and guilt, purification, and redemption.

Hierarchy creates the structure of the dramatistic society. Rhetorical critic Bernard Brock explains that according to Burke, social, economic, and political powers are unevenly divided in society. "Power endows individuals with authority. Authority establishes definite relationships among people, reflecting the degree to which they possess power." In Permanence and Change, Burke describes "bureaucratization" in terms of giving organization to the hierarchy. Bureaucratization of the hierarchy comes as people accept their positions and work within a hierarchical structure. This acceptance of position brings order to society.

A thorough understanding of the polar term "order," which indirectly suggests the opposite condition of "disorder," can only be achieved in light of Burke's notion of the Negative. Burke describes the Negative as the "essence" of language. Indeed, Burke states, "The essential distinction between the verbal and the nonverbal is in the fact that language adds the peculiar possibility
of the Negative." Burke contends that there are no negatives in nature. In nature "everything simply is what it is and as it is." The negative or nonexistence results from language or the separation of a symbol from the thing that is represents. Historically, since there is no negative in nature, Burke points out that, "The negative begins not as a resource of definition or information, but as a command, as 'Don't'." Language enables a person to accept or reject his/her hierarchical position or even the hierarchy itself. Acceptance results in satisfaction and order, whereas rejection results in alienation and disorder.

Guilt, purification, and redemption represent the effects of acceptance and rejection of the hierarchy. According to Brock's interpretation of Burke's works, whenever a person rejects the traditional hierarchy, (s)he "falls," and thereby acquires a feeling of guilt. Guilt is inherent in society because people cannot accept all the impositions of their traditional hierarchy. Conditions change, resulting in the rejection of some of the traditional modes. Also, each social institution has its own hierarchy, and when any one of these hierarchies is in conflict with another, rejection of one will inevitably occur.
Furthermore, guilt "reduces social cohesion and gives man the feeling of being less than whole, so that he strives to have his guilt cancelled or to receive redemption."\(^{28}\) The act of purification may be either mortification or victimage. Mortification is a "scrupulous and deliberate clamping of limitation upon the self."\(^{29}\) Therefore, mortification is an act of self-sacrifice. Victimage is the opposite of mortification in that it involves the purging of guilt through a scapegoat.\(^{30}\) Burke (as cited by Coyne) explains the significance of victimage in the following manner:

...is it not a terrifying thing that you can never get people together except when they have a goat in common? That's the terrifying thing that I begin to see as the damnation of the human race. That's how they have to operate; they get congregation by segregation. You might put that as your formula for this whole scheme.\(^{31}\)

Indeed, Burke's essay, "The Rhetoric Of Hitler's 'Battle,'" clearly demonstrates this principle of victimage wherein the German people united because of the scapegoat, Jews.

Although mortification and victimage are the means through which guilt is redeemed, it may be avoided through transcendence. Burke discusses guilt and transcendence in *The Philosophy of Literary Form, The Rhetoric of Religion,*
and *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Essentially, (according to communication scholar Barry Brummett) Burke is saying that the guilt or "sin" is put into a perspective which "redefines it as 'not-a-sin.' [but] as a virtue or as the requirement of some higher and nobler hierarchy."\(^3^2\)

The final point to be addressed regarding Burke's philosophy of rhetoric is his concept of identification. The "most concise expression of Burke's theory of identification"\(^3^3\) is found in *Dramatism and Development*. Burke writes:

> The term "identification" can be applied in at least three ways. The first is quite dull. It flowers in such usages as that of a politician who, though rich, tells humble constituents of his humble origins. The second kind of identification involves the workings of antithesis, as when allies who would otherwise dispute among themselves join forces against a common enemy. This application also can serve to deflect criticism, as a politician can call any criticism of his policies "unpatriotic," on the grounds that it reënforces the claims of the nation's enemies. But the major power of "identification" derives from situations in which it goes unnoticed. My prime example is the word "we," as when the statement that "we" are at war includes under the same head soldiers who are getting killed and speculators who hope to make a killing in war stocks. Often "we" must feel quite mean, when
introducing discriminations into identifications of that sort.34

Furthermore, Burke relates identification to the terms "substance" and "consubstantiality." He states:

```
For substance...was an act; and a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together, men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas, attitudes that make them consubstantial.35
```

Identification is seen, then, as an acting together that grows out of the ambiguities of substance. Both division and unity exist simultaneously. Division exists because each person remains unique and unity or consubstantiality exists to the extent that actors share a "locus of motives."36 To the extent that the audience accepts and rejects the same ideas, people, and institutions that the speaker does, identification occurs. The speaker's language will reveal the substance out of which (s)he expects to identify with his or her listeners. The person's words will reveal consciously or unconsciously his or her attitudes toward the obvious divisions. Brock maintains that, "The concept of identification will help the critic structure his insight into a speaker's sense of unity by grouping strategies into "clusters" until relationships indicate the speaker's concept of hierarchy and reflect the process of guilt, purification, and redemption.37
The preceding discussion has focused on Burke's philosophy of rhetoric. The remainder of this chapter will address the techniques of Burkean criticism. Techniques are defined in the most general sense as "analytical or critical tools, procedural suggestions or devices applied to some act to extract meaning and/or understanding."\(^{38}\)

**The Techniques of Burkean Criticism**

Dramatistic criticism consists of three phases of critical action. The first of these phases is the "statistical analysis of the verbal structures which comprise symbolic acts." Secondly, one must search for "a symbol (or symbols) which represent the essential character of the acts" (representative anecdote). The third phase is the "pentadic analysis of the interrelationships among the multiple dimensions of symbolic action."\(^{39}\) The techniques of dramatistic criticism may be considered attempts to answer questions which "explore the coordinates of the act."\(^{40}\) These questions and their corresponding techniques are as follows:

1. "What implies what?" (indexing, concordances)
2. "What equals what?" (cluster analysis, pun analysis and translating)
3. "What versus what?" (agon analysis)
4. "What strategies were employed?" (situation-strategy)
5. "What name best epitomizes this act?" (essentializing)
6. "What follows what?" (form)
7. "From what through what to what?" (purification, purification and redemption)
8. "Why?" (pentad)
9. "What identification occurred?" (identification) \(^{41}\)

Although not all of these techniques are applicable to every act, the critic should use as many of them as possible in order to achieve a thorough analysis of his/her subject. Unfortunately, a complete explanation of how to employ these techniques is beyond the scope of this chapter. The subsequent discussion will concentrate on the pentad which is said to be the foundation of the other techniques. \(^{42}\)

The pentad consists of five parts: act, scene, agent, agency, and purpose. Each part answers a question and has a corresponding philosophic terminology. \(^{43}\) Furthermore, the pentad is important in relation to substance. Substance is now defined as "something that stands beneath or supports the person or thing." \(^{44}\) The principle of substance is central in Burke's rhetorical criticism because all speeches must establish a substance that is the context for the speech or the key to the speaker's attitudes. \(^{45}\) There are four types of substance: familial, directional, geometric, and dialectic. \(^{46}\) Each type of substance is established when a given term from the pentad is featured to the point that
it dominates the speech.

The act for Burke is the key term in the pentad. The act is the word that names what took place, in thought or deed and answers the question, "What is done?" When the act is featured in discourse, the philosophy that dominates within the speech is realism. In defining realism, Burke cites Aristotle: "Things are more or less real according as they are more or less energeia (actu, from which our 'actuality' is derived)." Thus, "a form is an act." Things do not just exist, but rather they "take form." The terminology that is associated with the act suggests an emphasis upon verbs. The realist grammar treats the individual as a participant in substance.

The scene is "the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred." It answers the question, "When or where was the act done?" A philosophy of materialism corresponds to the scene. Burke refers to Baldwin's Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology in defining materialism as:

...that metaphysical theory which regards all the facts of the universe as sufficiently explained by the assumption of body and matter, conceived as extended, impenetrable, eternally existent, and susceptible of movement or change of relative position.
Darwin's *The Origin of the Species* illustrates some of the terminology that accompanies the domination of the scene: "accidental variation," "natural selection," and "survival of the fittest." These terms in and of themselves are not important. However, what the terms imply is noteworthy. They suggest that when the scene dominates, one is controlled by forces external to himself or herself. This would serve to remove responsibility from his or her actions. Geometric substance is paired with the scene. This type of substance refers to an object placed in its setting, existing both in itself and as part of its background. Essentially, this amounts to what Burke calls "participation in a context."

Agent is the term used to name what person or kind of person performed the act. Obviously, the question it answers is, "Who did it?" The philosophy corresponding to agent is idealism. This is defined as "any theory which maintains the universe to be throughout to work of reason and mind." Therefore, apart from the activity of the self or subject in sensory reaction, memory and association, imagination, judgment and inference, there can be no world of objects. Idealistic philosophies think in terms of the "ego," the "self," the "subjective," "mind," "spirit," and "consciousness." Burke suggests that treating ideas --
church, race, nation, historical periods, cultural movements -- as "personalities" usually indicates idealism. Furthermore, the dominance of agent grows out of the spiritualization of the family. Whenever important human economic relations have become idealized or spiritualized, the agent is featured.  

In turn, when agent is featured, a familial substance evolves. Thus, substance is defined in terms of ancestral cause. Under the head of "tribal" definition would fall any variant of the idea of biological descent, with the substance of the offspring being derived from the substance of the parents or family. For example, a doctrine of race supremacy such as the Nazi "blood" philosophy is based on familial substance.

The terms agency and purpose will be considered together. Agency refers to the means or instruments an actor used to perform an act. "How did the actor do it?", is the question that agency answers whereas purpose answers, "Why did the actor do it?" Therefore, agency and purpose exist in a means-ends relationship. Burke points out that "means are considered in terms of ends." But as "you play down the concept of final cause (as modern science does),...there is a reversal of causal ancestry--and whereas means were treated in terms of ends, ends become treated in
terms of means." As an illustration Burke shows that money, which is the means (agency) of obtaining goods and services, simultaneously is the end (purpose) of work. 62

In featuring the agency, the pragmatic philosophy is dominant. Pragmatism is defined by Burke as "the means necessary to the attainment of happiness." Directional substance is associated with the agency. In explaining directional substance, Burke says:

Frequently, with metaphors of "the way," the directional stresses the sense of motivation from within. Often strongly futuristic, purposive, its slogan might be: Not "Who are you?" or "Where are you from?" but "Where are you going?" 63

The philosophy corresponding to purpose is mysticism. The Baldwin dictionary describes the philosophy of mysticism:

...those forms of speculative and religious thought which profess to attain an immediate apprehension of the divine essence or the ultimate ground of existence...Penetrated by the thought of the ultimate of all experience, and impatient of even a seeming separation from the creative source of things, mysticism succumbs to a species of metaphysical fascination. 64

According to Brock, mysticism equals purpose because of such references as "the divine essence" and "the creative source." In mysticism, the element of unity is emphasized
to the point that individuality disappears. Identification
often becomes so strong as to indicate the "unity of the
individual with some cosmic or universal purpose." 65 This
means that everything is judged against a universal purpose
that has become a compulsive force.

Purpose is central to dialectic substance. This type
of substance reflects "the ambiguities of substance, since
symbolic communication is not a merely external instrument,
but also intrinsic to men as agents. The motivational
properties of dialectic substance characterize both the
'human situation' and what men are 'in themselves'." The
ambiguity of external and internal motivation creates
dialectic substance. 66

The areas covered by the five terms of the pentad
overlap upon one another. 67 Hence, ratios between the terms
may be established. A ratio is a formula indicting a
transition from one term to another. There are twenty
possible combinations of terms because the most frequently
recognized ten ratios may also be reversed. Thus, a mode of
thought in keeping with the scene-agent ratio would situate
in the scene certain potentialities that were said to be
actualized in the agent. Conversely, the agent-scene ratio
would situate in the agent potentialities actualized in the
scene. 68
According to Burke, ratios "are used sometimes to explain an act and sometimes to justify it." When people's actions are to be interpreted in terms of the circumstances in which they are acting, their behavior would fall under the heading of a "scene-act ratio." Moreover, Burke contends that:

Any change of the circumference in terms of which an act is viewed implies a corresponding change in one's view of the quality of the act's motivation. Such a loose yet compelling correspondence between act and scene is called "a scene-act ratio."

As an example of the scene-act ratio one may consider the rhetoric of wife-abusers. These men frequently explain, justify, and/or excuse their violent acts by saying that they were provoked by their wives and/or intoxicated at the time. As for enlarging the scene's "circumference," the wife-abusers sometimes indicate that they were abused as children, thereby creating a victim as victimizer scenario.

Another example may be helpful in explaining the nature of ratios. Insofar as people's acts reveal their different characters, their behavior would fall under the heading of an "agent-act ratio." The news media used this ratio when reporting on the selection of Dan Quayle as George Bush's running mate. Journalists raised questions about Quayle's
character by focusing on his golf weekend with Paula Parkinson and his enlistment in the Indiana National Guard during the Viet Nam War.

Many other examples could be given to explain pentadic ratios. Hopefully, though, the aforementioned examples demonstrated sufficiently that ratios function in an explanatory rather than quantitative manner.

Kenneth Burke's philosophy of rhetoric provides the critic with a theoretical framework for understanding people's basic rhetorical tendencies. Instead of just describing communication, Burke's dramatism furnishes a structure that aids in its interpretation. Although Burke's methods are as applicable to one kind of discourse as to another,72 his dramaturgical theory is especially useful in analyzing the discourse of people in the political arena. Indeed, as Burke once said, "Politics above all is drama."73 The following chapters will examine the "drama" of Pat Robertson's 1988 Presidential primary campaign in light of its religious sub-text.
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CHAPTER III

WHO IS PAT ROBERTSON?

Rhetoric may be viewed as an instrument for understanding and improving human relations.\(^1\) According to Kenneth Burke, "Human relations should be analyzed with respect to the leads discovered by a study of drama."\(^2\) Action is intrinsic to drama. Consequently, this thesis focuses on the rhetorical acts of the agent, Pat Robertson. However, in order to understand these acts, one must also achieve an understanding of an agent's formation of attitudes. Burke explains that, "But as the act derives from an attitude of the agent, the agent-act ratio can be narrowed to an attitude-act ratio...."\(^3\) Essentially, then, the study of an agent's attitude formation is equivalent to studying the agent himself or herself.

The purpose of this chapter is to answer the question, "Who is Pat Robertson?" Addressing this question is not a simple task because one must take into account what Burke calls the "paradox of substance." Burke contends that, "A character cannot 'be himself' unless many others among the \underline{dramatis personae} contribute to this end, so that the very essence of a character's nature is in a large measure
defined, or determined, by the other characters who variously assist or oppose him." Accordingly, this chapter will discuss the key people in Robertson's life who have helped and hindered him in attaining his goals.

Furthermore, Burke points out that the essence of an individual is shaped by his or her association with diverse organizations or even "general bodies of thought." Burke states:

In this complex world, one is never a member of merely one 'corporation.' The individual is composed of many 'corporate identities.' Sometimes they are concentric, sometimes in conflict.

In keeping with the aforementioned concepts, Robertson's personal, professional, religious, and political "corporate identities" will be discussed.

**Personal Identity**

On March 22, 1930, Absalom Willis Robertson and Gladys Churchill Robertson celebrated the birth of their second son whom they named Marion Gordon. In honor of his father's college roommate, Marion Gordon was nicknamed Pat. In honor of Pat's father, his older brother and only sibling had been named Absalom Willis, Jr., and was called Taddy.

Taddy shared a special closeness with his father whereas Pat was said to be the "darling" of his mother's
life. When Pat was only two years old, A. Willis Robertson was elected to the United States House of Representatives. He served in the House of Representatives for fourteen years. While his father was in Washington, D.C., Pat stayed with his mother in their historically significant hometown of Lexington, Virginia.

Although the Robertsons had a cook and a maid to whom they paid seven and five dollars a week respectively, they were not a wealthy family. A. Willis Robertson's annual salary of $10,000 provided the only source of income. Of course, during the Depression $10,000 a year could supply an extremely comfortable standard of living. The Robertsons might not have been able to afford everything they wanted, but they could certainly afford everything they needed.

Financially speaking, the Robertsons were upper middle-class. Socially speaking, they were definitely upper-class. In his *Language As Symbolic Action*, Burke writes, "We necessarily represent ourselves as members of classes, to varying degrees, whether we know it or not." Undoubtedly, the Robertsons were aware of their upper-class status by virtue of their distinguished forebears. As Pat Robertson has stated, "My mother was especially proud of her heritage and she went to great lengths to involve herself in genealogy and to trace the family tree."
The Robertson family tree includes a "number of kings and other nobles." However, they are most proud that their heritage includes a signer of the Declaration of Independence, Benjamin Harrison, and two Presidents of the United States, William Henry Harrison and Benjamin Harrison. Furthermore, the Robertson ancestry includes "John Churchill, the 2nd Duke of Marlborough, from whom Winston Churchill, former Prime Minister of England, is descended. \[12\]

The significance of being related to these revered relatives is best explained by Pat Robertson's statement that, "My mother was always saying to me, over and over again when I was young, 'You're a leader, you're a born leader'. I didn't really know what she was talking about, but she continued to instill this into my mind." Eventually, the message "got through" to Pat Robertson.

**Education:** With the exception of a very brief stay at a Baltimore military school, Pat Robertson was educated in public schools until he became a teenager. He was an extremely bright student. In fact, Pat skipped seventh grade. Pat was also "advanced" in areas other than education. At age thirteen he was smoking, staying out until three o'clock in the morning, and doing his best to lose his virginity. \[15\]
Partially in response to these actions, in his junior year Pat was sent to a military school in Chattanooga, Tennessee called the McCallie School. The headmaster of the school, Dr. William Pressly, remembers Pat as an exceptionally good student and a good football player. While at McCallie, Pat entered the Golden Gloves competition and—despite being younger and a little more "pudgy" than the other boxers—won at least one bout. This incident is one of many in which Pat Robertson demonstrated his competitive nature, his tenacity, and his ability to beat the odds against him.

When he was only sixteen years old, Pat Robertson enrolled in Washington and Lee University in Lexington. Pat joined a fraternity at Washington and Lee which was an all-male school. Nevertheless, Pat found plenty of female companionship by visiting the five girls' schools which were nearby on a regular basis. Despite doing a great deal of dating and drinking, Pat earned a Phi Beta Kappa key in his junior year and managed to graduate at age twenty with almost a straight A average. Pat majored in American and European history and minored in English literature.

A. Willis Robertson rewarded Pat's efforts at Washington and Lee by sending him to the University of London for a summer. Pat took one introductory arts course
at the University of London. However, he has referred to this experience as "Graduate Study" at the University of London which demonstrates a propensity for exaggeration.

Military Service: Upon his return from Europe in the fall of 1950, Pat Robertson, who had enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps Reserve two years earlier, reported for active duty in the Marine Corps. Actually, Pat had planned to enter graduate school at Yale in 1950. The North Korean invasion of South Korea in June changed his plans. Pat was initially stationed in Japan. Eventually, he was sent to Korea where he served in a combat zone. However, Pat did not do any fighting.

This fact did not escape the attention of fellow Marine, Pete McCloskey. In 1986 Mr. McCloskey publicly accused Pat of using his father's influence to avoid combat. A. Willis Robertson was a U.S. Senator at the time. McCloskey's charge raised serious questions about Pat Robertson's character and it therefore became an important campaign issue. Consequently, the circumstances surrounding McCloskey's accusations and Pat Robertson's response to the charges shall be thoroughly discussed in chapter six.

For now, though, the significance of Pat's military experience can be explained in terms of giving Pat a sense
of seriousness and a time for introspection. Regarding his Korean tour of duty, Pat states that all he could think of was:

   What is the meaning of life, why are we doing this, why are we here, what is the meaning of it all? It wasn't so much the horror of death, it was just the same sense of emptiness I had known all my life. I didn't know who I was or why I was on earth.²³

The feeling that life was futile and empty stayed with Robertson for several years.²⁴

**Postgraduate study:** Pat Robertson entered Yale Law School in 1952. Looking back on his law school experience Robertson says, "I thought then I would find this noble profession of law, and I went to Yale with great idealism."²⁵ Robertson's idealism was quickly strangled by the hands of realism. The law professors at Yale were, according to Robertson, "skeptics who believed with Justice Holmes that the law is not a great omnipresence in the sky, but can be explained by politics, economic interests, and 'what the judge had for breakfast.'"²⁶

While at Yale, Robertson developed a "smoldering resentment" of the Supreme Court as evidenced by the following statement:

   We would analyze cases of the Supreme Court and many times show the absurdity of what had been
written. When we saw the fallacy in the Court's reasoning, it was hard to understand why that body was superior to the President and superior to the Congress.²⁷

According to Michael Barone of The Washington Post, Robertson was looking for "absolutes" in his life which the law could not provide.²⁸

Nevertheless, Robertson did graduate from Yale in 1955. However, he failed the New York bar examination. Robertson says he failed because his "heart was not in it."²⁹ In other words, he did not study for the examination. A. Willis Robertson, who had been an attorney himself, was "perplexed" and "heartbroken" over his son's failure. He wanted to know what was wrong with Pat. Pat writes in his autobiography, "I doubted seriously if I could ever explain to Dad the disillusionment I felt about life.... Life was empty."³⁰

The emptiness remained in Pat Robertson's life until he became a born-again Christian in April, 1956.³¹ Four and a half months later he enrolled at New York Theological Seminary in Manhattan. He graduated with a Master of Divinity degree in 1958. By then, his life was very full. Robertson had a wife and three children.

**Marriage and Family:** While he was in law school at Yale, Pat Robertson met Adelia (Dede) Elmer. Dede Elmer was
from a "conservative, middle-class family; her grandfather had served as a state senator in Ohio." Dede was a graduate of the Ohio State University where she had majored in Social Administration and - like Pat - had minored in partying. She continued her education at Yale University School of Nursing which surprised her parents because they thought their daughter was too fun-loving and too "weak in the stomach" to be a nurse.

The Elmers were in for more surprises. Dede secretly married Pat Robertson on August 27, 1954. Ten weeks later on November 6, 1954, Dede gave birth to their first child, Timmy. Given Pat Robertson's strong stand on morals in America during his Presidential campaign, the circumstances of his marriage and his first child's birth became a campaign issue. Hence, as in the case of Robertson's military service, the topic shall be thoroughly dealt with in the sixth chapter.

However, it should be noted at this time that the early years of Pat and Dede's marriage were filled with tension. To begin with, neither set of parents approved of the marriage. The Elmers were Northerners, Roman Catholic, and Republicans. The Robertsons were Southerners, Southern Baptists, and Democrats. Secondly, Pat and Dede did not even establish a household together until November, 1955.
Thirdly, in December, 1955 Dede became pregnant again. Pat and Dede's second child, Elizabeth, was born on August 14, 1956. Within two short years, Pat Robertson was supporting a wife and two children. The pressure increased with the birth of their third child, Gordon, on June 4, 1958. The fourth and final Robertson child, Ann, was born on April 24, 1963. During this nine-year time period in which Pat Robertson got married and had four children, he also changed jobs several times as well as completely changing the "direction" of his life.

**Professional Identity**

*The Young Executive:* Shortly after his graduation from Yale, Pat Robertson went to work for W.R. Grace Company in New York. He had worked for the company one summer as an intern assistant to the tax counsel. Although W.R. Grace Company has been described as "a multi-industry conglomerate with an emphasis on chemicals, manufacturing, and banking," it was "largely an international shipping concern" in the mid-1950's.  

Robertson was hired as a management trainee. He was assigned to the Foreign Service School of the company to study economic conditions in South America. More specifically, Robertson was sent to Peru and to Bolivia to
analyze the management problems in textile, fertilizer, and cement plants and "to acclimate himself to managing in an international environment."\textsuperscript{41} Looking back on this experience, Robertson concedes that he learned a great deal but that he felt guilty when he saw "a rich American company (W.R. Grace) in the midst of extreme poverty selling trifles to poor Indians." Nevertheless, Robertson confesses, "I didn't say a great deal about it because I was a junior member of the team...."\textsuperscript{42}

Robertson worked for the W.R. Grace Company for about nine months. During this time, he had grown increasingly "restless."\textsuperscript{43} Robertson left W.R. Grace to start the Curry Sound Company with two Yale classmates. The company manufactured speakers. Unfortunately, the speakers had voltage problems which could not be easily rectified.\textsuperscript{44} In short, the Curry Sound Corporation was a failure. Robertson even had to depend upon his parents to provide support for his family.\textsuperscript{45}

The Ministry: With his personal finances in disarray coupled with his growing disillusionment about life, Robertson decided in April 1956 to go into the ministry. In his autobiography, Pat Robertson explains that his decision to enter the ministry was based on a "feeling" that he "should do something good for mankind."\textsuperscript{46} However, one of
Robertson's biographers, David Harrell, suggests that his initial ministerial aspirations might have been self-serving. Regarding the "gracious Protestant churches" in New York, Harrell notes, "Here was a Christianity that offered much to young Pat Robertson - culture, dignity, and perhaps most important, a regular and comfortable salary."  

Although Harrell may be mistaken concerning Pat Robertson's motives, Dede Robertson's own words, as recorded in her husband's autobiography, "indict" her. When Pat asked Dede what she thought of him going into the ministry, she responded by saying:

I think it might be fun. Maybe you could get a nice church, and I could sit behind a beautiful silver tea service and entertain. We could have a big old manse with rooms to spare. It sounds exciting.

On a more practical (and somewhat comical) note, Dede then added, "I guess if you're going to think seriously about going into the ministry, we ought to start going to church and find out what it's all about."  

Pat and Dede Robertson started to go to church. Three and a half years later they started the Christian Broadcasting Network. Within that three and a half-year time period, Pat Robertson went through many changes. He had become a born-again Christian and a Charismatic
Christian. The definitions and implications of these terms will be explained in the "Religious Identity" section. The remainder of the "Professional Identity" section will focus on the Christian Broadcasting Network which has consumed Pat Robertson's interest for the past seventeen years.

Christian Broadcasting Network: Through an unusual chain of events, Pat Robertson heard about a defunct television station in Portsmouth, Virginia that was for sale. After fasting for seven days, Robertson received - according to his autobiography - confirmation and assurance from God that he was supposed to buy the station which was reportedly worth $300,000.

One day after ending his fast, Robertson loaded his family in their old car and their belongings in a small U-Haul trailer and drove to Virginia. Robertson had a total of seventy dollars when he left for Virginia. However, what he lacked in money, he made up for in religious zeal. Robertson was determined to purchase the television station so he could broadcast Christian programs and evangelize America and even the world.

When Robertson met with the station's owner, Tim Bright, he introduced himself and said, "God has sent me here to buy your television station." When Bright wanted to know how much God was willing to pay, Robertson replied,
"God's figure is $37,000 and the station has to be free from all debts and encumbrances."\textsuperscript{52}

Amazingly enough, Bright eventually agreed to Robertson's terms. After a series of more miracles or extremely lucky occurrences depending upon one's perspective, CBN broadcast its first program on October 1, 1961. The signal was "halty" and "shaky,"\textsuperscript{53} but the actualization of Robertson's religious aspirations had begun. These aspirations are clearly spelled out in CBN's mission statement:

\begin{quote}
The mission of CBN is to prepare the United States of America, the nations of the Middle East, the Far East, South America, and other selected nations of the world for the coming of Jesus Christ and the establishment of the Kingdom of God on earth. Our ultimate goal is to achieve a time in history when 'the knowledge of the Lord will cover the earth as the waters cover the sea.'\textsuperscript{54}
\end{quote}

The magnitude of this mission is so great that it is almost incomprehensible. Yet the reality of CBN has, in some ways, surpassed Robertson's early dreams.

As of 1984, CBN was the largest noncommercial broadcasting network in the world.\textsuperscript{55} The Christian Broadcasting Network airs programs in South America, Central America, the Caribbean, Asia, Africa, Europe, and the Middle East.\textsuperscript{56} According to a publication of Americans for
Robertson which outlines Robertson's "business achievements," the Middle East television station "is reported to be the most popular and best-watched in the region, and the most authentic and objective news source."\textsuperscript{57}

As the aforementioned statement indicates, CBN does not rely solely on religious programming. In fact, CBN has a "secular commercial clone" in the United States called the Continental Broadcasting Network. The Continental Broadcast Network airs old reruns of "wholesome, family-oriented" shows as well as "CBN update News."\textsuperscript{58}

Apparently this commercial endeavor has been successful as evidenced by "annual sales in excess of thirty million dollars."\textsuperscript{59} The profits are "plowed back into the production of original programs 'based on Judeo-Christian values.'"\textsuperscript{60} One such program was a Christian soap opera called "Another Life" which was broadcast in the early 1980's. "Another Life" was one of many shows broadcast by CBN in hopes of attracting non-Christian viewers with the ultimate goal of converting these viewers to Christianity.\textsuperscript{61}

Robertson reached out to both Christians and non-Christians through his 700 Club Crisis Counseling Centers. Furthermore, Robertson created a program called Operation Blessing in conjunction with local churches in order to aid the poor. Operation Blessing gives people
everything from food and clothing to vegetable seeds for self-help gardens. In 1985 Robertson founded an organization to combat illiteracy called Heads Up. Heads Up features a "literacy - through - phonics" program called Sing, Spell, Read and Write. This program has received the support of many school teachers and has been endorsed by President Reagan.

Robertson's most ambitious project was the founding of CBN University in 1978. The CBN University has five graduate schools and a law school and was granted full accreditation in 1984 by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The goal of CBN University was and is "to permeate society with Christians trained for leadership in the media, education, and politics." Robertson has created other programs and organizations which promote Christian involvement in politics. These organizations shall be discussed in a subsequent section.

Whether or not one agrees with the stated purposes of Robertson's television network, university, and assorted programs, his accomplishments are impressive. Pat Robertson is a visionary. Yet, Robertson is not just a dreamer - he is a doer. Tim Robertson describes his father in the following way:
He's very fair, but he is also a very, very determined guy. If he has to get something done, he'll go in there and get it done. A lot of people don't have his sense of urgency, but if he has a need to get something done, he'll do it right then. He's not a procrastinator and he doesn't sit around and analyze a problem eighty-five different ways.\(^6\)

If Robertson had analyzed the feasibility of buying a television station when he had less than seventy dollars or if he had listened to his father who even called Pat's friends and asked them to bring his son "back to his senses,\(^6\) the CBN enterprise would have never materialized. Instead of relying on reason, Robertson acted out of faith. The foundation of this faith is explained the following section.

**Religious Identity**

**Born-again Christian:** When Pat Robertson first decided to go into the ministry in 1956 he thought his mother would be pleased. Gladys Robertson had been praying for her youngest son and had been sending him religious tracts for sometime. Consequently, her negative reaction to his latest career move surprised Robertson. Gladys Robertson told him:

> But how can you go into the ministry until you know Jesus Christ? You know how I know that
you don't know him? Because you
don't talk right. You never
mention his name. You've got to
accept him as Lord of your life,
Pat. Unless you do, you're going
to be just as spiritually empty a
minister as you are a businessman.
You cannot fill your emptiness by
trying to do the work of God....
You need to be born again.67

One week after this encounter with his mother, Pat
Robertson met with a "missionary-evangelist" named
Corneilus Vanderbreggen. Vanderbreggen essentially
challenged Robertson to replace his religiosity with
spirituality. Robertson complied by becoming a born-again
Christian.68 Robertson's born-again experience completely
changed the course of his life and therefore merits further
attention.

The term "born-again" is taken from the third chapter
of the book of John in the Bible. The born-again experience
as explained in the book of John is symbolic of giving up
one's sinful life in order to lead a holy life. Spiritually
speaking, one becomes a new person. Furthermore, born-again
Christians appear to have a "serene confidence" in their
relationship with God.69 They frequently talk about God and
Jesus Christ in terms of being a "real presence" in their
lives. God becomes a father figure and Jesus Christ becomes
a friend to them. Generally speaking, born-again Christians
are initially so excited about their "personal" relationship
with God that they seem "rude" and "presumptuous" in their attempt to share their experience with other people.\(^{70}\)

Pat Robertson displayed all of the classic characteristics of a born-again Christian. For the sake of holiness, Robertson gave up his "entire filthy vocabulary," he quit drinking all alcoholic beverages, and he threw away the huge nude painting by Modigliani which graced the Robertson's living room. More importantly, Robertson made a list of all the people he had ever "wronged" that he could remember. He wrote letters to all of these people asking for forgiveness and, when possible, made restitution.\(^{71}\)

Obviously, Robertson's born-again experience had a great impact on his life to the extent that it might even be considered traumatic. Kenneth Burke explains the significance of a traumatic experience by saying that it "can, as it were, endow a person with a key terminology, in terms of which he frames his attitude toward life...."\(^{72}\) Robertson's new terminology centered on salvation. He witnessed to his wife, Dede, and even read the Bible aloud to her. Understandably, Dede was upset over her husband's preoccupation with and approach toward her religious beliefs. In *My God Will Supply*, Dede writes:

> I'm afraid I deliberately set out to destroy the gains I could see in Pat's spiritual life by trying to get him mad. And when I couldn't
succeed, I grew depressed instead, banging pots and scolding Tim and wondering how long I could take life as the wife of a man who talked in born-again language, and worse still tried to get me to admit that I needed an experience like the one he had.73

Life became increasingly difficult for Dede Robertson because of her husband's actions. For example, when Dede was seven months pregnant with their second child, Pat left her for six weeks to go to Canada to pray. On another occasion when Dede was in Ohio caring for her sick brother, Pat sold almost all of their belongings and moved his family to a poor section of Brooklyn. Dede returned from Ohio to a communal living arrangement which included a former prostitute, an "amiable psychotic," and rats and roaches as housemates.74 Fortunately for Pat Robertson, Dede eventually became a born-again Christian and adopted his Charismatic beliefs as well.

Charismatic Christian: After becoming a born-again Christian, Pat Robertson enrolled in the New York Theological Seminary. Robertson started reading about miracles that were recorded in the Bible. He also listened to his professors say, "Jesus is the same yesterday, today, and forever." Robertson reasoned that if Jesus is the same today as he was yesterday, then there should be modern-day miracles. A fellow seminary student told Robertson that the
baptism in the Holy Spirit was the key to discovering the miraculous experiences he sought.75

After several months of fervent prayer, Robertson was filled with (baptized in) the Holy Spirit as evidenced by glossolalia. Glossolalia is the practice of speaking in a foreign tongue of which the speaker has no knowledge.76 A relatively recent scientific linguistic analysis of glossolalia revealed that it is a speech behavior which:

...displays language-like characteristics and structures without apparent semantic information, and which displays language-like structures which replace the rules of the speaker's natural language.77

The baptism in the Holy Spirit is said to be "charismatic" in nature. "Charisma" is a Greek word used to designate a special impartation of spiritual power and to denote the gifts of the Spirit conferred upon Christians.78

These gifts include "receiving a word of wisdom, receiving a word of knowledge, discerning spirits, performing miracles, healing, having faith by the Spirit, speaking in tongues, interpreting tongues speaking, and prophesying."79 Pat Robertson practices several of these gifts. However, he is widely known for receiving a "word of knowledge." Robertson explained this phenomenon to an interviewer from Time magazine by saying:
This is a very quiet word, brought forth in the spirit of a human being dealing with a problem that somebody has that God cares about and wants to help. The first time that it happened to me, I thought it was something I don't really want to do. But I worked up my courage and mentioned what I felt was being spoken, and somebody called in (to "The 700 Club") and said at that moment they had been gloriously healed. 80

At the core of the "word of knowledge" and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit is the belief in the supernatural leading of God. 81 This belief in the leading of God has been partially responsible for Robertson's political abstinence and his political activity at different points in his life.

Political Identity

A Senator's Son: As previously mentioned, A. Willis Robertson ran successfully for Congress in 1932 as a Democrat. He served in the House of Representatives for fourteen years. In 1946 A. Willis Robertson became a United States Senator. He served in the Senate for twenty years. Pat Robertson has jokingly explained the significance of his father's political career on him by stating, "Right after I learned to say 'Mommy' and 'Daddy,' I learned to say "constituent.'" 82 Indeed, Presidential expert Henry Graff contends, "In political families there are things a child
picks up with his mother's milk."

According to Robertson, one of the "things" he "picked up" was the notion that the members of his family were public servants. Pat Robertson also learned from his politically conservative father to have a deep respect for the Constitution as the supreme law of the land at the expense of Supreme Court decisions as well as learning a distrust of "government intervention in the affairs of people...." Regarding these points, in 1987 Robertson stated, "... I can't recall my father ever speaking them to me. And yet, there's something just deep inside of me that says, 'You're a conservative, you're for freedom, and speak just like your father.'" Pat Robertson may speak just like his father, but he has not always spoken in support of his father. In 1952, Pat Robertson accompanied his father to the Democratic National Convention and in 1953 worked as a staffer on the Senate Appropriations Committee. In 1956, Pat Robertson was chairman of the Stevenson-for-President campaign headquarters on Staten Island. However, Pat Robertson's political activity came to an abrupt halt, or so it seemed, in 1966. A. Willis Robertson was engaged in an extremely tough race for the Senate in 1966. Pat Robertson writes in his autobiography that he wanted to help his father win, but
the Lord "spoke to his heart" and said, "I have called you to my ministry. You cannot tie my eternal purposes to the success of any political candidate...not even your own father."^{88}

**Identity Crisis:** People often define themselves and are defined by other individuals in terms of what they do (occupation) and/or in terms of their primary interests. Consequently, as Kenneth Burke points out, "Anyone who would turn from politics to some other emphasis, or vice versa, must undergo some change of identity, which is dramatic...."^{89} Starting in 1974, Robertson seemed to be suffering from a "multiple personality disorder." He was vacillating between politics and religion. For several years, Robertson had been hosting "The 700 Club" which is CBN's "flagship program." Initially, most of Robertson's guests were ministers or evangelists. However, by the mid-1970's Robertson was interviewing politicians on a regular basis.^{90}

Robertson interviewed Jimmy Carter in 1976 just before the Presidential election. Robertson was so unimpressed with Carter that he ended up voting for Gerald Ford despite having helped Carter win a few Democratic primaries. Although remaining a Democrat, Robertson voted for Reagan in 1980. Robertson changed his party registration in 1984.
Reflecting on this change, Robertson comments:

I was a Democrat for about fifty-five years. I think they moved so far to the left in 1984 that I just couldn't go along. And I have been more at home for a number of years with the national platform of the Republican party, so I finally made it official.91

The ideas presented in Robertson's geopolitical newsletter, *Pat Robertson's Perspective*, which he began writing in 1977, were in fact better suited to the Republican's platform than to the Democrat's platform.

In 1978, Robertson organized the campaign of G. Conoly Phillips who ran unsuccessfully for the Senate.92 Robertson became involved in the Religious Roundtable in 1979. The Religious Roundtable is an important part of the New Religious-Political Right and shall be discussed in chapter four.

Robertson served as co-chairman of the Washington for Jesus rally held on April 29, 1980. The purpose of the rally was to bring "a million Christians to Washington to dramatize to the nation and the world that the church of Jesus Christ means business with God." In other words, the participants were supposed to pray for America. Nevertheless, the rally had political overtones, Robertson recalls that during the rally several people suggested to him that he ought to run for President.93
It is not clear whether Robertson took these suggestions seriously in 1980. Nevertheless, Robertson did see a need for the involvement of Christians in politics. He responded to this need by establishing the Freedom Council in 1981. According to one source, the Freedom Council offers Christians "a sixth-grade-level civics course, telling them how they can get involved in the political process."  

Pat Robertson stopped publishing his newsletter in 1982. He explained his decision to his supporters or "partners" by writing the following message:

Last spring the Lord made it clear to me that my job with the Perspective was coming to an end. As I waited on Him in prayer a couple of weeks ago, I was praying about the upcoming banking crisis. He clearly spoke to me, 'you take care of My work, and I will take care of the world's crises.' His clear direction to me and to CBN is to give all of our efforts to our primary mission of bringing the knowledge of the kingdom of God and of His salvation in Christ to entire nations around the world. And as this has happened His anointing upon me to write the Perspective has lifted.

Religion had once again become Robertson's dominant "personality." However, he was beginning to shift toward politics again in 1985.
A God-Given Go-Ahead: Rumors began circulating in the mid-1980's that Robertson might run for President. When the media questioned Robertson about these rumors in late 1985, he responded by saying that he was "prayerfully considering" a run for the Republican nomination. On August 1, 1986, at a reception sponsored by Bunker Hunt, Robertson made the following statement:

What began as a trickle has become a torrent. And in the last few months, tens of thousands of people just like you and those on this platform have been coming to me and standing on their feet cheering and saying, "Go for it!" And those of you who have known me for a long time know very well that's not enough. And you know that a decision of this magnitude, or any decision I would make, is very frankly only dependent on one criteria, what is God's will for me at a time like this? And I want to assure you that as somebody that has known God, and served Him, and served my fellow man for thirty years, that I know deep in my heart what God's will is for me in this crucial decision. And on September the seventeenth of this year, I plan to make a more definitive statement with the precise conditions I'm asking for.

Robertson announced the conditions he was asking for on September 17, 1986, from Constitution Hall in Washington D.C., "before a coast-to-coast closed-circuit television audience." Robertson said he would run for the Presidency
"when at least three million registered voters sign petitions committing to pray, to work, and to give toward a campaign effort." 99

By mid-September, 1987, Robertson had over three million signatures, many of which were secured through "frantic last minute efforts." 100 He wrote to his supporters: "I have walked with the Lord for more than 25 years. I know His voice. I know this is His direction. I know this is His will for my life." 101 On October 1, 1987, Robertson officially became a candidate for the Republican party nomination for the President of the United States of America.

Conclusion

In order to gain an understanding of a person one must analyze various aspects of that person's life. Indeed, Kenneth Burke maintains that personal identity is formed through "family, nation, political or cultural cause, church, and so on." 102 Hence, this chapter has examined Pat Robertson's identity in terms of his family, education, career, religious beliefs, and political evolution. Summing up fifty-eight years of experiences and assessing the impact of those experiences on one's life in less than thirty pages is not easy - especially when the subject is Pat Robertson.
He is an extremely complex person.

As a young man, Robertson seemed to have everything and yet he felt he had nothing. Even after creating an incredible television network, Robertson still seems to be searching for the ultimate purpose of his life. In popular vernacular, he is "trying to find himself." Robertson has traveled both the religious route and the political path in his journey of self-discovery. Hence, he need not worry about the "road not taken." Instead, maybe Robertson should concentrate on what he missed along the way.
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CHAPTER IV
ONWARD CHRISTIAN SOLDIERS

In order to gain a thorough understanding of an agent's rhetorical acts, the rhetorical critic must understand the context of the acts. For Kenneth Burke, the pentad's "scene" is the synonym of context. Burke explains that the scene is "the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred." The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the sociopolitical scene which helped give rise to Pat Robertson's rhetorical acts. However, before turning to this task, one additional point regarding the concept of "scene" should be made.

Burke states that the areas covered by the five terms of the pentad "overlap upon one another." The previous chapter demonstrated overlapping between the agent and the scene. Insofar as chapter three discussed the major events in Pat Robertson's life, one could argue that these events constituted Robertson's "personal" scene. This chapter will broaden the scope of the scene. Broadening the scene's scope will add depth to the analysis of Robertson's rhetorical acts. As Burke points out, "The 'same' act can be defined 'differently,' depending upon the 'circumference'
of the scene or overall situation in terms of which we choose to locate it."

Robertson's rhetorical acts shall be "located" in the territory of the New Religious Political Right (NRPR). The NRPR is composed of approximately ninety organizations. These organizations range from the well-known Moral Majority to the relatively obscure Interfaith Committee Against Blasphemy. According to the March, 1988 edition of Charisma magazine, Robertson's Presidential campaign "is running on the groundwork laid by such groups as Moral Majority and Citizens for Decency and is trying to harness the momentum of Christian activism they and others have triggered." The media refers to the Christian activists who supported Robertson's campaign as his "invisible army." The purpose of the following section is to identify the troops.

**Evangelicalism and Fundamentalism**

Various sources describe the members of the NRPR as evangelical and/or fundamentalist Christians. Consequently, evangelicalism and fundamentalism should be defined. However, as Peggy Shriver, author of *The Bible Vote*, points out, these terms are "as slippery as jello to define." Keeping Shriver's statement in mind, the following
definitions should be viewed as offering just the "basics" of evangelicalism and fundamentalism.

According to an "evangelical religious educator," James E. Plueddemann, (as cited in The Western Journal of Speech Communication) Christian evangelicalism historically is characterized by four distinctive features:

(1) Belief in the authority of the Scripture as revealed by God, (2) the necessity for each individual by faith to make a personal commitment to Jesus Christ who is both God and human and who died as our substitute for our sins so we can be reconciled with God, (3) a responsibility to share the good news (the evangel (or gospel)) of forgiveness of sins through Christ...(4) a responsibility to glorify God by living a holy life, with the life of Christ as our pattern.9

Theologian Gabriel Fackre maintains that the "born-again" label has become the distinguishing characteristic of contemporary evangelicals.9

Even if all evangelicals do in fact subscribe to the "born-again" experience, it is important to point out that not all of them share the same political philosophy. According to one source, "about forty percent of evangelicals tilt to the liberal side, sixty percent are more at home on the conservative side, while very few evangelicals take a moderate political position."10 As
evangelical leader Stan Mooneyham says, "Surely, Jesus' prayer for his disciples and for us that we might all be one did not necessarily mean pulling the same voting machine lever."\textsuperscript{11} Fundamentalists would like for evangelicals to pull the same lever -as long as it was for the conservative candidate. In fact, the following paragraphs will show that fundamentalism began as and continues to be a reaction against what Jerry Falwell calls "Liberalism" and "Modernism."

The fundamentalist movement received its name from a volume of books called \textit{The Fundamentals}. \textit{The Fundamentals} were widely circulated between 1909 and 1919. Their "prime purpose was the defense and exaltation of traditional views of the Bible. Nearly a third of the articles were devoted to this subject....in all of them the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures were vigorously maintained."\textsuperscript{12} The message of \textit{The Fundamentals} could be viewed as a response to various forces which "coalesced to challenge the concept of inerrancy in biblical scripture, to reduce societal adherence to a strict moral code, and to diminish the influence of evangelical Christianity in American society". These forces included Darwinism, "the European development of critical method in biblical scholarship, rapid industrialization, and the rise of state
- supported secular education."

The teaching of Darwin's theory of evolution in the public classroom gave rise to the famous Scopes "monkey trial" in 1925. As a result of the trial, fundamentalist beliefs received a great deal of scrutiny, much of which proved to be embarrassing. Consequently, fundamentalists seemed to retreat from their war on "liberalism" and "modernism." Yet, they have reenlisted in record numbers in the 1980's through their involvement in the NRPR. Fighting with the fundamentalists are conservative evangelicals, Mormons, some Catholics, and a surprising number of Orthodox Jews. The remainder of this chapter will be devoted primarily to explaining how and why these diverse religious groups came together to form a powerful political coalition.

**Behind-The-Scenes Strategist**

The NRPR was initially formed through the efforts of several shrewd, conservative political activists who labelled themselves as the "New Right". The key figures in the New Right include Paul Weyrich (leader of a group called the Committee for the Survival of a Free Congress), Howard Phillips (head of the Conservative Caucus), Ed McAteer (former national field Director for the Conservative
Caucus), Terry Dolan (leader of the National Conservative Political Action Committee), and Richard Viguerie (mass mailing expert and founder of Conservative Digest). Richard Viguerie is said to be an "indispensable figure in the effective emergence of the New Right." He therefore merits further attention.

Viguerie got seriously involved in politics when he was twenty-seven years old. He worked as a direct-mail fundraiser on behalf of John Tower who was running for the U.S. Senate in Texas in 1960. Tower was running against Lyndon Johnson who was also running for Vice President with John F. Kennedy. In his letters to conservative voters, Viguerie instructed them to, "Double your pleasure, double your fun. Vote against LBJ twice!"

Shortly after finishing his work for Tower, Viguerie went to New York City and joined the staff of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF). The members of YAF have been described as "campus radicals of the far right." Viguerie worked as a fundraiser for the conservative YAF and as the organization's executive secretary. He eventually became the executive director of YAF, but resigned from this position to become the group's direct mail coordinator.

In 1965, Viguerie started his own direct mail agency. The purpose of The Richard A. Viguerie Company (besides
paying the bills) was to spread the conservative message. Commenting on the importance of direct mail to the conservative cause, Vigerie has stated that "the conservative movement is where it is today because of direct mail. Without direct mail, there would be no effective counterforce to liberalism, and certainly there would be no New Right." Vigerie claims that direct mail is "the one method of mass commercial communication that the liberals do not control."  

Direct mail became the primary means of raising money for conservative candidates and causes after the passage in 1974 of a law regulating the financing of election campaigns. The law put a ceiling of one thousand dollars as the amount any individual could contribute to a campaign. Another provision of the law "established a system of public financing for presidential elections." This provision and its importance are explained as follows:

This money would only go to those candidates who could first raise small amounts of money in several different states. The money which the candidate could use to qualify for federal funding had to be raised with contributions of $250 or less. The practical effect of these provisions was that candidates could no longer rely on just a few large contributors; they would now have to seek much smaller amounts from many more people.
As the "king of direct-mail technicians," Richard Viguerie knew how to write the type of doomsday, liberal loathing letters which would make the conservative crowd's hearts heavy and their wallets light.

Viguerie not only knew how to write effective letters, he knew to whom the letters should be sent. His mailing list consists of almost twenty million names. Many conservative evangelical and fundamentalist Christians are no doubt included in this list. Indeed, Viguerie had predicted in 1976 that conservative Christians could be a critical part of the New Right. He had observed that many of the fundamentalist television evangelists had a large, devoted following which could become a formidable voting bloc. Viguerie and other members of the New Right decided to recruit these television evangelists and their followers for their cause. Their timing could not have been better. As the following section will explain, conservative Christians were becoming increasingly interested in politics because of several events which occurred in the 1970's.

A Call To Arms

In addition to being the decade of racial riots and antiwar demonstrations, the 1960's ushered in a new morality for a significant segment of the American population. This
new morality was one of self-indulgence, manifested by promiscuity and the use of illegal, hallucinogenic drugs. Consequently, after reviewing the literature regarding the NRPR, this student was surprised to find that the 1960's era was not the major motivating force in propelling fundamentalist preachers into politics. Conservative clergy did not enter the political arena until the 1970's when, according to Jerry Falwell, "the government was encroaching upon the sovereignty of both the Church and the family."25 Political scientist Robert Zwier notes that there were four key events which "provoked the right-wing Christian community into action." These events were the 1973 Supreme Court decision on abortion, the gay rights movement, the proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to question the tax-exempt status of some private schools and the proposed Equal Rights Amendment.26

Dr. Tim LaHaye, who is a Conservative minister and the president of the American Coalition for Traditional Values, contends that 1973 Roe vs. Wade decision to legalize abortion "has probably done more than anything else to bring about a merging of political activities between conservatives and religious fundamentalists."27 The U.S. Supreme Court reasoned that the right to privacy "is broad enough to encompass a woman's decision whether or not to
terminate her pregnancy.'\textsuperscript{28} The Court therefore decided that the state could not impose any restrictions on a woman's right to have an abortion during the first trimester of her pregnancy. Minimal restrictions could be imposed during the second trimester of a pregnancy. Essentially, then, the Supreme Court's ruling allowed women to have abortions until the end of their sixth month of pregnancy. This decision infuriated fundamentalists and Catholics who believe that human life begins at the moment of conception.\textsuperscript{29} The Court's decision was viewed by them as a mandate for murder.

Fundamentalists and other conservative religious groups were almost as upset over the gay rights movement as they were over abortion. Anita Bryant's crusade against homosexuality serves as a case in point. In 1977 an ordinance prohibiting discrimination against homosexuals in housing, public accommodations, and employment was introduced before the Metro Commission of Dade County, Florida. The ordinance would have allowed homosexuals to teach in private, religious schools. The prospect of homosexuals teaching her children outraged Anita Bryant who was a resident of Miami in Dade County.

Bryant fought the ordinance by forming an organization called Save Our Children, Inc. which was composed of conservative Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. The name
"Save Our Children" was indicative of Bryant's belief that "militant" homosexual activists would molest children and recruit them to the gay lifestyle. Bryant's crusade against homosexuality received national attention due to her appearances on numerous television shows including "Who's Who," "Phil Donahue," "The PTL Club," "The 700 Club," and Jerry Falwell's "Old Time Gospel Hour." The members of the conservative religious community shared Bryant's concern about homosexuality to the extent that they not only marched with her, but they eventually waged their own war against the gay rights movement.

Conservative Christians also decided to fight against the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). They were concerned about the wording of the ERA, which they felt was "too vague" and might "outlaw all distinctions between men and women." Jerry Falwell expressed concern that the "simplistic language of the Amendment could lead to court interpretations that might put women in combat, sanction homosexual marriages, and financially penalize widows and deserted wives." In short, conservative Christians believed that the ERA would legislate immorality.

A proposal of the Internal Revenue Service helped to prod conservative Christians into politics. Following the Supreme Court's ruling in 1954 to desegregate public
schools, the number of private schools rapidly increased. Ostensibly, many of these private schools were established in order to avoid desegregation. This fact did not escape the attention of Blacks and other groups who demanded that some action be taken against the private schools. IRS Commissioner Jerome Kurtz responded to the demand in the 1970's by developing a proposal that "could have denied the tax-exempt status of some of these private schools."³³

Many of the schools which might be influenced by the proposal were operated by fundamentalists. Consequently, several fundamentalist groups organized a letter-writing campaign and "deluged IRS offices with over 120,000 letters - apparently an IRS record." Responding to pressure from the fundamentalists, Congress got involved in the situation by approving a measure to cut off funds for implementation of the IRS proposal.³⁴ As in the case of the ERA, fundamentalists and other conservative Christians learned from this incident that they could have political clout.

In addition to the aforementioned factors, Jimmy Carter's 1976 Presidential campaign and his Presidency played an important role in the formation of the NRPR. With regard to Carter's 1976 campaign, Communication scholar Dan Hahn notes that Carter talked openly about his religious beliefs even when he was not asked about them. Carter
frequently made remarks such as, "I am a born-again Christian Baptist Sunday-school teacher deacon." He even told the American people, "We ought to make our own societal structure a better demonstration of what Christ is."\(^{35}\)

Considering these remarks as well as many others, Hahn argues persuasively that Carter was courting the evangelical vote by using the open proclamation of his religious beliefs as a campaign strategy.\(^ {36}\)

Political analyst and the Assistant Editor of *Church & State*, Albert Menendez, contends that Carter was generally successful in obtaining the evangelical vote.\(^ {37}\) However, Carter did not capture the hearts of all of the most conservative evangelicals and fundamentalists. Carter's most vocal critic was Jerry Falwell who "soared to national notoriety" after he publicly maligned his born-again brother for consenting to an interview with *Playboy*, for "lusting" and "committing adultery" in "his heart many times," and for using words such as "screw" and "shack up."\(^ {38}\)

Falwell and other conservative Christians were even more disenchanted with Carter after he had been in office for awhile. They believed Carter betrayed them. As Tim LaHaye states, Carter "campaigned as a Christian conservative but ran his administration as a Christian liberal."\(^ {39}\) LaHaye elaborates on this point by explaining:
Oh, he taught Sunday school on Sunday when he could, but as president he largely ignored us in his appointments. His political agenda was also different from ours: he favored the Equal Rights Amendment, refused to promote anti-abortion legislation or even halt government-funded abortions, opposed a School Prayer Amendment, and appointed more liberal judges than any president in American history.40

Conservative Christians were clearly upset with Carter's Presidential record even though the 1976 Democratic platform should have given them some indication that Carter would have a different political agenda than theirs.

In the 1980 Presidential election, angry evangelicals and furious fundamentalists were able to demonstrate their dissatisfaction with and distrust of Carter. These conservative Christians banded together to beat Carter. Consequently, they became part of the newly formed NRPR.

Although it is impossible to assess thoroughly the impact of the NRPR upon the 1980 Presidential election, there is some evidence to suggest that the NRPR did play a part in Reagan's victory.41 The NRPR probably had an even more significant role in the 1980 Senatorial races in which a number of well-established liberals such as Church, McGovern, and Bayh were defeated.42 Of the many organizations which compose the NRPR the three which were
the most important in the Presidential and/or Senatorial races were the Moral Majority, Christian Voice, and Religious Roundtable. These organizations are the subject of the following section.

**Marching As To War**

An implicit theme in much of the NRPR's literature is good versus evil. Members of the NRPR are fighting against abortionists, pornographers, homosexuals, communists, liberals, and secular humanists who have become the flesh-and-blood manifestation of evil to them. Hence, NRPR members believe that they are engaged in a holy war. Their main line of defense is the Moral Majority and to a slightly lesser degree, the Christian Voice and Religious Roundtable.

**Moral Majority:** The most well known NRPR organization, Moral Majority, Inc. (MM), was formally organized on June 6, 1979. 43 Jerry Falwell is the recognized leader of the MM, although Robert Billings served as the first executive director of the MM and held the post until he became Reagan's "liaison to the religious community" in 1980. 44 In fact, it was Billings who first approached Falwell in 1977 and asked him to consider forming an organization much like the one MM turned out to be. Falwell was not quite ready to enter the political arena then. 45 Perhaps Falwell was
remembering a sermon he preached in March of 1965 called "Ministers and Marchers." Falwell made the following remarks in that sermon:

"Relieving the Bible as I do, I would find it impossible to stop preaching the pure saving gospel of Jesus Christ and begin doing anything else - including fighting communism, or participating in civil rights reforms....Preachers are not called to be politicians but to be soul winners....Nowhere are we commissioned to reform the externals. The gospel does not clean up the outside but rather regenerates the inside."  

Fortunately for Falwell, changing one's mind is not immoral.

When Billings approached Falwell again, he brought with him several important members of the New Right - Ed McAteer, Paul Weyrich, and Howard Phillips. During the meeting, Weyrich remarked that a "moral majority" existed in America just waiting to be organized. This "magic phrase" (moral majority) caught Falwell's attention. Shortly thereafter it caught the nation's attention.

Interest in the MM was fueled by Falwell's "I Love America" rallies and by his multimedia presentation, America, You're Too Young to Die, which was shown widely around the country in 1980. America, You're Too Young to Die mixed images of "Charles Manson, atom bombs exploding, homosexuals embracing and aborted fetuses lying in bloody
hospital pans...."48 The production falsely attributed to Gus Hall, former head of the U.S. Communist party, a statement in which he supposedly proclaims, "I dream of the hour when the last congressman is strangled to death on the guts of the last preacher." Nor did Jimmy Carter make the remarks endorsing the "presence of homosexuals on his senior staff" which Falwell said he did. Falwell eventually had to recant his charges against Carter.49

Despite Falwell's fact-finding failings, the MM is influential in politics. Indeed, Moral Majority, Inc. was founded as a "tax-exempt lobbying organization for the purpose of influencing legislation on national, state and local levels."50 Its estimated number of members ranges from a conservative figure of 400,000 people to an unlikely high of five million people. Approximately 75,000 of these members are pastors, priests and rabbis.51 Included under the auspices of the MM is the Moral Majority Foundation which was established "to educate ministers and lay people on issues and to conduct voter registration drives." The MM Foundation claims to have registered three million new voters.52 Another important MM entity is the Moral Majority Legal Defense Foundation, which provides legal services to those "pro-moral organizations who are attacked by the godless, amoral forces of humanism."53
The activities of the aforementioned MM organizations are reported in monthly editions of the Moral Majority Report. The MM Report undoubtedly plays a crucial role in sustaining the MM by informing its members of the goals they have accomplished through their collective efforts and by challenging members all over the country to get involved in new causes. However, Samuel Hill and Dennis Owen, who are both professors of religion, argue that the "staying power" of the MM is due to its semi-autonomous organizational structure. The MM has fifty state branches and "something like county coordinators within each state." Hence, most of MM's power is concentrated at the local level.54

This arrangement has caused some embarrassment for Falwell because he cannot possibly screen all of the MM leaders at the state and county levels. In one instance, a MM leader was arrested for soliciting homosexual sex with minors.55 Another MM leader called for capital punishment for homosexuals, an idea which Falwell only "feebly and ineffectually repudiated."56 Obviously, some members of the MM have forgotten the principle that one should hate the sin, but love the sinner.

Christian Voice: Christian Voice (CV) was founded in January 1979 by the Reverend Robert Grant who had been the Dean of the California Graduate School of Theology.57 The
co-founder and executive director of CV, Richard Zone, says that CV began as a result of a threat from the IRS to challenge the tax-exempt status of their church in Glendale, California. Members of the church were working at the time to defeat Proposition 6, a referendum to give homosexuals equal protection under the law. Zone states, "I realized that this moral issue had been politicized and that our government was telling the moral conscience of the nation (the church) to stay out of the battle." 58

Christian Voice joined the battle through its lobby, educational foundation, and Political Action Committee (PAC). In 1979, the CV lobby "helped introduce an unsuccessful piece of legislation in Congress that would have proclaimed the United States a 'Christian nation.'" 59 The educational Christian Voice Fund provides information to CV's members whose numbers range from an estimate of 160,000 people to 187,000 people. 60 Christian Voice's non tax-exempt PAC is called the Christian Voice Moral Government Fund (CVMGF). The CVMGF "explicitly" endorses candidates and "offers its assistance to candidates' campaign committees." 61

Christian Voice has become infamous for its "Congressional Report Card" which showed how representatives in the Ninety-sixth Congress voted on sixteen select issues. These issues included Taiwan security, sex and racial quotas,
aid for Nicaragua, Salt II, forced school busing, sex education, school prayer, and abortion.\textsuperscript{62}

The "Congressional Report Card" concept and system have been criticized. First, lawmakers are given no opportunity to explain a response, but instead are forced into dichotomous "yes-no" answers which are interpreted as "moral-immoral."\textsuperscript{63} Secondly, the report cards do not really reflect a Congressman's morality, but rather his or her agreement with the Christian Voice. For example, Representative Robert Bauman of Maryland, who was charged with sodomizing a sixteen-year-old in 1980, scored ninety-four percent.\textsuperscript{64} Congressman Richard Kelly, who was implicated in the Abscam bribery investigation, scored one-hundred percent whereas John Glenn, an elder in the Presbyterian church, received a score of zero.\textsuperscript{65} Finally, several issues which have moral implications such as hunger, health care, and pollution have not been included in the report cards.\textsuperscript{66} In recognition of these problems with the Congressional Report Card, several members of the CV congressional advisory committee have resigned.\textsuperscript{67}

The Religious Roundtable: The Religious Roundtable (later renamed the "Roundtable" in a "calculated move to broaden its appeal"\textsuperscript{68}) was founded in September, 1979 by Edward McAteer.\textsuperscript{69} McAteer has compared the fifty-six
members of the Roundtable, which included Jerry Falwell, James Robison, and Pat Robertson, to the fifty-six men who signed the Declaration of Independence. McAteer proclaimed, "If those fifty-six men were willing to risk everything in order to give birth to freedom, can we do any less to preserve it in our generation?"\textsuperscript{70}

With regard to the above comparison, it is not surprising to learn that the Roundtable's members are considered the "elite" of the NRPR.\textsuperscript{71} Consequently, one of their primary tasks is to keep the NRPR and the nonreligious New Right in touch with each other. The Roundtable also publishes a newsletter which is sent to pastors. Among other things, the newsletter tells the pastors how they can get themselves invited to testify before a Congressional committee and where to write in order to influence pending legislation.

Much of the Roundtable's information comes from a "very conservative educational foundation" called The Plymouth Rock Foundation. According to professors of religion Samuel Hill and Dennis Owen, "The distinguishing mark of the Plymouth Rock/Roundtable materials is the claim that positions on highly specific social, political, and economic issues are biblically based."\textsuperscript{72}
Inflation is anti-biblical - "Amos took the higher power to task for 'making' the ephah small and the shekel great." Progressive tax-rates are anti-biblical - "Each...head of household is to pay the same portion of income to support the government." 73

The Roundtable is just one of many NRPR organizations which believe that "clear biblical answers can be found for even the most difficult and complex social questions." 74

The Roundtable became well known for its National Affairs Briefing held on August 21-22, 1980, in Dallas, Texas. Serving on the host committee were James Robison, Jerry Falwell, Pat Robertson, Charles Stanley, Richard Viguerie, Paul Weyrich, Jesse Helms, Phyllis Schafly, and Tom Landry (coach of the Dallas Cowboys). 75 They described the National Affairs Briefing as "a forum for pastors to be briefed by national authorities on all sorts of topics vital to making informed and responsible decisions about the forthcoming election." 76 Among the "national authorities" invited to address the 20,000 ministers and laity who would attend the National Affairs Briefing were Jimmy Carter, John Anderson, and Ronald Reagan. Carter and Anderson both declined the invitation. 77

Reagan, however, accepted the invitation. He arrived on time to give his speech, but was kept waiting more than an hour while Senator Jesse Helms, Jerry Falwell, and
prominent pastors James Kennedy, W.A. Criswell, and James Robison made their preliminary remarks. During this time, Reagan heard Robison give this commandment to the crowd: "Don't you commit yourself to some political party or politician. You commit yourself to the principles of God and demand those parties and politicians align themselves with the eternal values in this word (the Bible)!" The crowd jumped to their feet and applauded Robison's remarks.

In light of Robison's words, Reagan had to improvise. When he finally got his chance to speak, Reagan said, "A few days ago I addressed a group in Chicago and received their endorsement for my candidacy. Now I know this is a nonpartisan gathering and so I know you can't endorse me, but I only brought that up because I want you to know that I endorse you and what you are doing." The crowd jumped to their feet and applauded Reagan's remarks.

This incident was widely reported by the 250 members of the press who attended the Roundtable's National Affairs Briefing. As a member of the Roundtable, Pat Robertson also received some media attention which helped to validate his role as a leader of the NRPR. Apparently, Robertson was not altogether comfortable in this role. He resigned from the Roundtable and in the fall of 1980 he wrote in his Perspective that, "The attackers (of the religious Right)
have found an easy target in 1980 because the conservative Evangelicals involved in politics - Christian Voice, Moral Majority, and Religious Roundtable - have been, at times, unsophisticated, simplistic and inept."\textsuperscript{81} Nevertheless, Robertson also wrote that Evangelicals have a "constitutional right" to express their "concern about what they perceive as dangerous trends in our nation."\textsuperscript{82}

**Conclusion**

In the 1970's conservative evangelicals and fundamentalists did unite to form the NRPR which enabled them to fight against what they did, in fact, perceive as dangerous trends in the United States. They were joined in their battle against abortion, gay rights, and the ERA by some Catholics, Mormons, and Orthodox Jews who shared their views.\textsuperscript{83} As the NRPR's numbers grew, so did their political agenda. The NRPR decided also to wage war against family planning services, pornography, and genetic consultation.\textsuperscript{84} Furthermore, the NRPR is a staunch defender of a decentralized federal government, a strong national defense, and Israel.\textsuperscript{85}

The chief strategists of the NRPR organized the Moral Majority (which officially changed its name to "Liberty Federation" in 1986\textsuperscript{86}), the Christian Voice, and the
Roundtable in order to educate and enlist people in the political process. Although Pat Robertson was never a member of the Moral Majority or the Christian Voice and although he eventually resigned from the Roundtable, he was and is an important leader of the NRPR. Pat Robertson promoted the NRPR's political agenda through his program, "The 700 Club," his newsletter, *Pat Robertson's Perspective*, and through some of his books. Robertson's rhetoric in these mediums is the subject of the following chapter. However, the purpose of this chapter was to explain the "new wave of political activism by evangelical Christians" which constitutes the socio-political milieu or "scene" that ultimately helped give rise to Robertson's political activity.
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CHAPTER V

PAT ROBERTSON'S PRE-CAMPAIGN RHETORIC

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze Pat Robertson's pre-campaign rhetoric. Specifically, Robertson's rhetoric from 1972 through 1985 will be examined. Although Robertson did not officially become a Presidential candidate until October 1, 1987, he announced the possibility of his candidacy in 1986. Hence, Robertson's rhetoric from 1986 through 1988 is considered to be "campaign" rhetoric and it will be addressed in the following chapter.

The primary source material for this chapter includes five of Robertson's six books, nineteen editions of his newsletter, Pat Robertson's Perspective, and excerpts of transcripts from his television program, "The 700 Club." In order of their first edition publication the five books are: Shout It From The Housetops (1972), My Prayer For You (1977), The Secret Kingdom (1982), Answers To 200 of Life's Most Probing Questions (1984), and Beyond Reason (1985). For the sake of academic integrity, it should be noted that Shout It From The Housetops, The Secret Kingdom, and Beyond
Reason were co-authored respectively by Jamie Buckingham, Bob Slosser, and William Proctor. Unfortunately, it is difficult to determine how much influence each of these men had on Robertson's books. Considering, however, that Buckingham, Slosser, and Proctor are all professional writers, one may assume that they contributed more to the mechanics of the books than to their content.

As chapter one pointed out, Pat Robertson wrote his newsletter from February of 1977 through part of 1982. The 1977 and 1978 Perspectives were unavailable. Furthermore, the Perspective's inconsistent dating system makes it difficult to determine whether all of the 1979, 1980, 1981, and 1982 editions were obtained. However, the nineteen Perspectives which were available provided ninety pages of valuable information.

Equally important are excerpts from transcripts of "The 700 Club" which Robertson hosted for several years before becoming a Presidential candidate. While hosting "The 700 Club," Robertson did not use a teleprompter or cue cards which resulted in "spontaneous lectureettes." Referring to his television program, Robertson has stated, "...I ad-lib a good deal of what I say, so I'm not dealing with a script. This means that I will be an easier target for ridicule." The extemporaneous nature of Robertson's remarks make them
particularly revealing and several of his comments have indeed become an embarrassment to him.  

Robertson's rhetoric in his books, newsletters, and television program will be analyzed collectively. The merit of this approach is explained by Kenneth Burke who notes that "we must think of rhetoric not in terms of some one particular address, but as a general body of identifications that owe their convincingness much more to trivial repetition and dull daily reenforcement than to exceptional rhetorical skill." Although there are a few inconsistencies in Robertson's rhetoric, the same basic themes repeatedly emerge. The following sections will address these themes in terms of Burkeian philosophy and techniques.

**Law and Order**

Chapter two of this thesis described "hierarchy" as an important aspect of dramatism. Burke states that the principle of hierarchy is "grounded in the very nature of language..." Furthermore, he contends that man is "goaded by the spirit of hierarchy" or in other words, man is "moved by a sense of order." Burke even claims that, "The hierarchic principle itself is inevitable in systematic thought." Clearly, the concept of hierarchy or order must
be considered in a Burkeian analysis of a person's rhetorical acts.

Therefore, Pat Robertson's rhetorical acts must be addressed in relation to Burke's definition of hierarchy. In *Attitudes Toward History*, Burke defines hierarchy as "a ladder of authority that extends from 'lower' to 'higher,' while its official functions tend towards a corresponding set of social ratings." Burke elaborates on this definition in *A Rhetoric of Motives* by stating that the principle of hierarchy is "synonymous with the class divisions of youth and age, stronger and weaker, male and female, or the stages of learning, from apprentice to journeyman to master." Hierarchies are given organization through "Bureaucracy." 

According to Bernard Brock, social institutions such as the family, school, church, and clubs are "bureaucracies" which have their own hierarchy. With regard to Burke's concern about "class divisions," economic systems may be viewed as one of the most significant "bureaucracies." The importance of the hierarchic principle is also readily apparent in a country's form of government as well as in its judicial and educational systems. All of these factors should be considered when analyzing a nation's social order.
Communication scholar Barry Brummett points out that a Presidential election campaign offers an opportunity to reexamine the social order. Brummett states:

We do not merely choose candidates, we choose ways of being a nation and of defining ourselves. Each candidate's rhetoric answers questions such as: What sort of social order do we and should we have here? Why do problems (inflation, unemployment, etc.) arise in this social order? What can we do to restore social order? 12

Much of Pat Robertson's rhetoric is devoted to answering these questions.

Robertson describes the present social order as the "visible world." He says the visible world is a "material," "physical," and "temporary" world. 13 With regard to the visible world, Robertson claims, "Everything seems to be going wrong, and the forecast is worse." 14 By "everything" Robertson means the economy, defense, energy, crime, poverty, morality, education, hunger, and pollution. 15

According to Robertson, the aforementioned problems can be solved by reaching "from the visible into the invisible and bring(ing) that secret kingdom into the visible through its principles - principles that can be adopted at this moment." 16 The invisible world or secret kingdom which Robertson mentions is "the world of God's power and
resources." The principles he speaks of are the "laws of the kingdom" which he believes can bring about a "new world order." These laws include the Law of Reciprocity, the Law of Use, the Law of Perseverance, the Law of Greatness, the Law of Unity, the Law of Responsibility, the Law of Miracles, and the Law of Dominion.

The Law of Reciprocity is explained by Robertson in terms of two of Jesus' declarations: "Give, and it will be given to you..." and "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you." Robertson claims that even international relations respond to this principle. In fact, the Law of Reciprocity has "the potential to bring peace to the world." This statement is made with one qualification: The Law of Reciprocity will not work with "totally lawless renegade nations."  

The Soviet Union is at the top of Robertson's list of renegade nations. Robertson talks about the Soviet Union (or Russia) in unflattering terms in eighteen of his nineteen newsletters. Furthermore, with regard to the 1985 U.S. - Soviet summit, Robertson made the following remarks on "The 700 Club":

In my view, we will never achieve anything meaningful with the Soviet Union unless it will be to their benefit. And they will not keep any treaty that does not benefit them...because lying, according to
Lenin, is part of their strategy. And they don't mind lying in
written documents. If it's to
their benefit to keep the
agreements then they'll do it, but
basically speaking, their mindset
is one of deceit and harassment and
oppression. Ours is one of
openness and truthfulness and from
the Judeo-Christian point of view.
We come at these things from
totally different cultures, totally
different mindsets and I personally
don't think anything meaningful is
going to come out of it.\textsuperscript{21}

Considering Robertson's feelings about the Soviet Union, it
is difficult to understand how he could also believe that
the Law of Reciprocity might bring peace to the world.

The Law of Use is based upon the Biblical principle
that "...to everyone who has shall more be given, and he
shall have an abundance; but from the one who does not have,
even what he does have shall be taken away."\textsuperscript{22} Robertson
uses the Law of Use to indict welfare states and socialism.
On the other hand, he believes that capitalism is the
economic system which is "most closely related to the Bible"
and that the "profit motive is not evil," but rather it is a
"creative force."\textsuperscript{23}

Robertson makes it clear that it is all right to make
money, but it is certainly not all right to lose money. He
abhors debt and inflation. Robertson wrote about debt and
inflation in every issue of his Perspective. He painted a
picture of doom and gloom by frequently predicting a worldwide financial crash sometime in the 1980's.\textsuperscript{24} Robertson has contended that the only way to avoid such a crash is to put into practice a biblical concept called the year of Jubilee. The year of Jubilee was a system of redistributing wealth wherein every fifty years all debt was cancelled. Robertson believes that debt should be cancelled every fifty years on a worldwide basis.\textsuperscript{25} Undoubtedly, Robertson's proposal would alter the balance of power between nations and change the hierarchical principle implicit in the term, "third world nation."

Robertson's Law of Perseverance is almost self-explanatory. Robertson stresses the importance of not giving up no matter how great the adversity that one faces might be. This principle is so important to Robertson that he claims:

\begin{quote}
Had God given us no more insight than the Law of Perseverance together with the Laws of Reciprocity and Use, we would have enough to change the world.\textsuperscript{26}
\end{quote}

The theme of changing the world is also found in Robertson's discussion of the Law of Responsibility.

According to Robertson, the Law of Responsibility dictates that "whatever level of opportunity is given to us, both God and man expect us to give a certain standard of
performance."²⁷ Robertson believes that the United States is "the strongest power on earth" which means the United States has the responsibility of ordering the world economy and keeping world peace. Robertson chastises the United States for not living up to its responsibility and for not developing a "national fiber of noblesse oblige."²⁸

The concept of noblesse oblige is important to Robertson. He defines it as the obligation of people (or nations) of "high rank, position, or favor to behave nobly, kindly, and responsibly toward others." He also stresses this idea in his discussion of the Law of Greatness. In order to achieve greatness, Robertson advises people not only to be "trusting," "teachable," and "humble," but also to serve others. To Robertson, leadership equals servanthood.²⁹

Robertson believes that God's servants have access to His power through miracles. Miracles are a "disruption of God's natural order."³⁰ In his book about miracles, Beyond Reason, Robertson tells his readers, "And you can perform miracles if you but understand the power of God and the laws of faith and obedience that unlock God's power to those who believe in Him and serve Him."³¹ According to Robertson, God's power can be used to cure cancer, eradicate hate, manage money, and harness the forces of nature. With regard
to the latter, Robertson explains how (in the 1960's) he successfully "rebuked" a hurricane "in the name of the Lord and commanded it to stay away from our (CBN's) vicinity." Robertson also gives detailed accounts of miracles in his book, Shout It From The Housetops. In fact, learning how to follow God's guidance and how to tap into His power are major themes of Shout It From The Housetops.

The importance of power is also explicitly stated in Robertson's discussion of the Law of Dominion. The Law of Dominion calls for "man to have authority over the earth." By "man" Robertson means "Christians." In a 1985 fund-raising letter for the Freedom Council Foundation, Robertson wrote to his followers:

We must arise and exercise our responsibility before God to assert dominion on earth. I am certain that as we take authority in His name, God will raise up champions from among His people - individuals who, like David of old, will run out to do battle with the taunting Goliaths of secularism who are oppressing God's people, and lead others in the battle for our spiritual liberties.

Indeed, as early as 1979, Robertson wrote in his Perspective that, "Unless Christians desire a nation and a world reordered to the humanistic/atheistic/hedonistic model, it is absolutely vital that we take control of the U.S. government away from the Trilateral Commission and the
Council on Foreign Relations."\(^{36}\)

Robertson would also like to diminish the power of the U.S. Supreme Court. For example, in a 1982 broadcast of "The 700 Club," Robertson said:

> One thing that you might not be aware of is what the Supreme Court says is not, in American history, the supreme law of the land. A court merely decides a dispute of two parties before it, but only can an elected legislature with the concurrence of the executive also elected put a law into effect. The Supreme Court has claimed in a recent decision in the last 20 years -- that is what it says is the quote, supreme law of the land -- but is is not. It does not have and should not have under our constitutional system the force of law put into effect by elected representatives. And this is something we need to understand because we are now coming to the point where legislation is being made by judges who hold office for life. And that, ladies and gentlemen, is wrong.\(^{37}\)

Robertson's disdain for the Supreme Court is based on his belief that its decisions "have made a mockery of our religious freedom."\(^{38}\)

Ironically, Robertson has made some remarks which have raised doubts about his commitment to religious freedom for non-Christians. For instance, he has "repeatedly argued" that the U.S. Constitution says nothing about the separation of church and state but that the phrase appears in the
Soviet Constitution. In a 1981 broadcast of "The 700 Club," Robertson claimed that after the Soviet Constitution was written, a new doctrine came into being in 1920 with the American Civil Liberties Union. Robertson said that the doctrine was "designed to remove religion from American life and to bring U.S. policy in line with that of the Soviet Union."\textsuperscript{39} Robertson boldly proclaimed his remedy for this situation in one of his Perspectives. He wrote, "Above all else we need a national resolution - a constitutional amendment if necessary - reaffirming our Judeo-Christian heritage."\textsuperscript{40}

In his discussion of the Law of Unity, Robertson stated that the United States "had been founded as a Christian nation." However, America presently "struggles under a social philosophy of pluralism."\textsuperscript{41} Robertson longs for an America that is truly "one nation under God." He believes it is possible for the United States to return to its alleged Christian roots. He wrote in his book, Answers To 200 Of Life's Most Probing Questions, "If the church could achieve unity, it could change the political and social structure of society with no trouble at all."\textsuperscript{42}
Pat Robertson's Plea

Insofar as Pat Robertson calls for a new social and political order with conservative Christians in control, he has rejected the present order or what Bernard Brock refers to as the "traditional" hierarchy. The rejection of the traditional hierarchy results in a feeling of guilt. Actually, guilt is "inherent in society because man cannot accept all the impositions of his traditional hierarchy." Communication scholar Peter Coyne (citing William Rueckert) contends that guilt is "Burke's all-purpose word for moral guilt, all kinds of tensions, and any uneasiness...." According to Coyne, anxiety, embarrassment, and self-hatred may be used as substitute words for guilt.

No matter what one chooses to call it, the guilt must be alleviated in order to be "purified" and "redeemed." Guilt may be eliminated or "purged" through mortification or victimage. Mortification was defined in chapter two as a "scrupulous and deliberate clamping of limitation upon the self." Therefore, mortification is an act of self-sacrifice. Victimage is the opposite of mortification in that it involves the purging of guilt through a scapegoat. Hence, mortification is "suicidal" whereas victimage is "homicidal."
Although mortification and victimage are the means through which guilt is redeemed, it may be avoided through transcendence. In *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, Burke states that "criminality" (guilt) may be "transformed, transcended, transsubstantiated by incorporation into a wider context of symbolic action." This "wider context" is actually a higher order. When a person rejects the "traditional" hierarchy because he/she is following a higher or "nobler" hierarchy, guilt is redefined as a "virtue." As an example of this phenomenon, Burke explains that in his Confession St. Augustine handled different situations with "Scriptual formula":

Thus by confronting a current situation in terms of a Biblical response, such citations had the effect of making the situation itself essentially Biblical, to be classed with conditions not literally present at all. Thus there is a sense in which his Biblical terminology of motives enabled him to 'transcend' the sheerly empirical events of his times.

Pat Robertson's rhetoric provides a current example of transcendence of the empirical realm.

A cursory reading of Robertson's works, however, might lead one to conclude that Robertson primarily engages in victimage rather than in transcendence. Robertson's apparent scapegoat is secular humanism. In order to define
secular humanism, Robertson quotes Francis Schaeffer who has been described as "the leading intellectual" of the New Religious Right movement. 52 Schaeffer is the author of *A Christian Manifesto*. *A Christian Manifesto* was written as a reaction to the Humanist Manifesto I, "signed in 1933 by such academic elites as John Dewey" and to the Humanist Manifesto II which was "conceived" in 1973 by B. F. Skinner, Sidney Hook, and Isaac Asimov. 53

Both of the Humanist Manifestos declare faith in human reason and express skepticism of religion. 54 The Humanist Manifesto II, for example, includes the following statements:

We find insufficient evidence for belief in the existence of a supernatural, it is either meaningless or irrelevant.... Science affirms that the human species is an emergence from natural evolutionary forces.... There is no credible evidence that life survives the death of the body. We affirm that moral values derive their sources from human experience. Ethics is autonomous and situational, needing no theological or ideological sanctions. 55

Proclamations such as these have caused Robertson to agree with Schaeffer that "...Since [the humanists'] concept of Man is mistaken, their concept of society and of law is mistaken, and they have no sufficient base for either
society or law. Nevertheless, Robertson maintains that the humanist philosophy of "If it feels good, do it" permeates society and has been "openly embraced" by "millions" of people.

As a consequence of adopting the humanist philosophy, Robertson argues that America is grappling with illegal drug use, abortion, and an increased tolerance for nudity, fornication, adultery, homosexuality, incest, and sadomasochism. Robertson even argues that secular humanism is responsible for financial immorality as evidenced by exorbitant federal debt and "ever-increasing inflation."

Furthermore, Robertson contends that secular humanism has caused judges to be "less inclined to make decisions based on the Bible, the Constitution, natural law, or precedent."

Instead, according to Robertson, judges make laws according to "whatever seems sociologically expedient." In short, secular humanism "both permits and personifies" people's "basetest desires."

Clearly, secular humanism is the embodiment of evil to Robertson. Secular humanists are the enemy. By linking everything from illegal drug use to high inflation with secular humanism, Robertson creates one enemy. The importance of a single scapegoat has been noted by Burke who quotes Hitler as saying that "the knowledge that there are
various enemies will lead only too easily to incipient doubts as to their own cause."  

Robertson's battle against secular humanism is aided by his depiction of it as a religion. The god of the secular humanists' religion is the Antichrist because he is the "consummate figure of humanism." By referring to secular humanism as a religion with the Antichrist as its god, Robertson seems to put it on an equal, but diametrically opposed, footing to Christianity. Hence, secular humanists become a more potent enemy than if secular humanism had been depicted by Robertson as merely a fad or fringe philosophy.

Robertson makes secular humanism seem even more menacing to Christians by saying that children are being indoctrinated in the public schools by "humanist educators." Robertson contends that "the court has forced or permitted secular humanism to become our official classroom religion." Consequently, Robertson claims that America's public schools are more dangerous than "any place else." On a 1984 broadcast of "The 700 Club," Robertson warned his viewers:

The state steadily is attempting to do something that few states other than the Nazis and the Soviets have attempted to do, namely, to take the children away from the parents and to educate them in a philosophy that is amoral, anti-Christian and humanistic and
to show them a collectivistic philosophy that will ultimately lead toward Marxism, socialism and a communistic type of ideology.  

For Robertson, secular humanism is obviously his "devil" or his term which serves as "the symbol of a common enemy." The secular humanists represent the ultimate evil because they supposedly prey on children who are innocent and unsuspecting victims.

According to Robertson secular humanists not only control public education, they control the media, think tanks, the legal system, New York banks, multinational corporations, the Trilateral Commission, the Council on Foreign Relations, the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. Insomuch as Robertson believes that the wicked secular humanists occupy the highest positions in society's hierarchy of power, he is able to "plead guilty" to rejecting the hierarchy without feeling guilt. Robertson's rejection of the present world order is required so that he can accept God's nobler hierarchy.

As the previous section explained, Robertson contends that his conception of God's hierarchy can be achieved by putting into practice the "laws of the kingdom." He states:

There's a new world coming. And we already know its principles....They [principles or kingdom laws] will change the world as we know it and prepare the way for the new one,
even speeding its arrival.\textsuperscript{69}

Specifically, the new world which Robertson speaks of will be established when Jesus Christ comes back to earth to reign here for one thousand years. During this time period, referred to as the Millennium, the "perfect government" which is a "perfect theocracy" will be made possible "because the perfect law of God will be universally accepted by all mankind...."\textsuperscript{70}

However, before the Millennium occurs, "there must be a breakdown of the world system as we know it now."\textsuperscript{71} Robertson believes that this breakdown will take place when there is a massive war in the Middle East. Robertson's so-called Armageddon Theology\textsuperscript{72} will be discussed in the following section.

\textbf{War and Peace}

Thus far, Robertson's rhetoric has been analyzed in terms of Burke's concept of hierarchy. This section will focus on a pentadic analysis of Robertson's rhetoric.

As chapter two pointed out, the pentad is one of several techniques of Burkeian criticism. While it is true that the other techniques are unfortunately overlooked in favor of the pentad, it is also true that "the majority of Burke's techniques are related to the pentad and the ratios
among the terms and the questions that the terms and ratios ask. For example, a concordance "would attempt to trace a term in all of its scenes." Cluster analysis investigates the identifications arising out of a term's association with scenes, purposes, agents, etc. Agon analysis is related to the pentad in the agent-counteragent ratio. Hence, the techniques of Burkeian criticism complement the pentad and although they shall not be explicitly noted in the following analysis, several of the techniques were utilized.

Before turning to Robertson's rhetoric, it should be pointed out that the pentad attempts to answer the question, "What must we be prepared to look for, when anyone is saying why anybody did anything?" Insofar as the pentad focuses on "why," it is concerned with motive. Burke writes:

...for every judgment, exhortation, or admonition, every view of natural or supernatural reality, every intention or expectation involves motive, or cause.

However, Burke makes it clear that "we are not moved by the reality of a cause but by our interpretation of it." The discussion of motives is always a matter of interpretation. Furthermore, with regard to studying motives, Burke states that "a good proposition to have in mind" is: "Anybody can do anything for any reason." Burke nevertheless believes that motives may be derived from
language. If motives are defined as "labels for completed action," then it follows that one's motives are revealed in one's choice of words.

Robertson's (Agent) words (Act) in his books, newsletters, and television show (Agency) reveal a preoccupation with impending worldwide disaster (Scene) and the subsequent establishment of Christ's kingdom on Earth. The function (Purpose) of Robertson's rhetoric is to prepare Christians for Christ's return to Earth.

Like many Christians the foundation of Robertson's faith is his belief that "all Scripture is inspired by God." Consequently, Robertson contends that the Bible is "the book which holds the answers to all of your questions, no matter what those questions might be." Indeed, Robertson even claims that the Bible gives specific answers to questions regarding what will happen in the future. The following pages will explain Robertson's version of the future based upon his interpretation of the Bible.

According to Robertson, "Having been regathered from the countries of the world, Israel, a unified nation living in relative security, will be invaded by a confederation from the north and the east." This confederation will consist of the Soviet Union, Ethiopia, Iran, Somalia or Libya, and probably East Germany. Despite the military
strength of this confederation, Israel will not be defeated.

Robertson writes:

God...will intervene in Israel's behalf with a great shaking - earthquakes, volcanic activity, fire, confusion, and even fighting among the allied invaders. He [God] also speaks of fire falling upon Magog [Soviet Union], the homeland of the leaders of the force.... This could, of course, be a vision of nuclear bombing. But it may also be the direct, miraculous intervention of God....

Robertson believes that the attack on Israel will trigger a chain of events leading to the Second Coming of Christ.

Following the unsuccessful invasion of Israel, Robertson maintains that a ten-nation confederation like the European Economic Community will "make a league with Israel and then turn on her and begin to oppress her." The leader of this confederation will be the Antichrist. Initially charming and charismatic, the Antichrist will turn out to be a terrible tyrant who will not allow people to buy or sell without taking "the mark of the Beast." The mark of the Beast is the number 666 which Robertson calls the number of man or of the "quintessential humanist." Robertson writes that accepting the mark of the Beast on one's right hand or forehead signals allegiance to the Antichrist and seals one's fate to be doomed forever in hell.
Antichrist's reign of terror will last for seven years. This seven-year time period is called the "Great Tribulation" or the "Tribulation."\textsuperscript{87}

After the Tribulation ends, the Second Coming of Christ will take place. Robertson claims that Jesus will "come back to destroy this new economic leader [Antichrist] and his kingdom...."\textsuperscript{88} Then Jesus Christ will establish his own kingdom on Earth which will last for one thousand years. Robertson describes this Millennium as a time of "universal peace" wherein Jesus Christ shows "mankind what it would have been like if sin had never entered the world."\textsuperscript{89}

Interestingly enough, although Robertson's version of the future has been called "Armageddon Theology," he never explicitly mentions the Battle of Armageddon in his books or newsletters. However, Robertson implies that the Battle of Armageddon will take place after the Millennium. Robertson states that at the end of the Millennium, the following events will occur:

\textit{...Satan will be allowed to lead a revolt of those who have still refrained from voluntarily accepting the rule of Christ. Then, after a relatively short period, the Lord will remove Satan (all evil and opposition) and bring forth 'a new heaven and a new earth.'\textsuperscript{90}}
This new heaven and new earth will be the "ultimate and eternal kingdom."^91

In his book, **Answers To 200 Of Life's Most Probing Questions**, Robertson asks "'When will all this happen?'" Robertson answers this question by stating, "We can never say for sure, because God has not allowed man to know the times and seasons. We cannot say with absolute certainty that these are the last days of the age."^92 Yet Robertson does make it clear that he believes these are the "last days."

Robertson writes in his June 1979 **Perspective** ". . . we stand amazed as the pieces which form the end-times mosaic rapidly fall into place."^93 On January 1, 1980 Robertson told his staff at CBN that:

> What is started over in the Middle East is not going to stop short of a war. I believe in the next two years, I would put it at '82, but dates are risky, there is going to be a major war in the Middle East.... Now they [the Russians] are going to make the move, and that's what God is saying - we've got a couple of years.^94

Robertson's January, 1980 **Perspective** states that, "Undoubtedly the 1980s will bring serious dislocations to our world...." These dislocations are the "labor pains of an emerging new order - the Millennium."^95 The May, 1981 edition of the **Perspective** warns that "time is growing
short" and "by 1982 we can look for a major international confrontation."\textsuperscript{96}

As previously pointed out, the purpose of Robertson's rhetoric is to prepare Christians for Jesus Christ's return to Earth. Part of the preparation process is to remind Christians over and over again that Jesus will be returning soon. Robertson talks about the impending worldwide disaster which would make possible Jesus Christ's return in two of his books, in several of his television broadcasts, and in every issue of his newsletter. As Kenneth Burke notes in his essay, "The Rhetoric of Hitler's 'Battle,'" there is a great deal of power in endless repetition.\textsuperscript{97} Robertson seems to have recognized this fact.

Furthermore, a great deal of Robertson's rhetoric is devoted to giving Christians advice about surviving the Tribulation. For example, one of Robertson's 1979 Perspectives tells Christians that, "In a year or two there must be consideration given to the storage of food, fallout shelters, [and] primitive survival tools."\textsuperscript{98} Robertson also frequently gives financial advice. He recommends that Christians "find a savings and pension program backed by gold instead of dollars..." while at the same time telling them that "the best savings program is to store our treasures in heaven..."\textsuperscript{99}
The aforementioned statement is indicative of Robertson's prevailing pre-campaign attitude that Christians must be "aware" of their present world, but they must "focus" on the "glorious age coming" and "concentrate" on "the coming kingdom of God." Indeed, Robertson's primary topic is the Millennium. Robertson contends that the Millennium will be Christians' "finest hour." The Millennium will allow "God's people to rise to the place He has always intended for them...."

The most important purpose of Robertson's rhetoric is to make sure that Christians are "up for the challenge" of ruling with Jesus Christ. In his book *The Secret Kingdom*, Robertson writes:

> But, if His people are to govern with Him in these circumstances, they need answers to several big questions: How do you run a just government? How do you run a world? What principles work and what ones do not? ... He [Jesus], the King, talked about His own Kingdom and the way it works. He wants us to master those principles so we will be able to serve with Him properly.

To Robertson, Christians must learn to conquer and cope with the trials of this troubled world so that they can successfully manage matters during the Millennium.
Conclusion

An analysis of Robertson's rhetoric from 1972-1985 reveals his desire for Christians to be in control of America's educational, legal and financial institutions. Robertson believes that these institutions are presently being controlled by secular humanists. According to Robertson, secular humanists are aligned with Satan and are responsible for the evil in this world.

Robertson assumes that if Christians were in control as opposed to secular humanists, the United States would be much better off than it is now. Nevertheless, Robertson thinks that a worldwide crisis leading to Jesus Christ's return is imminent. Jesus Christ's return to Earth will allow Christians to take their rightful place as leaders.

These conclusions were made by analyzing Robertson's rhetoric according to Burkeian philosophy and techniques. Specifically, Burke's notion of hierarchy and the acceptance, rejection, or transcendence of the hierarchy as well as the pentad were utilized. The following chapter will make use of another extremely important Burkeian concept - identification.
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CHAPTER VI
PAT ROBERTSON'S CAMPAIGN RHETORIC

The purpose of this chapter is to analyze Pat Robertson's campaign rhetoric. Specifically, Robertson's rhetoric from 1986 through 1988 will be examined. Although Robertson did not officially become a Presidential candidate until October 1, 1987, he made a formal announcement in 1986 regarding his intention to "run as a candidate for the nomination of the Republican Party for the office of President of the United States of America" if certain conditions were met.¹ Hence, Robertson's 1986 rhetoric is justifiably considered to be campaign rhetoric.

The primary source material for this chapter includes one of Robertson's books, thirty-four transcripts of his television program, "The 700 Club," three articles written by Robertson for conservative journals, twenty-seven press releases, one campaign brochure, sixteen position papers, and four of Robertson's most important speeches. Robertson's book, America's Dates With Destiny, was published in 1986. The transcripts of "The 700 Club" are from various broadcasts aired between April 1, 1986 and June 24, 1987. The three journal articles were published in 1987.
before Robertson officially became a candidate. His press releases were dated from February 24, 1987 through May 16, 1988. Unfortunately, no information was available regarding the publication or distribution dates of Robertson's position papers and campaign brochure.

On September 17, 1986 Robertson delivered one of his most important speeches. In this speech entitled, "A New Vision For America," Robertson told his audience that he would run for President if he could secure the signatures of three million registered voters who would "pray," "work," and "give" toward his election.² With these conditions met, Robertson was able to deliver another speech on October 1, 1987 - his "Formal Declaration Of Candidacy" speech. Naturally, Robertson discussed some of his major concerns in this speech. He elaborated on these concerns in two other speeches entitled "Vital Message From Pat Robertson" and "What I Will Do As President."

Robertson's campaign rhetoric will be analyzed according to the Burkeian concept of identification. Identification has been called "the most crucial term in Burke's rhetoric."³ Therefore, the concept of identification merits further attention.
Identification

Identification may be viewed as an extension of persuasion. Persuasion stresses "deliberate design." Identification allows for deliberate design, but it may also include "partially 'unconscious' factors in its appeal." Burke offers a variety of definitions for the "unconscious," but his assertion that, "By the Unconscious we often mean the 'intuitive' or 'instinctive,'... the recognition that something is as it is, without pausing to ask exactly how one arrived at precisely that decision," seems to be most closely linked with identification.

Theoretically, the distinction between persuasion and identification has great significance. With persuasion there must be an "acting upon" the listeners before there can be an "acting together." Persuasion is a means to an end. Identification, however, may either be a means to an end or an end as "when people earnestly yearn to identify themselves with some group or other." In popular vernacular, a rhetor who persuades his listeners "pushes all of the right buttons" whereas a rhetor who identifies with his listeners succeeds in "connecting" with them.

From a practical standpoint the distinction between persuasion and identification loses some of its significance because a critic may not be able to differentiate between
them. Indeed, Peter Coyne points out in his dissertation, "Kenneth Burke and the Rhetorical Criticism of Public Address," that:

The decision as to whether an identification is planned [persuasion] or accidental is again a matter of interpretation and is further complicated by the vagueness of the amount or degree of purpose which is involved in an unconscious identification. As a result of this confusion, the critic will be perplexed by the decision of whether an identification was planned or unconscious and also by the kind of data necessary to support that an unconscious or conscious identification existed.

Burke himself writes, "So, there is no chance of our keeping apart the meanings of persuasion, identification ('consubstantiality') and communication (the nature of rhetoric as 'addressed')." 8

The aforementioned statement makes it clear that Burke equates identification with consubstantiality. Identification and consubstantiality both refer to "a sharing of the same substance." 9 To share the same substance means to share the same essences or properties. Burke explains the relationship between identification, substance, and consubstantiality in A Rhetoric of Motives.
He writes:

A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself with B even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so. Here are ambiguities of substance. In being identified with B, A is 'substantially one' with a person other than himself. Yet at the same time he remains unique, an individual locus of motives. Thus he is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance and consubstantial with another.¹⁰

Hence, the "ambiguities of substance" of which Burke speaks refer to the fact that both unity and division exist simultaneously.

Division is the "counterpart" to identification.¹¹ The union of these concepts serve as the motive for communication or rhetoric. Burke says, "But put identification and division ambiguously together, so that you cannot know for certain just where one ends and the other begins, and you have the characteristic invitation to rhetoric."¹² Pat Robertson's rhetoric provides an excellent example of the ambiguities of identification and division.
The Christian Candidate

In order to win a national election, Presidential candidates must obviously try to identify with as many people as possible. Yet the hackneyed maxim of, "If you try to please everyone, you will please no one" is still applicable. Robertson was keenly aware that he must have the support of evangelical Christians in order to be the 1988 Republican nominee for President of the United States. With their numbers estimated at seventy million, evangelical Christians formed the largest group of potential voters to whom Robertson might successfully appeal.

However, Robertson undoubtedly knew that he was not guaranteed the votes of all evangelical Christians. As chapter four pointed out, "about forty percent of evangelicals tilt to the liberal side..." A significant number of conservative evangelicals could be expected to follow the lead of Jerry Falwell who endorsed George Bush in 1986. Interestingly enough, Jerry Falwell and other leaders of the New Religious Political Right (NRPR) had met with Ronald Reagan in 1980 and "spent an hour with the governor trying to persuade him to select almost anyone as his running mate but the 'liberal' George Bush." Falwell's change of heart might have been due to Bush's declaration that he was in fact a "born again" Christian.
or it might have been due to Falwell's "newly won insider status within the Republican party" coupled with his aversion to Robertson's Charismatic beliefs. No matter what Falwell's motivation was for endorsing Bush, the message was clear: Robertson could not automatically count on the support of conservative evangelicals.

In addition to contending with a split evangelical voting bloc, one of the greatest challenges of Robertson's campaign was to convince voters that he was a serious candidate who had a chance to win not only the Republican nomination, but also the national election. Another equally important challenge in Robertson's campaign was to persuade Christians that he was not ignoring "God's call" on his life by focusing on politics instead of on his CBN ministry.

With regard to proving that it was God's will for him to run for President in 1988, Robertson stated in a 1986 interview with Time magazine that his main concern was, "Where would God have me to serve?" In trying to decide whether God wanted him to serve as President of CBN or of the United States, Robertson explained in another interview that he was "crystallizing" his decision through the following process:

The first step was intense prayer, and the second was consulting a number of Christian leaders. The third part is assessing the
reaction of Christian people. The fourth will be to observe some of the political races in 1986 where Christians are running for governor, congressman and so on. By the end of 1986 we'll all have a much clearer picture. But I feel that God is doing something very extraordinary among His people in this country and possibly I'm a part of it. 20

One month after making these remarks, Robertson added a fifth step to his crystallization process.

The fifth step involved a hurricane. In September of 1985, Hurricane Gloria was heading straight for Virginia Beach, Virginia. Robertson went on the air and prayed that the hurricane would be turned away from the Virginia coast. 21 Responding to a question about Hurricane Gloria on the June 11, 1986 broadcast of "The 700 Club," Robertson said that this incident was "extremely important" in his decision-making process to run for President because "I felt, interestingly enough, that if I couldn't move a hurricane, I could hardly move a nation." Robertson added that if the hurricane had come ashore, he would have seen that as a signal from the Lord not to "go for it." 22

On September 17, 1986 Robertson made his first official statement that he would probably "go for it". The date Robertson chose to make his announcement was highly symbolic because it was the one hundred and ninety-ninth anniversary
of the approval of the Constitution by America's founding fathers. Furthermore, Robertson made his statement from Constitution Hall in Washington, D.C.. Quoting George Washington, John Adams, and Thomas Jefferson, Robertson argued that God is the source of liberty. In Burkeian terms, Robertson was trying to establish "familial substance." Burke writes:

But the concept of family is usually 'spiritualized,' so that it includes merely social groups, comprising persons of the same nationality or beliefs. Most often, in such cases, there is the notion of some founder shared in common, or some covenant or constitution or historical act from which the consubstantiality of the group is derived. 23

Robertson wanted to remind his listeners of their common national and religious heritage.

After establishing familial substance, Robertson went on to explain his vision of America as "truly one nation under God." Then he stated that for the past three years, people had been coming to him asking him to be their "champion" in order to make their shared vision a reality. Robertson's final words in this important speech delivered to a coast-to-coast, closed-circuit television audience were:

Let me assure you that deep in my heart I know God's will for me in this crucial decision and I have His further assurance that he will
care for, continue, and enlarge the ministry of CBN which is so dear to my heart. So now to all of you...
I give you my decision. If by September 17, 1987, one year from today, three million registered voters have signed petitions telling me that they will pray - that they will work - that they will give toward my election, then I will run as a candidate for... President of the United States.24

Robertson's remarks served several purposes. First, by stating that people had come to him asking him to be their "champion," Robertson tried to dispel the rumor that he would run for President for his own aggrandizement. Second, Robertson made it clear that he had been in direct communication with God as indicated by His "assurance" that CBN would not suffer if he ran for President. Third, Robertson's assertion that he knows "God's will" signalled that his candidacy would have divine approval which in turn would mean that he was a serious candidate. God would not sanction a halfhearted effort. Finally, by asking for tangible evidence of support in the form of signatures and money, Robertson gave himself a safety net. He placed the responsibility of following through on God's will in the hands of his listeners. Robertson was obviously persuasive. He obtained over three million signatures and eleven million dollars for his "war chest."25
The Moral Candidate

As it became increasingly clear that Robertson would be a Presidential candidate, the media gave him a great deal of attention. Most of the media coverage focused on Robertson's religious background in relation to politics. For example, in an interview with a journalist from *U.S. News and World Report*, Robertson was asked a total of seven questions.

Four of the questions were:

1. Are voters ready for a clergyman's running for President in a country where church and state are traditionally divided?
2. And you wouldn't try to impose your religious values on people?
3. Do you believe God would be on your side in a race for President?
4. How much Republican support can you draw outside evangelicals?26

These questions are indicative of the major obstacles facing Robertson in his bid for the Presidency. The following paragraphs will explain how Robertson attempted to overcome these obstacles by distancing himself from his ministry while still trying to identify with evangelicals.

Robertson's most obvious attempt to distance himself from his ministry was his formal resignation from the Christian Broadcasting Network (CBN) on September 29, 1987. In his statement, Robertson said that the decision to leave CBN was "one of the most painful" that he had ever been
"required" to make. However, he added that, "If it requires personal sacrifice on my part to help preserve freedom in the United States of America, that is a small price to pay."
The most significant remark that Robertson made in his resignation statement was the reference to his "ministry" as "broadcasting" as opposed to evangelism. 27

Although the mission statement of CBN says that its primary purpose is evangelism, Robertson has been calling himself a "professional broadcaster" rather than a televangelist since at least 1983. 28 Robertson's desire to set himself apart from other televangelists was certainly understandable considering that in the early 1980's, Oral Roberts claimed to have talked to a 900-foot-tall Jesus, Rex Humbard closed a personal land deal for a million dollars "while begging for TV funds at the same time," and the Praise The Lord (PTL) network had been sarcastically called "Pass The Loot." 29

In March of 1987, PTL was renamed "Pay The Lady" after it was revealed that Jim Bakker had paid "hush money" to Jessica Hahn with whom he had committed adultery. Televangelism received another blow in February, 1988 when Jimmy Swaggart admitted to sexual misconduct with a prostitute. 30 Incidents such as these have given the term "televangelist" an extremely negative connotation.
Consequently, Robertson not only calls himself a "broadcaster," but insists that others do the same. His most virulent remarks on the matter were made to an interviewer from *Newsweek* who pointed to Robertson's past as a "T.V. evangelist." Robertson declared:

> I just want you to know that I'm not going to take it any longer, from anyone.... It's like calling a black man a nasty word that begins with an 'N.' I've never been one [an evangelist]. ...It is this incredible arrogance of the liberal media and guys like you who come around from your high horse, label me contrary to my desires.\(^31\)

Robertson's strong denial of ever being a televangelist may have backfired as evidenced by the statement of a television reporter who probably expressed the thoughts of many people. She said, "Ask him if he's a televangelist and he'll call you a bigot. Well, he was a televangelist, and if he's that touchy about just the title, then you wonder about what's behind the title."\(^32\)

Not only did Robertson want to rid himself of the title, "televangelist," he wanted to replace "Reverend" with "Mister." Therefore, on the same day that he resigned from CBN, Robertson resigned his ordination as a Southern Baptist minister. In his resignation letter, Robertson wrote, "...I am keenly aware of the deeply held belief in this nation ... that there should not be an established religion in the
United States of America nor should the government prohibit the free exercise of religion by any of the people." Robertson also tried to persuade voters that he would not impose his religious values on them when he formally declared his candidacy. He stated, "I believe in religious freedom for all Americans..." and he made it clear that his campaign would "seek to serve Americans of all faiths" as well as "reaching out to all the citizens of America, men and women of all faiths and denominations...."

Robertson's remarks speak to the issue of separation of church and state. Central to this issue is Robertson's interpretation of the Constitution of the United States. Robertson believes that the framers of the Constitution used "the Old Testament stories of God at work with His people, Israel, and the New Testament stories of the Christian church" as a model to "shape" the Constitution. Furthermore, Robertson maintains that, "The Constitution was intended for a religious people." When questioned about this assertion by a journalist from *U.S. News and World Report* in 1988, Robertson replied:

I didn't say the Constitution wasn't for everybody; of course, it's for everybody. But the framers of it - at least one of them, a key framer, John Adams - said this was meant for a moral and religious people.
Robertson had expressed a similar sentiment a few months earlier in 1987 when he said on *CBS Morning Break*, "Well I believe one hundred percent in the historical principle of separation of church and state, but that does not mean we should separate God from government because we believe in God."\(^{37}\)

However, in a 1986 interview with *Conservative Digest*, Robertson linked the concept of separation of church and state with communism. He exclaimed, "It's amazing that the Constitution of the United States says nothing about the separation of church and state. That phrase does appear, however, in the Soviet Constitution...."\(^{38}\) Technically, Robertson is correct. The phrase "separation of church and state" does not appear in the United States' Constitution. Nevertheless, the concept of separation of church and state is firmly established by the First Amendment, which bars official establishment of religion and guarantees the free exercise of religion, and by Article VI which bars a religious test for office.

With regard to a religious test for office, Robertson claims that "the media has done everything possible to place a religious test on those of us who are evangelical Christians."\(^{39}\) This statement is an example of masterful identification. The perception of persecution from a shared
enemy usually causes people to unite. Christians may be particularly susceptible to this phenomenon because they are usually taught that the righteous suffer for the Lord's sake. Hence, they may view their perceived lack of acceptance in the political realm as a spiritual struggle or a holy war.

Robertson has used another technique to deal with the issue of separation of church and state as it relates to a religious test for office. He complimented potential voters. For example, Robertson has frequently made statements such as, "I believe the American people are very fair, and I believe they dislike intolerance and bigotry." Burke calls this strategy "ingratiation" which is an attempt to "gain favor" through the process of "saying the right thing." The most important strategy Robertson employed to handle the separation of church and state issue was to replace the term "Christians" with the term "moral people." Expressing a similar thought, one journalist noted during Robertson's campaign, that "the name Jesus Christ rarely passes his [Robertson's] lips in public these days." The same journalist added, "Robertson learned early in the campaign that somewhat more secular notions like 'traditional values' and 'basic moral principles' resonate
more comfortably in living rooms...."\(^{42}\) Indeed, Robertson's fundamental campaign message was, "We must restore America's greatness through moral strength."\(^{43}\) Of course, moral strength can only be supplied through moral people.

On his television program, "The 700 Club," Robertson seemed to define only Christians as "moral people." For instance, he made the following comments on his May 14, 1987 broadcast:

...Where can you sing sweet freedom songs but in the United States of America. There are very few people around the face of this earth that have freedom. Now ladies and gentlemen, it is very much at stake. Some people question whether Christians should get involved in politics. If you don't get involved in politics, you will be among non-Christians, isn't that the way it is? If righteous people aren't in, then unrighteous people will be. If moral people aren't in then the only people left are the immorals. That's the correlation of that thought. If good people do nothing, then that's all it takes for evil to triumph.\(^{44}\)

However, in his speeches Robertson defined "moral people" as those who believe in God. His "stock" statement on the subject was:

*Studies done for us by George Gallup show that 94% of all Americans believe in God. Only 6% are atheists. Ladies and gentlemen, I passionately believe that the atheists among us should*
have every right of citizenship -- the right to print, to broadcast, to speak, to persuade, to run business, to organize politically, to run for office -- but I do not believe that the 94% of us who believe in God have any duty whatsoever to dismantle our entire public affirmation of faith in God just to please a tiny minority who don't believe in anything.45

Robertson made it clear in his formal declaration of candidacy that he considers Jews and Muslims as people who believe in something or who, in other words, believe in God.46 By way of antithesis, Robertson also made it clear that those people who do not believe in God are immoral.

Robertson's association of "moral" with "belief in God" allowed him to retain his appeal to evangelicals while reaching out to other religious groups. Furthermore, Robertson's message of restoring America's greatness through moral strength permitted him to promote his platform in a nonthreatening manner. The following section will explain Robertson's position on various key subjects and it will analyze Robertson's attempts to persuade voters to accept his proposed policies.

**The Conservative Candidate**

Although Robertson sought to broaden his appeal by modifying his religious rhetoric during the 1988
Presidential campaign, he made almost no attempt to alter his "far right" conservative positions. Perhaps in an attempt to "carve out an audience" for himself, Robertson proudly maintained that he was a "staunch conservative" as evidenced by the remarks he made in one of his speeches:

...I do not think that a conservative has any necessity to balance the ticket, as they call it, with some liberal. I will pick a conservative as a Vice-Presidential running mate. Once in, it would be my goal again not to try to make some sort of ideological balance in the White House. I do not believe the conservatives should be a hunted and endangered species in the White House...48

One cannot help but wonder if George Bush - who made "liberal" such a dirty word that it could not even be said, but was instead referred to as "the L word" - was listening to Robertson's speech.

As a resolute conservative, Robertson had his own list of "dirty words" which included, among other things, tort liability, subsidized farming, welfare, and the federal budget deficit. However, the "nastiest" words on Robertson's list were the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), the Supreme Court, and the Soviet Union.

Robertson had contempt for the ACLU because he believes the organization's battle for minority rights means the loss
of rights for the majority. He was incensed at the ACLU for having been "advocates in cases hostile to all forms of public expression of personal faith." According to Robertson, many members of the ACLU are atheists who are trying to remove all the vestiges of Christianity from the public schools in order to indoctrinate children with the religion of secular humanism.

Robertson's campaign rhetoric also revealed resentment toward the Supreme Court. Given Robertson's strong anti-abortion stand, it is not surprising that much of his resentment was based on the 1973 Roe versus Wade decision. However, at the heart of Robertson's indignation, was his belief that the Supreme Court justices "rewrite" the Constitution instead of interpreting it. Robertson explained the significance of this situation in his speech, "What I Will Do As President":

And I think that it is absolutely imperative that we reign in the runaway Judiciary. We have now a government, by fiat, by five unelected old men or sometimes women in black robes. That is totally contrary to the intentions of the framers of our Constitution. They are not accountable to anybody and instead of saying we are under the Constitution, they are now saying that when we propose a ruling it is above the Constitution because those who can interpret the law the final interpreter is the law and is higher than the law
[sic]. And they brought this startling statement in that a Supreme Court decision was the supreme law of the land. And that is totally out of context with the history of America. It is time to get back, ladies and gentlemen, to judges who believe their job is to interpret the law and the Constitution not try to rewrite it.\footnote{53}

When questioned about his willingness to accept Supreme Court decisions as "the law of the land" on \textit{Nightwatch}, Robertson replied, "Well, I would really have no choice." Yet, in the next breath he said, "The Congress of the United States is not subservient to the Supreme Court despite what it says in the press, and neither is the President."\footnote{54} This statement seemed to indicate that Robertson might not obey Supreme Court decisions if elected President. Robertson did not resolve this issue during his campaign.

Robertson's attitude toward the Soviet Union had even more serious implications than his attitude toward the Supreme Court. If Robertson had been elected, the so-called cold war would not only have resumed, but the "temperature" would have dipped considerably below freezing. In his formal declaration of candidacy speech, Robertson declared, "...the Communist Party who are the absolute rulers of the Russian people, have shown us nothing but treachery, deceit, and the most brutal forms of aggression...."\footnote{55} Robertson
also warned that, "The Soviet Union has a grand strategy ... to gain control over Middle East oil."56

In his pre-campaign rhetoric, Robertson maintained that the Soviet Union would invade Israel in the Middle East which would trigger a chain of events leading to the second coming of Jesus Christ. Hence, Robertson's campaign rhetoric regarding the Soviet Union raised questions about his "Armageddon theology." The most damning charges were made by Gerard Straub, former producer of "The 700 Club," on a national television news program called West 57th. Straub stated:

In 1969, he received a prophecy that said that he was chosen to usher in the second coming of Jesus. We actually had plans made on how to televise the second coming, as incredible as that may seem. That's why we had a television station in Jerusalem, they were convinced that the second coming would happen there. His whole ministry was pointing towards a message that Armageddon was going to happen, and when it failed to materialize as he predicted in 1982, I think he began to suddenly realize or refocus his energies to realizing that the way in which this is going to happen is through the political process, and that as the president of the United States he would be in a position to maybe help be part of this ushering in the second coming of Jesus Christ. If it were to happen on the heels of some cataclysmic event like a nuclear holocaust. He could be
sitting there and hear God say, 'Press that button, my son.' Pat would, I am totally convinced, press it.57
draub's views were shared by the Reverend Donald Dunlop, who presently serves as the pastor of the Baptist church that ordained Robertson. Dunlop claimed that "a person who was functioning totally with an apocalyptic view of history would have less restraint on the button than someone who was not apocalyptic in his view of history."58

Perhaps in an effort not to lend credibility to these charges, Robertson never directly confronted the Armageddon issue. However, he did try to convince voters that he did not have a desire to start a war that would destroy the world as evidenced by the following statements:

But if they [the Soviets] begin a venture in the Middle East, as I read the Bible, God is going to bring it to pass, not America or anybody else.59

I'm as much for peace as anybody and I think any thinking person wants peace in our world. Anybody looking for war is out of his mind, especially when we're considering nuclear war.60

I am committed to a vision of hope and promise for the people of this country....61

These statements stand in sharp contrast to his pre-campaign rhetoric which focused on war instead of peace and which predicted the third World War in 1982.
Robertson promoted his new vision of hope and peace through a variety of methods. He tried to persuade voters to accept his positions by using startling statistics and shocking examples. Robertson also employed analogies to make his points. In utilizing these techniques, Robertson was really no different than any other politician. However, there is one aspect of Robertson's persuasive strategies which warrant special attention.

Robertson used what might be called "class-conscious" rhetoric in his Presidential campaign. He frequently referred to his father's career in the U.S. Senate and to his genealogy which includes a signor of the Declaration of Independence and two American Presidents. By doing this, Robertson either consciously or unconsciously created "mystery."

Peter Coyne explained in his dissertation, "Kenneth Burke and the Rhetorical Criticism of Public Address," that mystery arises when there is "communication between different kinds of beings." By "kinds," Burke means not merely two different people but "two different classes of people." Different classes or kinds arise because of "different modes of living and livelihood" resulting in differences in properties. Coyne goes on to explain that:

As a result of these differences in properties, people become mysteries
to one another. This mystery or unknowingness arises in part to differences in biological properties (symbolically interpreted) as well as properties that arise out of their ways of living. Mystery leads to a special kind of identification.

Coyne points out that "an identification a person makes with another person or figure at the top of the hierarchy (or higher than the person on the hierarchy), his god-term, is highly persuasive." Persuasion is likely because the top of the hierarchy is "divine" or has aspects of "divinity." Hence, "the person is revered not for what he is, but because he represents an 'absolute substance.'" This perfection principle "hides" or "veils" the aspects of division which exist. Burke notes the significance of mystery as it relates to persuasion:

Rhetorically considered, Mystery is a major resource of persuasion. Endow a person, an institution, a thing with the glow or resonance of the Mystical, and you have set up a motivational appeal to which people spontaneously ("instinctively," "intuitively") respond. In this respect, 'an ounce of Mystery is worth a ton of argument.'

Obviously, Robertson was wise to associate himself with his honorable and famous forebears.
Media Management

Persuasion or identification cannot take place if voters do not have access to a candidate's message. Robertson channeled his message primarily through books, audiocassette tapes, and television. According to a biography of Robertson published by Americans For Robertson, four of his six books have been best-sellers. One of Robertson's books, The Secret Kingdom, was not only the number one religious book in America in 1983, it also appeared on Time Magazine's non-fiction, best-seller list.66

While books are a traditional medium for conveying a message, the use of audiocassette tapes shows innovation on Robertson's part. Robertson's campaign staff sent nearly 300,000 tapes of two of his speeches to voters in Iowa and New Hampshire. One Robertson aide said that the tapes were sent to people's homes so that they could hear what Robertson had to say and "'not have to fear that their neighbors will laugh at them for taking Pat Robertson seriously.'"67 A voter from Iowa, Esther Patrick, said that after listening to the tape, she and several of her friends decided to vote for Robertson. Patrick commented, "'He's so natural sounding. It was comfortable to hear him that way.'"68
Robertson is also very natural sounding on television. Journalists have compared Robertson to "the great communicator," Ronald Reagan. Adjectives such as "spellbinding," "sharp," "smooth," "genial," and "skilled" have been used to describe Robertson's on-camera performance (as well as his off-camera performance). Robertson's television talent should come as no surprise considering that he has had more than twenty-five years experience as host of "The 700 Club."

More important, however, than Robertson's television style is the content of "The 700 Club." Since the mid-1970's, Robertson has been interviewing U.S. Senators and Congressmen on his program as well as "a number of foreign presidents." He has even interviewed Jimmy Carter and Gerald Ford. Consequently, "The 700 Club" may be "as blatantly political as any program on television." Although Robertson quit hosting "The 700 Club" in September, 1987, he had been able to build a loyal constituency committed to his conservative causes through television.

Nevertheless, Robertson's experience on television was not entirely positive with regard to his Presidential campaign. As chapter five pointed out, Robertson did not use a script or teleprompter while hosting "The 700 Club" and many of his spontaneous remarks came back to haunt him.
during the campaign. Furthermore, as host of a show broadcast to a largely sympathetic audience, Robertson was used to saying whatever he wanted to say without being challenged or having his comments scrutinized.

Robertson's penchant for making offhand comments carried over to his campaign. For example, in February of 1988 Robertson claimed that his CBN network had broadcast the whereabouts of U.S. hostages in Lebanon, so they could have been rescued. He also charged that there were Soviet missiles in Cuba. Finally, when televangelist Jimmy Swaggart "got caught in a sex scandal," Robertson announced that George Bush's campaign had timed the scandal to embarrass him. 72

The wild assertions Robertson made during the campaign prompted one "neutral Republican strategist" to ask "'What if he's nuts?"' 73 Robertson is not nuts, but he certainly did make some unfounded charges and ridiculous claims. Indeed, Robertson earned the "media character rap" of "Facts be damned." 74 Naturally, Robertson's verbal escapades damaged his credibility and weakened his persuasive appeals. The following section will discuss other topics which had a negative impact on Robertson's 1988 Presidential campaign.
Crisis Control

During the course of his campaign, Robertson had to deal with several situations that could justifiably be considered crises because they had the potential to completely undermine his credibility. These crises included charges that Robertson used his father's influence to avoid combat in Korea, that his Freedom Council misappropriated funds, that he embellished his resume, and that he lied about his wedding date. The following pages will explain how Robertson dealt with these charges.

Given Robertson's "hawkish" stand on military matters, accusations that he tried to avoid combat had the potential to be extremely damaging to his bid for the Presidency. Robertson's accusers were Democratic Congressman Andrew Jacobs, Jr. of Indiana and former Republican Congressman Paul McCloskey, Jr. During the summer of 1986, Jacobs heard Robertson make a speech supporting military action by U.S.-backed rebels in Nicaragua. Jacobs recalled that McCloskey had once said that Robertson tried to avoid combat service. Jacobs asked McCloskey to provide further details. McCloskey sent Jacobs a six-page letter. In his letter McCloskey, who had been a fellow officer with Robertson on board the USS Breckinridge, wrote, "My single distinct memory is of Pat, with a big smile on his face, standing on
the dock and saying something like, 'So long, you guys, and good luck,' and telling us that his father had gotten him out of combat duty."

75 Jacobs and McCloskey started making public statements shortly thereafter which challenged Robertson's military record.

In responding to Jacobs' and McCloskey's charges, Robertson did not "turn the other cheek." Instead, he filed a thirty-five million dollar libel suit against both men in District of Columbia Federal District Court. Jacobs and McCloskey filed a motion to dismiss the suit. The suit against Jacobs was dismissed, but in July 1987 a federal judge refused to dismiss the suit against McCloskey, ruling that there was sufficient evidence to justify a trial.

76 The trial date was set for March 8, 1988 - Super Tuesday. Robertson tried unsuccessfully to get the date changed. Hence, on March 2, 1988, Robertson announced that he would submit his libel case to the "Iowa Libel Dispute Resolution Program." By doing so, Robertson declared, "I give up my right to damages to get the truth -- to clear my name, that of my father, and the honor of the Marine Corps."

77 Robertson did a good job of handling his Korean combat crisis. Filing a libel suit was an appropriate action considering the charges leveled against him. Furthermore,
Robertson was able to depict himself as a virtuous victim. When the judge refused to postpone the trial date, Robertson argued persuasively that both McCloskey and the judge wanted to keep him off the campaign trail at a critical time. Hence, Robertson became the victim of unfair treatment. When Robertson agreed to give up his "right" to damages in order to "get to the truth," he depicted himself as virtuous.

Robertson was less successful in combatting charges that his Christian Broadcasting Network misappropriated funds to his Freedom Council. Robertson formed the Freedom Council in 1981 in order to educate Christians in "conservative political tactics." Allegedly, CBN funneled over eight million dollars to the Freedom Council which is a tax-exempt organization. The funds were supposedly used to lay the groundwork for a Robertson primary victory in Michigan and Iowa. The charges are very serious because as a tax-exempt organization, the Freedom Council's political activities were supposed to be strictly nonpartisan.

Whenever the Freedom Council issue was brought up to Robertson, he denied that there was any wrongdoing. However, Robertson's typical strategy regarding this issue seemed to be, "If I ignore it, maybe it will go away."
Campaign officials at Robertson's national headquarters refused to comment on the charges involving the Freedom Council. Given that the intensity of the debate over Freedom Council funds never lessened, Robertson probably should have employed a different strategy to deal with the issue.

Robertson was also questioned about embellishments on his resume. For example, Robertson's resume referred to the one introductory arts course he took at the University of London as "Graduate Study." Moreover, Robertson's resume indicated that he was a "member of the board of directors" of the United Virginia Bank when, in fact, Robertson was a member of a local advisory board that had no directorial authority. Robertson stated that these errors in his resume "may have been the fault of imprecision on the part of his staff." Nevertheless, even if Robertson was not directly responsible for his resume's mistakes, he should have had more control over his campaign staff. Furthermore, these embellishments proved to be particularly embarrassing in light of statements Robertson made in his book, \textit{Answers to 200 of Life's Most Probing Questions}. Robertson defined a lie as "a deliberate attempt to deceive by use of any form of untruth. By words, gestures, circumstances, or silence an attempt may be made to convince another that there is a
reality different from what we know to be true."  

Insofar as Robertson maintained that he was married on March 22, 1954 when he was actually married on August 27, 1954, he lied according to his own standards. Robertson said he lied about the date in order to "protect his family" because he and his wife conceived their first child out of wedlock. Since Robertson had advocated in his campaign rhetoric, "abstinence before marriage," he was also called a hypocrite.

Robertson used two strategies to handle this embarrassing revelation about his past. First, he reminded his evangelical constituency that these events occurred before he had become a Christian. Second, he asked for mercy. Robertson was wise to use these strategies. Christians believe that, "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God...." As one voter commented, "It shows he's [Robertson's] as human as I am, I'm as human as he is, and we're all human beings...." Fortunately for Robertson, Christians tend to be forgiving people. Unfortunately for Robertson, forgiveness did not automatically extend to voting for him.
Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to analyze Pat Robertson's 1988 Presidential campaign rhetoric in terms of the Burkeian concept of identification. As an ordained minister and well-known religious leader, Robertson was able to identify with a large segment of the evangelical Christian community. However, he was not successful in broadening his base of voter support.

Interestingly enough, a noted historian, Garry Wills, argues that George Bush won the Republican nomination and the national election by "embracing Robertson's cause." If this is true, then voters accepted Robertson's message of "restoring America's greatness through moral strength," but they rejected the messenger. Robertson's own questionable moral character might have played a part in his defeat.
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CHAPTER VII
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to conduct a scholarly analysis of the rhetoric of Pat Robertson in order to understand him better as a Charismatic television evangelist and as a Presidential candidate. The major question this study sought to address asked: "What does Robertson's rhetoric reveal regarding his conception of the proper role of religion in politics?" In order to answer this question, several key issues were addressed including Robertson's interpretation of the Constitution and his opinion of the Supreme Court. Furthermore, this thesis explored Robertson's rhetoric in light of his different audiences as well as assessing his uses of the media. The most important findings of this critical inquiry shall be delineated in the subsequent pages. Before attention is turned to the study's conclusions, however, a brief review of each of the preceding chapters is appropriate.

In addition to explaining the major purpose of this thesis, chapter one gave an overview of the primary and secondary source material. Chapter one also briefly defined rhetoric and rhetorical criticism. Chapter two outlined
Kenneth Burke's theory of dramatism as the method used to analyze and interpret Robertson's rhetoric.

Chapter three answered the question, "Who is Pat Robertson?" by focusing on his personal, professional, religious, and political background. This information led to an understanding of Robertson's formation of attitudes which is an important aspect of analyzing a rhetor's acts.¹

The fourth chapter was concerned with the New Religious Political Right (NRPR). This chapter revealed that the NRPR was formed through the efforts of conservative political activists who labeled themselves as the "New Right." Leaders of the New Right persuaded prominent evangelical and fundamentalist religious leaders to enter the political arena. Consequently, the devoted followers of the religious leaders got involved in politics and became a formidable voting bloc.

Chapter five examined Robertson's pre-campaign rhetoric from 1972 through 1985. Robertson's rhetoric was analyzed according to the Burkeian concepts of hierarchy and the acceptance, rejection, or transcendence of the hierarchy, and by the pentad. The subject of chapter six was Robertson's campaign rhetoric from 1986 through May of 1988. Chapter six used Burke's notion of identification to achieve an understanding of Robertson's attempts to court the
evangelical vote while seeking to broaden his base of support.

This chapter serves as the culmination of chapters one through six insofar as it synthesizes the conclusions of the preceding chapters and makes claims regarding Robertson's rhetoric. Furthermore, a discussion of the usefulness of Burke's theories for rhetorical analysis will be included in this chapter.

**Primary Claims**

In accordance with Kenneth Burke's belief that personal identity is formed through the influence of "family, nation, political or cultural cause, church, and so on," a primary claim of this thesis is that the biographical data presented in chapter three offered a great deal of insight into Pat Robertson's personality and, hence, to his rhetorical acts. Robertson's preoccupation with his distinguished forebears no doubt stemmed from his mother's concern with the family's genealogy and her constant reminders that he was a "born leader." By his own admission, Robertson's initial interest in politics was a result of his father's career as a U.S. Congressman and Senator. From both parents Robertson developed a sense of *noblesse oblige*. The single most important event in Robertson's life was his conversion to
"born-again" Christianity. His born-again experience prompted Robertson to start a television ministry to evangelize the United States and the world. Robertson's Christian Broadcasting Network completely consumed his interest for fifteen years. In the mid-1970's, Robertson experienced a renewed interest in politics. For the next nine years, he was torn between religion and politics.

Robertson's dual interest in religion and politics was typical of many eminent ministers and evangelists in the 1970's (and the 1980's). A second primary claim of this study is that these clergymen entered the political arena because leaders of the New Right persuaded them to do so and because they believed that the government was encroaching upon the sovereignty of the church. Focusing on the issues of abortion, ERA, the gay rights movement, and a proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to deny the tax-exempt status of some private religious schools, religious leaders such as Jerry Falwell, Tim La Haye, Pat Robertson, and James Robison were able to persuade a large number of their devoted followers to get involved in politics. The NRPR's agenda has now been expanded to include a variety of conservative causes.
An analysis of Robertson's pre-campaign rhetoric leads to the primary claim that he not only wanted Christians to get involved in politics to deal with specific issues, he wanted them to take control of the government now as preparation for ruling with Jesus Christ during the Millennium. Robertson rejected the "traditional" hierarchy in order to respond to a "nobler" hierarchy. In short, Robertson transcended the present social order. Moreover, the claim may be made that Robertson believes a third World War leading to the second coming of Christ is inevitable.

Chapter six argued that Robertson faced unique challenges in his Presidential campaign insofar as he had to cope with courting a split evangelical vote while seeking to broaden his base of support. Robertson met this challenge by telling his evangelical audience that it was God's will for him to run for President. With regard to handling the issue of separation of church and state as a necessary aspect of broadening his base, Robertson resigned from CBN, he gave up his Southern Baptist ordination, and he referred to himself as a professional broadcaster rather than as a televangelist. Furthermore, instead of declaring that Christians must take control of the government as he had in his pre-campaign rhetoric, Robertson said that "moral people" or those people "who believe in God" must
take control of the government in order to "restore America's greatness through moral strength." Therefore, this study claims that Pat Robertson modified his rhetoric as an attempt to identify with a broader spectrum of the voter population.

Although Robertson talked about a future of peace and hope in order to quell the fear of his "Armageddon theology," he made no attempt to significantly alter his pre-campaign stance on the Supreme Court. This thesis claims that Robertson tried to persuade voters that the U.S. Supreme Court rulings are not the "supreme law of the land." Robertson believes that the Supreme Court Justices presently have more power than the President of the United States and Congress because they have the "privilege of amending the Constitution." And Robertson deeply resents that the Supreme Court Justices "rewrite" the Constitution instead of "interpreting" it. Robertson's attitude toward the Supreme Court raises serious questions about his willingness to abide by its rulings had he been elected President.

Robertson's bid for the Presidency was undoubtedly hampered by allegations that he tried to avoid combat in Korea, that his Freedom Council misappropriated funds, that he embellished his resume, and that he had fathered a child out of wedlock. A primary claim of this thesis is that
Robertson did not employ the proper strategies to deal with the Freedom Council scandal and the charges that he embellished his resume. Hence, Robertson was unable to repair the damage done to his credibility. His credibility was also harmed by his "funny facts", "wild charges", and "absurd denials."

In the final analysis, Robertson proved to a persuasive rhetor with only a limited audience. To employ Chaim Perelman's terminology, Robertson appealed to a particular audience, but not to the universal audience. Rational people could not be moved by Robertson's irrational rhetoric and often faulty line of reasoning. Moreover, Robertson simply could not overcome the "negatives" of his campaign. He was unable to provide a fitting response to all of the exigencies of his campaign.

**Secondary Claims**

The secondary claims of this thesis pertain to Kenneth Burke's dramatistic approach to rhetoric. Hopefully, the results of this study justify the claim that dramatism furnishes a useful structure for interpreting a rhetor's communication. With regard to Burke's philosophy of rhetoric, the concept of hierarchy and acceptance, rejection, or transcendence of the hierarchy proved to be
especially helpful in analyzing Robertson's rhetoric. The concept of identification was also useful. However, the claim must be made that from a practical standpoint, the critic may have trouble distinguishing between identification and persuasion. It would be nearly impossible to argue with a high degree of certainty that an identification was "unconscious" as opposed to "conscious."

The techniques of Burkeian criticism also have some practical limitations. As in the case of this study, if the critic wants to do a comprehensive analysis of an agent's rhetorical acts rather than just analyzing one or two speeches, he or she will find that it takes an exorbitant amount of time to complete the indexing and concordances. Cluster analysis and agon analysis are extremely time-consuming too. This fact may explain why the pentad is used so often by rhetorical critics while Burke's other techniques are ignored. However, as chapter two pointed out, the pentad is the foundation of the other techniques.

The concepts and techniques of hierarchy, identification, indexing, concordances, cluster analysis, agon analysis, and the pentad are just a few of Burke's many important contributions to rhetorical criticism. Kenneth Burke has earned the distinction of being named the "foremost rhetorician in the twentieth century."
Future Research

On May 16, 1988, Pat Robertson announced his decision to "suspend" his "candidacy for the Republican nomination for the Presidency of the United States." In a letter to his supporters dated March 9, 1988, Robertson wrote:

If my staff is correct, in the next couple of months we should have Robertson people—who hope and pray for the same things that you do for America—in control of the Republican Party in many states. This is an enormously important achievement, and will give us all the opportunity to see a conservative Congress elected in 1990 and further opportunity for dramatic victory in 1992.

This letter made it clear that Robertson plans to play an important role in the Republican Party. Hence, future research might center on Robertson's attempts to influence the platform of the Republican Party.

Robertson has also made it clear that he will not be satisfied very long with the role of "kingmaker." He wants to be king. Immediately after suspending his campaign in May, Robertson talked about running for President again in 1992. However, the author of this thesis called Robertson's campaign headquarters in mid-December, 1988 and was told by an "Administrative Secretary" that Robertson would not run again against George Bush. The Administrative Secretary stated that Robertson did not want to divide the Republicans
and that he would probably wait until 1996 to run for President. If Robertson does in fact run for President again, the rhetoric of his 1996 campaign should be compared to that of his 1988 campaign to see if he has altered his message in any significant way to make it more appealing to the voters.

In 1986 Robertson's book, *America's Date With Destiny*, was published. According to journalist Harrison Rainie, Robertson is "poised to fulfill what he sees as his ancestral and spiritual destiny."[^10] Robertson's date with destiny has been changed from 1988 to 1996. While it seems unlikely that Robertson will be elected President of the United States, Robertson should not be underestimated. As the "champion" of moral people and conservative causes, Robertson has learned that he might have to lose a few battles before he wins the war.
Notes for Chapter VII


9 Although I know the name of the "Administrative Secretary," she asked me not to use it in the thesis.
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The purpose of this study was to conduct a scholarly analysis of the rhetoric of Pat Robertson in order to understand him better as a television evangelist and as a Presidential candidate. The analysis of Robertson's religious, pre-campaign rhetoric revealed his preoccupation with the second coming of Jesus Christ in relation to his desire for Christians to rule the world with Jesus during the Millennium. Although Robertson modified his campaign rhetoric in an attempt to identify with a broader audience than his conservative evangelical followers, he was unsuccessful for a variety of reasons which included his lack of credibility.