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On November 3, 1970, the voters of the State of Indiana cast their ballots for the office of United States Senator. The men for whom they voted were Rupert Vance Hartke, the incumbent Senator and Richard Roudebush, M. C., from Indiana's Fifth Congressional District. Senator Hartke had represented Indiana in the United States Senate for two terms of office (1958-1970). Congressman Roudebush had been a member of the House of Representatives for five terms (1960-1970). Both men were considered tough, aggressive campaigners by their representative parties and the campaign promised to be hard fought. The closeness of the final vote indicated that indeed expectations were fulfilled. The subject of this work is a rhetorical analysis of that campaign.

General Background

On April 11, 1970, Senator R. Vance Hartke, United States Senator from the State of Indiana, announced in Indianapolis, Indiana, that he would run again for the Democratic Party's nomination for United States Senator. Because both of Indiana's major parties use the convention system of nomination for all statewide offices, and because Senator Hartke had been Indiana's Senator for two terms, his announcement meant that he would be the Democratic Party's senatorial candidate. The
Democratic convention was held in June, 1970, and Senator Hartke was easily nominated to head the Party's fall ticket. The second highest office to be contested was that of Secretary of State of Indiana. The chief position to be filled in the November General Election was that of United States Senator.

The Republican Party chose as its senatorial candidate, Congressman Richard L. Roudebush of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District. Congressman Roudebush had successfully been elected five consecutive times. Due to redistricting, the Congressman had represented the State from the Ohio border to the Illinois line. Indeed Congressman Roudebush was viewed by his party as a very strong candidate, especially after the White House urged Indiana's Republicans to back him.¹

In a State noted for its rough political campaigns, Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush waged one of 1970's dirtier races.² On November 16, 1970, twelve days after the voters of Indiana had cast their ballots, Indiana Secretary of State William Salin submitted to Governor Edgar Whitcomb official certification that Senator R. Vance Hartke had won re-election to the United States Senate by 4,383 votes: less than one vote per precinct. Congressman Roudebush's office


announced that the Congressman would seek a recount in several counties.³

From November 17, 1970 to February 23, 1972,⁴ representatives of Senator Hartke, Congressman Roudebush, and the State of Indiana engaged in moves and countermoves within the local, state, and federal judicial systems. Congressman Roudebush sought total recounts in Clark and Pike counties. Partial recounts were sought in Lake, Marion, St. Joseph, Grant, Madison, Vigo, Porter, Ripley, and Wayne counties. The major cities in which total or partial recounts were sought included: Jeffersonville, Gary, Hammond, East Chicago, Indianapolis, South Bend, Marion, Anderson, Terre Haute, Valparaiso, and Richmond.⁵ Senator Hartke's attorneys challenged the constitutionality of Indiana's recount laws by arguing that the United States Constitution specifies that only the United States Senate can judge the qualifications of a member.⁶

After scurrying from one local and state court to another to block recount petitions, Senator Hartke's representatives persuaded Chief


⁵"It's Hartke by 4,383 in Official Returns," p. 21.

⁶The Constitution of the United States of America in Article 1, Section 5: "Each house shall be the judge of the elections, returns and qualifications of its own members. . . ." It might be noted that never in the history of the United States has an incumbent in either House of Congress lost an election by virtue of a recount vote going against him when conducted by a committee of Congress.
Judge Luther M. Swygert of the 7th United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Chicago, Illinois, to appoint a three member panel to hear the arguments challenging Indiana's recount laws. On December 16, 1970, the panel ruled that the laws governing recounting election returns in Indiana were in violation of the United States Constitution.

In late December, 1970, Indiana Attorney General Theodor L. Sendak approached several Supreme Court Justices and asked them to intervene in the case. On December 28, 1970, Supreme Court Justice Thurgood Marshall received a request from Congressman Roudebush to halt the decision of the lower federal court's three-judge panel. Two days later, Justice Marshall announced that he would not rule on Congressman Roudebush's request until he had heard from Senator Hartke. The Justice received information from the two contending parties and on March 22, 1971, the Supreme Court agreed to consider arguments on the constitutionality of the Indiana election laws.

---


10"Delays Ruling: Justice Seeks Hartke Brief on Recount Bid," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), December 30, 1970, p. 9A.

On December 13, 1971, the Supreme Court heard oral arguments from both sides in the Hartke-Roudebush election recount case. The Supreme Court's decision was given on February 23, 1972. It ruled by a five to two vote that the Indiana State Laws governing the recounting of elections were constitutional. The recount was ordered. The official recount results indicated on June 30, 1972 that Senator Hartke had a net loss of forty-eight votes but a plurality of 4,484 votes.

The fact that neither Senator Hartke nor Congressman Roudebush clearly won the election is of interest to the rhetorical critic. Immediately the critic asks if a difference in the rhetoric of the campaign explains why neither candidate was able to capture a clear majority of the 1.7 million votes cast in the contest.

12"Supreme Court Hears Hartke Recount Case," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), December 14, 1971, p. 5C.

13"Roudebush Wins Plea on Recount: Supreme Court Says State Has Authority to Order Recheck," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), February 24, 1972, p. 1A.

14"Senate Recount Ends: Hartke Loses Votes, But Still Wins Election," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), July 1, 1972, p. 20. During the twenty month litigation proceeding Senator Hartke continued as the Senior Senator from the State of Indiana. He was provisionally sworn in for his third term as United States Senator from Indiana on January 21, 1971. Congressman Roudebush, who had given up a "safe" seat in the House of Representatives to run against Senator Hartke, became a consultant to the Veterans Administration. On June 4, 1971, he was appointed as Assistant Deputy Administrator of Veterans Administration.

Although Indiana does not have a statewide registration of voters, a tabulation of "Registered Voters for General Election, November 3, 1970," Larry Conrad, Indiana General Election Returns for 1970, p. 41, reveals a total of 2,717,831 registered voters for the 1970 General Election.
Senator Hartke's winning vote accounted for 50.123 per cent of the total while Congressman Roudebush managed to muster 49.877 per cent of the vote. Since the way in which a political candidate develops his messages for audiences represents practically the only factor in a campaign over which he has complete control, the following questions are a few of those raised by a student of rhetoric when a campaign was as close as was the Hartke-Roudebush campaign: 1) What were the dominate political concerns of the campaign; 2) What were the traditional values which affected the way the voter responded to political acts; 3) Which geographic conditions influenced the discussion of political concerns; 4) How well did each candidate adapt to his audience's political concerns and traditional values; and 5) What are the implications of the rhetoric of the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana for future campaigns in the State? In attempting to answer the questions I will be assessing the role of rhetoric in the final outcome of the election. Chapter II of this study will attempt to answer the first three questions. In Chapters III, IV, and V I will analyze each candidate's efforts at adaptation before partisan audiences, non-partisan audiences, and a statewide audience. Chapter VI will attempt an answer to the question on the role of rhetoric in the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana. These, then, are the key questions with which this study proposes to deal.

Significance of the Study

In our representative Republic, the method of selecting one's representative ought to be of vital concern for each citizen. The
myriad of courses in history, civics, and political science offered by our educational systems and the current fascination with the effect of modern electronic technology on political campaigning suggest that, indeed, the citizen is very interested in who shall represent him in the decision making process of our nation.

For the rhetorical critic a political campaign offers an excellent opportunity to analyze rhetoric as it functions to adjust ideas to people and people to ideas. Yet when we turn to a major study of future directions in rhetoric and rhetorical criticism, we find that only recently have two trends developed which have placed emphasis on 1) contemporary rhetoric, and 2) persuasive campaigns. In the past the rhetorical critic has focused on either an individual speaker, or an individual speaker in a campaign.

---


19 The section of this work on "Other Works Relevant to Political Speaking in Indiana" will clearly show that in this one State rhetorical studies have focused exclusively on one speaker or one speaker's campaign.
Recently, we have had strong indications that our horizons are being broadened. We have started to respond positively to the demand for relevance in rhetorical studies. In 1972, Theodore Clevenger, Jr., observed:

> Our convention programs are so in tune with the times as to read like the daily newspapers. Nothing happens in the society, or in any of its sub-cultures, that is not grist for our mill.\(^\text{20}\)

In our textbooks, we have seen much more emphasis on the process nature of communication since the appearance in 1960 of David K. Berlo's *The Process of Communication*. In our professional journals as well as in our textbooks we have begun to see more emphasis given to the role of rhetoric in historical movements and in persuasive campaigns. Yet works which discuss multifaceted aspects of a total persuasive campaign are few in number.\(^\text{21}\) So strongly has the need for broader rhetorical studies been felt that each of the sixteen recommendations of the "Report of the Committee on the Advancement and Refinement of Rhetorical Criticism"\(^\text{22}\) of the National Conference on Rhetoric urged rhetorical


critics to strive for a broader consideration of those suasory elements in their studies.

The current work proposes to analyze the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in the State of Indiana. In addition to the corporate campaign efforts of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush, I will analyze the rhetorical strategies presented by the candidate in face-to-face confrontations, addressing partisan audiences, addressing the same audience, and addressing similar audiences at different times. A review of rhetorical works reveals no evidence of such an extensive undertaking by an individual critic.

Review of Previous Works

Indiana, often referred to as "America's Heartland," has been the subject of a variety of books. A number of them are important to the study of political rhetoric. An indication of the interpretation of Indiana as "a state of mind" might be secured from a publication like Dale Burgess' Just Us Hoosiers: And How We Got That Way. The significant omission in Mr. Burgess' book is that of politics and politicians. Two other background presentations which do give the subject of politics

23By "corporate campaign efforts" I mean the analysis of relevant staff contributions, verbal, and non-verbal complements to each candidate's campaign such as outdoor advertising, campaign themes, and newspaper, television, and radio advertising. Insight into the significance of such matters has been suggested in: Samuel L. Becker, "Rhetorical Studies for the Contemporary World," The Prospect of Rhetoric, eds. Lloyd Bitzer and Edwin Black (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971), p. 30.

and political rhetoric as much attention as do most Hoosiers are John Bartlow Martin, *Indiana: An Interpretation*;25 and Irving Leibowitz, *My Indiana*.26 Both Martin's older account and Leibowitz's more recent effort place a great deal of emphasis on the best show in the state: who will be elected in the upcoming election.

The academic community has offered several works which are of assistance in understanding Indiana's political institutions including its speakers. From the discipline of political science two significant studies shed light on Indiana politics: Frank J. Munger, *Two Party Politics in the State of Indiana* (1955);27 and George Roberts, *The Democratic Party in Indiana— 1952-1958* (1962).28 Mr. Munger's work is of interest because it explains at length the significance and importance of the two party system in Indiana to the political candidate. Mr. Robert's work deals with the Democratic Party during the period when Senator Hartke was rising through its ranks to statewide prominence.

When we turn to recent research on political campaigning in Indiana which has been conducted in the field of communication, we find that most of that research has been completed at Purdue University.


Four dissertations have been selected from the Purdue group because of their recency and their insights into political speaking in the state. Those dissertations of particular value were Stephen M. Buck, *The Political Speaking of Paul V. McNutt* (1960);29 D. R. Smith, *The Political Speaking of Henry F. Schricker of Indiana* (1960);30 Henry Z. Scheele, *The Political Speaking of Charles A. Halleck of Indiana* (1962);31 and Donald J. Shields, *The 1962 Campaign of Senator Birch E. Bayh, Jr. of Indiana: His Speech Staff and Addresses* (1962).32

Each of the dissertations in communication provides unique background material for the study of political speaking in Indiana. Stephen Buck's study of the speaking of Paul V. McNutt gives one insight into the attitudes of Hoosiers and political speaking in Indiana circa 1935. D. R. Smith's work is on the only modern politician in the State who twice won the governor's chair with an intervening administration. Of particular interest to the critic is Smith's formulation of the Hoosier Creed: based upon those motivations which made Hoosiers pay attention to Governor Schricker's speeches. Henry Scheele's study of Charles A. Halleck reinforced the conclusions of Smith on the Hoosier Creed, that

29Stephen M. Buck, "The Political Speaking of Paul V. McNutt" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, 1960.)


is, at least as far as Halleck's congressional district was concerned.33

The most unusual dissertation of the four is Donald Schield's study of Senator Birch E. Bayh's campaign staff and addresses. Dr. Shields travelled with the Bayh campaign in order to get first hand knowledge of the interworkings of the operations and functions of the Senator's speech staff, and the reactions of the audience to those efforts. Although each of the studies is fundamentally an analysis of the efforts of one speaker, Shield's piece is closer to this work by virtue of studying the individual and corporate activities of at least one speaker in a total campaign.

Primary Source Materials

The primary source materials for this study consist of twenty-four speeches of the two principals which represent a total progression of each speaker's adaptation to an ongoing series of rhetorical situations throughout the campaign period. In addition there are personal notes which describe the various meetings in terms of audience size, make-up, and reactions. To supplement the twenty-four speeches of the principals of the study, there are endorsement speeches for Congressman Roudebush by President Richard Nixon, Vice-President Spiro Agnew, Secretary of Labor James Hodgson, Republican National Chairman Robert Dole, and many more. Tape recordings of endorsements for Senator Hartke include the International Presidents of the Fireman's and Policeman's Unions,

Local (Indiana) Union Leaders, Mrs. C. S. King, leaders of the Black Communities of Indianapolis and Gary, Senator Birch Bayh, George Reedy, and others. Other primary materials are composed of tape recordings of the television and radio advertisements of both candidates, campaign handouts, and interviews with principals and campaign workers.

Secondary Sources

The secondary sources for this study include subscriptions to the major newspapers in the State of Indiana during the Summer and Fall of 1970. Included in the list of subscriptions were The Gary Post Tribune, The Indianapolis News, The Indianapolis Star, The Evansville Courier, The South Bend Tribune, The Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), and The News-Sentinel (Fort Wayne). Each of the newspapers was selected to meet criteria of geographical distribution and circulation. For early background material on the career of Senator Hartke, use was made of the excellent five part series: Robert Flynn, "The Hartke Story," The Evansville Press, Evansville, Indiana, November 7, 8, 10, 11 and 12, 1958.

In addition to the coverage of the campaign by newspapers in Indiana, two national newspapers were consulted for the national picture of "Campaign 1970" and the Senate race in Indiana. Those newspapers were The New York Times, and The National Observer. The procedure was for the duration of the campaign to clip and save each relevant item from any source whatsoever.
Methods and Procedures

In the State of Indiana the saying is that "every Hoosier baby is born with a ballot in his hand." 34 Perhaps that is an overstatement, but Irving Leibowitz was more accurate when he wrote:

"Politics is the most unfair of callings," Steward Alsop wrote. "In no other vocation do professionalism and experience count for so little."

The exception, of course, is Indiana.

Alsop rightly pointed out that twice in the last twenty-five years the Republican Party has turned down the professional and offered its greatest prize to a rank amateur. This just doesn't happen in Indiana. The amateur doesn't beat the Hoosier pro. 35

Frequently issues are not as important as personalities in a political campaign. Candidates rely heavily upon party identification and the projection of a winner's image. These factors have led Frank Munger to assert:

... that Indiana practices two-party politics par excellence. Indiana's two major parties are strong, virile, well-disciplined, and evenly matched. They enjoy almost complete monopoly on political activity in the state. 36

From the description of the virile nature of political parties and candidates in Indiana, we can see that the case method is suggested

---
34 Martin, p. 282.
35 Leibowitz, p. 97; see also, Munger, p. 5ff.
36 Munger, p. 6.
as an approach to understanding a specific campaign. Further, it becomes obvious that such a study must focus on the relation between the men who sought to persuade and those whom they sought to persuade. As had been noted by Thonssen, Baird, and Braden one advantage to such criticism is that it overlaps with other orientations in order to focus intently upon the campaign "striving to pull all the elements into focus without fragmenting or over-classifying" findings. I intend to view the 1970 campaign efforts of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush from the viewpoint of their representing a "case" in which I may observe relevant suasive factors at work.

The efforts of each campaigner were directed at persuasive attempts to get Hoosier voters to vote for himself over his opponent; indeed, that is the primary purpose of a political campaign. Most observers and practitioners of political speaking would agree with Stephen Shadegg that, "the purpose of a political campaign can be summed up in one sentence--to address a persuasive request to every registered voter to support your candidate at the polls." Through party rallies, "appearances" at shopping centers and factory gates, radio-television

---

37We use the term "case" as does J. Jeffery Auer: ". . . an intensive, even microscopic, investigation in situ, of an individual case." J. Jeffery Auer, An Introduction to Research in Speech (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959), p. 120.


spot announcements, joint debates, billboards, brightly colored bro­chures, telephone calls by party workers, buttons, bumper stickers, etc. The candidates sought to align themselves with the values, beliefs, and prejudices of their audiences in order to have a positive cumulative effect on election day. Any case study of a political contest ought to attempt to evaluate the impact of the different channels on the results of the campaign.

In sum, both the conditions within the political parties in Indiana and within the political campaigns themselves, warrant a close scrutiny in order to determine the effect of the mixture of messages and channels. Let us now consider the chief agent of a political campaign: the candidate.

A political candidate uses strategies to align himself with the values, beliefs, and desires of his constituency. The primary expression of a candidate's strategies is the specific message which he presents to the audience. If one understands the value system of the audience and searches the messages of the candidate to those audiences, one ought to be able to determine those factors which account for the success a given candidate enjoyed.

James H. McBath and Walter Fisher have argued "that campaign communication is a special species of persuasion." They have contended that the nature of political persuasion is determined by the persuader's assumption of the psychology of his audience's perception.

---

of knowledge, belief, value, and action. From such a view comes the idea that campaign persuasion does not operate under rules of rationality and that "when one does discover facts and arguments in political communication, he does not necessarily expect validity, relevance, or soundness." Further, studies of voting behavior indicate that, the principal factor related to voting decisions is that of party loyalty. The closeness of the campaign under study would indicate that voters did not behave as if they were "typical." This was a campaign in which the electorate did not decide early in the campaign that they were going to vote for either Senator Hartke or Congressman Roudebush. This was a campaign in which persuasion was to play an important role. The point was expressed by political columnist Edward Ziegner thusly:

This reporter has learned that neither is Roudebush nor Hartke over the 51 percent mark. That means a lot. That (means) that the number of undecided voters remains relatively large, even this late in the campaign, enough, in both (Roudebush's and Hartke's) polls, to swing an election. That also meant that both candidates had to attract the uncommitted voter without alienating those voters already disposed toward him. Such a situation, according to McBath and Fisher, calls for a campaign of

---

41 McBath and Fisher, Campaign Communication, 17.


images in which the "potential elector is encouraged to vote for himself--that is, the candidate closest to his own self-image." Nor should one view McBath and Fisher's idea as novel. Commentators with diverse perspectives have arrived at similar judgments.

In 1961, Daniel Boorstin in his work, The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America, observed that in the United States image making is an everyday business by every element in our society. Specifically in the area of politics, Boorstin commented that "our national politics has become a competition for images, rather than between ideals," and that the trend has been accented through the domination of campaigning by television.

For sometime now, political scientists have agreed with sociologists Kurt and Gladys Lang that the political shows and speeches of politicians must not alienate anyone the least bit disposed to be on their side. Almost sadly the Langs have written: "The campaign period, then, would seem inherently to be less a period of potential change than a period of political entrenchment, a period in which attitudes are reaffirmed."

Viewing the phenomena rhetorically one would agree that Kenneth Burke's comments on identification apply to speaking in such a campaign as is under consideration here. Burke wrote:

44McBath and Fisher, 18.


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.47

Indeed every politician tries to persuade voters that he and they are acting together; that they occupy the same mental presumptions, concepts, images, attitudes, and perceptions. If a politician were constantly to employ any other strategy, he would soon be returned to private life. The rhetorical critic needs to account first for the presumptions, concepts, images, attitudes, and perceptions of those people who listened. The second task of the critic is to analyze the strategies and methods which were employed by the speakers in their attempts at identification with the audience.

In Chapter II, I will discuss: 1) the national significance of the Senatorial Campaign in Indiana, and 2) the psychological and social makeup of Hoosiers in 1970. Because Senator Hartke had been an outspoken critic of the policies of the Nixon Administration, because Richard Nixon had always done well in Indiana, and because Congressman Roudebush represented a political position which was nearly the exact opposite of the Senator's, the Nixon Administration did everything it could to elect Richard Roudebush. In providing such support, the Nixon Administration emphasized the race in Indiana as a clear cut choice for the voters between the "old" policies of the nineteen-sixties and the Nixon policies of the nineteen-seventies.

Upon undertaking an analysis of the psychological and social make-up of Hoosiers in 1970, not only will the economic and social climate of the state and geographic regions in the state be considered, but also consideration will be given to the attitudes, beliefs, prejudices and predispositions of Hoosiers. As a result of a consideration of the national significance of the campaign, and a consideration of both the psychological and social makeup of Hoosier voters, standards with which to assess specific messages in the efforts of each candidate to adapt to his audience ought to emerge. By the application of those standards to such extrinsic factors as campaign themes, printed handouts, and radio and television spot announcements, a determination ought to be made of how the two candidates sought to identify himself with the Hoosier mood. Thus we will attempt to determine the rhetorical scene in which both candidates functioned by seeking answers for two questions: 1) What were the dominate political concerns of the campaign; and 2) What were the traditional values which affected the way the voters responded?

Chapter III and Chapter IV will deal with the speechmaking of the candidates before similar audience types. In Chapter III a consideration of the intrinsic factors of each speaker's message before partisan audiences will be considered. In Chapter IV, the concern will be with the message of the candidates before non-partisan audiences. In both Chapters we will seek to find those local geographic concerns to which

48For the sake of this work the concept "rhetorical scene" will be intended as those psychological and sociological factors which determine a specific rhetorical situation.
each candidate had to adapt and how well the candidate adapted to the
audience. Both audience types were selected from the same geographic
region, Allen County of Northeastern Indiana. The partisan audiences
were workers for the Allen County Democrat and Republican Parties. The
non-partisan audience was the Downtown Rotary Club of Fort Wayne. Its
membership includes the leading businessmen and professional men in
Allen County. Because the membership is composed of tough-minded con-
sumers of public speaking, speaking before it would be considered to be
a task of some responsibility for most speakers.

An indication of the significance of being asked to address the
Downtown Rotary Club can be found in an incident which followed Senator
Hartke's address. The Senator received a standing ovation from the
audience at the completion of the speech. Two weeks later, when I
discussed the speech with one of the Senator's advance men in Knox,
Indiana, he said that the staff expected the audience to give polite
applause and leave. He also said that the response was taken as a sign
of having gained some ground in Fort Wayne. The Rotary Club platform
served as a political forum in Northeastern Indiana in 1970. On the
day Congressman Roudebush spoke, he shared the platform with Secretary
of Labor, James Hodgson.

The Fifth Chapter will consider the efforts of the two candidates
on television. The first appearance to be considered will be the joint
statewide televised debate of October 12, 1970. The second and third
occasions under consideration were single news conferences before a
similar audience. Both Senator Vance Hartke and Congressman Richard
Roudebush were seen on Fort Wayne, WANE-TV's, "News Conference '70." Senator Hartke was interviewed on October 25, 1970; Congressman Roudebush on November 1, 1970. Both "News Conference '70" programs were aired after the statewide televised debate. The same panel of reporters interviewed both candidates. I will analyze the intrinsic factors of the messages of each candidate in the televised debate and draw upon the "News Conference '70" programs for further illustrative material. The question which this chapter discusses ought to shed light on: how well each candidate adapted to his audience.

The final Chapter of the work will advance conclusions about the rhetoric of the campaign based upon the five rhetorical events selected for analysis. We will seek to answer the questions: What was the role of rhetoric in the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana, and what are the implications of the rhetoric of the 1970 Campaign for future campaigns in Indiana? Further consideration will be given to rhetorical implications derived from the study.

In each of the instances under consideration we will analyze the specific rhetorical scene, the specific rhetorical situation, and the specific response of the candidate to each. A rhetorical scene in a political campaign consists of those psychological-sociological factors which affect the ability of a speaker to identify with his audience. Within the overall rhetorical scene a speaker will confront exigencies which dictate a modification of his message in order to influence those auditors who are capable of change. The constraints which the speaker
has placed upon him or places upon himself will be called the rhetorical situation.⁴⁹

As indicated earlier, the consideration of the overall rhetorical scene for the campaign will be undertaken in Chapter 2. But since psychological and sociological factors of a specific rhetorical situation vary from local to local, a discussion of relevant specific aspects of each rhetorical scene will be undertaken where mandated.

From the analysis of the rhetorical scene and rhetorical situation, we ought to be able to evaluate the extrinsic factors which impinged upon the development of messages by each speaker. As we know the goal of each politician is to use suasory activities to lead the voter to "stand" with him: to identify with him. One indication of the identification ought to be the accuracy with which a speaker identifies and adapts to the psychological and sociological needs and values of his audience. A second indication of that identification ought to be the candidate's ability to adapt to the exigence of the rhetorical situation, before a specific audience, in a way suitable to overcome the constraints of the situation.

A critic ought to be able to study the messages of a speaker in the context of the rhetorical scene and the rhetorical situation and assess those elements in the messages which are designed to establish identification between audience members and the speaker. As a result of the study of the rhetorical scene in Chapter II, it will be necessary

---

to generate a standard by which to evaluate the intrinsic elements in each candidate's messages which appeared to be designed to enhance his identification with the audience.

In addition to the assessment of the intrinsic factors of the message which appeared to be designed to enhance audience identification, the study of the messages in this campaign ought to reveal those sound arguments to which partisan and uncommitted voters responded. This study will analyze the soundness of each candidate's arguments by:
1) identifying the characteristic patterns of reasoning employed by each speaker; 2) assessing the soundness of those patterns of reasoning; and 3) evaluating the cumulative strength of the reasoning in light of the appropriate elements in the standards generated in Chapter II.

The first task will be to identify the characteristic patterns of reasoning employed by each speaker. In the analysis of each message, I will employ a model of a layout of an argument devised by Stephen Toulmin. The Toulmin layout of argument scheme contains six elements which show the dynamic relationship between evidence, conclusions, the principle which justifies the conclusion based upon the evidence which was implied or presented and those elements which are offered when the argument is challenged. Specifically the six elements of the Toulmin structure of arguments are:


52Ibid., pp. 94-145.
1) Date—the evidence one appeals to in making an assertion;

2) Claim—the assertion or conclusion whose merits we are seeking to establish;

3) Warrant—the general statement or hypothetical statements which can act as bridges and authorize the sort of step to which our peculiar argument commits us;

4) Qualifiers—those model words which indicate the strength conferred by the Warrant on the Conclusion;

5) Rebuttal—indicates circumstances in which the general authority of the Claim would have to be set aside; and

6) Backing—other evidence and reasoning which can be called upon to lend authority and currency to the Warrant.

Schematically the six elements occupy a spatial relationship which looks like this:53

\[
\begin{array}{c}
D \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\vdots \\
\text{Unless}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Q, C} \\
\text{\textbackslash{}Since}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{W} \\
\vdots \\
\text{On account of}
\end{array}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B} \\
\text{R}
\end{array}
\]

After I have applied the Toulmin scheme to each argument then I will assess the soundness of each. Our standards of evaluation of the

\[53\text{Toulmin, The Uses of Argument, p. 104.}\]
soundness of each candidate's reasoning will be those formulated by Arthur Hastings who re-evaluated argumentation as it occurs in practice by an in-depth study of 250 samples of argumentation. In his contribution to Glen E. Mill's *Reason in Controversy*, Hastings posits nine patterns of argument, the critical tests for each, and the frequency with which each pattern appeared in the sample arguments he studied. Since Hastings' analysis is of arguments selected from speeches, debates, discussions, and written discourse, it would appear to be an appropriate standard by which to evaluate the soundness of political argument. Our procedure will be to subject the messages of each candidate to an evaluation by employing the identification and soundness standards whenever discussing a different set of messages in different rhetorical situations.

Our goal will not be a definitive statement on the logic of each speaker in each rhetorical situation. Rather, I will seek an assessment


55 The nine categories posited by Dr. Hastings, in order of frequency of occurrence, are: argument from example to a descriptive generalization (used twenty-six per cent of the time), argument from criteria to a verbal classification (used twenty per cent of the time), argument from testimony (used eighteen per cent of the time), argument from cause to effect (used ten per cent of the time), argument from definition (used seven per cent of the time), argument from circumstantial evidence to a hypothesis (used six per cent of the time), argument from observed effect to unobserved cause (used five per cent of the time), argument from comparison (used three per cent of the time), and argument from analogy (used two per cent of the time).
of the probable force of the reasoning of the candidate in his efforts at having the audience identify with him. In short, I seek an assessment not of logical validity, but of the image of identification projected by each candidate.

An assessment will be sought of that image in order to understand further the ways in which political speaking operates in our society. If politicians strive to identify with the psychological and sociological needs and values of their constituency and if we realize the extent of mobility in this nation during a given year with its effect of recreating a constituency, then projecting a favorable, accurate political image is a necessity for any politician. Those same factors mandate of the rhetorical critic that he devise ways of assessing the impact of the efforts of candidates. An approach such as the one suggested above ought to yield meaningful evaluation of the efforts of the subjects in this study.

56 For instance the mobility status between 1965 and 1970 for the population five years old and over for the 1970 census indicates that during that five year period, of the total population five years old or over, of 4,738,195, some 737,827 moved within the same Indiana county, 75,808 moved within the same economic area within the state, and a total of 662,019 either moved to a different economic area within Indiana or to a different state altogether. Further, when we realize that the 1970 Census indicates that the State of Indiana had an 11.4 per cent increase in its population, we see that any statewide office seeker has an extremely difficult task in just identifying his constituency. 1970 Census of Population, "Migration Between State Economic Areas," (Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce: Social and Economic Statistics Administration, 1972), pp. 21, 164.
Summary

Case studies of the communicative attempts of individual politicians abound. Recently appeals for broader approaches to the study of rhetoric have been issued. In this work, an attempt will be made to assess the probable force of the reasoning projected by two candidates in a total statewide campaign and the extent to which those messages identified each candidate with his auditors. Thus a measure of the role of rhetoric in the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana can be undertaken.

In an election as close as was the 1970 Senatorial campaign in Indiana, auditor identification with the messages of each candidate ought to be the key to the success of the winner of the election. In this close election the outcome ought to have been the result of considered choices of the electorate. As has been demonstrated above, the two political parties in Indiana are strong, virile, and well matched. Both candidates were viewed by their parties as winners. Finally, a large undecided portion of the electorate existed up to election day. Very recently political scientists have begun to suggest that in close elections such as the 1970 campaign in Indiana, more discriminate ballots are cast, and further that discriminate voting is more likely to be the result of close surveillance of image producing mediums such as television in its various forms (newscasts, interview shows, ads, and

---

political documentaries), and interpersonal relationships with family and friends.\textsuperscript{58} The question is how was rhetoric used by each candidate to secure identification with the audience?

In order to understand the function of rhetoric in such a campaign the critic must: 1) find those images which are vital to the voter; 2) analyze the various channels of communication employed by the two candidates in their attempts to identify with the voter; and 3) assess the probable effect of the effort. The remainder of this work proposes to do those three things.

\textsuperscript{58}For a real revelation as to how roughly half of the voters in this country who determine elections make up their minds see: Walter DeVries and V. Lance Tarrance, The Ticket-Splitter: A New Force in American Politics, (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wilham B. Erdmans Publishing Company, 1972), pp. 73-90.
CHAPTER II

THE NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF THE HOOSIER AUDIENCE

Any discussion of a process as changeable as the American political process has to proceed from a starting point. We will take as a starting point the 1968 Presidential Election. The 1968 Presidential Election resulted in the election of Richard M. Nixon. Richard Nixon had always been popular in Indiana. Many Hoosiers sincerely thought that Nixon could turn the country away from disorders, demonstrations and the war in Vietnam. Many thought that he would bring the country together again by providing a climate in which voices could be lowered. From January, 1969 to October, 1970, President Nixon attempted to change the domestic climate in America through the appointment of strict constructionists to the Supreme Court, to withdraw troops from Vietnam and thereby get America out of Southeastern Asia, and to combat the inflation which was the consequence of spending on social legislation, the war in Vietnam, and the space program. Throughout the period one of the chief opponents to Nixon's foreign and domestic policy was Senator Hartke. When the off-year election of 1970 saw Vance Hartke up for reelection, the Nixon Administration played an active role in the selection of Hartke's Republican opponent, Richard Roudebush, in developing stands on issues, and in providing "dignitaries" to speak in behalf of the Congressman. In order to put the 1970 Hoosier Senatorial campaign in
perspective, we must commence with the 1968 Presidential Election and the intervening acts of the Nixon Administration which lead up to the 1970 Senatorial Campaign.

In the photo finish that was the 1968 Presidential Election, Indiana, a state that had always supported Richard M. Nixon, gave the President 50.3 per cent of the vote to 38.0 per cent for former Vice-President Humphrey with 11.4 per cent going to Governor Wallace. In addition to supporting the Nixon-Agnew ticket, Hoosier voters responded to the Republican Party campaign slogan "Dick Nixon, Bill Ruckelshaus, and Ed Whitcomb will give us new leadership with new ideas" by electing Ed Whitcomb, Governor, a Republican legislature, and all statewide candidates except Bill Ruckelshaus. More important than the statistics for the 1968 election is the fact that that election probably represented the denouement of an era in mid-twentieth century social upheaval in America.

The eight year span (1960-1968) since Richard Nixon last campaigned for the Presidency was punctuated with a series of incidents which tugged at the very fiber of the fabric of the American scene. In the early 1960's President John F. Kennedy committed us to conquering space, broadening the base of Civil Rights, and supporting the government of

---

1White, Appendix A. The final national percentages of the vote read: Nixon 43.4, Humphrey 42.7, and Wallace 13.5.

South Vietnam. Each of the three commitments was to feature side effects which would test America's character during the decade 1960-1970.

The first Kennedy commitment, that of conquering man's last frontier of space, pointed up the disparity between the American middle class society and its racial minorities. The aerospace industry prospered and argued the practical value of space research by pointing to spin-off products like Teflon. Such arguments in the race in space satisfied most middle and upper class citizens. For racial minorities and their spokesmen, the space program did not allay the physical hunger, disease, and a humiliation they felt.

One ray of hope for America's racial minorities was the effort to pass the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The attempt to pass the Civil Rights Act seemed to encourage the disenfranchised, often minority group members, to test in any way possible, those in power. Since power is never voluntarily given, confrontations, riots, demonstrations, and legal action followed.

As if a commitment to space and turmoil over Civil Rights were not enough, the domestic picture was further clouded by our commitment to the government of South Vietnam. The three elements tended to pull together into acts of demonstration, the liberal, poor, young, and black of our society.

The aftermath of the first eight years of stress and strain (1960-1968) took on apocalyptic hues: assassinated were President John F. Kennedy, Reverend Martin Luther King, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy.
Furthermore, 35,000 American soldiers died in Vietnam while at home violence took its toll in Freedom Marches, and in burning cities. One chronicler of presidential elections in the 1960's, Theodore H. White, commented on the year 1968 in such terms as might more approximately describe the preceding seven years, when he wrote:

> It is difficult to be precise about the nature of the nightmare year out of which came Nixon's election. No phrase, no thought can catch, hold and bind together in one frame all the roaring events, the blood and disorders, the inflation and uprisings; for underlying them all was the general sense of breakdown—breakdown of old instruments, breakdown of manners, breakdown of institutions, breakdown of leadership uncertain of its purposes and unclear in its language, breakdown, above all, of ideas and dreams that once made America a community.³

By 1968 Americans seemed tired of demonstrations which lead to violence and lawlessness. They also seemed tired of the war in Vietnam. Every major politician in the 1968 Presidential campaign—Nixon, Humphrey, Wallace, McCarthy, Kennedy, Muskie, Agnew—understood that desire and tried to manipulate it into his own political effort. Throughout the campaign Richard Nixon made numerous promises. Among those promises were the appointment of a new Attorney General of the United States to restore law and order; the development of a secret plan to end the Vietnam war; and an attempt to lower our voices as a people. If such promises were to be realized, time and cooperation would be necessary. From January 1969, to August 1970, President Nixon had very little time or cooperation in his efforts.

³White, President, 1968, p. 518.
When viewing the major problems confronted by President Nixon during his first two years in office, the view is blurred by the fact that societal processes tended both to affect and be affected by individual "events" in the total flux of the scene. In the discussion which is to follow we must keep in mind that the cluster of attitudes which are provoked by the phrases "law and order," "Vietnam War," and "Nixonomics" form signals to which many Americans responded. When we discuss each in turn, we will be alluding to a broader composition which confronted America.

Nixon, Congress, and the Courts

In a perceptive paragraph in his "Introduction" to The Nixon Watch, Tom Wicker of the New York Times pinpointed the prevailing mood of the "Forgotten American" in 1968. Noting that typically the "Forgotten American" has fled from the inner city to the isolation of suburbs and small towns, Wicker predicted that the "Forgotten American" would not be caught dead rioting or demonstrating. According to Wicker, the "Forgotten American" was worried about crime, unrest, prices and taxes. Such an American was not "against blacks but thought they were getting too much, too fast, for too little effort." Further the "Forgotten American" was fed up with a war that was not being won, but he was shocked at the notion of an American defeat. On the questions of law and/or order, Wicker saw the "Forgotten American" as "inclined

---

to agree with J. Edgar Hoover that justice is only incidental to the maintenance of order."

The "Forgotten American" and the point of view expressed by Wicker was singled out from the very beginning of the 1968 Campaign by candidate Nixon. In his Acceptance Speech at the G.O.P. Convention on August 8, 1968, Nixon signaled his intent on law and order. Nixon said, "Let those who have the responsibility to enforce our laws, and our judges who have the responsibility to interpret them, be dedicated to the great principles of Civil Rights. But let them also recognize that the first civil right of every American is to be free from domestic violence."\(^5\) In order to assure that "the first civil right of every American" was protected, candidate Nixon promised throughout the campaign to appoint a new Attorney General of the United States and judges to the Federal Judiciary who were "strict constructionists" of the Constitution.

Almost immediately upon being sworn in as President, Nixon had the opportunity to fulfill his promise to appoint strict constructionists to the Federal Courts, especially to the Supreme Court. Early in the Spring of 1969, Chief Justice Earl Warren announced that after sixteen years of service he would retire. The Warren Court had been a liberal court. It had consistently ruled in favor of individual civil rights and integration of the races. The announcement provided the new President the opportunity to change the attitude of the Court.

---

President Nixon saw appointments to the Supreme Court as a potential source of pride; he could not have foreseen the embarrassment which such appointments were to cause him.

Another Supreme Court Justice was to leave the Court during the Spring of 1969. From the very beginning the resignation of Justice Abe Fortas was an embarrassment. Justice Fortas resigned his seat under threat of impeachment for having accepted and kept for eleven months a $20,000 check from a foundation set up by financier Louis Wolfson. In September, 1966, eight months after Fortas accepted the $20,000, Wolfson was indicted, and later imprisoned, for illegal stock manipulation. The whole affair offered Nixon the opportunity to appoint two strict constructionists to the Supreme Court.

The Spring of 1969 was a rough period for Nixon Court appointees. President Nixon nominated four men for the post of Supreme Court Justice. The first man, Warren Burger, Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, was nominated to replace retiring Chief Justice Warren on May 21, 1969. On June 9, 1969, Warren Burger was confirmed by the United States Senate as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The second man to be nominated by President Nixon was Clement F. Haynesworth of Greenville, South Carolina. Judge Haynesworth was the Chief Judge of the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals. At the time of his nomination, Haynesworth was fifty-seven years old, a Harvard Law School

---

graduate, and a recognized strict constructionist. Because of two incidents during his career, Judge Haynesworth was ultimately to be rejected by the United States Senate. One of the incidents provoked civil rights groups, the other provoked organized labor.

The first incident occurred in 1958 while Chief Judge Haynesworth's Court ruled on a case involving school desegregation in Prince Edward County, Virginia. Civil rights groups pointed out that while the majority of the Court ruled against the county's position, Judge Haynesworth voted against the majority. On August 12, 1969, Judge Haynesworth told the New York Times that 1958 was a time "when none of us was thinking or writing as we are today."\(^7\) Obviously, few were surprised when the N. A. A. C. P., CORE, The Urban League, the Americans for Democratic Action, the American Jewish Congress, and most prominent liberal politicians argued that the judge lacked a philosophy and sensitivity which would qualify him as a Justice of the United States Supreme Court.

But further in his career, Haynesworth had been involved in questionable behavior. From 1961 to 1963, while he heard a labor dispute involving the Textile Worker's Union and the Darlington Manufacturing Company, Haynesworth owned stock in and sat on the Board of Directors of a company (Deering Milliken) which provided vending machines in some of the plants of the Darlington Manufacturing Company. Thus Haynesworth came to be viewed by labor, in George Meany's words, as "hostile to

workers and negroes. With the press giving complete coverage to the episode, with liberal politicians opposed, with labor hostile to the nomination, and with various Civil Rights organizations outspoken against him, few were surprised when on November 21, 1969, the United States Senate denied confirmation to Haynesworth by a vote of "55 against to 44 for confirmation."

President Nixon was stunned by the rejection. The defeat was more embarrassing because seventeen Republican Senators, including most of the Party's Senate leadership, refused to vote for Haynesworth. The President commented that he would continue to nominate men who were strict constructionists. When he referred to Judge Haynesworth, President Nixon said, "the Supreme Court needs men of his legal philosophy to restore the proper balance to that great institution."

The next man to be nominated to the Supreme Court by the President was G. Harold Carswell. At the time of his nomination, Judge Carswell had sat on the bench of the United States Court of Appeals, 5th Circuit, for less than a year. The nomination of the fifty year old judge was viewed by congressional conservatives as a good choice, while others in

---


10 Naughton, p. 20.
Congress "denounced it as further evidence of the Administration's alleged 'Southern Strategy.'"\(^{11}\)

One immediate comment to the announcement of the nomination crystallized the arguments which were to emerge in opposition to Judge Carswell's confirmation. Joseph L. Rauh, Jr., Vice Chairman for the Americans for Democratic Action, said that the President had "again nominated an unknown, whose principal qualification for the post seems to be his opposition to Negro rights."\(^{12}\) Indeed the ordeal which was to follow was to illustrate that Judge Carswell lacked the scholarship and sensitivity to sit on the Supreme Court. Editorial comments in the New York Times illustrated the point of lack of qualification clearly.

On January 21, 1970, the editor noted that:

---

\(^{11}\)Robert B. Semple, Jr., "Southern Named to Supreme Court; Carswell, 50, viewed as Conservative," New York Times, January 20, 1970, p. 1. Perhaps a note on the reference to "Southern Strategy" is in order. The phrase applies to a series of reactions of the Nixon Administration which some commentators interpreted as attempts to forge a Republican Majority by attracting votes in the Southern Region of the country. Such items as the "Law and Order" theme of Nixon during the '68 Campaign, Strom Thurmond's influence in the selection of Vice President Agnew, Nixon's stance on integration, and his insistence of a "strict constructionists" on the Supreme Court were pointed to as signs of the strategy. In 1970, a bright young assistant of Nixon's 1968 Campaign Manager wrote a book: The Emerging Republican Majority. Although he argues to the contrary in the "Introduction" of The Emerging Republican Majority, Kevin Phillips demonstrates with his demographic analysis of voting trends that if the Republican Party employs the right strategy, the political future of the South is with it—at least at the Presidential level. See: Kevin P. Phillips, The Emerging Republican Majority (New Rochelle, New York: Anchor Books, Edition, 1970), pp. 286-289; 462-474.

\(^{12}\)Semple, p. 1.
In naming Judge G. Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court, President Nixon had displayed more glaringly than ever a talent for seeking out undistinguished candidates for the high bench.\(^{13}\)

Fred P. Graham of the *New York Times* wrote a devastating piece on the appointment entitled: "Carswell May Make Some People Long for Haynesworth." Mr. Graham commented that:

According to most people who have come in contact with him, Judge Carswell is an extremely intelligent, quick-witted and charming man. But when the Justice Department asked for a list of his legal articles and writings, he replied he had written none. He furnished a list of some 25 opinions that read, for the most part, like plumber's manuals.\(^{14}\)

The lack of scholarship argument probably would not have been strong enough to deny the appointment to the judge, but the lack of scholarship combined with other "faults" did work to deny the appointment.

A very serious question was raised when a 1948 speech of Carswell's came to light. Among other things, Carswell said in 1948:

I am a Southerner by ancestry, birth, training, inclination, belief and practice. I believe that segregation of the races is proper and the only practical and correct way of life in our states. I have always so believed, and I shall always so act. I shall be the last to submit to any attempt on the part of anyone to break down and to weaken this firmly established policy of our people.\(^{15}\)

Not only did Carswell make the speech, but also he published it in *The Irwinton Bulletin* on August 13, 1948. When asked on C. B. S. radio to

---


comment on the 1948 speech, Judge Carswell said:

I've read a summary of what you attribute to me as a young candidate some 22 years ago. I denounce and reject the words themselves and the ideas they represent. They're obnoxious and abhorrent to my personal philosophy. There is nothing in my private life, nor is there anything in my public record of some 17 years, which could possibly indicate that I harbor racist sentiments or the insulting suggestion of racial superiority. I do not so do, and my record so shows. Incidentally, I lost that election because I was considered too liberal.16

Judge Carswell's public record was not as blameless as he thought. On January 27, 1970, when testifying before the Senate Judiciary Committee, he denied allegations that his participation in the formation of a private golf club (Capital City Country Club Incorporated) in Tallahassee, Florida, in 1956 was not a part of an effort to prevent desegregation of the municipal facilities which the private club took over. Judge Carswell repeated at that time: "I am not a racist. I have no notions, secretive or otherwise of racial superiority. . . ."17

From January 19, 1970, to April 8, 1970, the Nixon Administration did everything it could to save the nomination of Carswell from defeat in the Senate.

One of the actions undertaken by President Nixon himself was to be later developed as a campaign theme for the 1970 off-year Congressional Elections. The theme was revealed in a letter from President Nixon to Republican Senator William B. Saxbe of Ohio. The Senator had


written the President of his concern of charges of less than whole hearted support of Judge Carswell by the President since the racism and mediocrity issues had emerged. In his response to the Senator, President Nixon asserted that, indeed, he did have full confidence in Judge Carswell. The President further noted what was to become a campaign theme in the fall. The issue according to the President was whether or not he could exercise his constitutional responsibility to appoint members of the Court without having those appointments frustrated by those Congressmen who wish to substitute their own philosophy or judgment on Court appointments. A Hoosier audience was to hear that same argument applied to Senator Hartke on October 20, 1970, when President Nixon said he wanted the support he had not had:

... on the decisions involving some critical appointments to the courts in which judges who stood firmly for the enforcement of law and order on a strict constructionist's basis were presented to the Senate and turned down. On these decisions, both Senators for Indiana (Senator Hartke and Senator Bayh) had been 100 per cent against the President and I think it's time to change that—I think we need one who is for us.19

On April 8, 1970, the United States Senate defeated the nomination of Judge Carswell by a margin of fifty-one to forty-five.20 President Nixon responded bitterly:


19Recorded by author from the WPTA-TV, Fort Wayne, Indiana, broadcast of the speech, October 20, 1970.

I have reluctantly concluded— with the Senate presently constituted— I cannot successfully nominate to the Supreme Court any Federal appellate judge from the South who believes as I do in the strict construction of the Constitution.  

The President turned for his next nomination to the Court to Judge Harry Andrew Blackmun of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Judge Blackmun was eminently qualified— Phi Beta Kappa, Harvard, and Harvard Law. Moreover, he had projected an image of being mildly conservative and scholarly. Almost as if relieved, the Senate completed hearings of Judge Blackmun's confirmation in a single day; two weeks later, the full Senate unanimously approved the appointment. President Nixon supported the Senate's action but was still resentful of its behavior toward his earlier appointments.

Two other issues confronted President Nixon from his election in 1968 through the 1970 Congressional Elections. Both of the issues were inherited from the Johnson Administration and one was primarily the result of the other. The two issues were the Viet Nam War and inflation.

---


Vietnam

In the October, 1967, edition of *Foreign Affairs*, ex-Vice President, Richard M. Nixon, summarized his view of America's future foreign policy. Mr. Nixon had travelled widely in order to gather first hand information on what world leaders thought the proper role of the United States to be. The opinion expressed in the article was that: the United States' commitment in Vietnam made Asia "a far different place" than it would have been without that commitment; potential confrontations between nuclear powers be averted; Red China had to be enticed into a better relationship with the United States; Japan ought to be expected to take a more active leadership role in Asia; and that the United States could ill afford a turn from internationalism to isolationism. One might conclude that the emphasis of the article was that of building buffer influences which would reduce friction between the Soviet Union, Communist China, and the United States.

Citizen Nixon's *Foreign Affairs* article was revealing as a statement of the basic foreign policy approach President Nixon was to take from January, 1969, to December, 1970, and beyond. In a clear, succinct statement, Mr. Nixon wrote:

```
I am not arguing that the day is past when the United States would respond militarily to Communist threats in the less stable parts of the world, or that a unilateral response to a unilateral request for help is out of the question. But other nations must recognize that the role of the United States as world policeman is likely to be limited in the future. To ensure that a U. S. response will be forthcoming if needed, machinery must be created that is capable of
```

meeting two conditions: (a) a collective effort by the nations of the region to contain the threat by themselves; and, if that effort fails, (b) a collective request to the United States for assistance. This is important not only from the respective nations standpoints, but also, from the standpoint of avoiding nuclear collision.25

Citizen Nixon's Foreign Affairs article did not elaborate on a specific plan but, rather, spelled out guidelines which would become a theme which President Nixon was to play, with variations, as soon as he was elected. But first citizen Nixon had to be elected.

In the early Spring of 1968, most Americans thought that President Lyndon Johnson would run for re-election against either Governor George Romney or Richard Nixon. After a brief skirmish with the press which followed an unfortunate Romney utterance that he had been brainwashed in his thinking about Vietnam and a poll which indicated a five to one preference of Nixon over Romney by New Hampshire Republicans, Governor Romney withdrew from the field.26 In a skillfully managed campaign, Richard Nixon won the Republic Party's nomination for the Presidency and, ultimately, the General Election of 1968. Some observers commented that Nixon won by saying as little as possible about any plans he may have had which might have solved the problems which confronted the country.27

On the significant issue of the 1968 campaign, Vietnam, the action of

26See White, pp. 68-75.
President Johnson gave candidate Nixon an excellent excuse to refuse to comment. As a result of President Johnson's efforts to end the Vietnam War, the antagonists in that War sat down in Paris to try to negotiate peace terms. Because he did not want to jeopardize those negotiations, candidate Nixon refused to discuss his plans for Vietnam at all. A representative question, and Nixon's typical response was:

Question: If you are elected President, what are the top priority things that you think must be done in this nation?

Answer: In foreign policy, the first item we must deal with is Vietnam. Everybody recognizes that. And on that I will stick with the position I have taken to date: I will not jeopardize the negotiations by indicating any of the various avenues I think should be explored or attempted to get the talks off dead center. But Vietnam must be the top priority item in foreign policy.28

The narrow Nixon victory occurred without the articulation of a clear plan for the resolution of the Vietnam War.

As President Nixon established himself in the White House in the Winter of 1969, he was confronted with a nation that was seething with discontent. In his Inaugural Address29 the new President described his country as "caught in a war, wanting peace," full of "empty lives, wanting fulfillment," and seeing "tasks that need doing, waiting for hands to do them." Nixon asked his countrymen to "stop shouting at one another . . . so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."


As he surveyed the scene, Richard Nixon urged that "to a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit." From January, 1969, until November, 1970, President Nixon faced a series of incidents, the foremost being the War in Vietnam, which emphasized that the shouting was not entirely over.

During his first Presidential Press Conference on January 27, 1969, Richard Nixon laid down three items which were conditions he would seek at the Paris negotiations: 1) restoration of the demilitarized zone in accordance with the Geneva Conference of 1954, 2) guaranteed mutual withdrawal of forces by both sides; and 3) the exchange of prisoners. In the intervening period the President initiated a unilateral withdrawal of troops from Vietnam. Although the troop strength of United States forces in Vietnam was to reach its peek of 542,500 men in February, 1969, a pattern of action was to soon emerge which reduced that figure to 284,000 men, and declining, by October 8, 1970. The pattern of gradual troop reduction was coupled with face saving pronouncements.

When we look at President Nixon's Press Conference and speeches from January, 1969, to October, 1970, we clearly see the pattern emerge. On February 6, 1969, South Vietnamese President Thieu speculated that the South Vietnamese Army was capable of relieving a sizeable number of American troops. When asked about President Thieu's comment at his own press conference, President Nixon said that when United States

---


"commanders in the field determined that the South Vietnamese are able to assume a greater portion of the responsibility for the defense of their own territory, troops will come back."  

One month later, during an active Spring Tet offensive by North Vietnam, President Nixon told newsmen:

The possibility of withdrawing troops (from South Vietnam) is something that we have, as you know, been considering for some time. There are no plans to withdraw any troops at this time, or in the near future. On the other hand, I have asked for a re-examination of the South Vietnamese effort and the training program of South Vietnamese forces.

To the extent that South Vietnamese forces are able to take over the greater burden of the fighting—and to the extent, too, that the level of fighting may decrease—it may be possible to withdraw.

As the Tet offensive continued, President Nixon reiterated the idea that possibly the United States could withdraw troops when the South Vietnamese Army was capable of filling the void.

By May 14, 1969, the original negotiating position of the President had become: 1) a twelve month, agreed-upon staged withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces; 2) the creation of an international supervisory body, acceptable to both sides, to verify the withdrawal, and arrange a ceasefire; 3) internationally supervised elections in South Vietnam;

---


4) arrangements to be made for the release of prisoners of war at the earliest possible time; and 5) the agreement by all parties to observe the Geneva accords of 1954 regarding South Vietnam and Cambodia and the Laos accords of 1962.\(^{35}\)

During the Spring of 1969, the United States, the North Vietnamese, and the National Liberation Front, were to meet peace offers with counter peace offers. But all the while, the United States appeared to be laying the groundwork for reduction in her troop strength. Finally, on June 8, 1969, at Midway Island in the Pacific Ocean, President Nixon and South Vietnamese President Nguyen Van Thieu, emerged from a six hour conference and announced that 25,000 American troops would be withdrawn by August 31, 1969.\(^{36}\)

One would expect that the efforts of the Nixon Administration to limit United States participation in the Vietnam War to be favorably received. Such was not the case. Throughout the Summer of 1969, anti-Vietnam War groups and spokesmen applied pressure on the Nixon Administration. The anti-war activity was to climax three times during the period 1969-1970: October 15, 1969 with the first organized nationwide Vietnam moratorium; November 15, 1969, a second, larger national


protest; and May, 1970, with diverse protests on college campuses to the military operation in Cambodia. 

Sandwiched between the October 15, 1969 moratorium and the November 15, 1969 protest was a major address of President Nixon which appears to have been designed to mobilize those citizens who agreed with him. One critic has argued that the President appealed to those whose view of America's involvement was that we were about the business of "defense of freedom, whose strength has resulted in facing crises and rejecting the easy way, (and) whose greatness has been the capacity to do what had to be done when it was known to be right." Another critic of the speech argued enthusiastically that President Nixon's, November 3, 1969, address was designed to lessen the impact of the two Peace demonstrations between which it fell and to focus attention on, and thereby, isolate young dissenters. The November 3, 1969, speech was a direct response to the deep divisions in the United States over the War in Vietnam. The speech reiterated that the United States would stand behind the announcement in Guam, that she would keep her treaty

37It is difficult to separate the anti-war protest of May, 1970, from protest in general. On April 30, 1970, President Nixon announced his decision to send United States troops with the South Vietnamese Army in an "incursion" into Cambodia. Across the United States, college campuses erupted with anti-war protests. On May 4, and on May 13, college students were killed during those protests by policing elements. As a result of the killings, they, as well as the War were focal points for demonstrations.


committments, provide a nuclear shield, and furnish arms. Further, President Nixon asked "the great silent majority" of Americans to support the President.40 A major consequence of the speech was probably the heightened activity of the anti-war demonstrators on November 15, 1969.

With war protests continuing, Richard Nixon used his public announcements to provide a climate which would permit increased troop withdrawals. On December 9, 1969, the President told the press that chances for a negotiated settlement in Paris were "not good," but that we would withdraw more troops by the end of the month.41 By the end of January, 1970, American troop strength in Vietnam had declined from 542,500 to 474,400.42 Throughout the Spring and Summer of 1970, the Nixon Administration withdrew troops amid ever present anti-war protest. Reports from Southeastern Asia were of increased military activity in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. President Nixon asserted that the United States would continue its withdrawal from Vietnam because the policy of supplying and training South Vietnamese (Vietnamization) was effective.43


In an address broadcast over radio and television on April 20, 1970, President Nixon announced that the military activity and the training of the South Vietnamese Army was such that he would withdraw an additional 150,000 American troops by the Spring of 1971.

In the very same speech in which the additional troop withdrawal plan was announced, the President commented on an increase in Communist (North Vietnamese) military activities in Laos and Cambodia. Little did the audience realize that a few short weeks later, the President would commit American troops to a joint American-South Vietnamese incursion into Cambodia.

The troop withdrawals and negotiation activities of the Nixon Administration up to mid-April, 1970, did little to pacify the vocal anti-war elements in our society. Many wanted out immediately. They realized that although American war casualties had been reduced, although the bombing in North Vietnam had not been resumed since March, 1968, America was draining its spirit, its will, and its coffers through the continuance of the War. Many young people in America, particularly on university and college campuses, formed the ranks of the vocal minority who through their actions focused attention on the fact that, although we were disengaging from the Vietnam War, our standing Army in Vietnam numbered about 415,000.

On the evening of April 30, 1970, President Nixon announced to the American public an action which he implied rivaled the great decisions

which led to victories in World War I, World War II, ended the Korean War, avoided war in the Middle East, and resolved the Cuban Missile Crisis. With a map of Southeastern Asia to assist him, the President took care to announce that the United States and South Vietnamese Armies were going to "clean out major enemy sanctuaries on the Cambodian-Vietnamese border."  

As the President saw the situation, the major difference between the Cambodian incursion decision and the decision on World War I, World War II, Korea, the Middle East, and the Cuban Missile crisis was that "in those decisions, the American people were not assailed by counsels of doubt and defeat from some of the most widely known opinion leaders of the nation." The President observed that:

> If, when the chips are down, the world's most powerful nation--the United States of America--acts like a pitiful, helpless giant, the forces of totalitarianism and anarchy will threaten free nations and free institutions throughout the world.

> It is not our power but our will and character that is being tested tonight.

The immediate reaction to the President's April 30th speech was more anti-war protest--especially on college campuses. The college campus protests were to involve nearly thirty per cent of all United States campuses and to provoke two major incidents of violence: at

---


46 Ibid., p. 24.
Kent State University and at Jackson State College.\textsuperscript{47}

The President was to respond to student protests and protesters, in general, in a variety of ways. Nixon was convinced of the correctness of his action as evidenced by a portion of his answer to a question at his May 8, 1970, news conference. When he was asked if he were surprised at the intensity of the protest against his Cambodian decision, the President said:

\ldots I know what I have done will accomplish the goals they (the protesters) want. It will shorten this war. It will reduce American casualties. It will allow us to go forward with our withdrawal program—the 15,000 Americans that I announced for withdrawal in the next year will come home on schedule.

And it would, in Nixon's opinion, serve the cause of a just peace.\textsuperscript{48}

The President was to call young anti-war demonstrators "bums," and he was careful to attack the extreme anti-war demonstrator in each speech he delivered during the Congressional Campaign in 1970. The President's own Commission on Campus Unrest was to take him to task for his behavior toward protesters in 1970 when it recommended:

We urge that the President exercise his reconciling moral leadership as the first step to prevent violence and create understanding. It is imperative that the President bring us together before more lives are lost and more property destroyed and more universities disrupted.


\textsuperscript{48}"Transcript of President's News Conference on Foreign and Domestic Matters," New York Times, May 9, 1970, p. 8. At the same Press Conference the President estimated that the immediate result of the Cambodian Incursion to amount to six or eight months delay in time during which the United States could train the South Vietnamese Army and saving "hundreds if not thousands of American lives" through the capture of arms and ammunitions.
We recommend that the President seek to convince public officials and protesters alike that divisive and insulting rhetoric is dangerous. In the current political campaign and throughout the years ahead, the President should insist that no one play irresponsible politics with the issue of "campus unrest."\textsuperscript{54}

The final resolution of campus protest in the Spring of 1970 featured two events which worked together to calm the turbulence: first, summer vacation for college students; and, second, after a series of announcements of the success of the operation in Cambodia, the withdrawal of United States troops from Cambodia on June 29, 1970.

As the off-year Congressional elections in the United States started to compete with Vietnam for newspaper headline space, President Nixon appeared to have shifted his emphasis to negotiation in Paris and attack on incumbent, domestic congressional leaders who had opposed him on Vietnam.

The Nixon Administration was to engage in a total effort in Campaign '70. The new efforts to negotiate a peace settlement in Vietnam seem to be enhanced by the appointment of David E. K. Bruce as the new chief American negotiator in Paris on July 1, 1970; President Nixon's visit to Europe during September, 1970; and a new offer of a five point peace plan during the height of the Congressional campaign on October 7, 1970.\textsuperscript{50} Throughout 1969-1970, Richard Nixon like a good

\textsuperscript{49}President's Commission on Campus Unrest, pp. 8-9.

\textsuperscript{50}For a transcript of the President's speech see: "Transcript of President's Address Offering New Proposals for Indochina Peace," New York Times, October 8, 1970, p. 18.
fencer, parried and thrust, against the realities of the Vietnam situation. Perhaps the best the President could have hoped for on the Vietnam issue at home and in Vietnam was a standoff. By late October, 1970, a standoff appeared to be what the President had accomplished.

Inflation

If the President managed a standoff on Vietnam, he lost ground on the one issue which many Americans viewed as being greatly aggravated by that war: rising inflation. Although many viewed the primary cause of inflation as the Vietnam War, Arthur Burns, Counsellor to the President, argued before the National Tax Foundation that the bulk of the increase in inflation had been caused not by defense establishment spending, but rather by civilian. Everyone thought that inflation had gotten out of hand. In 1965, consumer prices started to reflect the increase in Federal spending by moving up two per cent per year. By 1968, the rate of inflation per year had jumped to 4.5 per cent. During the year 1969 the rate of consumer price increase was six per cent. For the five year period (1965-1970) the Consumer Price Index rose more than twenty per cent.  

The response of the Nixon Administration to rising inflation during 1969-1970 was to hold down Federal spending, try to balance the


budget, and have the Federal Reserve System tighten the monetary policy of the country. The policy had results which were summarized and emphasized during a Presidential Press Conference on January 31, 1970. Douglas B. Cornell of the Associated Press asked the President:

Question: Mr. President, for several days I've been collecting some headlines that sort of point up the question I'd like to put to you. I'd like to run over some of these headlines with you—balance of trade makes slight progress in 1969; circus rings up record 1969 profits, Ringling Brothers; big firms 1969 profit down; Dow average hits new low for three years; G. N. P. rise halted; Ford joins G. M., Chrysler in work cutbacks; wholesale prices show sharp rise; U. S. Steel will raise prices February 1. The question is: How, sir, do you assess the possibility that we may be in for perhaps the worst possible sort of economic conditions, inflation and a recession?

The President's answer to Mr. Cornell's question was to be a standard by which most Administration spokesmen would answer any question on inflation or recession during the Summer and Fall of 1970. The response was always that the current situation was less severe than that of a given period in the past and that the situation was improving. After explaining what his Administration proposed to do about inflation, the President concluded his response to Mr. Cornell's question in this way:

---


I do expect that the present rate of inflation which was less in the second half of 1969 than in the first half, will continue to decline, and that we will be able to control inflation without recession.\textsuperscript{55}

When on July 30, the President was asked to evaluate his anti-inflation policies in light of a 4.7 per cent rising unemployment rate, his response was that the policies "... of course, have resulted in some cooling of the inflationary forces and, of course, one of the costs is that the economy slows down." The President concluded his answer with a statement which in one way or another would be asserted repeatedly throughout the 1970 campaign: "Long-term, however, this economy is going to move and the unemployment slack will be taken up."\textsuperscript{56}

From a national perspective Richard Nixon and his Administration went into the 1970 off-year with hostility toward Congress for the embarrassment caused by refusing to confirm the President's Supreme Court nominees, with significant unrest over the question of our role in Southeastern Asia, and with domestic inflation eating up the materialistic gains of most Americans. When attention is turned toward the psychological-sociological make-up of the 1970 Hoosier audiences and the principals of the Indiana Senatorial Campaign, one can see that each of the three factors discussed above played its role. For the year and a half that Richard Nixon was in office, prior to the 1970 election, public opinion polls bore witness to the concerns of the


citizens as being with the war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, inflation, and unemployment. Not only were those concerns articulated nationally, but also they were evidenced in Indiana. For the year and a half that Richard Nixon was in office prior to the 1970 election, R. Vance Hartke had criticized Nixon's domestic and foreign policies. In 1970 the Nixon Administration singled out for defeat three liberal Senators who were up for re-election: Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana, Senator Albert Gore of Tennessee, and Senator Charles Goodell of New York. Especially in the case of Senator Hartke, the Nixon Administration played an active role in the selection and support of a candidate who so far as possible was opposite the Senator in political thinking. The Nixon Administration's candidate, Congressman Richard Roudebush, had to go out and both defend President Nixon's policies since he had been in office and also attack Senator Hartke's actions.

Now that we have a broad national perspective we can focus on a careful consideration of the Hoosier audience in 1970, and consider: 1) three views of how voters perceive candidates; 2) the dominate characteristics of the collective Hoosier audience; and 3) the characteristics of the specific audiences for the speeches of this study. The audience will be analyzed according to the characteristics which would effect the ways in which they would react to the candidates. The analysis will deal with the political leaning, residence, ethnic status, economic level, and educational level for each audience. We will take both a broad view and a close-up of the audience for the
speeches under consideration.

Three Views of How Voters Perceive Candidates

If a candidate has as his goal close identification with the audience and if his audience numbers one and eight-tenths millions as was the case in this study, then a careful campaign designed to enhance that identification was necessitated. Dan Nimno wrote in his book *The Political Persuaders* that election campaigns are fought not "on the issues" but on themes. "The purpose of the campaign theme is to simplify complex public issues into brief clear recognizable statements to the advantage of the candidate." 57

The thematic approach of political campaigning has been validated by psychological and sociological behavioral studies. In general the ways one can respond to a message, campaign, or theme are many; but the result is that of "fitting" incoming sensory data to one's developed and developing cognitive system.

One general summary of the various ways an auditor can process a message approached the subject from the viewpoint of "dimension(s) in receiver images." The dimensions included: assimilating and/or contrasting the message with the cognitive system of the auditor; deleting from and adding to the message by the auditor; and rationalizing the incoming message to make it more acceptable. 58 Makay and Brown suggest


further that in the area of assimilation and/or contrast the auditor has three classes of variables which are at work. First, the auditor has "ego-involvement" in his perception of a message because he has needs which will govern the attention he will pay to it. Second, the auditor has images which serve as criteria for the assessment of a message. And third, the message itself is ambiguous to a marked degree,\textsuperscript{59} probably because the originator of the message functions in a manner similar to that of the auditor in processing information. Thus a picture emerges of an audience member who is engrossed in his own personal life and who is not inclined to attend to random, unstructured, disjointed messages. Nor is the audience member likely to attend to messages in which his attitudes and needs are not emphasized. Each audience member has learned a response pattern and is ready to respond in predetermined ways toward specific objects and situations.\textsuperscript{60} Each audience member acts as if he knows that his physiological drives (hunger, thirst, sex, temperature regulation, fatigue, and freedom from restraint)\textsuperscript{61} and his social needs (safety, love, self-esteem, and self-realization)\textsuperscript{62} must be addressed by the successful political candidate.

\textsuperscript{59}Makay and Brown, \textit{The Rhetorical Dialogue}, p. 128.


In general, audience members view speakers from a narrow, filtered perspective of "What's-in-this-for-me?" But the question remains: What is the specific perception of the messages of politicians which voters hold?

Some political scientists have followed the lead of social psychologists, described above, and have offered as one answer the perceptual balance theory. The theory was well summarized by Bernard Berelson and William McPhee when they wrote:

(Political perception) ... must serve a definitive psychological function for the individual voter. As in other spheres, so in the political: one function must be to avoid potential stress. ... The voter tends to see or invent what is favorable to himself and to distort or to deny much of what is unfavorable. This must leave him fewer internal conflicts to resolve—with, so to speak, a favorable balance of perception.63

Berelson and McPhee suggested that in order to avoid stress, voters will see in a preferred candidate what they want to see.

Other political scientists hold an image theory. This theory maintains that a candidate determines his own image with the voter. The candidate determines his image with the voters by appearances, speeches, stands on issues, etc. which convey the image he desires.64 In short the candidate who casts the most popular image wins the election because the audience identifies with him and stands with him.

---


64 Probably the most eloquent expression of this theory is to be found in the writings of Walter Lippmann. See: Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion (New York: Cromwell-Collier and Macmillan, Inc., 1922), p. 21.
Both views are theoretical. Although little empirical research has been conducted on the image thesis only a foolish politician would ignore trying to appear before the voters in order to let them know where he stands. Nor would a serious politician fail to use polling techniques, first to determine what his constituency thought were concerns, and second to determine what they thought of his voiced opinions of those concerns.

For this study, I will try to blend both perceptual balance theory and image theory in accounting for audience responses to the messages of the candidates. It seems to me that both the candidate and the audience member ought to, and indeed do, know what is favorable to himself. The candidate through political experience, newspaper accounts of reactions to policies, polling, etc., knows what audience members are thinking. The audience member knows from experience following the campaign, reading, and checking the record(s) of the candidate(s) if the candidate is deserving of his vote. Stated another way, the candidate must through his campaign speeches and themes demonstrate to the audience

65J. E. McGrath and M. F. McGrath have concluded that "perceptions of political figures are stimulus-determined rather than perceiver-determined for a large number of attributes. Thus (from our study) there seems to be much support for the image theory of political perception." J. E. McGrath and M. F. McGrath, "Effects of Partisanship on Perceptions of Political Figures," Public Opinion Quarterly, 26, 1962, 236-248.

66This fact is emphasized by tradition. Such procedures have been the historic ones. Recently a model has appeared which may be useful in partially resolving the image controversy. See: Robert O. Anderson, "The Characterization Model for Rhetorical Criticism of Political Image Campaigns," Western Speech, 37 (Spring 1973), 75-86.
member's satisfaction that indeed it is in the interest of both for the audience member to identify with the candidate by voting for him. So it would appear that both the perceptual balance theory and the image theory are only partial elements which tend to explain the result of a political campaign.

In the two chapters which are to follow, the analysis will be of the speeches of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush before: 1) the same service club; 67 2) the Allen County Democrat Party rally (Senator Hartke) and the Allen County Republican Party Rally (Congressman Roudebush); 68 3) a joint statewide debate. For each audience the analysis will be of its political leaning, residence, ethnic status, economic level, and educational attainment. In order to go from the larger audience to the smaller, the remainder of this chapter will discuss: the state of Indiana, circa 1970; Northeastern Indiana; Allen County, Indiana; and the audience characteristics of the Downtown Rotary Club.

The Dominate Characteristics of the Collective Hoosier Audience: Indiana--Circa 1970

In 1929 and again in 1935, two sociologists, Robert S. and Helen Merrell Lynd, wrote books about Muncie, Indiana entitled: Middletown and Middletown In Transition. In both books, the Lynds discussed the

67 The Downtown Rotary Club, Fort Wayne, Indiana. This group is non-partisan. Although both candidates addressed the same club, their speeches were at different points in the campaign.

68 partisan audiences.
set of attitudes which then prevailed. The attitudes included: being average; faith in progress; loyalty to family, town, state and nation; belief in free enterprise, suspicion of "government meddling;" and a strong commitment to the Protestant Ethic.

Following the 1970 election, the New York Times sent Aldin Whitman to Muncie. Mr. Whitman's article was entitled: "'Middletown' Revisited: Still In Transition." According to Whitman, the major changes in attitudes in Muncie of 1925, and Muncie of 1970 were: a higher divorce rate; stronger unions; disappearance of domination by the Ball family (Ball Jar manufacturing company) with accompanying dispersal of power to the business community at large; cultural dominance of Ball State University; and very little militancy among residents. With the exception of the latter item, each item in the list was probably more the result of the rapid rate of change in society in general from 1935 to 1970, than from a change in fundamental attitudes. To turn to the reported statements of Muncie citizens, like local real estate dealer Fred Miltonberger, is to find that "underlying attitudes are much the same as 

---


71 Ibid., p. 95.
they were before World War II." The picture emerges of a city which is friendly, easy-going, conservative, white, Protestant, home-owning, materialistic, and economically comfortable.

The description of Muncie can be generalized to the State of Indiana in 1970. Having as its motto, "The Crossroads of America," Indiana appears to many Hoosiers to be blessed. It has a sound economic base featuring forty-two per cent of its work force engaged in manufacturing. With four per cent of the work force engaged in farming, and with a corn blighted crop, Hoosier farmers managed to move from tenth place to ninth place in agricultural income for 1970. In general the state is an urban state with sixty-three per cent of the population living in urban settings as compared with a rural population of thirty-seven per cent. From 1960 to 1970 the state increased its overall population by ten per cent to a total of 5,143,422. Indiana is predominately white (94.1 per cent) and moderately well off (personal income at $3,421 per capita with 14.4 per cent of its citizens falling below the poverty level). The state has roots and the roots go deep.

Many writers have commented on the stability and conservatism of the Hoosier state. Recently three newspaper reporters from England went


74James L. Adams, "Indiana Farming: State Moves Up to 9th Place in Farm Income," Indianapolis Star, October 7, 1970, p. 36.
to the heart of the matter as evidenced by the following observation:

The small towns of central Indiana look very much like each other, and they look even more like film sets. The streets are always straight and lined with shady trees. The houses are wooden and painted white, with no fences of any kind between house and house or house and footpath. Most towns seem to manage a town hall or courthouse on the highest point of land, constructed along vaguely classical lines with pillars and white stone. There is always a war memorial, celebrating victories from Tippecanoe to Iwo Jima.\(^7\)

The journalists painted a picture of people who have faith in one another and pride in their communities.\(^7\) Former United States Senator William Jenner put the point well in his farewell speech in the United States Senate on August 21, 1958. Senator Jenner said:

I am happy to return to the life of a private citizen. No people anywhere in our country care more for home and family, for private life and our local communities than the people of Indiana. We have something of the feeling that our local communities are the hub of the universe, which was so strong among Americans in colonial and pioneer days.\(^7\)

With the exception of the Gary-Hammond-East Chicago section of Indiana, which most Hoosiers would rather ignore,\(^7\) Muncie attitudes prevail.


\(^{76}\)See: D. R. Smith, dissertation, p. 133; and Leibowitz, My Indiana, p. 292.

\(^{77}\)Congressional Record, Vol. 104, pt. 15, 85th Congress, 2nd session.

\(^{78}\)Leibowitz answers the two questions: "What's wrong with Gary"? "Why do Hoosiers instinctively distrust Lake County"? by asserting: "Lake County is corrupt. The plunderworld wants it that way. So long as gambling, prostitution and robberies are confined to certain notorious districts of the community, decent citizens shrug and go blissfully about making a living, mowing the lawn and cooking supper." Leibowitz, My Indiana, p. 59.
Those attitudes influence all of Hoosier society including Hoosier politics.

From a general political point of view Indiana is partisan and conservative. The partisan view is reflected in the fact that practically every public official in the state and each of his political appointees must kick in two per cent of his salary to the party coffer. The significance of the two per cent salary kickback can be emphasized in the following way: "since the mayor of Indianapolis alone makes some 2,000 patronage appointments, the 2 per cent kickback keeps the parties rolling in money." Another side effect of the two per cent kickback to the total climate is a particularly virile two party system.

The hoosier political scene has traditionally been one of active political conservatism. Any politician who has functioned within the system has had to project an image of proper philosophic conservatism mingled with personal professional activism. Statewide politics in Indiana is no place for amateurs: such had traditionally been the case and such was the case in 1970.


The 1970 Senatorial Campaign promised to be particularly lively. Because of his early opposition to the war in Vietnam,81 his opposition to the nominations of both Haynesworth and Carswell,82 and his rising unpopularity in Indiana, incumbent Senator R. Vance Hartke viewed himself as a marked man.83

Senator Hartke had been United States Senator for twelve years. Although he influenced federal patronage within the State of Indiana, the local Democratic Party officials were the ones who were viewed as in control of jobs. Further the Senator had both spoken and written against the war in Vietnam. In a state which houses the National Headquarters of the American Legion and where "flag-waving patriotism is a way of life,"84 any politician who had placed himself in Senator Hartke's stance would have been "marked for elimination." The Senator's stance was emphasized in Washington during the Summer when he voted with the majority on the Cooper-Church amendment to a military sales bill and thereby voted to limit future United States operations in Cambodia. The Cooper-Church


83At the news conference where he announced that he would run for his third term, Senator Hartke was reported as having commented that he was a man "marked for elimination" by the Republicans because of his voting record. "Hartke Says He Will Seek a Third Term in the Senate," New York Times, April 12, 1970, p. 38.

84Leibowitz, My Indiana, p. 8.
bill was widely heralded in the press as an unprecedented rebuff to an American President in time of war. Most Americans wanted our troops home as quickly as possible, but few Americans, or Hoosiers, would have disagreed with the conclusion of Jim Hampton and Patrick Young that most blue-collar workers they interviewed in Ohio felt:

The United States should withdraw from Vietnam and Cambodia. But until it does, all Americans should support U. S. forces fighting in Indochina.

Senator Hartke had to be very careful to align himself to the anti-war position without allowing his position to be interpreted as against the fighting man in the field. In a state as partisan as Indiana, distinctions frequently became blurred.

The Senator had also voted against the two nominees of President Nixon to the Supreme Court who lost. President Nixon took those defeats personally. The President and his 1970 Campaign strategists knew that they could significantly alter the complexion of the Senate if they could capture seven Senate seats. Senator Hartke looked like a prime target after he came under fire for having accepted a $30,000 campaign


contribution from the Spiegel, Inc. mail-order house.\textsuperscript{89} The Nixon Administration thought that with a tough, aggressive candidate, the Indiana Senate seat would fall into the Republican column.\textsuperscript{90}

In a well orchestrated move the Nixon Administration backed Congressman Richard Roudebush against Senator Hartke.\textsuperscript{91} Congressman Roudebush had been former National Chairman of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; extremely hawkish on Vietnam; and had a perfect rating as a Conservative by the Liberal Americans for Democratic Action for the year of 1970.\textsuperscript{92} The Congressman's major liability was his relative obscurity across the state. Because he had won five consecutive terms as a Representative, Congressman Roudebush was well known in the Central part of the state as an aggressive campaigner. The Congressman immediately launched an aggressive campaign which emphasized the National Administration's view that Vance Hartke was "unrepresentative of the thinking people of Indiana."\textsuperscript{93} With a great deal of support from Washington, the Congressman went on to attack Hartke and to uphold his theme that "Dick Nixon needs Richard Roudebush in Washington."


\textsuperscript{90}James M. Perry, "Yes, the G. O. P. Really Could Win the Senate," \textit{The National Observer}, August 31, 1970, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{91}Vecsey, "Hartke and Roudebush in Close Race," p. 34.

\textsuperscript{92}"1970 House Voting Record," \textit{ADA World} (September, 1970), p. 4 M. Congressman Roudebush's rating was 0 per cent. Senator Hartke's rating in the same issue (p. 13 M) was eighty-five per cent.

Senator Hartke countered the onslaught in the only way he could by developing his own theme of being "In Step with Indiana." But Hartke and Roudebush had to develop their campaign themes and images before the Hoosier electorate. Both candidates knew of the conservative nature of their constituency by virtue of their previous campaigns. They knew that on those occasions when they were to address statewide audiences they would have to be aware of those general audience characteristics enumerated above. But when each candidate was to address audiences in a swing section of the state such as Northeastern Indiana, specific audience analysis was called for.

Northeastern Indiana

Northeastern Indiana is comprised of nine counties which form Indiana's Fourth Congressional District. The district is urban.\(^9^4\) Even with the urban dominance farming is an important economic activity in eight of the counties. In 1970, the Indiana Department of Revenue indicated that based on the average 1968 individual adjusted gross income for all of Indiana's ninety-two counties the average income level for each county in the Fourth Congressional district was:

Allen County—5th ranked with $8,464;
Wells County—26th ranked with $7,333;
DeKalb County—28th ranked with $7,215;
Huntington County—40th ranked with $6,938;
Whitley County—43rd ranked with $6,921;
Adams County—44th ranked with $6,699;
Nobel County—50th ranked with $6,699;
Steuben County—58th ranked with $6,616; and
LaGrange County—65th ranked with $6,439.95

Of the total population of the Fourth Congressional District in
1970 (492,780), 66,134 lived on farms.96 Of the total number of people
who lived on farms 27,855 specified that they owned the property they
occupied. The median value range for that property was a high of
$18,600 for Allen County to $10,800 for DeKalb County. When one looks
at the total population of the counties in the district in light of
the number of specified owner occupied homes, one sees that approxi­
mately thirty-nine per cent (115,449 out of 492,780) owned their own
property. From the above consideration we can see that the constitu­
ency of the district was relatively affluent and relatively stable in
1970.


96These figures are a compilation of demographic figures found
in "Detailed Housing Characterstics: Indiana," 1970 Census of Housing
through 16-231.
From the census data one can conclude that the district was overwhelmingly Caucasian as was the State.\textsuperscript{97} For instance under the Census heading "Counties with 400 or More Negro Population," only Allen County is listed with a black population of 19,281; about eleven per cent of the total.\textsuperscript{98} Of Allen County's 19,281 black citizens, 2,308 indicated that they owned their own homes. The median value of those homes was $9,100.

If the Fourth Congressional District is sparsely settled by Blacks, there are even fewer Spanish speaking Hoosiers in the area. Census data reveal that only two counties (Allen and Adams) have Spanish speaking citizens in any number.\textsuperscript{99} Allen county had a total of 3,216 Spanish speaking citizens, 417 of whom specified that they owned their own homes. The median value of their homes was $12,500. The total Spanish speaking population of Adams County was 560 in 1970. Sixty-two of those citizens specified that they owned their own homes. The median value of the homes was $6,800.

Not only were the citizens of the Fourth District economically solvent and home owning, but also, they had varied educational backgrounds. For the male citizen of the district who was twenty-five years old or older, census data indicated that 53.4 per cent completed high

\textsuperscript{97}Barone, Ujifusa, and Matthews summarize the status of ethnic groups as: "Black 7%. Total foreign stock, 8%. Germany, 2%. Poland, United Kingdom, 1% each; others, 2%." Barone, Ujifusa, and Matthews, \textit{Almanac of American Politics}, p. 237.

\textsuperscript{98}"Detailed Housing Characteristics: Indiana," pp. 16-286-87.

\textsuperscript{99}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 16-333-35.
school. The median number of years of school completed by the entire group was 12.1. Of the women of the district twenty-five years old or older, 54.9 per cent completed high school. The median number of years of school completed by all women was 12.1.100

In 1970 the Fourth Congressional District of Northeastern Indiana was comprised of white, reasonably well educated, home-owning citizens. During the decade 1960-1970, the area sent Republican E. Ross Adair to the House of Representatives. In this century the area has had a moderate to conservative, Republican Party bias.101

During the 1970 Congressional campaign, Congressman E. Ross Adair ran for his eleventh term of office against Lawyer J. Edward Roush. Adair had defeated Roush in 1968 by 5,462 votes.102 From the accounts of the campaign for congress in the Fourth District,103 the report of


101Notes on an interview the author had with Ivan Lebamoff, Chairman, Allen County, Democratic Party, October 3, 1970 are used in discussing the political background of the area. Mr. Lebamoff maintained that prior to the anti-German propaganda of World War I, the German farmers of the area consistently voted for candidates of the Democrat Party. Mr. Lebamoff has become the Mayor of the City of Fort Wayne since the interview.


the concerns of the voters of the district is interesting. Both Con­möglichkeiten candidates agreed that the control of crime was an important issue. Newspapers around the state reported in August, 1970, that the Federal Bureau of Investigation Uniform Crime Report indicated an 8.5 per cent increase in criminal activity for the year 1969-70. The 1969 estimate for Fort Wayne, the only metropolitan area in the Fourth District, was 5,880. The number of crimes actually reported by the Fort Wayne Police Department for the same period was 4,885. The approach to the issue of crime each candidate took revealed the campaign strategy of each party statewide. Congressman Adair was consistently reported as saying of the issue:

The control of crime, I suspect, is right up at the top of the list (of issues bothering voters), and that leads into drugs, juvenile delinquency and campus unrest.

In short, the strategy was that of broadening the concept "control of crime." Congressman Adair included the cluster of attitudes on drugs, juvenile delinquency and campus unrest and thereby tried to turn the issue into one of "law and order." Mr. Roush's approach to the question fit his "people's campaign" of walking throughout the district and seeking the views of the voters: he interviewed victims of crimes.

---


105"Local Crime Rise is Below Average for Entire Nation," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), August 13, 1970, p. 8A.

The question of the economy was a standoff in the district. Although Mr. Roush pressed the view that the national economy was sluggish, inflation was high, interest rates were high, and local property taxes were very high, the Congressman countered with a nationwide administration view that President Nixon was cooling the rate of inflation and that local unemployment was only four per cent. In October 1970, the Department of Labor reported that the national unemployment rate was 5.5 per cent of the work force. The figure represented the highest rate of unemployment in seven years—a point Democratic candidates emphasized.\footnote{Jobless Rate at 7-Year High; Labor Raps Nixon, \textit{Journal-Gazette} (Fort Wayne), October 3, 1970, p. 1.} In metropolitan Fort Wayne for the month of October, the unemployment rate was five per cent.\footnote{September's Jobless Up, Not Down, \textit{Journal-Gazette} (Fort Wayne), October 29, 1970, p. 1D.}

The message of each candidate which appeared on billboards throughout the district went a long way toward encapsulating the predominate themes to which the voters were asked to respond. Congressman Adair's billboards carried a message from President Nixon which advised voters of the Fourth District: "You need him in Washington and so do I." Mr. Roush's billboards reflected a potentially emotionally laden appeal to whatever bothered the individual voter. Roush's billboards read: "This
time vote Democratic because you can't afford to wait for another election.\textsuperscript{109}

The Fourth Congressional District was important to the Indiana Senatorial campaign in 1970. Ex-Congressman Roudebush wrote that his poor showing in Allen County was a contributory factor in losing the election. Roudebush wrote: "My recollection is that I carried about sixty per cent of Indiana counties and lost the election primarily in Lake and St. Joseph counties as well as a poor showing in Allen county."\textsuperscript{110} President Nixon campaigned in Fort Wayne, Allen County, on October 20, 1970, to boost the campaign efforts of Congressman Adair and Roudebush. The district was a chief battleground of the campaign.

Northeastern Indiana, and the Fourth Congressional District are dominated by Allen County and its principal city, Fort Wayne. We have already seen that Allen County led the area in wealth, home ownership, and diversity of population. In addition, Allen County dominated the district in educational offering and manufacturing. Of the seven

\textsuperscript{109}In the election the voters gave Mr. Roush a 6,256 plurality. The percentages were: Roush, 51.9 per cent; Adair, 48.1 per cent. Since the election President Nixon has appointed E. Ross Adair Ambassador to Ethiopia. For the election returns see: \textit{America Votes 9: A Handbook of Contemporary American Election Statistics}, compiled and edited by Richard M. Scammon (Washington, D. C., Congressional Quarterly, 1972), p. 106.

\textsuperscript{110}Personal Letter to the author dated August 30, 1972.
institutions of higher learning in the district, five are in Allen County. 111 Allen County has over 350 industries which manufacture light industrial products. Such concerns as International Harvester, Dana Corporation, Tokheim Corporation, Essex International, Phelps Dodge Industries (two installations), General Electric (five installations), Central Soya, Magnavox Company (home office), and B. F. Goodrich provide steady employment for the entire region. 112 The region is usually described as "populous and strongly Republican." 113

Thus far we have seen the audience characteristics of Hoosiers in general, the Fourth Congressional District in Northeastern Indiana, and Allen County. Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush addressed the first group by statewide television. In the Fourth Congressional District both candidates each addressed local television audiences and partisan audiences. The only audience which both candidates addressed for which we have not provided an analysis was the Downtown Rotary Club, Fort Wayne.

111 The seven schools by county are: Allen, Fort Wayne Bible College, Indiana Institute of Technology (Fort Wayne), Indiana University Regional Campus (Fort Wayne), Purdue University Regional Campus (Fort Wayne), and St. Francis College (Fort Wayne); Huntington County, Huntington College; and Steuben County, Tri-State College.


The membership list of the Downtown Rotary Club for 1969-1970 read like a "Who's Who of Allen County." The membership of the club in 1969-1970 was approximately one hundred seventy-nine Active and Senior members. A close reading of the list reveals that fifteen medical doctors and dentists, five lawyers, one state legislator, two university presidents, eight educators from the elementary through university level, two ministers, and three architects were members.

In addition membership characteristics which are common to all Rotary Clubs; several business and services were represented. For example thirty-four members were identified as being in business for themselves. Of the larger industrial concerns only Magnavox lacked representation. International Harvester, North American Van Lines, Central Soya Company, General Electric Company, and Lincoln National Life Insurance Company were well represented. Because the club met at noon on Mondays during 1970, one might assume that most of the members were in positions where they could take the time for an hour and a half lunch in downtown Fort Wayne.

114 In 1972 the Fort Wayne Rotary Club sponsored the formation of a new Rotary Club for Allen County (The Anthony Wayne Rotary Club). Prior to 1972 the only other Rotary Club in Allen County was located in New Haven, Indiana.

115 This figure and each comment on the occupational and educational level of the club is based on a compilation of the total membership list from "Roster of Members of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club, Fort Wayne, Indiana: July 1, 1973 to July 1, 1974." Each member is listed by name, occupation, and the year when he joined the club. Hereafter referred to as "Roster."

116 Phillip E. Gutman. Mr. Gutman was elected President of the Senate of the 1972 Indiana Legislature.
Other ways in which the influence of the group can be seen is in the fact that two members were either on the Board of Trustees of Indiana University or on the Board of Trustees of Purdue University.\textsuperscript{117} When Congressman Roudebush spoke to the group he was introduced by a club member who also served during 1970 as Fourth Congressional District Chairman of the Roudebush for Senator Committee.\textsuperscript{118}

Rotary International and local Rotary Clubs are service organizations. The objectives of Rotary Clubs are four in number:

1) The development of acquaintance as an opportunity for service;
2) High ethical standards in business and professions; the recognition of the worthiness of all useful occupations; the dignity by each Rotarian of his occupation as an opportunity to serve society;
3) The application of the "Idea of Service" by every Rotarian to his personal, business, and community life;
4) The advancement of international understanding, good will, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the "Ideal of Service."\textsuperscript{119}

Given the goals of the group and the lack of competition in Allen County from other clubs, the prominence of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club was understandable.

The Fort Wayne Rotary Club was service oriented. The Club frequently invited speakers to speak in order to keep its members informed.

\textsuperscript{117}Richard Insheep, Publisher of the Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne) for Indiana University; and Walter Walb of American Hoist and Derrick Company for Purdue University.

\textsuperscript{118}Herbert G. Bredemeier, President of Concordia Senior College.

\textsuperscript{119}"Roster," p. 2.
A speaking invitation to a political candidate was to be viewed as a request from a non-partisan group. One member of the club told me in an interview on the day Senator Hartke spoke that the audience was very conservative, and therefore skeptical about the Senator's position on Vietnam.\footnote{Notes on an interview with Roger J. Manges, October 5, 1970. Roger Manges is Dean and Director, Purdue University Regional Campus, Fort Wayne. Dean Manges had been a member of the club for three years at the time of the interview. The qualitative statements about the club in this section are based on that interview.} It was Dean Manges' thought that the Senator would be "received with restrained polite applause."\footnote{The Senator received a standing ovation.} On October 19, 1970, Congressman Roudebush and Secretary of Labor, James D. Hodgson both addressed the Fort Wayne Rotary Club. Because of the frequency and calibre of the spokesmen who appeared regularly before the group, one could say that the Fort Wayne Rotary Club was a tough group of consumers of public address.

Summary

In this chapter we have focused on those factors which affected the perceptions of the audiences which Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush faced. We saw that the campaign was significant from a national viewpoint because Senator Hartke was viewed as being in difficulty due to his outspokenness on Vietnam and his liberal voting record. The Nixon Administration quickly recognized that it might have greater influence with the United States Senate if it could replace five or six...
Democratic Senators with Republicans. Because Senator Hartke had spoken against the war and had some identification with young anti-war demonstrators; because he had joined the opposition to President Nixon's efforts in Supreme Court appointments; and because many Hoosiers did think the Senator out of step, the Nixon Administration tried mightily to defeat him.

Each of the problems with which the Nixon Administration struggled was in some degree a problem for the Hoosier in 1970. Inflation was rampant. Unemployment was high. The War in Vietnam continued and most citizens wanted to terminate our involvement there. At the same time most people were living reasonably well. The innate Hoosier attitude toward politics was one of conservatism. The attitude may have been reinforced by the relative economic well being of most people. The task of each candidate was to reach Hoosiers with his message. In the next chapter, we shall evaluate the messages of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush before two audiences: one partisan and one non-partisan.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF ADDRESSES BY BOTH CANDIDATES
BEFORE SIMILAR PARTISAN AUDIENCES

There are two main streams of thinking with respect to man as a political animal. One tradition, backed by the finding that party preference is a very strong indication of voting behavior, assumes an irrational model of man. The view holds that men have very limited powers of reason and reflection, weak capacity to discriminate, and very short memories. Those who hold this view believe in manipulative merchandising of political images. The alternative view of political man is that he is a rational being who can think. Further it flirts with the idea that man seeks understanding, that he consistently attempts to make sense of the world around him by discrimination among the multitude of stimuli with which he is confronted.

Which ever view of political man a party or a candidate holds, one fact is certain: a significant element in the dynamic exchange between candidate and voter is "the word." "The word" forms symbols, which become message stimuli and are used as common currency between candidate, voter, and citizens at large.

The nature of the dynamic interchange of messages between candidates is responsible for an image which citizens place on the
candidates. Images are very important to both the candidate and the voter. From the view of the candidate a correct image of his constituency is so important that many of his resources are devoted to seeking information from local opinion leaders, polling opinions of the citizenry, and appearing before audiences in the capacity of an educator. In an interesting discussion of politicians' self perceptions of the way they spend their time, Roger Davidson coined the label "Mentor-Communicators." Mentor-Communicators are politicians who engage in speech making, radio and television appearances, and preparation of press releases and newsletters; in short, campaigning. The reason for such educational activity by politicians is to give visibility to their positions on campaign issues. The importance of such activity on campaign issues was summarized by political scientist, William H. Flanigan, as:

The candidates, after all, campaign on the issues more or less; the only determinants of voter choice which the candidates can manipulate during the campaign are the issue stands they take and the relative emphasis given the issues.

In summary, it would appear that politicians serve a function of educating the electorate through their position and emphasis on a given

---


issue. The goal of that function is advanced in messages which are articulated enough to affect the image ascribed to the candidate by the voter. From this line of reasoning, one would conclude that most politicians, witnessed by their campaign efforts, hold a view of man as a rational animal.

But in order to understand adequately the dynamic nature of the interchange of messages between candidates and voters, we need to take a psychological look at the organization of behavior. At best the environment of a political campaign is complex and ambiguous. For instance the 1970 campaign in Indiana was a collage of political elements: the efforts of the Nixon Administration to influence the outcome of the election; the campaigns of the candidates seeking offices at local, state and national levels; and the efforts of mass media to inform and interpret the campaign. Small wonder that the person at whom the effort was directed may have been confused. The problem for the voter in 1970, and in any election, was to sort through the blur and assign order and meaning to it. The problem was a perceptual one.

Rhetorical Scene—Nationally

In Chapter II, we saw that the Nixon Administration went into the 1970 Congressional Campaign after two years of frustration caused by the ongoing struggle with the resolution of the war in Vietnam, domestic demonstrations in protest of that war, and the inflation which was

5By rhetorical scene we mean those psychological-sociological factors which people indicated affected them.
partially caused by Vietnam. National public opinion polls from June, 1970, to November, 1970, reveal at various times during the progress of the off year election campaign the extent to which those issues were considered significant by voters.

When we look at what people told George Gallup's interviewers about the Vietnam War we find:

1. During July 31—August 2, 1970, Vietnam was chosen by more people (24 %) as the first major problem in the country and that the Democratic Party was the best party to handle the top ten problems-issues.6

2. During June 19-21, 1970, more people favored (71%) a plan of national service in substitution to the military draft than who opposed it (20%).7

3. During September 1970, the majority (55%) of those who responded to the question: "A proposal has been made in Congress (Hatfield-McGovern Plan) to require the U. S. Government to bring home all U. S. troops before the end of the next year. Would you like to have your Congressman vote for or against this proposal"? said that they wanted their Congressman to vote for the proposal.8

4. On the day immediately preceding the election sixty-one per cent of those polled in New London County, Connecticut; Shelby County (Memphis) Tennessee; Montgomery County, Illinois; and San Luis Obispo County,

6George Gallup, "Pollution Now Major Fall Vote Issue," The Gary Post-Tribune, August 30, 1970, p. B-4. Thirty-one per cent of the 1501 people in the survey said that the Democrats were best able to handle top problems; nineteen per cent said there was no difference in the two parties' ability to handle problems.

7George Gallup, "Civilian Service As Draft Option Wins Approval," Indianapolis Star, June 5, 1970, Sec. 1, p. 21. Sample size 1,519 adults in "300 scientifically selected areas."

8George Gallup, "Public Backs Firm Date on Leaving Vietnam," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), September 28, 1970, p. 1. Nationwide the percentages were fifty-five per cent for; thirty-six per cent against; nine per cent no opinion.
California said that the United States should withdraw from Vietnam by the end of 1971.\(^9\)

Although people said that Vietnam was of concern, at least one interpreter of election results, Richard Scammon, noted that the issue was not a major factor in the vote that was cast. Scammon wrote:

I have yet to find any evidence that this was a cutting issue in this election in any save a handful of situations. And by cutting issue I do not mean something people are interested in, I mean something that move people from habitual loyalty to something new.\(^{10}\)

When pollsters asked questions about the Nixon Administration's second major headache, demonstrations and unrest, they found:

1) twice during the campaign period (July 31-August 2 and September 25-28) the people surveyed mentioned "campus unrest" as the issue of significance second only to Vietnam, with "civil rights," and "crime and law enforcement" consistently appearing in the top five list.\(^{11}\)

2) Shortly before election day a majority (62%) of those who were asked if we should speed up racial integration answered that we should not. When asked if

\(^9\)This finding was the result of a referendum conducted by the Gallup Organization in cooperation with National Education Television in four indicator counties across the country. The counties were selected "on the basis of their past voting record and present-day representativeness." Election districts were selected and ballots with ten key voter issues were distributed to all the households in the districts. The following day the ballots were picked up. Sixty percent of all the ballots distributed were returned. George Gallup, "Voter Pattern Changes Noted Across Nation," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), November 8, 1970, p. 1A.


children should be bussed to achieve better racial balance, 78% of the group said they should not be bussed. Overwhelmingly the same group endorsed denying federal aid to colleges that do not expel students involved in a campus riot (79%) and having Congress vote more money to help police deal with crime (91%).12

One issue which had the potential of affecting each more directly than any other item surveyed was inflation. Interestingly the year 1970 produced not only high inflation but also high and rising unemployment. In October, 1970, a Gallup poll indicated that fifty-one per cent of those surveyed thought that more people would be out of work in their community during the next six months than were jobless at the time of the survey.13 More mid-westerner's expressed concern over the increase in unemployment than any other section; fifty-six per cent of those surveyed in the region indicated that they thought more workers would be unemployed.

In addition to the anticipation of more unemployment, most of the 1,497 adults surveyed during September 25-28, 1970, indicated that the "high cost of living" was the fourth most important problem facing the nation.14 The concern held throughout the campaign as is evidenced by Gallup's finding that sixty-five per cent of those who were asked in

12 George Gallup, "Voter Patterns Changes Noted Across Nation," p. 2A.

13 George Gallup, "Unemployment Fears Prevalent," Indianapolis Star, October 8, 1970, p. 41. The sample size was 1,422 adults in 250 localities.

November, 1970, if the government should set wage-price controls said that it should. The perception most people had of business conditions in their locality was generally positive. Nationally fifty-four per cent of those polled indicated that business was either "very good" (9%) or "good;" thirty per cent said business was "not too good." Most people during the 1970 campaign were concerned with the Vietnam War, demonstrations and unrest, and inflation. As indicated in Chapter II, generally Hoosiers evidenced they were concerned about the same issues as were other voters across the country. The difference between the concern of Hoosiers and that of the rest of the country was the perception of those problems which tradition and immediate circumstances created.

Rhetorical Scene--Indiana

In the discussion of "The Demographic Characteristics of the Collective Hoosier Audience: Indiana--Circa, 1970," many characteristics emerged. A preview of those characteristics is necessary. If we are to have a perspective of the attempts of the candidates to sway votes, one facet of that perspective will be the traditional Hoosier view of events. The messages of each candidate were judged, in part, by those traditional perceptions.

15George Gallup, "Voter Pattern Changes Noted Across Nation," p. 1A.

16George Gallup, "South Most Optomistic On Economy," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), August 16, 1970, p. 1. Survey was conducted on August 1-2, 1970, when 1,501 adults were interviewed.
One set of traditional Hoosier perceptions which have been discussed might be labeled "faith." For instance we have seen that many writers have commented on the Hoosier's faith in the Protestant Ethic of hard work, planning, and tending to one's business as ultimately being rewarding. Two consequences of the "faith" perception which are characteristic of Hoosiers are being average and being secure in a knowledge that we all will progress. If everyone is busily engaged in his chosen occupation, then the opportunity to be distinctly different or outstanding is minimized. Each person will be "average." Further, if everyone is busily engaged in his chosen occupation, he will progress. As the individual progresses, society will progress. Because of the prejudice against outstanding difference, individual progress and also societal progress will be slow.

The line of reasoning thus far would suggest that Hoosiers have a traditional belief in owning property. A combination of the belief in property and in progress equals a belief in free enterprise. "The government" at any level should not meddle. The institution in the United States which is least trusted by most Hoosiers is the Federal Government.

Although Hoosiers trust the Federal Government least, this is not to suggest that they are disloyal. In a State whose history indicates having been strongly influenced at times by both the Klu Klux Klan and the American Legion, one would expect Memorial Day and the Fourth of July to be enthusiastically celebrated. Although loyalty for most Hoosiers flows outwardly (family, town, state, nation), patriotism
may be a stronger traditional characteristic than conservatism.

In viewing the specific rhetorical scene in which Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush functioned in 1970, one can conclude that not only were those issues which concerned most Americans present but also they were viewed by patriotic, conservative, believing people. The messages which were advanced by the candidates were constrained because they had to reflect being average, faith in slow growth and progress, belief in property and free enterprise, loyalty, patriotism, and conservatism. Both candidates had been successful with Hoosiers in the past; they understood the rose colored glasses their audiences wore.

Now that we have on standard by which to judge the efforts of each candidate to get voters to identify with him let us briefly consider a way to assess the messages presented to Hoosiers in 1970 in specific rhetorical situations.

Specific Rhetorical Situations

In each of the speaking situations to be analyzed, characteristics of the specific audience, the message, the immediate response to the message, and the appropriateness of the message will be assessed. For each speech, the specific characteristics for the audience which were significant will be considered: size, age, sex, and general affluence. In the analysis of each message, I will diagram the arguments in each, employing a model devised by Stephen Toulmin; identify and evaluate an

argument by subjecting it to the analysis of reasoning posited by Arthur Hastings; and evaluate each argument for its appropriateness in light of those national concerns and Hoosier perceptions discussed above. From the analysis I ought to be able to understand better the role of each speaker's "message" in the 1970 campaign.

The Message Diagrammed

From the time Aristotle wrote about "proofs" in speech making until today, many of those people who function both as critics and teachers of effective oral communication have had a tripartite view of the way a speech functions. Aristotle wrote:

Now the proofs furnished by the speech are of three kinds. The first depends upon the moral character of the speaker, the second upon putting the hearer into a certain frame of mind, the third upon the speech itself, in so far as it proves or seems to prove.

Of the three proofs—ethos, pathos and logos—only logos appears to be complete in the speaking situation. Expressed another way, the point is that in a speaking situation the element which is apparently complete

---

18 Hastings, "A Reformulation of the Modes of Reasoning in Argumentation."

will be "the speech itself, in so far as it proves or seems to prove."20

Traditionally four forms of discourse which seem to prove have been discussed in textbooks on composition: narration, description, exposition, and argumentation.21 Each form of discourse is developed internally by its practical substances: evidence and reasoning. Each form of discourse may appear in persuasive efforts such as campaign speeches. The problem for the critic is to get to the micro-level of discourse and to explain its effect on the macro-level of the form of the discourse.

Recently one scheme has emerged which assists the critic in his efforts to analyze the micro-level of discourse. Starting with a discussion of logic and the role of reasoning in thinking, Stephen Toulmin based his analysis of argument on the premise that:

... logic is concerned not with the manner of our inferring, or with questions of technique: its primary business is a retrospective, justificatory one—with the arguments we can put forward afterwards (after inferring conclusions) to make good our claim that the conclusions arrived at are acceptable, because justifiable, conclusions.22

20It is interesting to note that from the age of Aristotle until today the precise effect of the speech itself is inconclusive. After discussing relevant experimental research on the effect of logical arrangement in messages Edwin Bettinghaus concluded: "There seems to be some merit in having the appearance of logic, even if there is no merit in actually making sure that the materials are all arranged in such a way as to ascertain the (structural) validity of the materials." Edwin P. Bettinghaus, Persuasive Communication (New York, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), p. 159.


22Toulmin, The Uses of Argument, p. 6.
In his attempt to explain the primary business of reasoning, Toulmin advanced a scheme with which to analyze the micro-elements of the structure of arguments.

The Toulmin structure of arguments\(^{23}\) has six elements:

1) **Data**—the evidence one appeals to in making an assertion;
2) **Claim**—the assertion or conclusion whose merits we are seeking to establish;
3) **Warrant**—"The general, hypothetical statements (rules principles, inference--licenses or what you will) which can act as bridges, and authorise (sic) the sort of step to which our peculiar argument commits us;"\(^{24}\)
4) **Qualifiers**—those modal words which indicate the strength conferred by the Warrant on the Conclusion;
5) **Rebuttal**—indicates circumstances in which the general authority of the claim would have to be set aside; and
6) **Backing**—other evidence and reasoning which can be called upon to lend authority and currency to the Warrant.\(^{25}\)

\(^{23}\)Toulmin, *The Uses of Argument*, pp. 94-145.

\(^{24}\)Ibid., p. 98.

\(^{25}\)Backing for the warrant is difficult to discuss for most arguments fail to be pressed far enough to reveal it. Because the originator of the message is selective in revealing items of data upon which he asserts his claim, and because he frequently allows the audience to supply the warrant which permits the leap from his data to his claim, the originator of a message frequently is not challenged to the point where backing for the warrant is mandated.
Schematically the six elements occupy a spatial relationship which looks like this: 25

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{D} \\
\text{Since} \\
\text{W} \\
\text{On account of} \\
\text{B} \\
\text{Q, C} \\
\text{Unless} \\
\text{R}
\end{array}
\]

The Toulmin model is useful as a method for analyzing argument for four reasons: 1) it portrays in a spatial pattern the dynamic relationship between data and claim; 2) it provides for the material support of warrants; 3) it emphasizes factual analysis of a unit of proof and material validity by investigating a proof within the context of related information; and 4) it provides explicitly for ways of qualifying and limiting the force of a claim. 26 The use of the Toulmin model will provide us with a micro-view of the arguments advanced by the candidates.

Audiences respond to messages in total rather than at the micro-level. The structure of their language, their formal schooling, the structure of the message presented to them, suggests to audiences that they might expect certain formal reasoning patterns to emerge in the message. In our society not only has the educational system conditioned


audience members to expect formal reasoning patterns in messages but also it has tried to suggest "tests" with which to judge those patterns. I am not suggesting that each audience member had had specific instruction in logic, argumentation, debate, but that subjects such as literature, composition, history, etc., are about the business of systematically continuing a prejudice for western patterns of thought by which one is conditioned to assess arguments.

Assessing Arguments

In the realm of written and oral communication one study has as its conclusion that writers and speakers use nine patterns of reasoning in advancing ideas. In 1962, Arthur Claude Hastings assumed the task of investigating how people reason when they engage in argumentation. Employing an empirical method, Hastings analyzed "over 250 samples of argument . . . from speeches, debates, and other discourse."27 As a result of the study, we have a reformulation of the modes of reasoning in argumentation which is more comprehensive than is the scope of the modes of reasoning covered in textbooks; is more thorough in advancing methods of evaluating arguments; and is more comprehensive.28

The nine modes of reasoning which Hastings found in his analysis were argument from example to descriptive generalization--appeared twenty-six per cent of the time; argument from criteria to verbal


28Ibid., p. 161.
classification—appeared twenty per cent of the time; argument from authority—appeared eighteen per cent of the time; argument from cause to effect—appeared ten per cent of the time; argument from definition to characteristics—appeared seven per cent of the time; argument from circumstantial evidence to hypothesis—appeared six per cent of the time; argument from sign to an unobserved event—appeared five per cent of the time; argument from comparison—appeared three per cent of the time; and argument from analogy—appeared two per cent of the time.\(^\text{29}\)

With descriptions of the modes of reasoning and the frequency with which each appeared as background, the following will consist of a definition of each and a presentation of the appropriate tests for each mode.

In the process of reasoning from example to a descriptive generalization the essential characteristic of the process is the verbal formulation of a description of an aspect of reality which is based on typical instances, examples, or samples of reality.\(^\text{30}\) The four questions which are useful in evaluating this pattern of reasoning are:

1) Is the description an accurate formulation of observed reality?
2) Is the information representative, typical, and consistent with the rest of the field?
3) How much of the time would the relationships hold true, and under what qualifications would they be altered?
4) Were special circumstances present which might alter the situation?


The procedure of argument from criteria to a **verbal classification**
is to classify or categorize a situation by proving that a certain label,
classification, or verbal description may properly be attached to an
aspect of reality.\(^3\)\(^1\) The seven tests which can be applied to this mode
of reasoning are:

1) What is the implicit definition being used?
2) Are the criteria acceptable as a definition of the
classification, label, adjectival category?
3) Are there exceptions or qualifications to the
definition and criteria?
4) Are other criteria necessary for an adequate defini­
tion?
5) Do the characteristics described meet the criteria?
6) Are enough characteristics described to justify
inclusion in this category?
7) Could the event fit better into another category,
or be classified differently on the basis of the
characteristics?

**Argument from authority** is the next category of reasoning to be
considered. In using this form of argument, a speaker supports his
conclusions **directly** by presenting an authority who has asserted the
conclusion too.\(^3\)\(^2\) There are five tests for such arguments:

1) Was the source able to observe the situation?
2) Is the authority competent in this field?
3) Is the authority motivated to be accurate?
4) What internal evidence is there of the truth
of the conclusion?
5) Does the testimony have factors which are highly
correlated with accuracy?

\(^3\)\(^1\) Hastings, "A Reformulation of the Modes of Reasoning in
Argumentation," p. 36.

\(^3\)\(^2\) Ibid., p. 126.
When a speaker asserts that because certain events exist other
certain events can be expected to exist simultaneously or subsequently
because of the original events, he is engaging in argument from cause to
effect reasoning. In such instances the speaker is involved in a pre-
diction which must pass the following tests:

1) Is the cause a true cause of the effect?
2) How probable is the effect on the basis of the
correlation?
3) Is the cause a sufficient cause to produce the
effect?
4) Are there any other factors operating to interfere
with the production of the effect?

In argument from cause to effect the key is to ask the degree of the
probability of correlation. The higher the correlation of the two major
variables, the more probable is the argument.

The mode of reasoning which begins by defining a situation, prin-
ciple, concept, or state in a certain way and then an application or
implication of the situation, principle, concept drawn to fit character-
istics of a different situation, principle or concept is called argument
from definition to characteristics. The process is one of applying
logical consistency to statements about reality. The tests for such a
mode include:

1) Is the definition an accurate or agreed upon
definition?
2) Do the implications or characteristics follow
from the definition?

33 Hastings, "A Reformulation of the Modes of Reasoning in
Argumentation," p. 65.

34 Ibid., p. 46.
3) Are there any conflicting, inconsistent or superseding principles involved?

The inductive method of hypothesis is the basis for the next mode of reasoning to be considered. In argument from circumstantial evidence to a hypothesis, the reasoner begins with several facts from which he infers a theory to account for those facts.\textsuperscript{35} The five tests for the evaluation of argument from circumstantial evidence to a hypothesis are:

1) Does the hypothesis explain the circumstantial evidence?
2) Is the evidence adequate to justify the hypothesis?
3) Can other evidence confirm the hypothesis?
4) Is there any contradictory evidence?
5) Are there other hypotheses which would be equally more probable?

When one known event is taken as an indication of the existence of an unobserved event, attitude, state, or condition, reasoning from sign(s) to unobserved event has occurred.\textsuperscript{36} Test questions which can be asked of sign reasoning include:

1) What is the correlation of the sign with the event signified?
2) Are there other events which would more reliably account for the sign?
3) With what certainty is the effect produced?

The next form of argument to be considered is comparison. In argument from comparison one event is shown to be similar to another, \textsuperscript{35}\textsuperscript{Hastings, "A Reformulation of the Modes of Reasoning in Argumentation," p. 78.}

\textsuperscript{36}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 55.
and conclusions drawn about the first event are then applied to the second. There are eight tests for such arguments:

1) Are the conclusions asserted about the first event reasonable?
2) Do the events and the factors involved seem to be typical of their type?
3) Are the elements which are compared really similar?
4) Are the similar elements the essential elements or factors?
5) Are an adequate number of essential similarities presented?
6) Are there any differences in essential elements?
7) Is the strength of the conclusion reasonable relative to the known similarities?
8) How many events (factors) are utilized in the comparison?

With such a variety of test variables affecting the strength of a comparison, one ought not be surprised at the infrequency with which this mode of reasoning is employed.

The final potential mode of reasoning which might appear in the speeches under consideration is argument from analogy. Hastings defines the process of reasoning from analogy in the following:

To support a conclusion, a comparison is made between the situation under consideration and another situation. The second, analogical event is similar, not on the basis of facts or circumstances, but on the basis of abstract principle; the structure of the abstract relationships of the two events is the same. The conclusion which is drawn about the analogical event is applied to the topic situation.38

Analogical reasoning hinges on relations, concepts, and principles rather than facts. Tests of analogical reasoning must focus on the

---


38Ibid., p. 111.
relationships involved. Five questions can be asked of such reasoning:

1) Are the factors in the first instance equated justifiably with the factors in the other?
2) Are there any differences in the relationships which could affect the conclusion?
3) Are the relationships accurate in terms of the actual situation?
4) Can contrary conclusions be made from the same analogy?
5) Does the conclusion appear true on the basis of previous experience, the context, and facts of the situation?

Stephen Toulmin has written that

... utterances are made at particular times and in particular situations, and they have to be understood and assessed with one eye on this context. The same, we can now argue, is true of the relations holding between statements, at any rate in the majority of practical arguments. The experience of the rational judgment is itself an activity carried out in a particular context and essentially dependent on it: the arguments we encounter are set out at a given time and in a given situation, and when we come to assess them they have to be judged against this background.39

I think that the perception of politics and campaign issues which were held by Hoosiers, the Toulmin layout of arguments, and Hastings reformulation of the modes of argument provide a good background from which to judge the speaking in the 1970 senatorial campaign in Indiana.

In summary, the analysis of the messages which follow will include:

1) laying out the argument;
2) identifying and testing the reasoning pattern; and
3) assessing the reasoning in light of Hoosier perceptions.

Rally Speeches


> It is highly desirable that a leader of opinion in a democracy should be able to state his views clearly and convincingly. But all that the oratory can do of value to the community is to enable the man thus to explain himself; if it enables the orator to persuade his hearers to put false values on things, it merely makes him a power for mischief. Some excellent public servants have not the gift at all, and must rely upon their deeds to speak for them; and unless the oratory does represent genuine conviction, based on good common sense and is able to be translated into efficient performance, then the better the oratory the greater the damage to the public it deceives.\(^{40}\)

The candidates who made the speeches that are the subjects in this study were each opinion leaders in the Hoosier community. By words and deeds both Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush had represented the State of Indiana for ten years or more. In the analysis of the speeches which follow, I will consider how each candidate explained himself and his convictions with good common sense.

The first two speeches for analysis feature Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush before a partisan political rally in Fort Wayne, Indiana. Although "winning votes is the first objective of most political speaking,"\(^{41}\) professional politicians agree with the observation of former United States Representative Charles E. Halleck that most of the

---


people politicians talk to during a campaign are already committed to their party. Halleck asserted that "what you try to do is get them out and get going and stimulate them to action." The former Governor of Maryland, Theodore McKeldin, has offered specific advice on political rally speech making. After noting that the address "should run no more than twenty-five minutes," McKeldin advised that a good rally speech should do three things:

1) arouse the enthusiasm of the audience, 2) give the campaign workers sound arguments to use in their campaigning, and 3) say something that will make the papers and get a mention on the air.

It would appear that an ideal politician speaking at a rally would evidence characteristics of a cheerleader, educator, and prophet.

Although Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush had distinctive backgrounds and personalities which affected their style of speaking, one thing was clear: the backgrounds of both men conditioned their differing views on political speech making.

---


43 McKeldin, Politics U. S. A., p. 325. With the increased newspaper, radio-television coverage of political campaigns, McKeldin's third point has been embraced by most politicians to the extent where former journalists are hired to advise speech writers or to write speeches themselves which contain quotable quotations. See: Thomas C. Sawyer, "Message Preparation in a Primary Election Campaign--A Case Study," and "The General Election Campaign--A New Rhetorical Situation Changes the Message," Makay and Brown, The Rhetorical Dialogue, pp. 437-511.
An indication of Senator Hartke's views on the importance of public speaking can be found in his book, *You and Your Senator*. In the context of a comment that a senator uses public forums to report to his constituents in the roles of their ambassador to Washington and opinion leader, Hartke commented on public speaking by saying:

> Speaking is a part of a Senator's equipment. Finding the words for an informal or leisurely exchange of thoughts is fairly simple. It is different when one appears as the chief attraction at a major event. The gathering is assembled for a particular purpose. The topic must be appropriate to the occasion; the talk must be informative and, above all, impart a point of view which, frequently the speaker feels should be promoted. That requires research for accurate and interesting background data and orderly presentation of the material in language that is precise and readily understood by a listening crowd. It requires time for reflection—a commodity that Senators find in short supply.

We can see from the comment that the Senator expresses ideas on speech making which one would expect from a lawyer-politician.

Congressman Roudebush is a businessman-politician. Roudebush's training and background include: a Bachelor of Science degree (1941)

---


45 Hartke, *You and Your Senator*, p. 66.
from Butler University in Indianapolis, Indiana;\textsuperscript{46} a military career with the 376th Bomber Group during World War II—he won five battle stars in action in the Middle East, North Africa, and Italy; a career as a successful dealer in livestock in the Roudebush Commission Company; and activity in a variety of military service groups which culminated in being elected National Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars (1957-58). Although he had had a course in public speaking at Butler University, Congressman Roudebush found that serving "as both State and National Commander of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, ... was of great help in making public presentations."\textsuperscript{47} Roudebush prefers to address the emotions of an audience; he had a distaste for the assistance of speech writers in his campaign. On the point, Roudebush wrote:

Finally, in regard to my philosophy of political speech making, I have always felt that it is much more important to appeal to the emotions rather than to quote the record or statistics. The better speeches I made during the campaign, I feel, were the ones I gave extemporaneously or spoke from my notes. The speeches with little appeal were those prepared by others, and frankly, I never was able to get a speech writer with whom I agreed.\textsuperscript{48}

So we have seen that both men who delivered the speeches we are about to study had had background training and experiences which conditioned two distinct views of speech making: one the view of a

\textsuperscript{46}Of his formal speech training Congressman Roudebush has said: "I do recall that one of my professors at Butler was Doctor Gray Burdin who now heads up the Dale Carnegie Institute. I did not participate in any debating societies or oratoric contests, as I remember." Letter to author, August 30, 1972.

\textsuperscript{47}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{48}Ibid.
lawyer-politician, and the other the view of a businessman-politician. Both men had been successful with Hoosier audiences for over ten years; both men were trying again. Let us now consider an analysis of one of their speeches before a politically partisan audience.

Allen County Republican Rally Speech

In September, 1970, the Republican Party of Allen County was the political force in Northeastern Indiana. For ten years Allen County Republicans influenced the selection of E. Ross Adair as United States Representative from the District. During the decade beginning in 1960, Northeastern Indiana sent Republicans to the State Legislature in Indianapolis. From 1964 until 1972, Republican Harold Zeis was Mayor of Fort Wayne, the major city in the area.

With all the influence of the Allen County Republican Party during the nineteen-sixties, the Party never held a political rally of all of the Republican Clubs of Allen County until the "Roudebush for Senator" rally of September 11, 1970. The general chairman of the rally was

---

49Richard Roudebush, "Speech Before the Allen County Republican Rally," Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce Building, September 11, 1970. For a transcript of the speech and a comment on how the transcript was obtained see Appendix A.

50Adair's law firm partner, Orvis Beers, was Chairman of the Allen County Republican Party. The two men managed to control practically all federal and state patronage in the entire Congressional District.

51"Presidents of G. O. P. Clubs to Officiate at Roudebush Rally," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), September 10, 1970, p. 12B. The article listed the names of the Presidents of nine clubs as forming the committee for the rally.
Herbert Bredemier, President of Concordia Senior College in Fort Wayne, and Chairman of the Roudebush for Senate Committee. The rally was to commence at 7:00 P. M. after a full day of appearances by Roudebush at the Veterans Hospital in Fort Wayne, a news conference, and a reception. Although the rally afforded the opportunity for candidates for all offices to mingle with party workers and to be introduced to them, the principal speaker at the event was Congressman Roudebush.

The Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce building in downtown Fort Wayne, Indiana is a handsome, functional gathering place for those who have commercial interest in Northeastern Indiana. On the evening of September 11, 1970, most of the people who gathered around the bar in the anteroom adjoining the second floor multi-purpose (ballroom, dining room, club meeting room) were fashionably dressed. Inside the multi-purpose room were a half dozen young people filling red, white, and blue balloons with helium gas, while four young musicians played popular music of the day. The generous supply of helium balloons were tied to the seats throughout the 440 seat seating arrangement. At one end of the room, below a stage was a modified speaker's platform with a long table covered with a white covering and seven chairs behind it. As the audience viewed the speaker's stand it noticed that to the left of the

---

52Congressman Roudebush was partially disabled as a result of an injury in World War II.

53Descriptions and comments of audience size, age, sex and general affluence are based on notes of the author entitled Republican Rally, September 11, 1970.

54My notes show that the figure is an actual count.
table was a flag of the United States; to the right the flag of the State of Indiana and the teenage band. Around the room were G. O. P. Elephants, small clusters of three United States flags, and many red, white and blue balloons. Gradually the room filled with people from the anteroom bar. Many were carrying their drinks with them.

The audience which confronted Richard Roudebush on September 11, was composed predominately of middle aged, affluent looking, married couples. The people in the audience who were in the late teens or early twenties appeared to be either workers or performers. The size of the audience was small when compared with the total number of available seats. As Congressman Roudebush spoke, my wife and I each counted approximately 270-280 people. One comment by a woman in her early thirties to her male companion was, "Doesn't look like a very big crowd: I'm surprised." Most of the audience was grouped in the first third of the room close to the speaker's stand, with, perhaps, a third of it clustered in groups in the middle third of the room. Prior to the speech making the audience members talked politics with a familiarity one would expect of such a group. My notes suggested comments which indicated that many spoke of their jobs with the city, county, or state government. As the speech making began, Orvis Beers, Allen County Republican chairman, introduced the people on the platform, and candidates who were in the audience. Beers introduced, Fourth District

55To illustrate the point further, one group of singers for Congressman E. Ross Adair who had performed were described by the Congressman, himself, as "lovely matrons."
Congressman E. Ross Adair, who formally introduced Congressman
Roudebush.

Richard Roudebush stood before the Allen County Republicans in
an effort which had he been successful would have represented the height
of his political career. Richard Roudebush appeared rotund, greying
at the temples and successful. Since he had never lost an election,
Roudebush had little reason to doubt that his success would continue as
he laughed with his audience at his joke that it was nice of Indiana's
junior Democratic Senator to take time out of his 1972 Presidential
speaking maneuvers to appear anywhere in Indiana on behalf of his
opponent. But when Roudebush commenced major arguments of his speech,
curiously he started on a defensive note by countering a Hartke charge
that the Republican Party was trying to buy the Indiana Senate seat.56

From the very beginning of the campaign Senator Hartke sought to
develop a campaign issue on the premise that the Republicans were going
to use their money in a television campaign which would, in effect,
serve to buy the Senate seat. On August 21, 1970, Senator Hartke used
a speech at the Evansville Press Club to challenge his opponent to
follow the provisions of the pending Congressional legislation which

56Throughout the Spring and Summer of 1970, Democratic Party
leaders in both houses of Congress tried mightily to pass legislation
to limit campaign broadcast spending. The Democrats sought legislation
which would have affected the 1970 Congressional elections. Republicans,
who considered the idea at all, wanted the legislation to become effective in 1971. By August, 1970, there was little hope for the passage of
such legislation. See: "Campaign Spending Curb Stalled by House Recess:
Survival in Doubt; Supporters Lacked Votes to Approve Bill," Journal-
Gazette (Fort Wayne), August 15, 1970, p. 3A.
would have limited spending for advertising to seven cents per vote cast
in the last election of United States Senator in Indiana. The total
limit would have amounted to $143,718. The Senator further proposed a
monthly audit of both candidate's advertising expenditures by a non-
partisan organization such as the League of Women Voters. Robert P.
Mooney, political reporter for the Indianapolis Star, reported Hartke
as having argued in Evansville that:

We have seen numerous examples in recent years of men
marching from total oblivion into offices at the state
and national level, equipped with little past recognition
for public service but armed with massive amounts of money
and assisted by shrewed television manipulators of public
attitudes.57

Realizing the edge which is held by an incumbent politician, aware of
the general comparative economic plight of the Democratic Party, and
concerned with his lack of widespread recognition within the state,58
Congressman Roudebush refused. Mooney reported Roudebush's refusal in
the Congressman's own words:

57Robert P. Mooney, "Advertising Spending Lid Riles Roudebush,"

58It is interesting to note a flyer distributed at the Republican
Nominating Convention in June, 1970, which attempted to inform conven-
tion delegates about Richard L. Roudebush. In the world of politics a
conservative Congressman may find himself at a distinct disadvantage
when challenging an incumbent in a statewide race. Roudebush told
Indianapolis News, Political Editor, Edward Ziegner, "It's (running a
statewide campaign) by far the most physically demanding. Running state-
wide is a different ball game than running in a district. . . . When
it comes to statewide, the demands are multiplied about ten times on
the physical demands of the person." Edward Ziegner, "I'll Reflect
Hoosier Thinking, Roudebush Declares," The Indianapolis News, October 7,
I feel very strongly about the importance of widely publicizing his (Hartke's) record so that the voters of Indiana understand that he does not represent them in any way in 1970, that he never has supported President Nixon at any time and that I feel it is time we render that vitally needed legislative support of our President in the U. S. Senate.

Throughout June, July and August Senator Hartke and Democratic State Party Chairman, Gordon St. Angelo, repeated the charge often enough so that Congressman Roudebush's opening argument at the Allen County Republican Rally was:

I also see by the newspaper tonight that Larry O'Brian, that distinguished . . . National Chairman of the Democratic Party has got into the act on behalf of my opponent. He's spread a great deal of error today, I think in a press conference he has entered in Republican affairs and Republican finances. But I might say that he has continued a tradition started by my opponent and then Gordon St. Angelo in being completely inaccurate in his figures and I don't think he should be that concerned. . . . He's (Hartke) saying that we're spending too much money; we Republicans, we're trying to buy the Senate seat here in Indiana. . . . Now the press continues to print that we are going to spend 3.2 million and once in awhile Vance has it up as high as 4.5 million. I don't know where the money's coming from. But one night this past week here was Gordon St. Angelo in one location saying we were going to spend 2.5 million; down the road thirty miles was Vance saying we were going to spend 3.5 million.

Roudebush argued that the figures employed by the Democrats in describing his campaign were inaccurate. When one uses the Toulmin model with this argument it looks like this:

---

59 O'Brian appeared in Indianapolis on behalf of Hartke, September 10-12, 1970.
If we analyze this argument employing Hasting's reformulation of argument and the appropriate test questions of the particular type of argument, we find that it represents an argument from examples to a descriptive generalization. Further, by using typical instances which had long been reported of the charge, the Congressman should have been certain the audience would accept his description of the situation.
But a charge of buying an elected office has to be answered. Congressman Roudebush's answer was:

Of course this is completely ridiculous. Let me again emphasize . . . as I did twice today in press conferences here in Allen County and . . . in Delaware County . . . the figures being quoted are entirely inaccurate. The total budget of the Republican Party is less than one million dollars; it's about 900 thousand dollars and that's for all the candidates that are running statewide. Now Orvis (Beers) knows this, (unclear) knows this, we all know it that are in the official party of the Republican Party. . . . May I say to you that we have released to the newspaper certified copies of our bank account. And it somewhat gives me to say this, that the Republican Central Committee of Indiana and the Roudebush for Senate Committee now has something like fifty thousand dollars in the bank.

By revealing how much the Republican Party intended to spend for all statewide candidates, Congressman Roudebush attempted further to demonstrate the inaccuracy of the figures which were used by the Democrats.

Schematically the argument was developed thusly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Democrats are</td>
<td>The total budget of the Republican Party is less than one million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 inaccurate in their figures.</td>
<td>dollars; it's about 900 thousand dollars and that's for all statewide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Previous argument.)</td>
<td>candidates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B . . . we have released to</td>
<td>B the Roudebush for Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 the newspapers certified copies of our bank accounts. . .</td>
<td>2 Committee now has something like fifty thousand dollars in the bank.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This sequential argument appears to be an argument from example to descriptive generalization but it is in reality an argument from authority; Richard Roudebush's authority.

In the State of Indiana the campaign spending laws are such that each committee of a candidate must periodically file, in the county where it was organized, a statement of its assets and expenditures. Such records are considered so unimportant by county officials that they are quickly misplaced. Consequently, investigators such as Bernard Nossiter of the Washington Post and James Polk of the Associated Press found that because of varying figures an accurate count of campaign assets of both Congressman Roudebusch and Senator Hartke to be practically impossible to pinpoint. In Max McCarthy's, Elections for Sale, McCarthy commented on the efforts of Polk and Nossiter in the following way:

Polk figured that the ($100 a plate dinner held in Chicago during Hartke's Senatorial Campaign) dinner receipts, $80,900 before expenses, represented about an eighth of the money Hartke spent, with most of the remainder coming from peace and labor groups. The Washington Post placed Roudebush's spending at $1 million, Hartke's at 550,000. As of October 24, 1970, the records of the secretary of the Senate showed that neither spent a single penny.59

The argument is one from authority because: 1) Richard Roudebush was probably one of a few in the room who knew what his campaign assets were at the beginning of the campaign on September 11, 1970; 2) any critical individual must have assumed that the reported nine hundred thousand dollars would have been added to by November,\(^60\) and 3) ultimately only Roudebush knew the sources of funds for his complete campaign. Although the Congressman provided party workers with ammunition to be used in their arguments on the point that ammunition came from a highly prejudiced source. Further the point must have been of particular concern for the Congressman for he considered it first in his speech.

Following a bit of humorous transitional narration about the meeting being both a kick-off of the campaign and a kickout of Vance Hartke, the Congressman started his offensive against the Senator. Roudebush said:

I guess I aggravated him a little bit, I tied the title of "big spender" on him. I said that he was a thorn in the side of President Nixon. I think that he is a man who has done more to fan inflationary fires than any person who has served in the Congress of the United States from the State of Indiana. . . . I made an analyzation of the bills that he introduced during the 93rd Congress. Do you know that they have a price tag of twenty-two billion dollars during the lifetime of the legislation? And do you know that for the twelve years that he served in the Senate, I was unable to find one single instance where he's taken any action of cutting expenses: during the twelve years he's served in the Senate.

\(^60\)To my knowledge no major newspaper commented on the certified copies Congressman Roudebush said he released to the "newspaper." The lack of comment may have been due to the September-November time factor.
This argument from authority looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D I analyzed the cost of the 1 bills introduced by Hartke during the 93rd Congress... They have a price tag of twenty-two billion dollars during the lifetime of the legislation.</td>
<td>Because (W) I think he is a man who has done more to fan inflationary fires than any person who has served in the Congress of the United States from the State of Indiana.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ... for the twelve years he served in the Senate, I was unable to find one single instance where he's taken any action of cutting expenses...</td>
<td>I tied the title &quot;big spender&quot; on him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If one remembers the general conservative nature of Hoosiers and that Congressman Roudebush justly called himself a rock ribbed Republican who was fond of his "Watchdog of the Budget" award, then when the Congressman told the partisan audience that Vance Hartke was a "big spender" they were inclined to accept the charge. One need not be concerned with the sophistry of adding up the price tag of proposed legislation of the Senator, one need not be troubled by the idea that Hartke had expressed concern over the defense budget being too "fat," the slogan "big spender" was easier to focus on.

As for Roudebush's view of widespread concern about inflation: first it was not a new concern; second, Vance Hartke was fanning inflationary fires; and third President Nixon was making a determined effort to halt it. Closer to home, the question of unemployment in Indiana was also tied to Hartke. The Congressman said:
You know he (Hartke) said he wanted to talk about our foreign economy and unemployment . . . Now we're going to talk about economy in these debates . . . And oh yes, he's complained about defense costs and he's constantly attacked these expenditures, so now he talks about unemployment. Unemployment in the industry of Indiana, is largely in need of defense oriented industries. And we are reducing defense expenditures, I wonder who is responsible. Certainly, inflation is not new. During the years of 1960 to 1970, your government spent nearly sixty billion dollars more than it took in. And I'll say this, this senior Senator I hope to replace willingly took one of the primary places in this orgy of expenditures. We certainly, what I am saying my good friends is that we simply can't afford to keep Rupert Vance Hartke in the Senate another six years.

The argument is a tortuous one following as it does the big spending indictment, but by implication and Roudebush's authority the audience was provided with a new view of Hartke's behavior. We need a scheme to follow the flow of the argument.

Data--------------------------------------------------Claim
D Hartke has said he wants to debate inflation and unemployment. Because (W)
1 Anyone who complains and attacks defense expenditures ought to realize
D He has complained about defense costs and he's constantly attacked these expenditures, so now he talks about unemployment.
2 A reduction in defense spending is going to increase unemployment in defense oriented industries and thereby affect the whole economy. (Implied)
D We are reducing defense expenditures.
The chain argument continues:

Data

Unemployment exists

Because (W)
the solution to unem-
ployment in Indiana
would be more defense
 oriented industry.
(Implied)

Data

D Hartke has spoken against
1 defense expenditures;
D We reduced defense expen-
ditures;
D Unemployment resulted;
3 (claim)
1
D The unemployment which
4 exists in Indiana needs
defense industries; (claim)
2
D Inflation is the result of
5 over spending between 1960-
1970;
D Hartke willingly took one of
6 the primary places in that
orgy of expenditures.

Claim

2 Unemployment in
Indiana is large-
ly in need of
defense oriented
industry.

Claim

3 ... we simply
can't afford to
keep Rupert
Vance Hartke in
the Senate an-
other six years.

Because (W)
(supplied)
Hartke's role in
the Senate in the
past ten years
demonstrates that

This argument is one from circumstantial evidence to a hypothesis.

For a partisan the evidence may appear to confirm the hypothesis. A
partisan may not be bothered with the simplistic cause of Senator Hartke's
outspokenness about the defense budget affecting the need for defense in-
dustry in Indiana; the partisan certainly had daily reminders in the form
of Hartke political advertisements that he had supported many of the
social programs of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations; and certainly the partisan would agree that Hartke had to be replaced. But if one asked the partisan if Hartke had caused inflation, unemployment in Indiana, and the Federal Government's expenditure of sixty billion dollars in excess of revenue during 1960-1970, the answer would probably be "no." In short the hypothesis does not adequately explain the circumstantial evidence.

After a humorous explanation of the number of fairs, footlong hot dogs, steak sandwiches, horses, hogs, calves, bears, and beauty queens he had encountered during the campaign, the Congressman reaffirmed his faith in the thinking of Hoosiers:

I want to say the campaign is going very well. . . . But you know as I travel around the state of Indiana, mostly I just talk to the people. I talked to the good old Hoosier and I've listened to his complaints. I've listened to the things that have disturbed him.

Well, you know, down in my part of the state, there's more talk about corn leaf blight. . . . It's played havoc with our farm crop in southern and central Indiana. Yes, I talk about farm prices. The cost of things that farmers and businessmen must buy. About inflation and the decrease in the purchasing power of our dollar. Yes, what we are often (asked) the people are still most interested in the war in Vietnam. And these tremendous problems that our President is faced with in the case of the Middle East. Yes, there are plane hijacking, and ecology, and pollution, and drug control, crime in the streets and the disturbance on our college campuses. You know in the ten years I've been in the Congress, my good friends I have never found a better way of finding out what's bugging our people than coming back to Indiana and talking to people just as I'm doing here in Allen County tonight. And I want to say that when I become your state Senator, and I will be, I intend to continue to do just that.
This argument from examples to descriptive generalization looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D  . . . as I travel around the State mostly I just talk to the people.</td>
<td>The campaign is going well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  . . . corn leaf blight (to be of concern in southern and central Indiana.)</td>
<td>In my campaign people are telling me about their problems. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  Inflation of concern to farmers and businessmen</td>
<td>Since (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  &quot;... the people are still most interested in the war in Vietnam.&quot;</td>
<td>. . . the ten years I've been in Congress I've never found a better way of finding out what's bugging our people than coming back to Indiana and talking (to them) . . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  People are concerned about the Middle East.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D  People mention plane hijacking, ecology, pollution, drug control, crime in the streets, and disturbances on college campuses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we have seen in the previous section devoted to public opinion of problems in America, the evidence for the Congressman's claim was good. The claim flattered the audience and was properly accepted.

One of the functions of a rally speech is to encourage party workers. In the next portion of the speech, Congressman Roudebush attempted to use narration to encourage party workers and to remind them that "There are those who would substitute this great democracy . . . of ours for the proven failures of socialism; the guaranteed way of life; the government ownership, the Communist thought (that) provides
according to the needs of the individual." Consequently, each party worker was urged to work for local, state, and federal candidates until the election was over.

Richard Roudebush ran for election with the blessing of President Nixon. A minor theme in the Roudebush campaign was that "Dick Nixon needs him in Washington." Such a theme provided Senator Hartke with an argument which was used against himself in his own 1964 campaign. Hartke accused Roudebush of being a "rubber stamp." Roudebush followed the appeal for a party worker's support in his speech with a section which was designed to counter the "rubber stamp" charge. Roudebush said:

There are so many good things about America. Why do we always have to talk about the bad things? I'll say to you that I think that Dick Nixon is doing a wonderful job as President. Like Ross Adair said just a moment ago, I think that he'd do a better job, if he had the help of a friendly or at least a cooperative Congress. Let me make one thing clear. I want to say this to any Democrat who may be in the audience tonight or who may read these remarks tomorrow. Neither party, the Republican Party or the Democratic Party has any monopoly on intelligence or patriotism. The Democrats and the Republicans alike want honesty in government. They want sincerity in their representatives. They want good government. . . . Some of the greatest patriots I've ever known, some of the most dedicated public servants I know are seated on the other side of the political aisle. . . . Now I want to help President Nixon. . . . I know that the fellow that I'm running against says what's the use of sending Dick Roudebush to the Senate he will be a rubber stamp, but this is not true. But I want to assure you of one thing, while I won't be a rubber stamp, while I will analyze each piece of legislation that comes before me for a decision, and will use whatever intelligence I have to decide what is right for my country. I'll never be the blindly partisan stumbling block that Mr. Hartke has been during the twelve years he's been in the Senate.

Actually there are two arguments from example to descriptive generalization in the above. Ultimately the perception of the situation
and Congressman Roudebush's response to it would serve to validate

the claims. The arguments look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>There are so many good things about America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mr. Nixon is doing a wonderful job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Neither Party has a monopoly on intelligence or patriotism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>We all want honesty and sincerity in our representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>There are great patriots and public servants in both parties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>... that he'd (Nixon) do a better job if he had the help of a friendly or at least cooperative Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I think ...&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A partisan audience ought to accept the line of reasoning for it is based on assumptions which a Republican audience of party workers ought to agree with; politicians are not necessarily blind, unthinking people.

For the remainder of the speech, Congressman Roudebush addressed himself to specific issues which concerned most Fourth District Republicans in 1970: The war in Vietnam; campus unrest; and Hartke's stance on the two issues. On the question of the war in Vietnam, Congressman Roudebush said:

You know I could discuss many of the problems that plague our nation. That horrible little dirty war in Vietnam that has gone on for so long. Cambodia, Vietnamization, that popular new term of making it possible for South Vietnam ... to take care of her own defenses. May I say without any equivocation, without any reservation I support Dick Nixon in his foreign policy. I think that his winding down the war in Vietnam is exactly what we must do at this time. I think that his intrusion into Cambodia ... to knock out the privileged
sanctuaries was a courageous and honest act by a great President. And I think that Vietnamization is working. You know, my opponent has opposed the President on all these matters.

The breakdown of the argument is:

Data

D 1 I think Nixon's winding down the Vietnam War is what we must do.
D 2 I think that his intrusion into Cambodia... was a courageous act by an honest President.
D 3 I think that Vietnamization is working.

(Q)ualifier

Claim

1 "... without any equivocation, without any reservation, Dick Nixon in his foreign policy

The second asserted claim in the reasoning pattern is:

Data

You know Hartke's record. (Implied)

Claim

2 Because (W) My opponent opposed the President on all these matters.

Because (W) his previous stands demonstrate (implied)

The Congressman's perception of Senator Hartke's response to winding down the war via Vietnamization may have been faulty (the disagreement was on means rather than the end result), his audience responded favorably to the claim that Hartke opposed the President on all the detailed examples of Vietnam Policy.

Roudebush quickly moved to a second area where he thought Hartke was viewed as culpable by the audience: campus unrest. He said:

Let's talk about campus unrest. I have two educators here with me tonight. Perhaps they'll agree with me, perhaps they
won't. But I want you all to know that there is no stronger defender of the right to dissent than Dick Roudebush in the Congress of the United States. The right to dissent is a right guaranteed to us by our Constitution. You don't have to agree with Ross (Adair) and you don't have to agree with Dick Roudebush, Harold Zeis, or with Governor Whitcomb or anyone else. That's your right to dissent. That is your right guaranteed by law. But let me tell you this, regardless of where this act occurs on the college campus or in the streets, when you start throwing bricks at policemen, when you start burning buildings, when you start doing bodily harm, or killing people, or maiming people, you're not dissenting. You're a criminal and should be treated as such.

In the four partisan rallies where I observed the Congressman speaking, the biggest audience reaction was to his line of reasoning on campus unrest. Two state supported institutions had had widespread demonstrations of consequence during the period: Indiana University, Bloomington, and Indiana State University, Terre Haute.61 One Indiana University incident which occurred during the demonstration period resulted in a fire in a library. At Indiana State the demonstrations were such that during the Summer of 1970, State Attorney General, Theodore Sendeck, pressed legal charges against several administrators and the President of the Student Government. Hoosiers, as were many Americans, were baffled and frustrated by the lawlessness they saw on their college campuses. Roudebush's argument from definition consistently met with approval. The breakdown of the argument is:

61This is not to say that other college campuses in Indiana were unaffected by demonstrations. Most had their anti-war supporters.
An argument from definition is a semantic argument. If the audience agrees with the two distinct definitions of the terms then the conclusion would be accepted. Based upon the applause of the audience we might conclude that the audience accepted the argument.

When Roudebush turned to Hartke's stance on campus unrest and the war in Vietnam, he used three specific legislative instances to show that the Senator did not reflect the attitudes of the audience on those matters. Congressman Roudebush told his audience:

I mentioned not long ago that my opponent has been a stumbling block to the President. Let me give just two
or three quick examples. Bill Cramer ... who was just nominated by our own party to run for the Senate down in Florida actually introduced basic legislation, which made it a federal crime ... to cross a state line in order to incite a riot; cause a riot. May I say Dick Roudebush supported this legislation; Mr. Hartke voted against it. You know that there is another bill, that on numerous occasions has been put in as a rider or as an amendment on basic legislation, which would eliminate any type of Federal aid to a student, remember convicted of inciting a riot, or causing damage, or assault or battery on a campus.

... I want you to know Dick Roudebush supported those amendments. Vance Hartke voted against them. I want you to know and I know I have been criticized here in Allen County and otherwere (sic), for being a sponsor of a petition of Congress that supports our fighting men in Vietnam and opposed trade with Communists nations. I don't know of two higher purposes or objectives that any member of Congress could have. May I say that Mr. Hartke voted against the legislation that would restrict trade with Communist nations.

There are two arguments in the above and they look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Bill Cramer &quot;... introduced basic legislation which made it a Federal crime to cross a state line in order to incite a riot; cause a riot. ... Mr. Hartke voted against it.</td>
<td>My opponent has been a stumbling block to the President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because (W) Nixon wanted these two pieces of legislation (implied) and Hartke voted against it. ...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D another bill that on numerous occasions has been put in as a rider or as an amendment on basic legislation which would eliminate any type of Federal aid to a student ... convicted of inciting a riot, or causing damage, or assault and battery on a campus. ... Vance Hartke voted against them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The implied Roudebush claim is that he supported the President because he had voted for the legislation. The second argument in the above sample was used as the basis for a Roudebush television commercial which, in turn, led to a formal complaint by Senator Hartke to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee of Congress. The thirty second commercial showed an individual dressed in what appeared to be Vietcong pajamas receiving a rifle from someone. The voice-over for the ad said the guns used to maim and kill American boys result from trade with Communist Countries. Senator Hartke voted to permit trade with Communist Countries. The concluding question for the ad was: "Isn't that like putting a loaded gun in the hands of our enemies?"

Although the Executive Director of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Samuel J. Archibald, has written that Hartke received little benefit from his appeal of the ad to the committee, the ad and the line of reasoning upon which it was based were an issue in the first half of the campaign. Mr. Archibald wrote:

We (The Fair Campaign Practices Committee) set up an arbitration system in 1968. Senator Hartke asked for arbitration during the 1970 campaign. We asked Roudebush if he would agree to arbitration under the rules.

We informed him we would turn the case over to the American Arbitration Association, if he agreed, but Roudebush refused to arbitrate. Under our rules, all we could do was notify Hartke that Roudebush refused to arbitrate and was in default. Hartke could have used this as a beautiful publicity
weapon to beat Roudebush around the head and shoulders. He did have one press conference, but it was ineffectual.62

The argument that appeared in the Allen County Republican Rally speech which formed the theme of the controversial ad looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claims (implied)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want you to know I have been criticized here in Allen County for</td>
<td>C I oppose 1 communism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being a sponsor of a petition of Congress that supports our fighting</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>men in Vietnam and opposes trade with Communist nations.</td>
<td>I don't know of two 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the fighting man in Viet-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nam.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>higher purposes or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objectives that any</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>member of congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>could have.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Congressman followed the claim with a secondary claim which implied that Senator Hartke supported Communism and aided the enemy against the fighting men in Vietnam. The Congressman concluded his reasoning with:

"May I say that Mr. Hartke voted against the legislation that would restrict trade to Communist nations."

The reasoning is in the form of example to a descriptive generalization. The examples did not warrant the generalization. The whole reasoning process appeared designed to elicit an emotional response; for some, the reasoning may have done just that.

The conclusion of Roudebush's Allen County Republican Rally contained an undeveloped claim that the Democratic controlled Congress had stalled President Nixon's legislative program; an appeal to partisans

to help President Nixon by working for the election of every Republican candidate; and a humorous story of an incident during the 1964 campaign. The very last line of the speech was, perhaps, the Congressman's most effective emotional appeal in his rally speeches. After telling the audience that he had made only one campaign promise to anyone, anywhere, Roudebush said to his audience, "if you elect me your United States Senator, I say to the people of Indiana, never again will you have cause to be ashamed of your Senator."

Summary of the Analysis of Roudebush's Republican Rally Speech

Congressman Roudebush addressed a highly partisan group in Fort Wayne, Indiana on the evening of September 11, 1970. The audience which viewed the Congressman delivering his speech from manuscript were leaders and workers of a political party that had dominated politics in Northeastern Indiana for ten years. Although Roudebush commenced on the defensive by explaining the financial state of his campaign, he emphasized his conservative stance on student unrest, the economy, the war in Vietnam and attacked Senator Hartke in those areas. Two typical responses to the speech which was punctuated at twenty-eight points with laughter, applause, or other verbal responses were:

I think he sparked some enthusiasm for his campaign among what was predominately campaign workers--which I think was good;63

63Carl Syms, drug salesman in Fort Wayne as recorded by the author following the speech.
It's a type of speech that reaches a number of people. Simply from the standpoint that it seems to be an honest speech. I think that this is the main thing that seems to come across. . . . He believes in what he is saying. (When asked what the major strength of the speech was, the respondent said) Americanism—a wholesome completely dedicated Americanism.64

The month following the speech in Fort Wayne, Congressman Roudebush was reported to have answered the question, "What image do you want Indiana voters to have of you?" by saying:

So I want to be looked on as an enlightened rural resident of Indiana who loves his state very deeply, who loves his nation very deeply, who has a high sense of moral code, and one who has a great patriotic love of his nation and really, this is not at all phoney with me, it's the way I really feel.65

As we have seen in the analysis of the speech, the message presented at Fort Wayne developed Congressman Roudebush's self-perception and some in his partisan audience received the image as it was intended.

Now that we have a sample of Congressman Roudebush addressing the attitudes of a Hoosier audience, let us turn to a similar attempt by Senator Hartke before an audience in the same geographic area.

64 John Thompson, Assistant Vice-President of Hubb Airlines, Fort Wayne, as recorded by the author following the speech.

Allen County Democratic Rally

Senator Hartke's address to the Allen County Democratic Party represented the culmination of a four-day walk across the state by Democratic state candidates. Although the Senator was involved elsewhere, Mrs. Hartke, Larry Conrad, candidate for the office of Secretary of State, and J. Edward Roush joined together the day prior to the rally in a joint walk in Allen County. As Democratic County Chairman Ivan A. Lebamoff indicated the goal of the walk was to have been "a real person-to-person campaign in the finest tradition of the Democratic Party." Further Lebamoff commented, "It has become obvious that our party is not going to be able to match the tremendous outlay of money the Republicans are spending to elect a Senator and to retain control of state offices." Lebamoff concluded, "Since we cannot outspend the Republicans, we are determined to out work them."

Money was not chairman Lebamoff's only problem, he had to rebuild a political party structure which had been out of power in the area for nearly ten years. On the brighter side of the rebuilding job was the fact that the Democratic Congressional candidate, J. Edward Roush, was

66 Vance Hartke, "Speech Before the Allen County Democratic Rally," Hoagland's Hayloft, Hoagland, Indiana, October 1, 1970. For a transcript of the speech see Appendix B.

67 "Rally Set for Hartke at Hayloft," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), September 29, 1970, p. 1B. Based on reports filed by seven Republican national campaign committees in mid-October, one news item indicated that the Republicans collected $8.3 million to $3.5 million for the Democrats. See: "5 Times Demo Total; GOP Raising More Money," The Evansville Courier, October 28, 1970, p. 2A.
better known as a result of having actively campaigned in the Fourth Congressional District since his narrow defeat by Congressman E. Ross Adair, in 1968. Not only was Mr. Roush established in the district but also, he was regarded as a younger more aggressive campaigner than Congressman Adair. With an attractive local leader of the ticket, a four-day walk in which "pressing the flesh" was emphasized, and Senator Hartke encouraging local party workers, the Allen County Democratic Central Committee announced that they expected more than 1,000 people to attend the free rally at Hoagland's Hayloft on October 1, 1970.

On the evening of October 1, 1970, approximately 350 people crowded into the upper level of Hoagland's Hayloft to hear Senator Hartke speak. Most of those in the audience had been at the Hayloft for a few hours before the Senator's speech and had enjoyed the hot dogs, soda and beer which were provided for the gathering. Naturally the topic of discussion was politics.

---

68In 1968, Roush was up for re-election in a newly redistricted area. The bulk of the "new" Fourth Congressional District contained what was formerly Congressman Adair's old Fourth Congressional District. Roush lost the election by 5,400 votes. He moved his law practice to Fort Wayne and immediately started building a political base for the 1970 election.

69In 1970, Mr. Roush was a young lean looking fifty year old, whereas Congressman Adair was a stout sixty-three year old man. For a good account of the campaign in the District see: Doherty, "Adair Making Driving Stretch Run Against Roush in Fourth District," p. 6.

70"Hartke Slatas Major Talk," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), October 1, 1970, p. 1B.
The Senator was slated to speak at seven-thirty. As half past seven came and went the Senator's audience waited patiently and listened to a phonograph playing records of martial music. An hour later, Ivan Lebamoff and Congressman Roush mounted the raised speaker's stand and the program of introducing candidates, pleading for funds by asking people to "pin a dollar" on the donkey, and campaign oratory began. Although the Senator was to have begun his speech at seven-thirty, and most in the audience had seen him arrive much earlier, he did not speak until eight-thirty. About ten minutes after eight, the audience which was seated above the room where a press conference was being conducted began to clap their hands and stamp their feet. An aid of the Senator asked the audience to stop the noise for it affected the filming of the press conference. The aid assured the audience that the Senator would be there shortly.

Analysis of the Speech

When Senator Hartke finally stepped onto the stage he was introduced by candidate Roush. As he approached the lectern an incident occurred which emphasized the fact that the Senator was running behind schedule. Senator Hartke looked out over a diverse audience: it was composed of young, old but mostly middle-aged people. By my count there were ten Blacks in the audience. One could not say there was a

71 The delay was due to the late arrival of several members of the local press. A press conference had been called at the Hayloft for seven p. m. The conference was not completed until about eight-twenty, p. m.
predominance of male or female. Every seat in the place was taken and people were standing around the room. As the Senator thanked Ed Roush for his introduction one of his aides rushed to the speaker's stand and pointedly handed the Senator a black ring binder which contained his speech. The Senator tossed the binder on the floor of the speaker's stand with a loud thump. As he did so Hartke said,

There is the speech I was going to give to you. The black book. It's got the wretched record of Richard Roudebush in it.

By emphasizing the alliteration in "wretched record of Richard Roudebush," the Senator got such a laugh that the feedback seemed to encourage the thought that the audience overlooked his being late.72 The Senator said, "Oh, that's good to hear."

Hartke continued that the response was especially good to hear because he thought he would be tired; but he was not. Hartke said, "We've been in twenty-seven counties in four days and that's not bad for the beginning of this campaign."73 As a result of not having his

72I do not want to place too much emphasis on the lateness of the Senator's appearance, but the late arrival appeared to be a deliberate attempt at showmanship.

73The one point about the campaign operation of both candidates that struck me most was the view of each candidate of his involvement in the campaign. Following Hartke closely was a demanding task because he nearly maintained a schedule equal to the twenty-seven counties in four days described in this speech. On the other hand, Congressman Roudebush, perhaps because he had been injured in an air plane crash in Georgia three years earlier and did not have Hartke's stamina, was of the opinion that two or three major appearances a day were enough. I frequently heard people say during the campaign that Congressman Roudebush had commented that he was weary.
preparing text and receiving such a warm initial response, I think that the Senator was more visibly responsive to audience feedback.\textsuperscript{74} I also think that the first third of this speech is not as clearly organized as the first third of other Hartke rally speeches I recorded. After suggesting that he would have to catch up "someday" with Mrs. Hartke who had left Fort Wayne the day before, the Senator quickly noted why the speech was late in starting and that "they are going to give me some more equal time down here in one of these stations."\textsuperscript{75} At that point a young lady who handed the Senator a glass of water and was thanked when he said, "You know what Alvan Barkley used to say when they gave him water like that, he'd never touch the stuff." A measure of the effectiveness of the Senator's brief introduction to his speech was that it had been interrupted seven times with either applause and/or laughter. Hartke managed to turn a bad speaking situation into a good one.

Following the introduction Hartke succinctly stated his thesis as, "Nineteen hundred and seventy is going to be a very important year in your life, . . . for one simple reason: Nineteen seventy and this election is going to make the difference in which way America is going to turn." In the initial development of the theme, Hartke commenced with an attack of a statement of Congressman Roudebush. Hartke employed

\textsuperscript{74}My notes dated, October 1, 1970, are: "Much better without the text of a speech; good physical gestures."

\textsuperscript{75}The reference was to the Vietcong pointed gun advertisement of Roudebush.
an argument from example to descriptive generalization when he said:

I want to say one thing to you. I do not feel that it is my place as United States Senator to make a statement about the President of the United States that I find it distasteful for him visiting in Yugoslavia. That's what my opponent said about the President of the United States. He found it distasteful for the President to visit Yugoslavia. I think that he's damned lucky that he got to go! Most places Nixon tried to go in this world, he got chased out before, remember?

When the reasoning is diagrammed it looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D President Nixon went to Yugoslavia in September, 1970.</td>
<td>I think he's (Nixon) damned lucky he got to go to most places Nixon tried to go in this world, he got chased out before, remember?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roudebush said that he found it distasteful for the President to go to Yugoslavia.</td>
<td>Since I do not feel that it is my place as a United States Senator to make such a statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On September 27, 1970, President Nixon left the United States to visit in Great Britain, Yugoslavia, Italy, Spain and our peace negotiations in Paris. James Reston of the New York Times pointed out that the purposes of the visits were twofold: 1) to dominate newspaper headlines thus enhance Republican campaign efforts; and 2) to try to strengthen the Israeli-Arab peace talks by urging the maintenance of the Middle-East cease-fire. Since Marshall Tito of Yugoslavia was

---

76 James Reston, "On Campaign Trail," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), September 17, 1970, p. 4A.
viewed as President Nasser's most influential friend in Europe, the President was reported to be seeking Tito's intervention with Nasser.

Congressman Roudebush did make the statement which the Senator attributed to him. By raising the point Hartke emphasized for the audience the Congressman's conservatism and, in addition, introduced President Nixon as an integral part of the campaign. The audience appreciated the claim and responded to it with laughter. Hartke followed the argument with a rambling narration in which he observed that President Eisenhower was prevented from going to Japan in nineteen fifty-eight, and that a young man in his party emphasized Hartke's age by referring to Eisenhower's administration as having occurred during his childhood. The latter idea was used as a transition to the claim: "I want you to know that I'm a United States Senator, United States Senator from the State of Indiana. There are over five million people in this state and I want to represent every one of them. . . ."

In the development of the claim that he represented all the people of the State of Indiana, Hartke employed a chain of reasoning in which he emphatically said that he was not ashamed of his association with young people, Negroes, organized labor, businessmen and farmers and that he wanted all of them to work on his campaign. Had any other politician made such an appeal it would have been considered as standard campaign fare, but when Hartke emphatically embraced young people, Negroes, organized labor, businessmen and farmers only the latter group was non-controversial for him.
We have already seen that many Hoosiers were greatly disturbed by campus demonstrations. Hartke had addressed campus anti-war rallies; he had been an active participant in the November 1969 anti-war rallies. Hartke could not turn his back on young people, he had to embrace them no matter how controversial that act may have been in Indiana.

Although there were few Negroes in his immediate audience and despite the fact there had been little dramatic repercussion from the violence of the mid-sixties in Northeastern Indiana, many Hoosiers sincerely felt that Negroes had gained too much too rapidly. Across the State of Indiana, the black populations in Indianapolis, Gary, and Fort Wayne had always supported Hartke and the Democratic Party. The Senator had to continue to seek that support.

Organized labor in Indiana had always supported Vance Hartke because he championed their causes. At the beginning of the campaign many Democratic candidates were warned by "Mr. Labor," AFL-CIO President, George Meany, that the Democratic Party was in trouble with labor. As a candidate Senator Hartke managed to stay in grace with organized labor. As Max McCarthy has demonstrated, a study of financial records shows that organized labor contributed $95,600 to Hartke's 1970 campaign effort.\(^7\) Even if organized labor did ultimately contribute money and men to Hartke's campaign, he had to work for that support because he had taken positions in the past which George Meany had attributed as the basis for the disintegration of the Democratic Party. On August 30,

\(^7\)McCarthy, *Elections for Sale*, p. 31.
1970, Meany told six labor reporters in an hour and forty minute inter-
view that the Democratic Party "almost has got to be the party of
extremists," and that the support of young anti-war demonstrators by
liberal Democrats contributed to that condition. Further the labor
leader added that labor as a force would be inclined to support indivi-
duals rather than a party in the future. From the point of view of
past performance on the issue of anti-war activity, the Senator could
have been in trouble with labor in early October, 1970. The Senator
sought to reaffirm his labor ties in this speech.

Two incidents occurred during the summer of 1970 which the
Republican Party partisans advanced as evidence of the point that the
Senator used his office to advantage in dealing with business interests.
Both incidents were frequently referred to in newspapers, political
advertising, and political conversations. Both actions were subjects
of political cartoons around the state. For example, one political
cartoon which appeared on the front page of the *Indianapolis Star* on
August 26, 1970 showed a characterization of a sweating Hartke (the
figure was labeled HARTKE on its shoulder) looking out of a large window
at a tow truck hauling away an automobile labeled as "Leased cars at
cutrate prices." Behind the car and truck was the dome of the capital
building. Slipping from Hartke's hands were sheets of papers with

---


79Ibid., p. 55.

80The *Star* has the largest newspaper readership in the state.
dollar signs and the words "Spiegel Mail Order." On the floor was another sheet with the words "Hartke Vote for Air Ticket Tax Secrecy."

The three items referred to incidents which were viewed as damaging. The tow truck representation called attention to an event in early August 1970. On August 10, the United Press International ran a story in which fourteen Senators and sixteen Representatives were reported to be taking advantage of the special offer of Ford Motor Company and Chrysler Corporation to lease top-line Lincoln Continentals and Chrysler Imperials for a rental fee between $750 to $950 a year. Both Senator Hartke and Senator Bayh of Indiana were on the list. As a political issue in the Hartke-Roudebush case, Republicans in Indiana quickly pointed to a potential Hartke conflict of interest because the Senator was a member of the Senate Commerce Committee. Republicans quickly pointed out that the Commerce Committee had as part of its duty writing laws governing automobile safety, air pollution and trade. Both of Indiana's Senators quickly gave up their leasing privileges and announced that the practice had been engaged by many members of Congress over a long period of time.81

The cartoon reference to "Spiegel Mail Order," reflected the fact that Hartke had accepted a thirty thousand dollar campaign contribution from the Spiegel Mail Order Company in Chicago shortly before

the car leasing episode. The final item in the cartoon appeared to have been added for the sake of spicing up the implied claim.

Each of the depicted items in the cartoon were factual in nature and considered an embarrassment for the Senator. Hartke had expressed very early in his career the idea that office holders never really make money out of politics but the people who enjoy the fringe benefits of doing business with the government do make money. The reporter to whom the comment was made wrote in a subsequent article:

In setting up his operations as mayor (of Evansville, Indiana), Hartke showed he remembered well the lessons he learned as far back as November, 1951—that the people who make money out of politics are the contractors, suppliers and insurance men who deal with office holders.

On the list of those who contributed to Hartke's campaign for Senator (in 1958), and those who bought several tickets to the Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner are most of the men who have benefited from their business associations with the city. Somehow they have been persuaded to share their gains with the political organization which made those gains possible.

In a state where political patronage employees "contribute" two per cent of their wages as a matter of course to the party which provided their jobs, the appearance of one or two of the embarrassing items would not have had much affect on the Senator's campaign. But when several items tended to converge during the political campaign, the

---


83 Flynn, "The Hartke Story," November 12, 1958, p. 3A. On the whole Flynn's five part series is balanced and critical. The section presented above is not cynical or anti-Hartke when read in context. It is more in the nature of good factual reporting.
Senator could have ignored each, denied each, or strongly proclaimed his affiliation with the affected group. The Senator chose the latter course of action and as a result those issues were meaningful primarily to the supporters of Congressman Roudebush. Thus employing the argument that he represented all of the people of Indiana, the Senator managed to reaffirm ties with previously tried groups.

The Senator continued his speech in such a way as to assume the political offensive; he developed a common Democratic Party argument on the state of the economy when he said:

Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight, we came to this country and we said that it was high time to end the high cost of living and to end the unemployment. I'll be doggoned, twelve years later we got another Republican President and here we are back again trying to cure the ills of the Republicans once more. You know a fellow told me the other day, he said you have to have a Republican elected Governor of the State of Indiana and President of the United States every once in awhile just to appreciate how good it was under the Democrats. I said I might agree with that statement but I don't think we have to do it quite so often.

The audience responded to the argument with laughter and applause. The argument from example to generalization developed a frequently heard myth that the election of Republicans to office brings with it economic recession. In this particular case the argument looks like this:
Data

D 1958 we came to this country and said it was time to end the high cost of living and high unemployment.

D 1958 we had a Republican President and a Republican Governor (Implied).

D We now have a high cost of living and high unemployment. (Implied).

D Twelve years later we have another Republican President and here we are again trying to cure the ills of the Republicans once more.

Claim

A fellow told me the other day that every now and then we need Republican control every once in awhile in order to appreciate Democrats.

Because (W) Republican control of government brings Republican ills (Implied).

The myth developed in the form of a description based upon examples. This partisan audience was not concerned that the high cost of living and higher unemployment was an integral part of the effort to disengage from domestic and foreign policies which originated with the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, they responded to the Senator's argument with agreement.

While he was on the topic of Republicans, Hartke advanced his speech with an allusion to the bitter Republican Party fight which led to Congressman Roudebush's selection as Republican Senatorial Candidate; and a positive endorsement of J. Edward Roush's record as an ex-congressman. The reference to the bitter Republican Party struggle which resulted from the nomination of Richard Roudebush was one that many of the Democrats at the rally relished. Most people in the audience were aware of the struggle for it had been reported in newspapers around the state since late Spring. The episode commenced when Republican
Party Treasurer, John K. Snyder obtained the support of Governor Edgar Whitcomb, and State Party Chairman Buena Channey in an effort to be the Party's candidate for the Senate race. The "Snyder for Senator" forces were quickly squelched when National G. O. P. Committeeman, L. Keith Bulen and representatives from the White House backed Congressman Roudebush. John Snyder withdrew from the race when he was offered the opportunity for an appointment for the Federal Trade Commission. Roudebush went on to win the nomination at the Republican Convention in June.

In the meantime in a move which appeared to be an attempt to strengthen his influence in the Party, Governor Whitcomb advanced his own candidate for State Party Chairman in opposition for former ally Buena Chaney. Chaney managed to defeat the challenge, but the struggle for leadership was felt throughout the Republican Party in the state.\(^{84}\)

Although Hartke only referred to the problems of the Republican Party in this section of the speech, he directly stated positive features of Congressman Roush's prior record when he said:

But Ed Roush, I was in Logansport, day before yesterday, and you know as well as I do, that you were there and I was there during the flood of Logansport when we saw them putting the sandbags on the river trying to keep the water from coming into the business places of downtown and into the homes in the city. But that's been all over now. No more floods, because there were three reservoirs that the two of us were

able to work together with a Democratic President to bring on that Wabash River: the Huntington Reservoir, the Missisinewa Reservoir, and the Salamoni Reservoir. Of course I want you to know that we have been accused of big spending because we invested in the idea that floods need not be.

For young people, let me say to you that we invested in the young people. And I think it's a tremendous investment. We say that this country had been built on the idea that it has a free elementary and secondary educational system. And yet my opponent had the gall to vote against the effort to try and make sure that that educational system is continued.

The endorsement of Ed Roush served several purposes: 1) it provided information about tangible projects for which Roush and Hartke could claim credit; 2) it provided information about Roush's previous accomplishments which audience members may not have known; and 3) it provided Hartke with an opportunity to defend himself against the "big spender" label and attack the record of Roudebush. The argument is from examples to descriptive generalization and it appears thusly:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D A Democratic President,</td>
<td>.. . we invested in the ideas that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hartke and Roush worked for three reservoirs to prevent flooding of</td>
<td>1) floods need not be, and 2) elementary and secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Wabash River.</td>
<td>needed funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D We invested in young people by supporting elementary and secondary</td>
<td>Democrats, Hartke and Roush view such spending as an investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education.</td>
<td>(Implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Of course I want you to know we have been accused of big spending...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the partisans in the audience were not inclined to dispute that Roush and Hartke had been part of the effort to get flood control in the Wabash River basin, nor would they be upset with the two for "investing" in education. As far as Congressman Roudebush's vote on educational appropriation was concerned, most in the audience would not doubt that he had voted against such an expenditure. The whole reasoning pattern functioned as a transition to a point which Hartke emphasized often during the months of June, July, August, September and up to mid-October: Congressman Roudebush was a member of TRAIN and TRAIN was a part of the John Birch Society. The Senator said:

We say that this country is built on the idea that there shall be no society which is going to control us with ideas which are radical or extreme. And yet my opponent went on the television night before last, in Louisville, Kentucky, and finally admitted, after he constantly denied it for days and days and days, he finally admitted not only that he was a member of TRAIN, but he finally admitted that TRAIN is a part of the John Birch Society. . . . When asked if he endorsed the philosophy of the John Birch Society . . . he hummed and he hawed. (And I'm repeating now what they told me he said down there.) He, he finally said, "Well, let me just say that I'm not in favor of any extremists groups." I'm going to tell you here and now that my opponent is a member of TRAIN which is an ad hoc committee of the John Birch Society. I'm going to tell you here and now that he delivered Robert Welch's book called, The Politician under his name to the Indiana State Library at Terre Haute. That book is the handbook of the John Birch Society. He gave it to them in nineteen hundred and sixty-four. I'm going to tell you here and now that it was Thurston Morton, the Republican National Chairman, who made the damnable indictment of the John Birch Society, when he said, "There are three organizations that I fear: The Communist Party, the Klu Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society." And then Thurston Morton made this statement, he said, "I resent the fact that the John Birch Society is attempting to use my party, the Republican Party as its instrument to try and gain control of this country."
The argument looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D My opponent admitted on television in Louisville Kentucky, that he was a member of TRAIN and that TRAIN is a part of the John Birch Society.</td>
<td>I'm going to tell you here and now that my opponent is a member of TRAIN which is an ad hoc committee of the John Birch Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D When he was asked if he endorsed the philosophy of the John Birth Society, he said (and I'm repeating hearsay here) &quot;Well, let me just say that I'm not in favor of any extremist group.&quot;</td>
<td>Because (W) We have these admissions from Roudebush I say . . . Since (B) I'm going to tell you that in 1964 he delivered Robert Welch's book, The Politician under his name to the Indiana State Library at Terre Haute. The book is the handbook of the John Birch Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B I'm going to tell you that it was Thurston Morton, the Republican National Chairman who said: &quot;There are three organizations that I fear: The Communist Party, the Klu Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society.&quot; . . . &quot;I resent the fact that the John Birch Society is attempting to use my party, the Republican Party as its instrument to try and gain control of this country.&quot;</td>
<td>Implied) B I'm going to tell you 2 that it was Thurston Morton, the Republican National Chairman who said: &quot;There are three organizations that I fear: The Communist Party, the Klu Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society.&quot; . . . &quot;I resent the fact that the John Birch Society is attempting to use my party, the Republican Party as its instrument to try and gain control of this country.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a state with as marked a conservative bent as we have seen Indiana to have, one might question the efficacy of so detailed an attack as that which was made by Hartke. No one in the audience would have doubted the truthfulness of Hartke's examples. Indeed Roudebush's name did appear as a sponsor on the stationary of the Committee to Restore American Independence Now. The TRAIN committee had petitioned and organized letter writing campaigns to Congress urging that all aid and trade with Communist nations cease. The Committee may have been a front organization of the John Birth Society but Roudebush flatly denied that he was a member of the Society. When asked about the charge, Roudebush said, "I am not now and never have been a member of the John Birch Society and Senator Hartke knows it."85

Hartke had taken pains to imply that Roudebush's philosophy embraced the John Birch Society, but he never directly claimed that the Congressman was a "Birchite." Everyone knew the Congressman was a conservative but few, it would seem, bought the Birchite implication. Shortly after the Fort Wayne speech, the Senator dropped the argument from his speeches. The argument from examples to descriptive generalization was developed effectively but it attacked a straw-man issue.

To press the point of Roudebush's general undesirableness as a candidate, Hartke again reminded his audience that 1970 was a very important year because the country's future was to be decided and that Richard Roudebush represented a negative philosophy. Hartke said:

Now folks, I said that nineteen hundred and seventy is a very important year to you, because the course of this country's future destiny is going to be decided in this election. . . . But if there is a voice which is heard throughout this country, which gives any kind of support to a negative philosophy, . . . which says that Medicare is a thing which is not really for people, which says that rat control is really not for people, which says that the National Lakeshore Park is not for people, which says that conservation generally, is not for people, which says that elementary and secondary education's support from the federal government is not for the people, which says that higher educational support from the federal government is not for the people; it's that philosophy, which is the negative philosophy of my opponent. He has said "No," "No," "No," to every single piece of progressive legislation that's been submitted to the Congress in ten years. This man has a negative philosophy of government. He was fifty years behind the time when he was elected in nineteen hundred and fifty (sic), and he's never moved a step forward since. This man says no to you. He says no to young people. He says no to anybody who wants a job. He said at Lafayette, Indiana, a week ago last Sunday that five and a half per cent unemployment is satisfactory. I say that's sheer nonsense.

The "negative philosophy" section of Hartke's rally speeches always received an overt response—especially when he later added the lines to the speech: "He is a 'no man.' He indeed is an 'abominable no man.'" The line of reasoning used to develop the claim was one from criteria to verbal classification. Hartke used a number of examples to provide backing for the warrant to the claim. When the argument is laid out it looks like this:

86I first detected the change of emphasis in my recording of a rally speech on October 6, 1970, at a Democratic Fish Fry in Huntington, Indiana. Of course the "abominable no man" sobriquet had been heard before in Indiana. In fact Congressman Donald Bruce of Indianapolis took pride in being called the "abominable no man." See Leibowitz, My Indiana, p. 101.
D Roudebush voted "no" on Medicare; rat control; National Lakeshore Park; conservation generally; and support for elementary and secondary education. Because (W) Roudebush's voting record indicates his philosophy

Since He has said "No," "No," "No," to every single piece of progressive legislation that's been submitted to the Congress in ten years.

B He said at Lafayette, Indiana, a week ago last Sunday that five and a half per cent unemployment is satisfactory.

If there is a voice which is heard throughout this country, which gives any kind of support to a negative philosophy

(Claim) it's that philosophy which is a negative philosophy of my opponent.

Considering that the Congressman took pride in being the watch dog of the Congress on financial matters, the audience would not doubt that he had voted against the measures the Senator said he voted against. Implicit in the list of "no" votes is a description of a negative philosophy toward programs which appear to be designed to help people. Indeed Congressman Roudebush had appeared with Hartke in Lafayette and had in parrot-like fashion espoused the Nixon Administration's view that five and a half per cent unemployment was acceptable while the economy was "cooling" and we were disengaging from Vietnam.\(^7\) Roudebush's comment

had been widely reported and the partisan audience probably agreed with Hartke's conclusion.

Senator Hartke continued his offensive by using a narration of the specific idealist social programs of the John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson Administrations as "god-terms" toward which he would urge voters to turn. Such programs as Partners in Progress for South America, the Peace Corps, and the man on the moon space project were used by the Senator to illustrate both the spirit of the Kennedy-Johnson Administrations and Hartke's and Ed Roush's involvement with them.

Senator Hartke used his narration of the "spirit" of the Kennedy-Johnson years as an era to which the country ought to return by solving the problem of racial unrest, the problem of the War in Vietnam, and the problem of campus unrest.

On the question of race relations, Hartke said:

The question of the races which we thought we settled one hundred years ago in a great Civil War has now reared its ugly head in an entirely different form and new form and it has to be settled. And let me remind you of one thing and I say to you from the depth of my heart, and I would tell you this whether I was running for election or not:

---

88Makay and Brown note that "god-terms" are useful to a speaker because they produce "a specific series of anchorages" which probably shape and influence the reception of the message by the audience. Certainly a partisan Democrat in 1970 responded to the allusion to the "spirit" of the Kennedy Administration. See: Makay and Brown, The Rhetorical Dialogue, pp. 136-142. In his provocative essay "Ultimate Terms in Contemporary Rhetoric," Richard M. Weaver discussed "charismatic terms," which it seems to me might also serve to account for the potency of the Hartke reference. See: Richard M. Weaver, "Ultimate Terms in Contemporary Rhetoric," Language is Sermonic, ed. by Richard L. Johannessen, Rennard Strickland, and Ralph T. Eubanks (Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1970), pp. 105-111.
this is a noble experiment in America of whether we can take a society and put together the races and live in harmony. And I tell you, especially those of you who are younger, that if this experiment fails in in America, then chances of it being successful in the rest of the world are very, very minimal. And let me remind each and every one of us who are white here tonight that we are a minority in the world. . . . But I'm saying that if this experiment fails in America, then we can look forward to racial wars throughout the world in a terror which is not within the distinct understanding to man.

The argument employs reasoning from cause to effect. It looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>(Q)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>The racial question has raised its ugly head and has to be solved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Since (W) Hartke says so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>If the problem is not solved here in America it's unlikely to be solved anywhere else in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Claim) then we can look forward to racial wars throughout the world in a terror which is not within the distinct understanding to man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Whites are a small minority of races in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From a strict application of the tests of reasoning from cause to effect the Senator's argument was a sound one. Continued racism by the minority whites of the world would probably be a true cause of future racial wars. The population of Northeastern Indiana features so few racial minorities that it had been spared the holocaust which had been visited upon many areas of the United States in the mid-1960's. But many in the audience had viewed the disturbances on television and had thereby had selected exposures to the racial disturbances of the period. The major reason for the rejection of the argument was suggested by the
Senator himself; the audience may have found the claim inconceivable.

The second problem which Hartke discussed in the section was the Vietnam War. Many political analysts viewed Hartke as extremely vulnerable in the election because he had taken an outspoken position on the war. Hartke confronted the issue squarely when he said:

Not everyone in this room has always agreed with Vance Hartke. I'll say probably a lot of you. There may be times when there's been a great majority, and maybe a few do yet today. I'm personally proud of my independence. I'm proud of my record. I come to you completely proud of that. I'm going to talk about the war just a moment. I want to tell you quite honestly, that fifty thousand of America's finest young people died in that war. When I first raised the questions as to where we were going, less than three hundred had died. And now my deepest fears have been confirmed and I'm not happy about it. So I come to you with a clear conscience. That's an important thing to Vance Hartke. And I'm interested in President Nixon doing what he said he was going to do to end the war. And I'll tell you, I'm not the one who is going to chide him if he settles the war. Even if he settles it on October 25th, 1970, just in time to try and win the election. That's alright with me, you'll find Vance Hartke right by his side if he gets a stand-still, cease-fire. Because I am an American first.

Hartke developed three chain arguments in which he suggested examples of his past behavior and asserted claims based upon those behaviors which explained his view of the war. The chain of reasoning follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>There may have been times when a great majority disagreed with me on the War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not everyone in this room has always agreed with Vance Hartke. I'll say probably a lot of you have not agreed with me. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because (W)
D Hartke has been outspoken on the war.

D I'm personally proud of my independent record on the War.

D When I first raised questions as to where we were going, less than three hundred had died.

D And now my deepest fears have been confirmed.

D I come to you with a clear conscience on that I was frustrated as I think most.

D Americans were by the war so I spoke out against it.

D Hartke's outspoken on the war. (claim)

D I'm interested in President Nixon doing what he said he was going to do to end the war.

And I'll tell you, I'm not one to chide him if he settles the war.

Reservation Even if he settles it on October 25th, 1970, just in time to try to win the election. . . . You'll find Vance Hartke right by his side if he gets a stand-still, cease-fire.

This argument was probably one of the more effective arguments the Senator used with partisan audiences. The argument allowed the Senator to demonstrate that he was an independent man; to suggest that time had demonstrated him to have been correct in his initial assessment of our involvement in Vietnam; and to assert his patriotism by

At the beginning of the 1970 Senatorial Campaign the Indianapolis Star reported that 1,268 Hoosiers had been killed in the War in South-eastern Asia. "Indiana Viet Death Toll Hits 1,268," Indianapolis Star, June 22, 1970, p. 16.
standing with the President if he should manage to end the war. Probably everyone in the partisan audience knew about Hartke's position and many in the audience wanted to see our troops home more quickly.90

On October 7, 1970, President Nixon addressed the nation on the subject of "a major new initiative for peace."91 The new initiative took the form of a five point plan which called for: 1) a cease-fire in place in Southeastern Asia; 2) an international conference to discuss peace in all of Southeastern Asia with Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos as the principal concern; 3) a negotiated time table for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam; 4) a joint effort to establish a political settlement in Vietnam satisfactory to all concerned; and 5) the immediate and unconditional release of all prisoners of war held by both sides. Many of the political signs had pointed to the President's announcement so few politicians were surprised by it. In fact Hartke had anticipated the action three days prior to the President's speech.92 Immediately following the announcement political candidates announced their support of the plan. Senator Hartke was reported to have said: "Without seeking to be self-serving, I can truthfully say he has offered a series of proposals for peace which I have prayed for


and worked toward for almost five years."93 The same newspaper article reported that "Rep. Richard Roudebush . . . called the proposal courageous and vowed not to make it a campaign issue." On the next day, Congressman Roudebush apparently had indicated that the plan was a campaign issue. Roudebush said:

I am pleased that my opponent immediately endorsed the President's plan, but it certainly takes an exercise in mental gymnastics to see any close similarity between the President's plan and those made by men who have repeatedly attempted to tie his hands in the matter of foreign policy.94

The Congressman continued by pointing out that Hartke had supported the Hatfield-McGovern amendment which set specific deadlines for total withdrawal of American troops from Southeastern Asia; Hartke had supported the Cooper-Church amendment which placed deadlines on the United States-South Vietnamese incursion into Cambodia; and Hartke had repeatedly attacked the corruptness of the governments of Cambodia and South Vietnam. In each instance the previous position of Senator Hartke would work directly against the Nixon proposal. No matter what the motivation for or immediate result of the peace proposal, when Senator Hartke developed his defense of his actions in relation to Vietnam as he did in this speech, partisan audiences at least understood the Senator to be a man of conscience on the question.


94"Hartke's 'Mental Gymnastics' Hit," Indianapolis Star, October 9, 1970, p. 16.
Upon the completion of his argument in defense of his Vietnam stance, Hartke turned to a consideration of another area which presumably gave him difficulty. Using the abrupt transition of "You talk about the campus unrest," the Senator said:

. . . the Democrats didn't cause the campus unrest and the Republicans didn't cause the campus unrest, it's there. And so President Nixon after the tragedy which happened on Kent State—when I visited the campuses of this state at the request of the President and spoke against violence—when very few people could go onto a campus—I don't mind telling you, at some personal danger to myself, I might tell you. I appeared on the campuses here and I said to those individuals, that we cannot condone violence, that we cannot condone criminal action, that violence must be treated as absolutely in non-conformity with social justice. That crime must be treated as a crime. And if you commit a crime you must pay the penalty. And I said that violence was counter-productive. And I said then to those people who thought that there was no answer, that the best they could hope to get with violence was to go to jail and that the worst they could hope to get was to go to the coffin. That was the voice of Vance Hartke then. Speaking for peace on our campuses, speaking for peace in the world, speaking for peace in our streets, speaking for the peace for the brotherhood of man. And if I'm going to be condemned for anything, I don't mind being condemned for being in love with my brother, all mankind.

The reasoning met with the approval of the audience. Hartke related to them his interpretation of the events which followed the Kent State affair. The argument from examples to descriptive generalization takes this form in the layout:
Democrats didn't cause campus unrest and Republicans didn't cause campus unrest; it's there.

After Kent State, President Nixon asked me to visit the campus of Indiana.

I told students that we cannot condone violence or criminal action; "that violence must be treated as any other violence is treated as absolutely in non-conformity with social justice."

Hartke's record had revealed him speaking out for peace. For those who may have questioned the sincerity of the warrant of the claim, perhaps illumination can be found in the idea that Hartke had come from the small coal mining town of Standal, Indiana, and was raised in a close-knit Lutheran household. Robert Flynn has pointed to those two facts and has concluded:

Hartke has been accused of being insincere because his acts of thoughtfulness sometimes seem to have a wholesale appearance. To Hartke himself, however, he is sincere.95

In addition, the examples which were cited by the Senator, with the exception of his having been asked by President Nixon to speak on college campuses, were a matter of record. The Senator's claim eloquently stated his conviction.

95Flynn, "The Hartke Story," November 11, 1958, p. 3.
But Hartke's actions following Kent State were only part of the scene which followed that tragedy. The Senator assessed the behavior of President Nixon and in so doing led into a partisan call to the party workers to work for the election of all Democratic candidates. The Senator said:

So then the President decided that he had to listen and I say that he does listen. (I remind you again let's have that voice of ours heard so that he can hear it on November 3rd with that tremendous victory.) Because he did listen after Cambodia. He went to the American Bar Association, he asked them: "What'll I do"? For which I commend him. The American Bar Association said that he should have an independent commission free from all political domination, investigate the cause of campus unrest.

President Nixon appointed that Commission himself. . . . And he named a Republican by the name of William Scranton, former Governor of Pennsylvania, his envoy to the Middle East, as the chairman on campus unrest. That commission reported. What did that commission report? The most remarkable report in the history of the United States of America. Because this is what I spoke about earlier when I said that 1970 is the challenge date. It said that President Nixon failed the country to provide that moral leadership necessary to end the violence on the campuses of the United States of America.

Now the challenge is up to him. Will he accept this, this criticism of his own commission, and treat it as he should, as constructive criticism, asking the President of the United States to assume the position of leadership which a President should and is obligated to do. . . . So I say to you tonight if you want to have a better country, if you want peace overseas and want the war in Vietnam ended like I do, if you want peace here at home on the streets, on the campuses, if you want crime really dealt with, if you want to deal with the problems of cancer, heart disease, and research which he (Nixon) vetoed, if you want the veterans to have their money in the hospital, which was the Vance Hartke amendment, if you want to have a better and brighter America, then you put the message to him now. And that message must be from here on in to elect Democrats in such overwhelming numbers, in such overwhelming numbers, that he'll understand that in the next two years of his
Presidency he has to start being the President of all the people of these United States of America.

There are three arguments from example to descriptive generalization which led to the call for action discussion of campus unrest. Those arguments look like this:

Data

So then (after the campus violence at Kent State) the President decided he had to listen

Because (W)
I say he does listen

Since (B)
He went to the American Bar Association for advice. They told him to establish an independent commission.

Data

President appointed commission
William Scranton headed it.

The Commission reported that President Nixon failed that moral leadership that was necessary to end violence on the campuses of America.

Data

The President does listen (claim₁)

Because the Commission told the President that he failed in moral leadership on our campuses. (claim₂)

Because (W)
Only by a large Democratic victory will President Nixon understand.

Claim₁

He sought advice on handling campus violence (Implied)

Claim₂

(The report was) the most remarkable report in the history of the United States of America.

Claim₃

... in the next two years of his Presidency he has to start being the President of all the people of these United States.
As far as the audience was concerned, Hartke could have concluded his speech with the climatic claim which they all applauded. The Senator did not end on that note, however; he went on to express his optimism in an America about which he credited Winston Churchill with saying "... it is a remarkable nation." Hartke reminded the audience that the most significant contribution that they could make in nineteen seventy would be to demonstrate America's generosity "by establishing a society which is the envy of the world."

After urging his audience to be proud to be a Democrat because "Democrats have always tried to be on the right side," Hartke concluded with a final appeal in which he said:

So I'm asking you tonight, in this meeting in October, to give us thirty days--thirty days of the most inspirational Democratic spirit that Ivan Lebamoff can summon from you.

Summary of the Analysis of Hartke's Democratic Rally Speech

We have seen Senator Hartke in an effort where a potentially harmful speaking situation was turned into a desirable one. In playing on variations of the theme that "nineteen hundred and seventy is going to be a very important year in your life . . . for one simple reason: . . . this election is going to make the difference in which way America is going to turn," the Senator managed to attack both the record of his opponent and the performance of the Nixon Administration while he defended his own record.

In attacking Congressman Roudebush's Congressional record, the Senator provided the audience with specific arguments which demonstrated
the Congressman's conservatism: "He is a 'No' man."

In defense of his past behavior on the questions of the Vietnam War and campus unrest, the Senator managed to project an image of being correct and sincere in his stance on the war and being on the side of law and order where domestic disturbances were concerned. A man who was a lawyer and a United States Senator had little choice but to be on the side of law and order.

Finally, the Senator managed to use The Report of the President's Commission on Campus Unrest to indict President Nixon on the charge of failing to assume the moral leadership of the nation and to exhort the partisan audience to elect Democrats in such overwhelming numbers that he would have to assume that leadership.

The speech was interrupted twenty-two times with either applause or laughter. Although the Senator provided the partisan audience with specific arguments to be used in their own discussions during the campaign, he managed to address, not only "mere partisan" issues, but also larger philosophical questions which confronted the nation. In this address Vance Hartke probably typified Teddy Roosevelt's description of an opinion leader in a democracy as one who "should be able to state his views clearly and convincingly."

Conclusions About the Efforts of Congressman Roudebush and Senator Hartke Before Partisan Audiences

As we have seen both Congressman Roudebush and Senator Hartke addressed themselves to the issues which plagued Americans in 1970:
Vietnam, campus unrest, inflation, and unemployment. On the issue of Vietnam, Congressman Roudebush emphasized his conservative brand of patriotism by arguing that he wholeheartedly supported President Nixon's efforts to resolve the problem and by implying that Senator Hartke aided the enemy in that conflict by voting for legislation which encouraged trade with Communist countries. Senator Hartke countered that approach by presenting arguments which emphasized his own liberal brand of patriotism which stood for support of President Nixon if he should manage a stand-still cease fire. Further, the Senator argued for a higher loyalty—a loyalty to peace at home and abroad. If our earlier observation of that aspect of Hoosier conservatism which views loyalty flowing from home to family to state to nation is true, perhaps Hartke's higher loyalty of peace was too abstract for many Hoosiers. Further, for many Hoosiers the fact that Hartke had had close affiliation with campus unrest related to the war was a concrete factor in their acceptance of the "higher loyalty" arguments of the Senator.

When both candidates discussed the questions of campus unrest with their partisan audiences both said the same thing: lawlessness cannot be tolerated. Congressman Roudebush developed his position in the strong climactic statement: "But let me tell you this, regardless of where this act occurs on the college campus or in the streets, when you start throwing bricks at policemen, when you start burning buildings, when you start doing bodily harm, or killing people or maiming people, you're not dissenting. You're a criminal and should be treated as such."

The Congressman's audience loudly applauded the statement because they
knew the value of planning, slow growth and hard work which lead to success and property ownership. The two recent groups in the memory of the audience which might have been viewed as "special" because they appeared to benefit from the very system their actions tended to destroy had been the visible participants in violent dissent. The young on college campuses and the minorities which President Johnson's "Great Society" had given "things," had been seen in the streets maiming, burning, killing and looting. The strong statement of Congressman Roudebush represented the right thing to do.

On the other hand, when Senator Hartke placed his similar statement in the overall context which called upon the people to elect Democrats in order to demonstrate to the President that he had to become the President of all the people, the effect was not so strong as was the effect of Congressman Roudebush's claim. In order to evaluate Hartke's claim that violence on the street was counterproductive and could not be tolerated, one had to find out if indeed the Senator did appear on college campuses as a peacemaker. Hartke said he came as a peacemaker. Peace making often is conciliatory rather than dogmatic and as a result it is frequently viewed as a passive rather than active role. In short, in the partisan addresses studied in this chapter, the passive-appearing Hartke was probably weaker than the active-appearing Roudebush on the issue of campus unrest.

When both men discussed the twin questions of inflation and unemployment neither said anything which would have indicated a major advantage to himself on the issue. Senator Hartke told his partisan
audience that unemployment was too high, but in this particular speech he offered little to correct the problem other than the idea of electing Democrats to office. Even though unemployment and inflation were both out of control, on the concrete level of materialism the vast majority of those people both men addressed probably did not feel the effects of either.

Congressmen Roudebush's solution to the unemployment problem in Indiana as revealed in his speech was an interesting one for a Conservative Republican. The Congressman said that unemployment in Indiana was in need of defense oriented industry. When carried to its completion of reasoning, it would ultimately lead to more federal spending. The Congressman's position was ironic.

When the Congressman said that five and one half per cent unemployment was acceptable to him, he probably came close to expressing a more accurate statement of Hoosier prejudice. In the overheated economy which featured both inflation and high unemployment most Hoosiers were working and living well. In the Fort Wayne area unemployment had not reached the national level and jobs were available. The conditioned Hoosier view was that those who wanted a job could find a job. I suspect that few in his Fort Wayne audience would have challenged the Congressman on his view of the economy.

Congressman Roudebush had as his goal in the campaign an image which showed a rural Hoosier with a moral code who loved his state and his country. Senator Hartke, if we judge by his Fort Wayne speech, had as his goal an image of a responsible Senator who represented all the
people of the State of Indiana in the cause of peace. In the rally
speeches studied here both men relied heavily on reasoning from examples
to descriptive generalizations to explain their individual view of a
given issue. I would judge that Congressman Roudebush came closer to
accomplishing his concrete goal than did Senator Hartke in accomplishing
his more abstract one.

Partisan audiences are committed to the speaker. Although most
audiences which a candidate confronts during a campaign are partisan,
there are occasions when a candidate has to address non-partisan
audiences. In the next chapter we will consider the speeches of Senator
Hartke and Congressman Roudebush before the same non-partisan service
club: The Fort Wayne Rotary Club.
CHAPTER IV

SENATOR HARTKE AND CONGRESSMAN ROUDEBUSH

BEFORE NON-PARTISAN AUDIENCES

Rhetorical Restraints

In the study of political campaigns a plethora of written material exists on approaches to partisan audiences, but little exists on the rhetorical restraints imposed by non-partisan audiences.¹ Such occasions call for the utmost of political "acumen" or capacity to look at the political spectrum with as little projection of personal bias, dreams, or wishes as possible.² Political acumen is especially called for with non-partisan audiences because of five key factors: 1) such audiences are likely to vote; 2) such audiences are likely to be local opinion leaders; 3) such audiences are likely to have their minds made up on the election by the time of the address; 4) such audiences are to

¹We do have insider accounts of specific restraints for a given speech, but we do not have a base from which to view such restraints. One such account is Thomas Sawyer's consideration of Roger Cloud's speech to the Cleveland, Ohio City Club on April 10, 1970. See: Makay and Brown, The Rhetorical Dialogue, pp. 437-484. The point is that Sawyer's account and the account of others is limited to one candidate, and, one isolated speech at a point in time with little consideration of broad restraints on a politician as he addresses non-partisans.

²For a good discussion of political "acumen" see: White, The Making of the President 1964, pp. 174-196.
be expected to use their powers of selective perception and retention in weighing the message of the candidate; and 5) such audiences require of the speaker that he perform his task in such a way as to encourage supporters and latent supporters without antagonizing supporters of his opponent. Not only are the generalizations valid for non-partisan audiences in general, but they are valid for the group which Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush addressed: The Fort Wayne Rotary Club.

In the discussion of the specific characteristics of the membership of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club in Chapter II, we saw that of 179 members, fifteen were medical doctors and dentists, five were lawyers, two were presidents of universities, eight were educators, two were ministers, three were architects and thirty-four were identified as owning their own business firm. In addition our study showed that managerial personnel from International Harvester, North American Van Lines, Central Soya Company, General Electric Company, and Lincoln National Life Insurance Company were represented on the membership list. These people are in professions and occupations which vote. As Fred I. Greenstein has written:

Thus we see that in 1960 (and the findings are much the same for other years) high electoral turnout was associated with the following interrelated clusters of attributes: college education; professional, managerial, or white-collar occupation; metropolitan residence. Each of the attributes listed by Greenstein applied to the membership of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club.

---

A second consideration of non-partisan audiences is that they are opinion leaders and influence others. As our discussion of the membership of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club indicated, leaders of business and professions comprised the membership. As community leaders they belonged to many formal and informal groups and if Katz and Lazarsfeld's theory of personal influence is valid, they provided information on candidates and issues which helped others make up their minds. Although the influence of such leaders is limited to those with similar background, still a positive influence in the professional and business communities could benefit a candidate in two significant ways: with contributions and with campaign workers. A favorable response on the personal influence level from such a group as the Fort Wayne Rotary Club was desirable. Conversely an unfavorable response from such a group could damage a campaign.

Although non-partisan groups such as the Fort Wayne Rotary Club are non-partisan by intent, they are not predominately undecided as a rule. We know that such an undecided condition is virtually unheard of in our two party system. Individuals in the group will have two overriding influences which condition the original view of a candidate: their previous voting behavior and their general philosophic view. Such a condition is not unusual for we know that in a given presidential election approximately seventy-five per cent of the voting population knows which presidential candidate they are going to vote for prior to

---

the national nominating conventions. In off elections such as the 1970 Senatorial Election in Indiana, probably more than seventy-five per cent of the voting population have made their selection of their candidate very early in the campaign. So at best a candidate is confronted with an audience composed of his partisans, his opponent's partisans, and undecided individuals who are probably leaning one way or the other. The best guide in an approach to such a group may be their general political philosophy. In the case of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club, we have seen that it was a conservative group.

The fourth factor which ought to influence greatly the content of a message to a non-partisan group is the interplay of selective exposure, selective perception, and selective retention on issues in a campaign. Because individuals do expose themselves primarily to material with which they already agree, and because individuals perceive more readily those items which are salient to their attitudes and retain only the most salient ones, the speaker ought to give very close

---


consideration to "that narrow group of issues which concerns them most." 9

Through careful consideration of salient interests of the audience and through political acumen the candidate who addresses a non-partisan audience must strive to do two things; to conduct himself in such a way as to activate both supporters and latent supporters. We know from theory and practice that voters tend to vote "more against candidates they dislike than for the candidates they like." 10 Or in the less guarded words of Richard Nixon's life long political advisor, Murray Chotiner, "The American people . . . vote against a candidate, against a party, or against an issue, rather than for a candidate or an issue or a party." 11 Probably the overriding concern for a candidate before such an audience is to say as little as possible which could be construed as some "thing" against which one could vote. Speaking before a non-partisan political audience permits the audience member to adjust his perceptions of a political candidate to his long-term political prejudices and vice versa; it is a demanding audience for the speaker.


The Ideal Non-Partisan Speech

Even though non-partisan audiences are difficult audiences for a candidate to address, such audiences do offer the candidate the opportunity to reflect "the ultimate values of the political community" by "advising" his audience so that they may make rational choices on salient issues. In fact speaking before a non-partisan audience offers the candidate an opportunity to elaborate upon his campaign themes and slogans and if he chooses, to attack political concerns in the sense of defining the political situation.

The politician who approaches a non-partisan audience realizes the latitude in which he must work: he can demonstrate political acumen by using the situation to define the political situation more clearly for the audience; he can do variations of his campaign themes and slogans and thereby effectively address primarily his supporters in the audience; but he cannot be narrowly partisan.

Before considering an analysis of the speeches of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush let us briefly review the dominant audience traits and major concerns of the members of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club.


Dominant Traits of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club

As we have seen in Chapter II, there are five dominant traits of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club. The important trait is the inherent leadership status which is evidenced by the professional and managerial make-up of the club. Secondly, the club is generally conservative in nature. Third, the group had as its goal the "Idea of Service." Fourth, a speaking invitation to anyone was meant to be viewed as a non-partisan invitation with the purpose of keeping the members of the club informed. Finally, because of the frequency and calibre of speakers who addressed the group, the audience could be considered tough consumers of oral communication.

Review of Major Audience Concerns

From the analysis of political concerns in the Fourth Congressional District which was offered in Chapter II, we saw that control of crime, inflation and the sluggish national economy, unemployment, and maintaining the general level of "quality of life" with a high rate of home ownership, few student or racial problems, and diversity of economic opportunity were of interest to the Rotary Club audience.

Both Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush addressed the Fort Wayne Rotary Club and were confronted with a similar non-partisan audience. Let us turn our attention to the effort of each candidate before the group.
On October 5, 1970, Senator Hartke had a full schedule in Fort Wayne, Indiana. At 6:15 a.m., the Senator greeted the day shift of workers as they approached the General Electric plant in the city. At 11:00 a.m., the Senator spent forty-five minutes talking to the students and faculty of Indiana-Purdue Universities' Regional Campus in Fort Wayne. At 12:15 p.m., Hartke had lunch and addressed the Fort Wayne Rotary Club at their weekly meeting. For the remainder of the afternoon of October 5th, the Senator held a press conference and toured the Veterans Hospital in the city.15

Although the Senator had had an active morning, he looked fresh as he entered the Chamber of Commerce Building in downtown Fort Wayne. He was dressed in a dark blue suit with a light blue shirt and a dark red and blue tie with a thin gray stripe separating the two colors. In the lapel of the Senator's coat was an American Flag pin; fifteen minutes earlier at the Indiana-Purdue Regional Campus, the pin was not there.16

After the 130 or so Rotarians and their guests had sung songs, had lunch, and enjoyed the fellowship of one another, the Senator was introduced. Hartke went to the speaker's stand, opened the black ring

15"Hartke Slates Visit Monday," p. 1B.
16Based on author's notes dated October 5, 1970.
binder which contained his speech and commenced with a one paragraph introduction to his speech. In that introduction to the Rotary Club, Hartke made references to two of the members of the Club, the nationwide General Motors strike, the car leasing episode (one of the Club members referred to was a local auto dealer), and Bun candy bars which were manufactured locally.

After reminding the audience that 1970 was an election year, the Senator told his audience:

I do not come to visit with you about elections, I really just want to visit with you for a few moments and hopefully it its satisfactory with you, to give you the chance maybe to visit with me about some of the things you're concerned with.

In that statement, Hartke suggested that he was not going to speak on "mere" partisan issues. As the speech developed, the point that this presentation was to be one of a philosophically oriented partisan analysis of political and social issues became apparent. In the question and answer period following the speech, partisan issues were more fully considered.

Through the use of testimony the Senator elaborated on and emphasized the progress of the country when he said:17

Back in the early days, a fellow named Watson said that the liberty God gave us we've taken. I think that within the framework of humanity, America has indeed done just that. The liberty God gave us, we've taken. I think that basically most Americans would say, by in large, we've done very well with it. We are a remarkable group of people. . . . We came over here, sort of I suppose you'd say, a mixed bag.

---

17All quotations are from a tape recording of the speech by the author. For the entire text of the speech see: Appendix C.
We've gotten along very well. We've taken a nation which was raw and had a lot of resources, but we've utilized those resources, by in large, for humanity. Winston Churchill made this statement about America; he said, "It's a remarkable country, it demands neither tribute nor ransom from friend or foe." And that's us. He's talking about us. He's talking about all Americans. We have, by in large, used the liberty God gave us . . . in a fashion which at least is commendable to mankind.

Hartke's audience was not likely to disagree with his assessment of the strength of the country as he developed his description of America.

Through the use of references to Watson's statement and Churchill's observation the Senator developed arguments which look like this:

Data

| D  | Back in the early days, a fellow named Watson said that the liberty that God gave us we've taken. |
| B  | Winston Churchill made this statement about America, he said, "It's a remarkable country, it demands neither tribute nor ransom from friend or foe." |

Claim

| We came over here . . . (and have) taken a nation which was raw and had a lot of natural resources, but we've utilized those resources, by in large, for humanity. 
Because (W) I think that within the framework of humanity America has done just that. |
Since (B) We've utilized those resources, by in large, for humanity. |

Although such a complimentary claim was not likely to be disputed by the audience, the Senator hastened to add that we had made mistakes as a nation just as men make mistakes as human beings. But the fact remained that the United States had come a long way. The Senator further emphasized the point when he continued:
We've come a long way. We've developed an airplane which can go faster than the speed of sound. We've developed a country which, by and large, can produce more food than we can eat; more entertainment than we can enjoy. I suppose of all the people in the world, we are most blest.

The argument from examples to descriptive generalization looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 D</td>
<td>We've come a long way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 D</td>
<td>We've developed an airplane that can go faster than the speed of sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 D</td>
<td>We've developed a country which, by and large, can produce more food than we can eat; more entertainment than we can enjoy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The audience probably agreed with Hartke's prologue in which he assessed the strength of the country. When the Senator turned to his consideration of the immediate climate of the country, he did so by developing his thesis that "there is a great anxiety about where this country is going" in such a way as to continue to assert his faith in its ability and thereby refute those who advocate a negative view. Hartke said:

And yet I do not believe it takes an expert in social analysis to look upon America today and say, somehow, someplace there is a great anxiety about where this nation is going. Some people have asked a question have we lost our way. Some people have said well we've reached the zenith and that's the end. I refuse to subscribe to that negative philosophy. I personally believe that we have just touched the edge of what could be a great and glorious time. Not alone for those of us here, but through example, possibly we could create a great and glorious world for all those who are on this little planet which moves out through the universe. We now have taken ourselves out into
space. And there is no reason to expect that man being the inquisitive and experimental animal he is—that we're not going further out. How far, I don't know. Nor do you—and I suppose that the Biblical prophecy is still true, "that whatever (the) mind of man can conceive, that he can do." And so the conception of the mind certainly is not without limits.

The Senator testified to his belief by going from instances of doubt which were generated by street disturbances, campus disturbances, inflation, and dissatisfaction with the Vietnam War to a statement of his view of where the country might go. In diagrammed form the argument is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And yet I don't believe</td>
<td>I personally believe that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that it takes an expert</td>
<td>we have just touched the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in social analysis to</td>
<td>edge of what</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>look upon America today</td>
<td>could be a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and say, somehow, some-</td>
<td>great and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place there is a great</td>
<td>glorious time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety about where this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation is going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people have asked</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the question have we</td>
<td>I refuse to subscribe to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lost the way.</td>
<td>that negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some people have said</td>
<td>Since (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>well we've reached the</td>
<td>We have successfully</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zenith and that's the</td>
<td>taken ourselves into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>end.</td>
<td>space and will go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And I suppose that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Biblical philoso-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phy is still true,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that &quot;Whatsoever the</td>
<td>And so the conception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mind of man can con-</td>
<td>of the mind certainly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ceive, that he can do.&quot;</td>
<td>is not without limits.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Senator addressed those comments to an audience composed of successful men who were members of a group which placed emphasis on service. The audience probably agreed with the Senator's positive assessment. But the Senator still had to consider the specific concerns of anxiety which were abroad in the country. Hartke commenced his analysis of the anxiety he saw in the land when he said:

In this nation of course I see things, and you do too, which disturb me. There are poor people. But by in large, most people are not poor. And that's not right. There are hungry people. But by in large, most people are not hungry. And that's not right. There are people who are denied the opportunity to go to work. But still, by in large, most of the people of this nation, some ninety-five per cent roughly, still are gainfully employed. And yet there are those who are out of work and that's not right. There's anxiety and there's frustration.

When broken down the argument looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>In this nation of course I see things, and you do too, which disturb me. There are poor people. But by in large most are not poor. And that's not right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I see these things (Implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>There are hungry people. But by in large most people are not hungry. And that's not right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>There are people who are denied an opportunity to work. But still, by in large, most of the people of this nation--some ninety-five per cent roughly--still are gainfully employed. And yet there are those who are out of work and that's not right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>There's anxiety and there's frustration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The argument is from examples to descriptive generalization. We have seen in Chapter II that generally speaking, the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana had low unemployment, fairly high home ownership and was stable. The Senator's audience was in an environment where they personally may have had little contact with the conditions which he described; although they probably shared the Senator's overall concern with "disturbing things." A general concern may have been held by the audience, while the Senator's specific analysis of that concern may not have been directed to the specific concerns of individual audience members and therefore may not have had as much impact as he would have wished.

Senator Hartke told his audience that he would like to talk about such matters not on the abstract partisan level of Democrat or Republican accusation toward one another, but on the concrete level where the problems were problems for people. In short, the Senator told his audience problems exist and a politician does himself a disservice if he lays complete blame for them on his opposition.

The speech which the Rotary Club heard started on a high level of statement about the greatness of the country. That statement was elaborated upon by a more concrete presentation of concerns of many people in the country. The series of claims which followed were designed to address a specific issue with which the businessmen in the audience could clearly identify: the investment tax credit. After having used as a transition the statement: "Now I've had my differences with President Johnson as you well know, and they came on several fronts," Senator Hartke told his audience:
When I went to the Senate in nineteen hundred and fifty-eight, I was confronted with a situation which put me on a committee of which I am no longer a member because we worked. The committee went out of existence: the committee on unemployment problems. I spent more time on field trips than any other United States Senator. We did formulate some programs, not alone to criticize the cause of unemployment, but to perfect hopefully for people an opportunity to go to work. And by in large it worked. In that (series of programs) for example, was the idea that we must modernize the American plant and equipment. And that we did in nineteen hundred and sixty-two with the tax revision act of that time and the accelerate depreciation act. I was in the forefront of those who advocated the investment credit. In nineteen hundred and sixty-five, President Johnson because of the need for additional revenue, came to the Congress and asked for a suspension of the investment credit. I objected. I said that they would have the investment credit back in a year's time, because no nation can continue to increase its productive capacity, if it cannot stay modern. And in this society today, a businessman has to have enough capital or otherwise he can hardly afford to keep modern. Less than nine months later, President Johnson came back and asked for the reinstatement of the investment credit. In nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, President Nixon came to the Congress and asked for the repeal of the investment credit. And all those Democrats and Republicans—except Vance Hartke—on the (Senate) Finance Committee went along with him—and it's on the books—I stand before you here tonight to tell you of the day that something along that line is going to be back on the books. There is no way in my opinion unless you provide for an investment tax capital, that this nation can truly remain competitive industrially with people like Germany and Japan. That's a simple fact of life and the quicker we realize it—that it is not an expense of government or a loss of revenue—but an investment into the future of this great American democracy.

Essentially in the long discussion of his understanding of the investment tax credit, Senator Hartke used two examples in developing a chain of reasoning which led to the claim: "There is no way . . . unless you provide for an investment capital that this nation can truly remain competitive with people like Germany and Japan." The chain of reasoning from examples to descriptive generalization looks like this:
184

Data

D In 1958, I was placed on the committee on unemployment.

D We worked hard on the committee and formulated some programs to provide the opportunity for people to go to work.

Because (W) I say the committee proposed good programs. (Implied)

Since (B) In that, for example, was the idea that we modernize the American plant and equipment. And that we did in the 1962 tax revision act which contained an investment credit provision.

Data

D Claim

1 I said that they would have the investment credit back within one year's time, because no nation can continue to increase its productive capacity, if it cannot stay modern.

Because (W) A businessman has to have enough capital or otherwise he can hardly afford to keep modern.

Since

Less than nine months later, President Johnson came back and asked for the reinstatement of the investment credit.

Claim

1 By in large the programs worked.
In 1969 President Nixon came to Congress and asked for the repeal of the investment credit. Because (W)

The repeal of the investment tax credit is on the books.

Because Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Finance Committee, . . . went along with him (Nixon).

There is no way . . . I stand before you here tonight to tell you of the day that something along that line (investment credit) is going to be back on the books.

That's a simple fact of life and the quicker we realize it (as) an investment in the future of this great American Democracy (the better).

The industrial output of the United States had fallen to about three and one half per cent by August, 1970. That decrease coupled with a four per cent decrease in the first quarter was "technically a recession." The Nixon Administration had urged "belt tightening" by restricting the supply of money and cutting government spending. As a

---

result of the efforts unemployment was increasing. Dean Miller conclud-\[ed that the situation represented the "worst business turndown in ten years." Senator Hartke had presented a similar explanation to the one advanced for the Rotarians on September 18, 1970, when he argued that "an increase in productivity would stop the rise in unemployment."\[20

The businessmen in his audience had already felt the consequences of the act of revoking the investment tax credit. Further they were confronted with higher costs in their operations as well as a growing scarcity of capital. Senator Hartke's line of reasoning made sense.

Hartke continued his discussion of his activity in 1959 by describing for the audience what he thought had happened to the programs of that era which had been designed to assist the elderly. Those programs, according to the Senator, were not implemented because of bureaucratic operations which failed to act on them.

In closing on the point, the Senator prophesied "that unless we meet the unfinished business of America and get on with that business soon, the liberty which God gave us may be taken away from us in a fashion which may be more severe and more cruel than anything most of us have experienced in our lifetime."

Turning from the economy to a related societal problem, the Viet-

In nineteen hundred and sixty-five when I saw this country taking what I thought was a wrong turn, I said, then, publically, what most Democratic politicians in my state and the nation said was utter suicide. I wanted to know where we were going in Vietnam; what we intended to accomplish there; what the end result would be; what would happen if we didn't go in; and where this was all going to lead. And the answer was, "Vance go home and be quiet. Don't criticize President Johnson." I wasn't very welcome in very many places around the State of Indiana for awhile, I don't mind telling you; but only 300 Americans had died when I said that. Now my worst fears have been confirmed. We were lead down one of those cunning corridors that sometimes people take in the course of history.

The argument functions in such a way as to allow the Senator to present directly his interpretation of his actions over a five year period. Hartke's conservative audience probably had very mixed reactions to the defense, for as we have seen most Hoosiers in 1970 favored getting out of Vietnam as quickly as possible as gracefully as possible. But in 1965, 1966, 1967, and 1968 by the Senator's own admission he "wasn't very welcome in very many places around the State of Indiana." If the analysis of the characteristics of the Rotary Club audience is correct, one of those places where Hartke had previously not been very welcome was at their meetings.

In 1970 the Vietnam situation had changed so that the Senator could use examples of his previous behavior to generalize about the current uneasiness in America. The Senator's diagrammed argument looks like this:
**Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>In 1965, . . . I said, . . .</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>what most Democratic politi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cians in my state and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nation thought was utter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suicide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>l</th>
<th>I questioned our involve-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ment in Vietnam.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because (W)

. . . I saw this country taking what I thought was a wrong turn.

. . .

Since (B)

B I wanted to know

1 where we were going in Vietnam; what we intended to accomplish there; what would happen if we didn't go in; and where this all was going to lead.

The second claim in the chain argument was developed as follows:

**Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>Claim above.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Claim**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2</th>
<th>We were led down one of those cunning corridors that sometimes people take in the course of history.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Because (W)

Little had been accomplished by the war and thousands have died. (Implied)

. . .

. . . only 300 Americans had died when I said that.

The Senator quickly moved from his argument in defense of his position on the Vietnam question to a consideration of the broader concern that the uneasiness in the country had to be alleviated. The Senator said:

I hope that we'll take those steps which will have to be taken to get back on the main track. That basically means simply that we have to change our course of action. We must realize that we may be the most powerful nation
in the world; that we do have the power to destroy everything on this planet, (doesn't surprise you did it?) but that we can't end a war against a little fifth rate country. That shows you the limit of power. That's not very encouraging. That is a fact with which no man has ever lived with before except our generation. We live in that generation. They can talk all about the troops we have in Germany or in Berlin, yet anyone who is a military general knows very well that if the Russians wanted to move in, or the East Germans wanted to move into Berlin tomorrow, our troops would be over run there overnight. It's not our troop personnel there that keeps those Russians at bay or the East Germans at bay, it's that nuclear capacity and never forget it. And we all know also, that if (God save us from this) that catastrophe should arise that in a half an hour it's all over, everything, us and them. We may save the bombsights but we'll not save the people. Then that prophecy of Job in the third chapter, the 21st verse, will really be true. What is it? That those that are living envy the dead.

The series of claims in which Senator Hartke discussed the limit of American power looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hope we will take those steps which will have to be taken to get back on the main track.</td>
<td>That basically means simply that we have to change our course of action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(W) I think We need to confront our problems. (Implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following two schematics offer two more arguments which develop claim above.

1
We must realize that we may be the most powerful nation in the world; that we do have the power to destroy everything on this planet (didn't surprise you did it?) but we can't end a war against a little fifth rate country.

Because (W) Our involvement in Vietnam and Germany demonstrates it.

Since (B)

They can talk about the troops in Germany or in Berlin, . . .

If the Russians wanted to move in, or the East Germans wanted to move into Berlin tomorrow, our troops would be overrun there tonight.

Because (W) . . . anyone who is a military general knows . . .

Since

That's not very encouraging, that is a fact with which no man ever lived before except our generation.

It's not our troops personnel there that keeps the Russians at bay or the East Germans at bay, it's the nuclear capacity and never forget it.
The argument is quite complicated moving as it does from a claim that we must change our course of action through the examples of the limit of our power as evidenced by our activity in Vietnam and Germany, to the descriptive claim of the consequences of nuclear war. Fundamentally the audience probably recognized prior to the Senator's speech that problems existed, that the United States was limited in what it could do in foreign affairs, and that nuclear war would be overwhelmingly destructive. In his development of the reasoning pattern, Senator Hartke merely emphasized his view of the relationship our foreign policy had to the uneasiness he saw in the country.

Senator Hartke abruptly turned from his analysis of the involvement of the United States in foreign affairs to the domestic economic picture when he said:
Here at home, I do not believe in the doctrine of austerity. The alternatives which are being presented—I say were not presented in my view under the Democratic Administration—which have been accelerated under this administration, is (sic) that you have austerity in your economic philosophy or you perish. Now I'm just going to tell you one thing. If I told you that either you're going to take this course of action or you're going out of business—you'd take the course of action which would keep you in business. I don't believe that. That's not Americanism. That's not the American economic theory. There's no such thing as a constant pie in America, never has been. The great genius of America has been that we have always been able to accommodate, not alone an expanding population, but an expanding opportunity to enjoy. Not alone the quantity of life, but the quality of life. And the quality of American life is better today than it was before. Just as Bob Baninger who is my coordinator down in Columbus said when he picked me up at the airport, he said, "Vance, I don't want to go back to those good old days. I'll tell you what the good old days mean to me. They meant that I studied with a kerosene lamp. They meant I chopped wood where my mother cooked in a wood stove. I've got a nice house and I'm carrying you in an air-conditioned car now. That's what I don't want to get away from."

There are two major claims in Hartke's analysis of the general economic picture in 1970. The first claim is indeed harsh: "the alternatives which are being presented . . . is (sic) that you have austerity or you perish." The audience was very much aware that the economic picture was bleak, but few would have agreed with the severity of the choice described by the Senator. The second claim was a more positive description of the growth of America which history had borne out: "the great genius of America has been that we have always been able to accommodate, not alone an expanding population, but an expanding opportunity to enjoy."

Because the Senator was offering his analysis of the economic condition of the country in the context of an extreme alternative which
was quickly followed with a more positive historical analysis of the country's ability to accommodate, the potential negative impact of the first claim was probably lessened. In schematic form, the first argument is seen to be based on the Senator's generalized experience, whereas the second claim is one based on argument from definition to characteristics. The second claim is the stronger of the two. The development of those claims follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D 1 Here at home I do not believe in the doctrine of austerity.</td>
<td>The Nixon Administration has forced austerity on the economy. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D 2 The alternatives which are being presented ... is (sic) that you have austerity or you perish.</td>
<td>If I told you that either you're going to take this course of action or you're going to go out of business--you'd take the course of action which would keep you in business.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second claim:

Data

D Claim 1

D That's not the American economic theory.

Because (W)

There is not such a thing as a constant pie in America, never has been.

Since (B)

The great genius of America has been that we have always been able to accommodate, not alone an expanding population, but an expanding opportunity to enjoy.

Just as Bob Barringer who is my coordinator in Columbus (said) when he picked me up at the airport, he said, "Vance, I don't want to go back to those good old days. I'll tell you what the good old days mean to me. They meant that I studied with a kerosene lamp. They meant I chopped wood where my mother cooked in a wood stove. I've got a nice house, and I'm carrying you in an air-conditioned car now. That's what I don't want to get away from.

Senator Hartke offered an analysis similar to his analysis of the economic structure when he turned to social conditions in America. Through a description of a dilemma of either anarchy or repression which he attributed to the Nixon Administration, Hartke managed to advance his own view of the genius of American politics. Hartke told his audience:

In the social structure the same sort of dilemma is presented to the American people. They tell you either you're going to have anarchy, or you're going to have repression. And both are lurking there just willing to
take over if we permit them to. But that's not America. The great genius of America in the political structure has been the fact that we've been able to take a diverse population, mold them together, live side-by-side with not having in any room hardly for any two people agree with each other. Let alone five or six hundred. And that individuality is the trademark of Americanism. The right for you to go ahead and say Vance Hartke I disagree with every damn thing you say. I disagree with everything you've done in the Senate; I'm going to do everything I can to beat you in the race for this office. Or on the other side, you can go the other way and say I agree with you and I'm going to try and help you. Or anyplace in between the whole spectrum.

There are two claims in the sample. The first one presented an extreme alternative which was credited to the actions of the Nixon Administration and is lacking in support. The second claim denounced the earlier claim by offering a definition of the genius of the American political structure. The diagram of the two lines of reasoning looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They tell you either you're going to have anarchy, or you're going to have repression.</td>
<td>Because (W) On the social structure side of the same sort of dilemma is presented to the American people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As I view it the Administration's actions indicate the dilemma. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second claim in the sequence was developed as follows:

Data

On the social structure side the dilemma of a choice of anarchy or repression is offered. (Implied)

Claim

But the dilemma is not in keeping with "individuality which is the trademark of America."

Because (W)

The great genius of America is the political structure has been the fact that we've been able to take a diverse population, mold them together, . . . with not having in any room hardly any two people agree with each other.

Since (B)

It is illustrated by the right for you to go ahead and say, Vance Hartke, I disagree with every damn thing you say. I disagree with everything you've done in the Senate; I'm going to do everything I can to beat you in this race for this office. Or on the other side you can go the other way and say I agree with you and I'm going to try and help you. Or anyplace in between the whole spectrum.

The Port Wayne Rotary Club was a conservative audience. I have already suggested that it was unlikely that the Rotarians accepted the dilemma of the economy described by Hartke. The second dilemma of anarchy or repression being the alternatives in the social sphere was also unacceptable to the group. "Anarchy" and "repression" are
strong concepts. In 1970 neither concept could have been fairly applied to the reactions of government to social disorder. But the impact of the anarchy/repression dilemma was lessened when the Senator offered his definition of the genius of the American political structure to the audience.

As he did in his analysis of the dilemma of the economic picture, Hartke made his views of the dilemma which America confronted on the social scene more tolerable, by placing each in a favorable relationship with a more acceptable concept. The strategy allowed the Senator to criticize in such a way as to affirm his belief in the traditional American values of growth, accommodation, and individuality.

The theme of Senator Hartke's address was that there was a great anxiety on the question of where America was going. The Senator's analysis of that anxiety emphasized the continuing strength of America, but also criticized the dilemmas which he saw being offered to the American people. The dilemmas described for the comfortable Rotarians in Fort Wayne had been generalized and therefore not "felt" by them.

In pursuing the development of his thesis, Senator Hartke tried to make his analysis more specific when he told his audience:

Now this is what I think is creating the anguish and anxiety, frustration and despair which I see in America today. I've travelled this state. I've seen people who, frankly walk with tears in their eyes. A mother comes to me and says, "Vance, what can I do? I have an engineering student who has his master's degree and can't find a job." A Royce Sandy at Greencastle in the unemployment line, I said, "What do you do"? He said, "I just came back from Vietnam and I can't find a job."
The argument serves to vivify the plight of those who suffered as a consequence of the economic dilemma the Senator described. Hartke employed his own experience to justify the claim. The argument is diagrammed thusly:

```
Data                                          Claim
D  Now I've travelled                           Now this (the economic situation) is what I
    1 this state.                               think is creating the anguish and the anxiety,
D  I have talked with                           frustration and despair which I see in America
    2 Hoosiers about their                     today.
    lack of economic                            
    security. (Implied)                        
        Because (W)

Since (B)

B  A mother comes to me                          
    1 and says, "Vance what can I do? I have an
    engineering student who has his master's
    degree and can't find a job."

B  A Royce Sandy at                             
    2 Greencastle in the unemployment line, I
    said, "What do you do"? He said, "I just came
    back from Vietnam and I can't find a job."

The specific instances cited by the Senator may have been apocryphal from the viewpoint of internal factual accuracy. On October 18, 1970, the Indianapolis Star published a story in which it maintained
that upon checking the Senator's use of the "Roy" Sandy\textsuperscript{21} example, it found that Sandy was currently unemployed but that he had had a job for six days in June, 1970. In the report, Sandy denied ever having the job; his mother told the paper he had a job for a few days in June but quit after "he got burned when a machine exploded." Apocryphal or not, the selection of the two examples of unemployment among young people, one with specific training and one returning from serving in the military, illustrated one of the major causes of uneasiness in the country in 1970.

Senator Hartke started his 1970 campaign by emphasising that the country had to experience a reconciliation. The Senator was reported to have told the Indiana Democratic State Convention delegates, "in my view, the reunification of America is the overriding political consideration of our time, reeling to and fro without clear purpose, we will become a nation at war with itself."\textsuperscript{22} The theme of anxiety in the land was not unique to Hartke in 1970; some commentators went so far as to say President Nixon, Vice-President Agnew and the entire Nixon Administration was culpable in contributing to national anxiety.

\textsuperscript{21}\textit{"Here's Another Side to Hartke's Sad Tale About Jobless Viet Vet," Indianapolis Star, October 18, 1970, Sec. Z, p. 10.} Hartke clearly uses the name "Royce Sandy" in each of the speeches I have recorded. The Star article maintained: "But a check with other sources indicated that the caller (phone tip to the newspaper) and the Senator had to be talking about the same Roy Sandy." It might be noted that in 1972 the Senator underwent ear surgery designed to correct a loss of hearing.

\textsuperscript{22}\textit{Paul M. Doherty, "Hartke Urges National Reconciliation as Campaign Opens," Indianapolis Star, June 17, 1970, p. 15.}
In late September, 1970, political analyst, James Reston wrote of the campaign:

In the 1930's the majority of the people had serious economic troubles and the appeal of the Democrats was to fear poverty. In the 70's, the New Majority is fairly well off, and the appeal of the Republicans is to the fear of anarchy.\textsuperscript{23}

Near the end of the campaign, the Republican Mayor John Lindsay of New York City charged that the Nixon Administration's 1970 political strategy "has spread a cloud of suspicion and mistrust over our whole nation."\textsuperscript{24}

The Senator's idea probably was not a new one for the Rotarians, but his development of it allowed him to characterize and define the political scene as he saw it.

The Senator continued his speech to the Rotarians by pleading that America had to put its "powerful industrial machine back into gear," and tend to domestic matters by avoiding "every single cocktail operation or dictatorial fight over in Timbukto or anyplace else in the world."

Hartke started the concluding portion of his speech with these words:

\textsuperscript{23}James Reston, \textit{Journal-Gazette} (Fort Wayne), September 20, 1970, p. 12E. Emphasis added. It is interesting to note that the \textit{Journal-Gazette} frequently identifies political columnists by name only.

This (sic) is some of the things I'm talking about. I'm not talking about surrender, I'm not talking about moving out of the mainstream. I'm talking about going back to traditional American values. That is to make this country a shining example for the rest of the world: economically, politically, and morally. I don't need to ask the members of the clergy. They'll tell you their church knows they're in trouble. But the church recognizes it, they know they've got a tough time pulling themselves out of this hole. They recognize quite honestly that it's not just enough to have a Sunday morning service. And damn few youngsters . . . are there anymore. And they're searching at least, and they're grappling with this problem. And they're dealing with it trying to determine how again they can recreate in these people in America (which has such a rich religious heritage) how they can come back to it again and make it something real for them, instead of going ahead and getting the imaginary trip on drugs, that escape and realism. . . . You see this is . . . not going to be solved simply by crackdowns. It's not going to be solved by ignoring the situation. It's going to be solved by action—concrete action by people who have brains and thought and the best minds of this country ought to be dedicating themselves to that proposition. And it has to start in the White House.

Three claims are put forth in the above sample of argument. The claims are a summary of the Senator's views and a direct suggestion on how to solve the outlined problems and an attempt to place the blame on the doorstep of the White House. The claims are diagrammed thusly:
This (the concern over the economy and trend toward the fear of anarchy) is some of the things I'm talking about. (We all want) ... to make this country a shining example for the rest of the world: economically, politically, and morally. We all know we are in trouble in the three areas where we have led traditionally. (Implied) Since (B) I don't need to ask the members of the clergy. They'll tell you their church knows they're in trouble. ... It's (these problems are) going to be solved by action ... and the best minds of this country ought to be dedicating themselves to that proposition.
Claim$_3$ is the culmination of the reasoning. It looks like this:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Data} \\
\text{D Traditional American} \\
\text{1 values emphasized men who have a sense of morality and who have leadership thinking together in order to solve problems. (Implied)} \\
\text{Because (W)} \\
\text{Hartke says ... (Implied)} \\
\text{D Claim$_2$ It's (these problems are) going to be solved by action ... and the best minds of this country ought to be dedicating themselves to that proposition.}
\end{array}
\]

After having listened to the Senator's development of the speech an audience member would have been hard put to deny claim$_1$ and claim$_2$ above. But Hartke had to offer further reasoning in order to make the generalized claim stick. The Senator did offer specific elaboration which tended to support claim$_3$, "And it (solving the problems) has to start in the White House," when he said:

I say this kindly to President Nixon . . . I have not seen his reaction to the Commission on Campus Unrest. I know that he is a political personality and aware that he cannot always just turn a deaf ear to the people. If I say there's one thing that's happened somehow in this country we've taken the government from the people. The way to return it to them is to make them understand in high places, that the people must come first. And what the Commission on Campus Unrest says to me . . . is the fact that they said to the President, "You must lead. You must lead," And in what field? "Moral leadership." That's a challenge. And I hope and pray when the President comes back from his visit, that he'll accept it in the good graces in which it was offered to him: as constructive criticism for the future of America.
Hartke employed the conclusion of the Commission Report on Campus Unrest to do two things: 1) lay the blame for the anxiety in America at President Nixon's doorstep; and 2) to appeal to that ingrained Hoosier prejudice that government has been taken away from the people.

The final argument of the speech looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Leadership must originate in the White House.</td>
<td>Nixon must lead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Nixon is a political personality and aware that he cannot always just turn a deaf ear to the people.</td>
<td>Because (W) . . . what the Commission on Campus Unrest says to me . . . is the fact that they said to the President, &quot;You must lead. You must lead.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (I think that) if . . . there's one thing that's happened in this country, we've taken the government from the people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D The Commission on Campus Unrest said the President must exercise moral leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conservative audience of Rotarians may not have agreed with the thrust of Hartke's contention that the Nixon Administration had taken the government away from the people, but I suspect that many in the audience selectively perceived the idea that the government had been taken from the people and concluded with the Senator that it was necessary "to make them understand in high places, that the people must come first."

The Senator rapidly concluded his speech by indicating that the very items of his analysis motivated him to oppose the President and
our involvement in Vietnam. Hartke left the positive suggestion that his speech was an attempt to outline a philosophy "which must be met with specifics. The specifics must deal with each individual problem."

As with most speeches to service groups, Senator Hartke's speech before the Fort Wayne Rotary Club was followed by a question and answer session. Three questions were put to the Senator. Individual audience members were interested in the Senator's specific views on Vietnamization; on the Soviet Union's involvement in the Middle East; and on what the United States could do to pull out of Vietnam without giving the land to the Communists.

A strict question and answer interview format affords the interviewer the opportunity to develop a philosophy by the way he handles questions. Very often questions put to a speaker following a presentation such as the Senator had given the Rotarians becomes distinctly more partisan. In this format where time was running out for the audience and the speaker, Senator Hartke answered each of the questions from a stance which reinforced his previous behavior.

In response to the question on the Vietnamization program, Hartke maintained that such a program would not work in Vietnam or anywhere else in Southeastern Asia until the destructive bombing which was the doing of the United States stopped tearing those countries apart. The Senator agreed with Secretary of Interior Wally Hickel who wrote President Nixon that you cannot tear a country together.

Senator Hartke sided with the plight of Israel in responding to the question of the Soviet Union's involvement there. Although Hartke
never directly analyzed the involvement, he did use his response to comment positively on the very recent attempt of President Nixon to bring some stability in the area. In passing I might offer the judgment that the Senator was probably wise not to offer a direct analysis of the question, for such an approach to such a question required more time than he had.

On the final question of how the United States could withdraw from Vietnam without giving the land to the Communists, the Senator took the stance that the people of Vietnam wanted peace; that the Saigon government was corrupt and that he agreed with President Eisenhower's comment that the United States would provide economic aid to Vietnam if the corruption were cleaned up; and that President Nixon would soon come forth with a standstill cease-fire which we never had tried before and from which the Senator allowed his audience to imply the land control question would be resolved. However the Senator avoided a direct answer to the question.

At the conclusion of his address to the Fort Wayne Rotary Club, Senator Hartke received a standing ovation.

Summary of Senator Hartke's Speech to the Fort Wayne Rotary Club

In the earlier discussion of the latitude in which a politician could operate in preparing a speech for a non-partisan group I suggested two approaches a speaker might take, and one approach which would be least fruitful. I said that a politician could demonstrate his acumen by using his speech to define the political situation more clearly for
the audience, or he could do variations of his campaign themes and slogans and be primarily effective with those already committed to him. The least fruitful approach would be one of a presentation of a narrowly partisan analysis.

When Senator Hartke addressed the Fort Wayne Rotary Club, he clearly chose the role of a man who was trying to display his political acumen in such a way as to define the political scene. The strategy incorporated an affirmation of the greatness of America with an analysis of the anxiety in the country; an affirmation of a particular salient issue of the audience (the investment credit tax) with an analysis of the consequences of the fiscal policies of the Nixon Administration (unemployment among the trained young and the returning veteran); and affirmation of individuality with an analysis of the attempted dilemma of anarchy or repression; and an affirmation of the right of the people to control government rather than vice versa with an ascription of the lack of moral leadership to President Nixon.

When the Senator was confronted with a particularly harsh description of a dilemma as he was with the analysis of both the economic and social scenes, he quickly lessened the negative impact of the description with the definition and affirmation of Hoosier prejudice. In the case of the affirmation was that the American system was one of growth and accommodation; in the case of the social dilemma, it was that individuality was the trademark of Americanism. The Senator's strategy adroitly permitted him to avoid the clear presentation of an item which an audience member could vote against.
The image which Senator Hartke sought to present was one of a man discussing political questions in a philosophical context. The strategies which were manifested in the speech itself were sufficiently artistic so that the audience was presented with little against which it could clearly vote.

Two weeks after Senator Hartke spoke to the Fort Wayne Rotary Club, Congressman Roudebush addressed the group. Let us turn our attention to how the Congressman developed his ideas before the group.

Richard Roudebush Before The Fort Wayne Rotary Club,
Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce, October 19, 1970.

Four significant events need to be noted in an attempt to understand better what had happened between the date of Senator Hartke’s address to the Fort Wayne Rotary Club and Congressman Roudebush’s appearance before that group. First, on October 7, 1970, President Nixon went on nationwide television to announce that he had a new proposal for the resolution of the conflict in Southeastern Asia. Second, both Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush had appeared on statewide television in a "debate format" on October 12, 1970. Third, as part of the total effort on the part of the Nixon Administration during off-year elections, President Nixon made a campaign appearance in Fort Wayne.

25A detailed analysis of the debate will be included in Chapter V.
on October 20, 1970.\textsuperscript{26} The Fort Wayne visit of the President was part of his twenty-two campaign visits to states during the last three weeks of the 1970 campaign. President Nixon's Fort Wayne appearance cancelled the scheduled second statewide debate by the candidates for the same evening. Since both candidates professed to have "won" the first debate, it followed logically that James Roberts, Roudebush's news secretary, told the press that Roudebush "expects to live up to the full commitment agreed upon." Senator Hartke was reported to have told the same newsman that Nixon's visit "smacks suspiciously of a desperate attempt to get Roudebush off the debate hook. I am convinced that this last minute ploy was engineered to take the sting out of Roudebush's negative television appearance."\textsuperscript{27} The effect of the visit by the President with its timing and planning was to cancel the second statewide debate. The fourth event which ought to provide insight into Congressman Roudebush's speech to the Rotarians was the speech which immediately preceded his own.

\textbf{Summary of a Speech by Secretary of Labor,}

\textbf{James B. Hodgson, Before the Fort Wayne Rotary Club, October 19, 1970}

Congressman Roudebush shared the Rotary Club platform with Secretary of Labor James B. Hodgson on October 19, 1970. The appearance

\textsuperscript{26}Adair and Roudebush announced confirmation of the President's visit on October 14, 1970. Larry Allen, "Nixon Visit Tuesday Lift to GOP Campaign," \textit{Journal-Gazette} (Fort Wayne), October 15, 1970, p. 1.

\textsuperscript{27}\textit{Ibid.}, p. 11.
by Secretary Hodgson meant that he and not candidate Roudebush, would receive primary attention during the appearance. The appearance also meant that a portion of the Congressman's subject matter, unemployment and the economy, would be pre-empted by the Secretary. Since the Rotarians allowed only one and half hours for lunch, Club business and a "program," when the program consisted of two speakers then each of the speakers could view himself as at a disadvantage. Congressman Roudebush was in a difficult situation as a speaker.

Both Congressman Roudebush and Secretary Hodgson had spent the morning of October 19, 1970, conferring with local party officials at breakfast and touring the Fort Wayne Community School's Regional Vocational Automotive Training Center in downtown Fort Wayne. As part of that tour, Secretary Hodgson addressed "some fifty local labor leaders and city and school officials . . . (on) 'how to get equipment to fill buildings like this. Money is tight.'" The Secretary suggested that the recent twenty per cent cut in defense spending ought to free equipment which might be secured for such a purpose. The Secretary promised to look into the matter when he got back to Washington.28 After the visit to the Automotive Training Center both Secretary Hodgson and

28Dell Ford, "Sec. of Labor Reinvents Plan For School Aid," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), October 20, 1970, p. 1B. Miss Ford reported that the school officials had tried to get equipment for the school through the 1963 National Industrial Equipment Reserve; an act very similar to the Secretary's proposal.
Congressman Roudebush went to the Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce building for the noon luncheon of the Rotary Club.\(^{29}\)

At the Rotary Club, Secretary Hodgson told the Rotarians that he confidently expected unemployment to begin to rectify itself after the first of the year (1971) due to an increased gross national product. Hodgson pointed out that the gross national product had been better in the first two quarters of 1970 than it ever was in 1969. The Secretary asserted that the country was on its way back to a healthy growth rate—not a growth rate that was inflation inducted.\(^{30}\) The Secretary continued by arguing the Nixon Administration was opposed to wage and price controls in such a way as to suggest indirectly that the previous Democratic administration was the cause of inflation. The Secretary developed the view by suggesting that the Federal government from 1965 to 1969 was acting fiscally and monetarily like a drunken sailor. Further the Secretary told his audience that unemployment was not as dismal as the 5.5 per cent jobless rate would have indicated. The argument was

\(^{29}\)Hodgson returned to Indiana in behalf of Roudebush late in the campaign. The Secretary went to South Bend, Indiana, an area which had been added to the list of cities with unemployment between eight and ten per cent during the summer of 1970. According to the account of Roger Burdsell, Hodgson's "message" at that time was similar to the one presented earlier in Fort Wayne. Roger Burdsell, "Labor Secretary Backs Nixon Moves," \textit{South Bend Tribune}, October 30, 1970, Sec. 2, p. 1.

\(^{30}\)Gary Grace and Bayne Morley, "Hodgson Sees Jobless Drop in Next Year," \textit{Journal-Gazette} (Fort Wayne), October 20, 1970, p. 1B. I might note that throughout the 1970 campaign Administrative spokesman took any tenth of an increase gain in employment, G. N. P., or any other economic indicator to argue that inflation was being curbed and the economy was recovering.
that the unemployment rate among youth was four times greater than that of the adult rate. The solution to that situation according to Hodgson was more emphasis on education in the crafts and trade area. The Secretary continued his speech when he argued that the Nixon Administration had been a "people-minded administration" which had quietly proposed policies which would solve the economic plight of the country. The first task of the Administration had been to "cool" the confrontation in the streets and on the college campuses as well as in Vietnam; that, according to the Secretary was what the Administration had done. The second task was to get control of the economy which the Administration was doing. The picture of the Nixon Administration which emerged as a result of the Secretary's speech was one of a no-nonsense problem solving group who needed men like Ross Adair and Richard Roudebush to continue its problem solving activities.

Secretary Hodgson had been introduced by Congressman Roudebush. When Hodgson completed his speech the program chairman for the day introduced Congressman Roudebush.

Analysis of Roudebush's Speech

As Congressman Roudebush looked out over the audience of about 160 people, he opened his black ring notebook and began his speech by

\[\text{Estimate is based on author's notes dated: October 19, 1970.}\]
emphasizing that things were happening in Fort Wayne. The Congress-
man said: "... it's a hard act to follow—and this makes it my
consternation as I stand before this great group today and follow the
Secretary of Labor and know the President of the United States is coming
tomorrow. I guess that Fort Wayne is sort of the center of things."
The Congressman continued his introductory comments by reminding the
audience that he was aware that he had a limited amount of time.
Roudebush said: "But I will try to keep my remarks very brief and give
you a chance to ask questions if you will. I do have my eye on the clock,
I will say; and I will certainly live within the time given me." An-
other indication of the Congressman's attention to the alloted time was
evidenced by what for him was a very brief, one paragraph, introduction
for his speech.

The audience quickly learned that Congressman Roudebush's strat-
egy in this speech was that of defining the issues of the campaign and
his stand on those issues. Roudebush defined an issue as "something
that troubles the people at a given time in a particular area." As
such Roudebush continued "you have to categorize issues according to
time, and place, and occurrence." The Congressman offered that issues
are determined through polls, letters to his offices in Washington,
D. C., and Indianapolis, and face-to-face contact with people as he

32 My notes indicate that the Congressman was wearing a light brown
shiny (sharkskin) suit. I also had the impressionistic note that
"Roudy intimidated by audience and lack of time."

33 All quotations are from the transcript made from a recording
of the speech by the author. The transcript is found in Appendix D.
travelled about the state. Up to that point in the speech Roudebush had used narration and description buttressed with personal examples to establish a primer on the evaluation of an issue in a political campaign. I judged the information to be slightly informative and slightly original. The approach was a safe one for the Congressman for it allowed him to lay ground work from which he could project an image of a mentor-communicator and express his political views in a manner which suggested that he was not going to be merely partisan.

The Congressman concluded his primer on campaign issues when he offered a long list of "main issues" of the campaign. Roudebush said:

Now you might be interested in knowing what I think are the main issues of this election of 1970. Well certainly and I don't mean these in order of preference, I must say. I'm just giving you a list of the ones that occur to me. First the war in Vietnam. And I would say this would include the recent proposal of Richard Nixon on the peace offensive. And certainly the riots and disorders that have affected many of our cities and many of our campuses. The economy that our Secretary (Hodgson) just talked about including the level of inflation. Drug usage. You'd be amazed at the amount of interest there is in the percentage of drug usage that we have now. And certainly the associated crime with that usage. Another newcomer . . . on our last poll--I think twelve per cent of the people felt it was the most important issue of this campaign. And that is the environment. The human environment or the ecology. And now, beginning to heat up again, the Middle East, that's another issue of the campaign especially Nasser's death. A few weeks ago, wherever I went, everybody wanted to talk about airplane hijacking and that was of great interest. And I think it emphasizes what I said in my opening remarks about time and place and occurrence. Or we could go on and on about wage and price controls that the Secretary didn't
talk about today but did in his breakfast (speech) this morning. But these are all the main issues. And of course to that you could add many many things and categories that I haven't discussed like civil rights and women's liberation movement and all these other things.

What the Congressman accomplished with the list of eleven potential issues, nine of which he called major issues, was to provide a preview of the argumentation of his speech. Roudebush signalled his intent when he said, "Now I think perhaps it might be of interest in about five minutes to cover these issues and my position on each of them and I will attempt to do so."

The Congressman commenced his analysis with a strong endorsement of the Nixon policy on Vietnam. He said:

First I want to say that I support without any mental reservations at all the plans advocated by Dick Nixon in regard to Vietnam. And I very violently oppose the numerous efforts made to hamstring our President; and here I cite the Cooper-Church Amendment, the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment, another amendment . . . to prevent the use of draftees in Vietnam, the Hart-Cooper Amendment which would limit the ABM sites to just two in number. I would say to you that I very strongly support our President in his planned peace offensive that he discussed by nationwide television just recently. And I regret so much that there hasn't been more, let's say, more indication of acceptance.

34I think there was a mix-up between the Congressman and the Secretary. Although the Secretary did not emphasize wage and price controls before the Rotarians as he did at the breakfast meeting, he did speak to the point before the Rotarians.
The argument from example to descriptive generalization is diagrammed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nixon's peace plan of early October, 1970. (Implied)</td>
<td>I very violently oppose the numerous efforts made to hamstring our President: and here I cite the Cooper-Church Amendment, the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment, and another amendment... to prevent the use of draftees in Vietnam, the Hart-Cooper Amendment which would limit the ABM sites to just two in number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short what the Congressman had done in the argument was not to assess the merit of the Nixon peace plan, but by implication he attacked Hartke's previous voting and the record of all those who had voted for the specific legislation. The argument was worded in such a way that those in the audience who had knowledge of the campaign could see it as a partisan attack; those who accepted the statement at face value would merely see a man who supported President Nixon.

Congressman Roudebush abruptly turned from Vietnam to his standard argument from criteria to verbal classification on the question of "law and order." Roudebush told his audience:

---

On riots and disorders I am strictly a law and order man. I believe that the written law is for everyone to obey. I don't believe you can excuse the violation of the law for any cause or any purpose. I don't think anyone has the right to interpret what law they're going to obey and which one they are not going to obey. I would say that when someone does break the law he should be very quickly apprehended and speedily prosecuted. And I would say in the case of college disorders, that certainly I am one of the strongest supporters of the right to disagree or dissent. I think anyone has the right to disagree with our President, our Governor, our Senator, our Congressman, or anyone else. But when dissent crosses that line of demarcation and people start throwing bottles or bricks or burning buildings or causing injury or death to other people they're not dissenting. Of course they aren't they're common criminals and should be treated as such under the criminal code.

The chain argument consists of two claims with which few would disagree for if one were to grant the definitions of "dissent" and "criminal acts" implicit in the argument one would also grant the claims. The arguments look like this when diagrammed:

```
Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D</th>
<th>I believe that the written law is for everyone to obey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I don't believe you can excuse the violation of the law for any cause or any purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because (W) I think the law is for everyone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I don't think anyone has the right to interpret what law they're going to obey and they are not going to obey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I would say that when someone breaks the law he should be quickly apprehended and speedily prosecuted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Claim (Q)

On riots and disorders I am strictly a law and order man.
```
Of course they aren’t (dissenting) they’re common criminals and should be treated as such under the criminal code.

Because (W) the law says throwing bottles or bricks or burning buildings or causing injury or death to other people are criminal acts. (Implied)

As I noted in the last chapter the argument is designed to elicit an emotional response from property minded Hoosiers. Each of Roudebush’s audiences applauded his statement of the argument, although the Rotarians neither applauded as loudly or as long as did the other audiences I observed.

The Congressman turned from “law and order” to an evaluation of the economy. After taking a cue from Secretary Hodgson, Congressman Roudebush first emphasized the positive factors in the economic picture and secondly, posited as a solution to high unemployment vocational education.

In his analysis of praiseworthy factors in the economy, Roudebush said:
In regard to the economy the Secretary (Hodgson) has already discussed this. I would say there are some happy indicators in the economy and it presents a mixed outlook of course. He (Hodgson) mentioned the fact that the gross national product was again showing gains. And, this I think is good. He did mention the fact that new housing starts, ... has finally shown an increase. And I should say too that the total number of people employed in our country even now ... is at its highest peak in the history of our nation. The Secretary also did mention the fact the breakdown of the Bureau of Labor statistics indicate that most of our unemployment today and the really ... critical area is in the age bracket of sixteen to twenty-four while those age twenty-five and above on our labor force really has remained almost constant. Actually I think the level is about 3.4 to a high of 3.5 however, the under twenty-five is where we find the real radical unemployment. ...

The argument is one from the authority of James Hodgson, Secretary of Labor. The Congressman placed his own interpretation on the observations of Hodgson but essentially he relied on the argument of the Secretary. Diagramatically the argument is:
In regard to the economy, the Secretary (Hodgson) has already discussed this.

Because (W)

I agree with Hodgson's evaluation. (Implied)

Since (S)

He did mention the fact that the gross national product was again showing gains.

He mentioned the fact that new housing starts ... has finally shown an increase.

And I would say too that the total number of people employed ... is at its highest peak in the history of our nation.

The Secretary also did mention the fact that the breakdown of the Bureau of Labor statistics indicate that most of our unemployment today ... the critical area is in the bracket of sixteen to twenty-four while those age twenty-five and above on our labor force really has remained ... almost constant. Actually I think the level is about 3.4 to a high of 3.5, however the under twenty-five (group) is where we find the real radical numbers of unemployment.

Indeed the economic indicators were mixed in October, 1970. To Roudebush's credit his line of argument fit nicely into the political reality expressed by Richard Scammon and Ben J. Wattenberg in *The Real Majority*: "The great majority of the voters in America are unyoung,
unpoor, and unblack; they are middle-aged, middle-class, middle-minded."³⁶ That reality, however, obscured another, perhaps more meaningful reality in 1970: the World War II "baby boom" comprised the under twenty-five age group. In short, the statistics were correct but the interpretation of them slighted their true meaning. The immediate audience before Roudebush first were "voters" in the Scammon-Wattenberg sense and second lived in an area with relative unemployment and where the adage "anyone who wants to work can work" prevailed. The point is important because the Congressman continued by implying that the solution to the unemployment among the sixteen to twenty-four age group was vocational education; a point which we shall see he strongly emphasized during the question and answer period.

The Congressman refined for the audience his thinking about youthful unemployment when he continued:

... the under twenty-five (group) is where we find the real radical unemployment and the real radical numbers of unemployment. Here I think there are many things that must be done and I am sure if there are educators present that they might take exception to what I am saying. I am a great vocational rehabilitation man. I think that the failure of unemployment of our youth is unique in the United States. Actually no other country in the world that I know of has this similar problem that we have here in the United States. So instead of answering the question let me ask a rhetorical question. Don't you think it's quite possible we may be educating our youth in the wrong direction? Don't you think it is quite possible we would have a much lesser unemployment rate among young workers if they were given a skill such as a building trade, such as in automobile mechanics and things of this type? This punctuates my belief in vocational rehabilitation.

When the argument is diagrammed it looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Radical unemployment for 1 under twenty-five age group.</td>
<td>I am a great vocational rehabilitation man and I think more young people ought to be trained in vocational and trade schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem is unique to our 2 youth—Roudy thinks</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical questions and 3 the answers they suggest: &quot;Don't you think it's quite possible we may be educating our youth in the wrong direction&quot;? &quot;Don't you think it's quite possible we would have a much lesser unemployment rate among young workers if they were given a skill such as a building trade, such as in automobile mechanics and things of this type&quot;?</td>
<td>My answer to the rhetorical question is that radical unemployment for the under twenty-five age group would be taken care of with vocational training. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The argument was spurious and an unthinking response was the one sought.

The Congressman would need to clarify a few items of information prior to establishing "vocational rehabilitation" or vocational education as a solution to the unemployment among youth. The points to be clarified were: 1) was the problem of youthful unemployment unique to the United States? 2) How many young people were being trained in "a building trade," or "in automobile mechanics"? 3) How many in the building trade industry were unemployed at the time? 4) How many mechanics were unemployed? 5) How many building trade people and mechanics were needed to fill the vacuum in such areas, if one existed? A bit later, in the question and answer period, the Congressman provided a clue to the assessment of the argument when he answered a question which was based
on this portion of his presentation. Roudebush said: "I merely said this, in many cases I think that there are just one whole hell of lot of kids in college that who (sic) would do much better in vocational rehabilitation." The total thrust of the argument suggests that "college kids," who probably did not show up in the 1970 unemployment figures because they were not in the job market with other under twenty-five year olds, were the Congressman's concern. At best the implications of the Congressman's argument were curious, at worst they were frightening. At best, the Congressman was merely confused about the group he had reference to in the under twenty-five and unemployed category. Or, at worst, the Congressman saw vocational education as an instrument to quell social disturbances. In either case the line of reasoning was not sound.

On the related issues of drug usage and crime, Congressman Roudebush had told his audience that the big problem in the country was the consumption of heroin. Roudebush told the audience what was being done to prevent the use of both heroin and marijuana when he said:

In regard to the drug usage and crime, of course, I think it is rather redundant to say we're all against crime. Of course we are. In regards to the drug usage the big problem we have in this country is the tremendous consumption of heroin. Heroin is the main drug that causes our big problem. And really it's very difficult to control the illicit trade in drugs and the illicit traffic in drugs. I have talked to the people at the Bureau of Narcotics and they have estimated that with the very best police surveillance with the use of electronic listening devices which we are now authorized to use and have used with great success that still only about ten per cent of this illicit supply of drugs can be stopped cold. Recognizing this the Nixon Administration has worked very quickly toward attempting to dry up drugs at their source. And
the source of the opium poppy for use here in the United States is chiefly Turkey and the opium poppy . . . narcotic is manufactured . . . in the Republic of France. And we are working very closely with both Turkey and France now to not only discourage the planting of opium poppy but the manufacture of the illicit drugs in these clandestine type laboratories mostly in the Montsai area. Typically France has always been . . . permissive in the case of drugs . . . They never had a real (drug) problem in France and for the first time we see the employment of more and more agents in France . . . . Our marijuana problem is mostly with the Republic of Mexico. And I'm very happy to tell you that Mexico too is cooperating.

The diagram of the Congressman's assessment of the problem aspect of the drug issue shows him to be reasoning from examples to descriptive generalization. Essentially Roudebusch suggested to his audience that each of the three claims in his analysis were based on his "talk" with the people at the Bureau of Narcotics. When diagrammed the claims look like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 D</td>
<td>Everyone is concerned about drug usage and the crime associated with it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 D</td>
<td>The press in recent months had carried articles on efforts in Turkey, France and Mexico to halt the flow of illicit drugs. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 D</td>
<td>Roudebusch &quot;talked with the people at the Bureau of Narcotics . . . .&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 D</td>
<td>In regards to the drug usage the big problem we have in this country is the tremendous consumption of heroin.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 D</td>
<td>My sources of information lead me to believe it. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Roudebusch's talk with people at Bureau of Narcotics)
The data for Congressman Roudebush's first claim in the drug usage question was incomplete. I doubt that many in the audience had an adequate enough understanding of the heroin problem to agree or disagree with the Congressman. The press had devoted space to efforts of the Bureau of Narcotics at paying Turkish farmers not to grow poppy plants, seeking assistance from the Republic of France in closing manufacturing points where poppy was converted into heroin, and using dogs on the Mexican border to sniff out concealed marijuana. Neither the press nor the government had done much to inform the public in 1970 of the United States military personnel's usage of heroin in Southeastern Asia as a cause of the demand for heroin on American streets when they were returned to civilian life. Nor had the public been informed of the involvement of organized crime in trafficking in drugs. What the Congressman revealed to his audience as the basis of analysis had been common knowledge. Whether or not the audience would agree that heroin was the main drug which caused the big problem, I do not know; I tend to doubt that they would.

Roudebush's second claim in the analysis recounted for the audience the efforts of the Nixon Administration to dry up the source of such drugs. Those efforts were ineffective. The diagram follows:
Data

D Claim 1 Heroin is the main drug that causes our big problem.

D ... it's very difficult 2 to control the illicit trade in drugs and illicit traffic in drugs.

D I've talked to the people 3 at the Bureau of Narcotics and they have estimated that with the very best police surveillance with the use of electronic listening devices which we now are authorized to use and have used with great success that still only about ten per cent of this illicit supply of drugs can be stopped cold.

Claim

Because (W) The Nixon Administration recognizes the difficulty in controlling domestic drug traffic and is trying to dry up that traffic at its source.

Since (B) The source of opium poppy is Turkey, the Administration has sought Turkish assistance.

Since heroin is manufactured in France, the aid of France has been sought.

The ground work for the police activity referred to by Roudebush was laid when the Senate finally passed and the President signed the District of Columbia Crime Bill. During the 1968 Campaign, Nixon made crime in the District of Columbia a symbolic national issue by calling the city the crime capital of the nation. Eighteen months later after a protracted effort of the Attorney General John N. Mitchell and the entire Administration the bill was passed. The provisions of the bill included: 1) authorization for "no-knock" searches, under which an officer with a warrant could force his way into a building, without
announcing his presence or identifying himself if there were reason to believe evidence inside would be otherwise destroyed—this provision was to have been specifically included to handle drug raid problems; 2) preventive or pretrial detention for up to sixty days without bail if a hearing established that the defendant might commit further crimes if he were released; 3) establishment of a mandatory five year sentence upon a second conviction for a crime of violence where the defendant carried a gun; and 4) authorization for wire-taps by the police with court approval, with restriction of their use when the communication involved is between physician and patient, attorney and client, clergyman and parishioner, or husband and wife. Senator Sam J. Ervin led the opposition to the bill and argued that it was not merely a local law enforcement bill but represented the Administration's national crime policy. The two Senators from Indiana split the vote on the measure: Hartke voted "yes," Bayh voted "no." Congressman Roudebush supported the act. Even with such lenient police measures the drug problem continued to grow. Consequently the Nixon Administration, in a highly publicized move, acted to get at the potential foreign sources of drugs.

The third claim in this chain of reasoning which formed Roudebush's analysis of the drug problem is diagrammed thusly:

The cooperation of Mexico on the stoppage of the flow of marijuana into the United States was well known to the audience.

The ultimate cure to the problem of the usage of drugs in the country according to the Congressman was the education of the youth of the nation on the dangers of drugs. The Congressman did not advance a specific format for such educational undertakings; he was content to say that "we can render the supply at best" and "education" would have to do the rest.

When Roudebush took up the question of ecology with the Rotarians he said he wanted to compliment the business segment of the country for their efforts in the area because they were without benefit of tax incentive. Roudebush hastened to add that he had introduced a bill in Congress to provide tax incentives to industries to assist them in their efforts to abate pollution.

According to the Congressman the real element in our society responsible for pollution was the individual. Roudebush pointed out that each American daily created seven pounds of junk; partly through creative packaging of products and partly through indestructible containers made of plastic and aluminum.
In his discussion of ecology Roudebush sought to affirm that he was standing by the businessman in his efforts to solve the pollution problem. Through the use of narration and description, Roudebush "fixed" the problem with the individual, but failed to advance a concrete approach to its resolution. The Congressman would have profited from not mentioning the "issue" for he revealed a sparse knowledge of the subject.

The last issue Congressman Roudebush took up was that of the Middle East situation. Essentially, Roudebush elaborated on his view that President Nasser of Egypt had been a "moderate man in spite of his rhetoric" who had "given the Arabs a sense of nationalism." That line of reasoning had frequently appeared in the United States as a result of the evaluation of Nasser following his sudden death in Cairo, Egypt, September 28, 1970. The Middle East situation contained a counter-balancing element to the Arabs: the State of Israel. The Congressman had to comment on our support to Israel.

The Israeli democracy had been one of the political units in the Middle East that the United States had supported with military arms. The Congressman told his audience that he endorsed such a relationship so that a meaningful peace could be secured in the Middle East. Roudebush said:

Now how do I feel about arms to Israel? I very definitely support continued supplying of military material to the Israelis. . . . because I realize that parity must be maintained between the Arab and the Jew if we'll ever have a meaningful peace in the Mid-East. If we allow the Arab block nations or the Israelis to attempt to go to the
peace table strictly from a position of strength, I don't think we'll ever have a meaningful peace.

The diagram of the argument from examples to descriptive generalization takes this form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D The Russians have provided 1 and continue to provide arms to the Arabs. (Implied)</td>
<td>I very definitely support continued supplying of military material to the Israelis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D The Americans have provided 2 and continue to provide arms to the Israelis. (Implied)</td>
<td>Because (W) If we allow the Arab block nations or the Israelis to attempt to go to the peace table strictly from a position of strength, I don't think we'll ever have a meaningful peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D The Arabs attack the Israelis and lost the war in six days in 1966. (Implied)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D . . . because I realize that parity must be maintained between the Arab and the Jew if we'll ever have a meaningful peace in Middle East.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Congressman as well as most of his audience might well have acknowledged that the Middle East question probably was unsolvable. In the meantime most Western nations agreed that "parity" of strength was the best answer under the circumstances. The Congressman ought not to have a problem in taking the position he did.

Roudebush concluded his speech by telling the Rotarians that he was opposed to wage and price controls because they would not work and called for questions from the audience.
Question and Answer Period

Because of the lack of time, Congressman Roudebush failed to elaborate on many of the five questions put to him. For example when he was asked how he felt about the legalization of marijuana, Roudebush confidently asserted that he was "absolutely opposed" to it for it was "the first step to hard drug usage," but he offered only his opinion in support of the controversial conclusion.

The Congressman's reaction to the second question put to him, on whether or not his support of vocational education precluded education in math and science, elicited the response discussed earlier, that he somehow saw vocational education as being in great need for many college students. The Congressman's explanation of the point had less meaning than his intent in developing it had.

The third question put to Roudebush received the crisp answer, "No." Essentially the question was: "Would you favor paying farmers in Turkey not to grow poppy plants?"

Congressman Roudebush was unsettled by the fourth question for it appeared designed to negate the impact of his professed concern over ecology. The question was: "Would you be willing to back national legislation for the removal of aluminum cans which are non-deteriorating"? Roudebush answered:

Ah, would I be willing to back legislation making it unlawful to use aluminum cans? . . . No, I wouldn't go that far, but I certainly would be willing to back legislation that would encourage the return of containers, or something of this type. Really, I'm not real clear in my thinking as to how far I'm willing to back
legislation making it illegal to go that far. That's a tough one that you threw me there, but I would think there should be some sort of legislation concerning throwing garbage away in state or national parks.

Like the previous question, the final question put to the Congressman was politically embarrassing. The question was: "When will you next appear with Senator Hartke on a televised debate?" The answer was:

I'm not real sure--but it will occur I'm rather sure of that. I ah I regret very much--that will have to be my last question because I promised I'm honored to a 1:30 time limit and I've got twenty seconds to say this. I just regret that some statements have been made that the President of the United States is coming to Indiana to take me off the hook on the television. This is so ridiculous, this is so asinine--that it really doesn't deserve comment. The President of the United States is probably, I would say, was completely unaware that we had a televised debate in Indiana (laughter). And this is so stupid. I had no part in trying to get out of the second debate. I don't know why I should--I think I won the first one. (laughter)

The final question concluded the Congressman's address to the Rotarians on a highly partisan campaign issue: was Richard Nixon's appearance in Fort Wayne on October 20, 1970, the evening scheduled for the second debate selected because that choice would cancel the second debate? The Congressman might have succinctly concluded on a less partisan note had he merely stopped after his first sentence in the response: "I'm not real sure--but it will occur I'm rather sure of that."

Instead Roudebush hurriedly used Hartke's wording that the President was coming to Indiana to get Roudebush "off the hook." Although Roudebush used "ridiculous," "asinine," and "stupid" to denounce the idea, I suspect his response had more effect with his supporters than with those who were neutral or pro-Hartke.
The audience applauded politely and hurried back to their jobs.

Summary

When Roudebush addressed the Fort Wayne Rotary Club on October 19, 1970, the campaign was in its last phase: Senator Hartke had preceded him by two weeks; Hartke and Roudebush had appeared in a debate over statewide television; and the audience knew that the President of the United States would be in town the day after the address.

One of the major factors which influenced the Congressman's Rotary Club speech was the fact that he shared the platform with James Hodgson, Secretary of Labor. Mr. Hodgson and Congressman Roudebush both presented complete addresses. Consequently, the Congressman was confronted with less time and fewer ideas to be developed in his speech.

Roudebush commenced his address by indicating to the Rotarians that he was going to discuss the issues of the campaign and his stand on those issues. The definition of an issue which was offered, "something that troubles the people at a given time in a particular area," was circumstantially based and therefore imprecise. The definition of an issue offered by Roudebush was a good definition of a "concern" but it lacked the specificity needed for the development of an argument. Roudebush's definition was well selected in that it permitted him the leeway to use more description and narration in explaining his view of political circumstances. The definition also served as a basis for establishing a primer on campaign issues and assuming the stance of a mentor-communicator.
Congressman Roudebush developed his views on seven major areas of concern: Vietnam, "riots and disorders," the economy, illegal drug usage, ecology, the Middle East crisis, and wage and price control. In the development of the points in the area of the economy, Roudebush referred to what Secretary Hodgson had said and elaborated on those observations by providing his own emphasis. Frequently, the Congressman was imprecise in his thinking and suggested that he was hurried in the development of his ideas.

Congressman Roudebush set out to establish himself as a mentor-communicator elaborating the issues of the 1970 campaign for the Rotarians. The approach appeared to be designed to de-emphasize "set" Roudebush campaign themes. Due to the limitations of a prepared manuscript and having followed an address by the Secretary of Labor, the Congressman appeared rushed. The analysis of "issues" which was offered was frequently spurious and inadequate. The answers to specific questions from the audience--particularly the last two questions--seemed to put the Congressman on the defensive. Roudebush's response to the final question ended his Fort Wayne Rotary Club address on an aggressive, partisan note.

I suggested at the beginning of this discussion of political speaking before non-partisan audiences that such addresses required of a speaker that he demonstrate political acumen. Congressman Roudebush's development of his primer on campaign issues theoretically ought to have demonstrated his political acumen. Unfortunately the execution of the analysis of campaign issues which the Congressman
offered was such that only the very partisan, selective Roudebush supporter would have concluded that he had done well. Although the membership of the Fort Wayne Rotary Club were conservative, they were not stupid. Congressman Roudebush might have better served the purpose of displaying political acumen by carefully limiting the number of "issues" he wished to address. Had he limited his analysis to four or five "issues" rather than nine, the Congressman might have carefully developed each in such a way as to encourage supporters and latent supporters without antagonizing supporters of Senator Hartke. Because he was not as selective as he might have been, Congressman Roudebush failed to develop his analysis of any issue as well as he might have.

When Senator Hartke addressed the Rotarians he employed a strategy in which he developed a philosophical context within which he offered an analysis of the contemporary American scene. Both Hartke and Roudebush discussed concerns which we have seen most Americans ought to have viewed as salient. The difference in the discussions of the two men was that when the Senator discussed the investment tax credit, for instance, his emphasis was on the credit as a vehicle to keep the American productive capacity on a par with more modern plants in Germany and Japan. In that way Americans could be provided more jobs through the competition. When Congressman Roudebush discussed his praise for the efforts of private industry in abating pollution, his legislation was designed to profit the businesses. The Senator addressed concerns from the viewpoint of alleviating the anxiety and
fear in the nation; the Congressman was content to react to each situation. The Senator took the opportunity to define in a partisan way the political situation; the Congressman was content to react.

The philosophical approach taken by Senator Hartke went further to instill enthusiasm in his supporters and latent supporters than did the approach taken by Congressman Roudebush. Of the political acumen displayed by the two men as they addressed the Rotarians, Senator Hartke appeared to have a better grasp of the situation.

The Fort Wayne Rotary Club was a tough conservative audience. Many of the Rotarians had probably had several items for which they could vote against Vance Hartke. When Senator Hartke completed his speech he had so developed his ideas that he had contributed little to the list of items against him. On the other hand, Congressman Roudebush developed his ideas in such a way that only his most partisan supporters would have approved. When considered together, Senator Hartke's address to the Fort Wayne Rotary Club was superior to the address of Congressman Roudebush before the same group.

Throughout this chapter there have been references to the statewide television "debate" of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush. In the next chapter I will offer analysis of that "debate" as well as other television appearances by the two candidates.
CHAPTER V

THE SACROSANCT TRADITION

In the history of the United States argumentation, debate, discussion, and majority rule have been sacrosanct. The first representative government in America, the Assembly of Virginia, commenced operation on July 30, 1619, with the seed of America's sacrosanct tradition implanted in its character. The Assembly of Virginia was to consist of "two Burgesses out of every Town, Hundred, or other particular Plantation, to be respectively chosen by the Inhabitants, ... wherein ... all Matter shall be decided, determined, and ordered, by the greater Part of the Voices then present; reserving to the Governor always a Negative Voice."¹

The sacrosanct tradition of the use of the "word" in determining policy in our society continues to be the genius of our political system. As the nation grew the debates which resulted in compromises reflected the changes in society. Those debates and compromises appear cyclical in nature; approximately every hundred years a significant political debate has forced our people to re-evaluate the political framework by which they would govern.

¹The first and second Charters and the Ordinance for Virginia are in Henry Steele Commager, editor, Documents of American History (New York: Crofts, 1946), Two volumes in one. See: I: pp. 8-14.
A little over a hundred years after the opening of the Assembly of Virginia, the English colonies became embroiled in a series of events which led to revolution, the establishment of a set of rules (the Articles of Confederation) for governing the loosely structured group of independent states and the revision of that set of rules into the Constitution of the United States of America.

With passage of another century the country found itself involved in debates, compromises, and ultimately a war which drastically changed the complexity of its politics.

Throughout our history various periods of debate, discussion and compromise featured politicians paired off in order to represent different positions on major questions. In the twentieth century the addition of technology to the sacrosanct tradition of debates and discussion constitutes the major change in that tradition. For instance the role of rail transportation in defeat, President Woodrow Wilson's efforts to have the United States accept the League of Nations and the Peace Treaty which ended World War I cannot go unnoticed. President Franklin Roosevelt's use of the radio as a compliment in the political process was another breakthrough. In the last half of the twentieth century the growth and use of television has had and will continue to have profound effect on how our political life is conducted. Whereas advocates in the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries addressed audiences membering two or three hundred, John F. Kennedy and Richard Nixon were estimated to have addressed a total of between
85,000,000 to 120,000,000 Americans.² As a result of the success of the Kennedy-Nixon debates in 1960, politicians have come to view television as a very important medium in political campaigning. Most use of television as a political tool has failed to contribute significantly to the tradition of debate, discussion and compromise which had been characteristic of early forensic encounters. Such a condition is more a function of a lack of a significant issue during the infancy of television than a reflection on the potential of the medium.³ One thing is certain as a result of the stir caused by the Nixon-Kennedy debates few politicians can ignore the role of television in the political process.

Although the Nixon-Kennedy debates in 1960 failed to consider matters of substance, they did provide an illusion of involvement with the political process for many Americans. From a similar vantage point ten years later, television viewers around the State of Indiana had an opportunity to view Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush in what amounted to a weak continuation of the sacrosanct tradition.

²White, The Making of the President 1960, p. 332. In his discussion of the size of the audience for the Nixon-Kennedy Debates, White offers conflicting estimates: George Gallup said 85,000,000; NBC said 115,000,000; CBS said 120,000,000 viewed the debates.

³The general lack of comment on any substantive matter during the debate runs throughout critical assessments of the Nixon-Kennedy Debates. Television as a political tool of some importance was praised but such praise was not extended to the handling of substantive issues by either Vice-President Nixon or Senator Kennedy. See: the conclusions of Earl Mazo, Malcolm Moose, Hallock Hoffman, and Harvey Wheeler in The Great Debates: An Occasional Paper on the Role of the Political Process in the Free Society published by the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions (Santa Barbara, California: The Fund for the Republic, Inc., 1962), p. 5; 8; pp. 11-12; and p. 16.
Television As A Political Tool

The role of television as a political tool has emerged simultaneously with the growth of the television industry. According to Theodore White, "in 1950 . . . (of) 40,000,000 families only 11 per cent (or 4,400,000) enjoyed the pleasures of a television set. By 1960 the number of American families had grown to 44,000,000, and of these no less than 88 per cent, or 40,000,000, possessed a television set." The use of television as a political tool had been realized by Richard Nixon as early as the fall of 1952 when he used it to secure his spot as Republican Vice-President nominee by broadcasting his famous "Checker Speech." Throughout the early and mid-nineteen fifties political campaign advisors viewed television as an expensive tool which could be used to reach primarily partisan audiences. Such a statement is not meant to suggest that the potential or nature of political television had not been surmised; both had been. For example both the size of the potential audience and the potential of a sense of involvement which television fosters was evidenced in the headline of columnist Jack Gould's, January 25, 1955 column. The headline for Gould's column for that date read: "Television in Review: President's Press Conference an Example to Millions of Democracy at Work." Although television does


5Jack Gould, "Television in Review," New York Times, January 20, 1955, p. 39. The column was devoted to the first televised Press Conference held by a President. On January 19, 1955, President Eisenhower was the first President to face the television cameras in a Press Conference.
permit a sense of involvement on the part of the audience, it also conditions the expectation of the audience.

Few would contend that television today has progressed beyond its infancy in terms of potential use. In the late nineteen-forties, fifties, sixties, and seventies entertainment of the formula situation comedy, variety, and interview programs have been perfected. The attempt to cover news stories by television journalists has had to compete with the built in bias for entertainment of the television audience. Secondly, television journalism has had to be much more selective of the choice of the conflict which was to be covered in a news broadcast. In short, the audience bias toward entertainment and the news consumer's interest in conflict have mediated against in depth, potentially dull, consideration of substantive matters. Further when one realizes that many of the television decision makers on political campaign staffs received their initial training producing entertainment programs on television, one quickly concludes that serious discussions of substantive political matters on television during a campaign would be viewed as unrealistic.®

All of the above factors, the use of television primarily as an entertainment medium, the effect of the entertainment mode on news

®For example in 1968, Presidential candidate Richard Nixon had as his man in charge of television production Roger Ailes. Prior to working for Mr. Nixon, Ailes produced the Mike Douglas Show. The Mike Douglas Show had songs, jokes, and "personalities" as its substance. In 1970 Mr. Ailes was hired by Congressman Roudebush as his television campaign advisor.
coverage of defeating in depth consideration of substantive matters, the natural selection of successful television procedures of entertainment shows as political television advisors by candidates, have conspired to negate lengthy considerations of substantive issues in political television campaigns.

Politicians have realized that the nature of television coincides with one of the major goals of any politician; it permits the illusion of appearing to take a stand on an issue without seriously preventing action of an opposite nature on the same issue. Secondly, politicians have been quick to realize that they can be the guests in the homes of thousands, or even millions, with one television appearance. And being good "guests," most politicians are careful not to offend any host. Consequently, politicians who use television say little which is controversial and appear content to reach the partisan voter. Although many politicians do not expect to convert uncommitted voters with television appearances, few would ignore the use of television; the potential lack of public exposure is the overwhelming factor in such a decision.

Since the 1960 Nixon-Kennedy Debates one political rule of thumb has emerged concerning televised debates: If you are the incumbent or ahead in the campaign do not give your opponent exposure by debating him on television. Earl Mazo, in his discussion *The Great Debates* illustrates the point thusly:

*There will be occasions in the future, however, when a candidate would prefer to avoid a mass television audience. Take a President running for a second term, for instance. Because of the enormous prestige of his office, any President automatically attracts almost universal attention.*
It is certain that a candidate-President would hesitate to offer his opponent the opportunity to capitalize on the aura that surrounds the highest office in the land. A series of debates probably is possible under these circumstances only if the incumbent is positive that it would be to his best interests.\(^7\)

Mazo's point applies to a President, a Senator, a Congressman or any politician.

Vance Hartke had been a United States Senator from Indiana for twelve years. One of the major problems of his opponent at the beginning of the campaign was lack of recognition across Indiana which he felt.\(^8\)

Further Congressman Roudebush started his campaign "approximately 10 per cent behind" Senator Hartke with about one-third of those polled indicating that they were uncertain of support for either candidate. From the point of view of the first part of the above quotation of Mazo, Roudebush should have challenged Hartke to a debate; as events transpired the reverse was true.

The On Again Off Again Debates

The moves and counter moves which ultimately led to the not-so-great statewide television debate of Vance Hartke and Richard Roudebush on October 12, 1970, make an interesting saga.

Throughout the campaign, Congressman Roudebush's attempts to use television as a political tool were ineffective. For example the spot

\(^7\)Earl Mazo, et. al., The Great Debates, p. 7. Emphasis added.

\(^8\)Letter to the author from Mr. Roudebush dated August 30, 1972. The observations which follow are Roudebush's relative position at the beginning of the campaign from the same letter.
advertisement for Roudebush in which Senator Hartke was portrayed as
a purveyor of weapons to the Viet Cong had two results: 1) a great
deal of criticism of the Congressman, and 2) official complaints of
unethical conduct to the Fair Campaign Practice Committee and the
Federal Communications Commission. A second example was the accept-
ance of an invitation to appear on the National Education Television
Network program, "The Advocates" by both candidates. "The Advocates"
challenge had been hand delivered by Hartke aides to Congressman
Roudebush's offices in Indianapolis, Indiana, and Washington, D. C.,
on September 2, 1970.9 On September 6, 1970, the editorial page of the
conservative, pro-Roudebush newspaper, the Indianapolis Star, ran its
regular political column "Behind Closed Doors" with the subtitle, "Who
Outsmarts Whom in Setup for Hartke-Roudebush Debate?"10 The analysis
contained in the article was that Congressman Roudebush never expected
Senator Hartke to accept the invitation to appear on "The Advocates."
Further, the analysis continued that had Senator Hartke refused the
invitation the Congressman would have had an advantage in future
negotiations on offers to debate. The editorial writers of the
Indianapolis Star wondered how Congressman Roudebush would accept an
invitation to represent himself before a liberal audience in Boston,
Massachusetts, who would be asked to vote on which man did the better

9"Roudebush OK's Debate with Hartke," Gary Post-Tribune,

10The Star City Staff, "Behind Closed Doors: Who Outsmarts Whom
in Setup for Hartke-Roudebush Debate?" Indianapolis Star, September 6,
job of representing his position to them. On September 13, 1970, Congressman Roudebush's office announced that The Congressman had decided not to appear on "The Advocates" because "more Hoosier voters would be reached if debates were held in Indiana and covered by Hoosier newsmen."11 As a result of Roudebush's use of television spot advertising and the early maneuvering over debating on television and Hartke's reaction to it all, political columnist, Ed Zuckerman, concluded: "The Republican candidate has been spending money for expensive television campaigning while the Democrat has been grabbing the publicity."12

As the campaign progressed Senator Hartke justifiably charged that Congressman Roudebush was avoiding any statewide debate with him. On September 2, 1970, Congressman Roudebush agreed to "five invitations to a public debate with Hartke from television stations in South Bend, Vincennes, and Bloomington, Indiana, Louisville, Kentucky, and from the National Educational Television network in Boston, Massachusetts. . . .13 Of the original five debate invitations Congressman Roudebush reneged on the National Educational Television debate and the WTIU-TV, Bloomington appearance. The Bloomington appearance was scheduled after the first statewide debate of October 12, 1970. More importantly, because it was scheduled on October 28, 1970, after the October 20, 1970, date of the proposed second statewide television debate had been


cancelled due to President Nixon's visit to Fort Wayne, Indiana on the 20th, many thought the October 28th meeting ideal for the second televised debate. Unfortunately Congressman Roudebush had to withdraw from the October 28th agreement "because of a visit to Indiana by Mrs. Pat Nixon."

Both candidates appeared in the locally televised encounters in the following locations: 1) South Bend in late October where both men went on a half-hour call-in television program to answer questions from callers; 2) Vincennes; 3) South Bend on WDAU-TV for a half-hour call in show; 4) Louisville, Kentucky, where Congressman Roudebush admitted his association with TRAIN and TRAIN's association with The John Birch Society. Generally the local joint appearances on television were not well covered by newspapers.

After the first statewide television debate on October 12, 1970, Congressman Roudebush appeared to avoid joint appearances with Senator Hartke. On October 20, 1970, the scheduled second statewide broadcast of an hour debate was cancelled because President Nixon was in Fort Wayne in behalf of Congressman Roudebush on that date. On October 27, 1970, both men had agreed to appear in a press conference/television debate format before the South Bend-Mishawaka Chambers of Commerce. Congressman Roudebush insisted that each man be given a half hour

---

separately before the press. The demand was honored. On that same day, October 27, 1970, both candidates were to debate the issues before the Kiwanis Club of Gary, Indiana. Congressman Roudebush withdrew from the debate after claiming that he had a conflict in his schedule. Congressman Roudebush's avoidance behavior emerged following the telecast of Indiana's first statewide television debate of Senatorial candidates. The original negotiations between the two candidates had called for two statewide telecasts, Congressman Roudebush reneged on the second one. The time has come to analyze the Hartke-Roudebush debate of October 12, 1970.

Format of the Debate

Throughout the month of September, 1970, representatives of the campaign staffs of Congressman Roudebush and Senator Hartke met with officials of the Indiana State Broadcaster's Association in an attempt to negotiate ground rules for a televised debate. Finally on October 7, 1970, Hoosier voters were informed that the three parties had successfully concluded an agreement on a format for two debates: October 12th and October 21st.

---


The television format for the Hartke-Roudebush debate was based on two factors: 1) question and answers by the candidates of each other, and 2) questions asked by one of three journalists which were to be answered by each candidate. In outline form the format for the debate of October 12, 1970, was: 18

1) Explanation of the rules for the debate and introduction of the panel of journalists by John Scott, Publisher and Editor of the Lafayette Journal-Courier and moderator for the program.

2) A three minute opening statement by each of the candidates; speaking order was determined by a flip of a coin. Hartke won; he spoke first and assumed he would speak last.

3) After the initial statements each candidate asked two questions of the other in alternate order. All questions were to be asked within thirty seconds.

4) Upon completion of the initial "candidates" portion of the broadcast, each member of the panel of journalists had thirty seconds to ask a question to which both candidates were to respond in a maximum of two minutes time. The three journalists who made up the panel were: Harry Fry, News Director WTWI-TV, Terre Haute; Fred Heckman, News Director of WIVC-TV, Indianapolis; and Hortense Meyers, United Press International, Indianapolis.

5) At the end of the hour each candidate had three minutes to make a closing statement.

6) An agreement was reached that the questions which were asked by the candidates were not to be personal in nature. To insure that the questions asked of the candidates by the newsmen were not personal, two referees previewed them in order to eliminate such questions. The referees were to time the candidates'

---

18 These preliminary considerations are detailed in the text of the debate of October 12, 1970, found in Appendix E. All quotations from the debate itself are from the same source.
remarks and questions during the program. Judge Charles White of the Indiana Appelate Court and Judge Richard Giffin of the Indiana Supreme Court served as referees.

The positive effects of such an involved format were: 1) the enhancement of a variety of voices and faces on the program which might increase audience interest; 2) the provision of six minutes of uninterrupted comments by each candidate in the opening and at the end of the program; and 3) the increased possibility of candidate clash on "issues" since both men were to respond to the same question put by a journalist. The negative effect was that a severe limitation of two minutes per answer which was placed on each candidate; the format did not encourage an answer which might display depth of understanding.

Further, because each candidate responded to every question, the number of questions asked by the newsmen were limited to a total of nine in sixty minutes. The television broadcast was clearly designed more for entertainment than for detailed discussion of "issues."

Analysis of the Hartke-Roudebush Debate

The manner of the candidates clearly suggested that each had a definite strategy for the projection of a clearly defined image into Hoosier living rooms on the night of October 12th. Although both men prepared for the debate in a similar fashion, Congressman Roudebush may have been more concerned with his image. Senator Hartke prepared for the program by employing an approach used by John F. Kennedy for the

Preparations for the televised debate between Senator Hartke and Mr. Roudebush originated with informal discussions involving Dr. Karl O'Tessker of our campaign staff, Johnny Allem (campaign press secretary), myself, and in most cases, the Senator, in efforts to draw up accurate and clear positions on questions and issues likely to be raised in the debate. We then posed a series of our own questions, testing the Senator's responses to locate problem points or areas needing more preparation.

The Hartke campaign planned its own television inside the organization. Johnny Allem, Hartke's press secretary, was responsible for co-ordinating the efforts of the two firms, Concept Films of Philadelphia which produced and edited the Senator's television commercials and Zimmer, McClasky and Lewis of Louisville, Kentucky. Zimmer, McClasky and Lewis specialized in placing commercials and buying broadcast time.

As shall be seen later in this analysis, Senator Hartke's strategy coincided with his general strategy in challenging Roudebush to

---


21 See "Nixon Advisor Helps 'Sell' Roudebush," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), October 11, 1970, p. 4A for a balanced coverage of the television operation of both campaigns.
debate in the first place; Hartke wanted to define his role as that of the candidate on the political offensive. The Senator started the campaign by shedding twenty pounds and undertaking a schedule of appearances which sometimes included twenty stops a day. Hartke wanted to debate his record of legislative leadership. In short, the Senator wanted to project a tough, aggressive, knowledgeable image.

When Congressman Roudebush responded to the question, "How did you prepare for the debate with Senator Hartke?" his answer was short: "By my staff asking questions (or sometimes serving in the role as my opponent) before a TV monitor."\(^{22}\) Roudebush's answer is responsive to the inquiry but not complete. Congressman Roudebush cancelled most of his appearances from Friday October 9 through Monday, October 12, 1970. There were two reasons for such an action: Roudebush had had a cold early in the week of October 5th and he needed to prepare for the debate.

The preparation by the Congressman and his staff for most of the weekend was under the direction of Robert Alshouse, the full-time deputy of Roger Ailes. Roger Ailes was the former producer of the Mike Douglas Show who handled the television portion of the 1968 campaign for the Presidency of Richard Nixon. The Ailes firm was hired for the Roudebush campaign at a fee reported to have been $60,000. Political columnist Ed Zuckerman of the Gary Post-Tribune wrote an article entitled "Top TV Coach Rehearses Roudebush"\(^{23}\) in which he reported on just how much

\(^{22}\)Letter to the author dated June 1, 1973.

of a television coach Alshouse was. A few excerpts from the Zuckerman article provide insight into the nature of the coaching of Richard Roudebush:

"Our only concern is making sure that the candidate presents himself in the best light," he (Alshouse) said.

Alshouse discussed some of the basics, such as how to hold your hands and which way to look in order to present the best camera angle, and, of course, how to know which camera is on.

A visit to his (Roudebush's) headquarters reveals what kind of preparations go on. In his (Roudebush's) office, there is a miniature television studio equipped with camera, microphone, videotape recorder and television set.

The Congressman had the coaching and equipment to be well prepared when the television camera was turned on for the debate.

Out of the coaching and the prior campaign themes came the strategy which the Congressman employed during the debate. Roudebush sought to project an image of a humble, grateful, rural family man.

On the evening of October 12, 1970, television viewers of eighteen different stations and radio listeners of twenty different radio stations were exposed to the program. Although the debate originated from WFBB-TV in Indianapolis, the major station in the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana to broadcast it simultaneously was WPTA-TV, Fort Wayne, Indiana. A check of facts concerning the coverage area of WPTA in 1970 indicate that with the exception of LaGrange County, WPTA programming was viewed in fifty per cent or over of the television

households during a given week. A check of the local television listing for Monday, October 12, 1970 indicated that the 9 P.M. Hartke-Roudebush Debate was broadcast in color; was precluded by "Laugh-In;" and followed by "Man from U.N.C.L.E." For those viewers who wanted to switch to the offering on the other two major networks in the 9 P.M. slot, a color broadcast of the "NFL Football" game between the Green Bay Packers and the San Diego Chargers or a color broadcast of "Mayberry R.F.D." and "Doris Day" were the viewing options. The Hartke-Roudebush Debate had to compete with the prime time entertainment.

Those Hoosiers who watched the color version of the broadcast saw a set which had a blue background with red desks and chairs dominating it. Both men were seated throughout the program. Senator Hartke looked thin, energetic, and active when compared to his heavier opponent. The Senator wore a dark blue suit with a medium blue shirt under a tie which had a red and blue diamond design on it. Congressman Roudebush wore a brown suit, light blue shirt, dark blue tie, and an American flag in the lapel of his jacket. Almost upon commencing the opening statements, each man clearly identified the image he wished to project to his audience.


26 "Fort Wayne Television," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), October 12, 1970, p. 5B.

27 Based on author's notes while viewing the debate. The notes are dated, October 12, 1970.
In discussing the debate let us consider, in turn, the opening statements of each candidate, the two questions of each candidate, the questions of the newsmen and the responses to those questions, and the concluding statement of each candidate.

Opening Statements

Senator Hartke had won the toss of the coin which determined the speaking order. Hartke chose to speak first and, he thought, last in the debate.28 The Senator's strategy of assuming the political offensive was quickly apparent in his opening remarks. The organization of that segment of the program was as follows: 1) emphasizing the significance of the election, 2) the assertion of the necessary criteria in making the decision of whom to vote for and 3) a comparison of the Hartke "record" with the Roudebush "record." The Senator's opening was as follows:

My friends in Indiana this election nineteen hundred and seventy will be a crucial one for each and every one of us. It's important, not alone, that we decide the individual that is going to the United States Senate; it's important that we decide upon what basis that decision is going to be made. The future for our children, the future for America, depends upon whether that intelligent decision which has been the backbone of America, is going to be repeated in the State of Indiana. Necessary for making such a decision--the individuals themselves; what

28A post debate comment about the event was attributed to the Senator in an article by Larry Allen. Allen wrote: "Although Hartke said he wasn't "disappointed" in the format for the debate, he was "somewhat surprised" when he was told to go first with a concluding statement during the program." Larry Allen, "Hartke For More 'Depth' in Second Roudebush Debate," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), October 14, 1970, p. 10.
they stand for, what their record has been, and what they propose to do in one of the elements that must be considered.

Let's take the record. I've been in the Senate of the United States for twelve years. I have been active in practically every facet of government which concerns people. I've been in the position which, I think, that the people of the State of Indiana recognize that my concern is for them: for their problems, for their happiness, for their children.

On the other hand, my opponent, Richard Roudebush, has been in the House of Representatives for ten years. His concern has primarily been one of saying no to people. And I say that as an objective person looking at the record.

And I think it's important for you to look at that record too. I would like to look at the record in education where the Adult Education Act is the Hartke Adult Education Act. Where the elementary and secondary education bills bear the Hartke name and (were) consistently opposed by my opponent. Where we have the situation for Medicare; where I am a staunch supporter of Medicare, voted for it, worked for it, and made it livable for our Senior citizens. He (Roudebush) opposed it. These are examples, only examples of the concerns. My concern for people; his concern for things. Where are we going in the future?

I think that what we've done in the past is only the beginning. There's a lot to be done. We have an Administration in the State (of Indiana) which has increased property taxes and all over has been an increase in the violence and tempers of America. Certainly, reconciliation is the need of our time. Peace. Peace overseas. Peace in America. Prosperity for America. That should be the hallmark of America and that's what Vance Hartke stands for. And upon that I ask for your support.

Most of the effort of Senator Hartke in this portion of the debate is devoted to narration of sentiments to which Hoosiers would agree. The Hoosier creed endorsed concepts such as: voting for one's representatives on an intellectual basis; faith in the futures of their children and of America; and being involved in the political process enough to
consider individual candidates and what they stand for. When the Senator turns to take a look at "the record," he enters an argument from examples to descriptive generalization which is at its root a comparison of the position of both candidates on two specific policies which were in effect: the issues of education and Medicare. The argument is advanced to support the larger Hartke claim "that the people of the State of Indiana recognize that my concern is for them. . . ." The argument looks like the following when cast in the Toulmin form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D I would like to look at</td>
<td>My concern for people; his concern for things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 the record in education</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where the Adult Education Act is</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Hartke Adult Education Act.</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Where the elementary and</td>
<td>These are examples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 secondary education bills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bear the Hartke name and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(were) consistently opposed by my</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opponent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Where I am a staunch supporter of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare . . .</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D He (Roudebush) opposed it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Medicare).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples provided by the Senator are at best illustrative of one half of his claim: "My concern for people . . ." The other half of the claim, " . . . his (Roudebush's) concern for things" is not discussed. The Senator's effort fails in that in his haste to indict Congressman Roudebush in the argument no direct proof is offered for that portion of the claim which contains it. I doubt that such an
indictment could have been made in three minutes; Hartke could not clearly make it in three months of campaigning.

In the final portion of the Senator's introductory remarks he used assertion to remind the audience that: 1) the State government with its Republican Governor and Republican Legislature had increased property taxes; 2) that America was in a period of "an increase in the violence and tempers of America;" 3) that reconciliation was needed; and 4) that Vance Hartke stood for rectifying not only the above, but also for peace and prosperity. The concluding portion of the Senator's effort was so common that any politician running in the mid twentieth century for any statewide office in Indiana could have uttered the remarks.

The Senator established a mood for the debate which was one of being aggressive politically and being "issue" oriented from a partisan perspective; he said little that was of substance.

Unlike Senator Hartke, Congressman Roudebush used his initial three minutes to establish good will and to provide biographical data for the audience. We have seen that Congressman Roudebush was concerned that his lack of recognition across the state was his biggest problem.  

29During the campaign, I noted that the largest Roudebush outdoor billboards featured only the name "Roudebush." Each letter in the name was a red capitalized, three-dimensional, block letter lined in white. The background for the billboards was blue. Hartke on the other hand had billboards featuring a photograph of himself, balanced to his left and right by an equal number of candidates (or occasionally the Hartke family). The background of the photograph showed the United States Capital building. Each person in the photograph had his arms around the waist of the person to his right and left; each person was striding forward with his right foot. The whole effort was a visual description of the Hartke theme which appeared on the billboard: Hartke and his associates were, "In Step With Indiana."
Roudebush wanted people to think of him as a big, lovable, gentle, firm, friendly, rural Hoosier. Because there is not an argument worth noting all I need do is provide the Congressman's actual words to demonstrate that he used the time to establish his image strategy. Congressman

Roudebush said:

Well, thank you very much Mr. Moderator. First I want to thank the many people and the many institutions that makes this program possible; first our panel and then I think of Eldon Campbell of the Indiana Broadcasters Association. The facilities of Channel 6 and the many stations that are carrying this program throughout Indiana. I appreciate all their efforts.

I might say that I'm well aware of the fact that I am best known in central Indiana where I've represented twenty-nine counties in the House of Representatives over the past ten years. And I'm also completely aware of the fact there's (sic) many parts of Indiana where "Roudebush" is not exactly a household word. For the benefit of those folks who live in areas that I have not represented, I would like to just do a very brief biography.

I was born in 1918, fifty-two years ago on a farm near Noblesville, Indiana. I still live in that immediate vicinity. I went through the community schools of Noblesville township. (I was) graduated in 1941 from Butler University with a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration and went almost immediately into the armed forces of the United States and prior to Pearl Harbor. When I returned from the armed forces, after three years (of) service, two years of which were overseas, I became quite interested in Veterans' Organizations. . . . I believe my activities were recognized by my election as State Commander in 1952 and 1953. Later my activities in the state with the Veterans of Foreign Wars gained national attention when I became the National Commander in 1957 and 1958. I believe that this service with the great veterans' organization . . . whetted my interest to (sic) public life. So in 1960, I made my first run for public office. And in May I received the nomination and in November I was elected the Sixth District Congressman. I served three terms in the Sixth District, one term in the Tenth (District), and I currently represent the Fifth District of Indiana.
Very quickly, I'd like to tell you about my family. I have a wonderful wife, Marge, who is now in Muncie, Indiana watching this show, I'm sure, with a Republican group. And a very wonderful daughter who is also attending a Republican meeting tonight, and my little boy, Chip, at home who is watching the show too. I love them all very much. My wife has been my constant companion during my years in public life. And would say tonight that I want to represent the people of Indiana simply because I feel that my opinions more closely resemble those of our citizens than does my opponent.

Whereas Senator Hartke chose the strategy of a tough, aggressive, "issue" approach to his opening message, Congressman Roudebush chose to offer an image which was the opposite of the Senator's. If the Roudebush campaign was preoccupied with the lack of widespread recognition of their candidate, then Roudebush's effort to slow the pace of Hartke's momentum was successful. Further the Congressman was effective in introducing himself to those voters who did not know him in a manner which ought to appeal to the Hoosier preference for one who is loyal to his family, home, town and country. Even the final statement in the Roudebush opening emphasized his attempt to identify the Hoosier bias of distrust of those who are more oriented toward national affairs than toward state or local affairs. Roudebush said: "I would say tonight that I want to represent the people of Indiana simply because I feel that my opinions more closely resemble those of our citizens than does my opponent." By taking the "folksy" approach, Roudebush may have been more in tune with basic Hoosier bias than was Senator Hartke. Certainly the initial six minutes of air time which was shared by the two candidates clearly set the tone for the remainder of the hour: Hartke continued to be aggressive on partisan issues and Roudebush continued to be "folksy."
The Two Questions Asked of Each Candidate By the Other

The rules for the Hartke-Roudebush debate stated that after the initial statements of the two candidates each could ask, in rotation, two questions of the other. The time limit for asking questions was thirty seconds. The time limit for a response to the question was two minutes. Because each man attempted to pack partisan background information into the lead into the question, both were cautioned by the moderator for abuse of the time limit. The two questions asked by Senator Hartke were: 1) "Will you please explain to the people of Indiana why you have given so little support to the President"? and 2) "Would you please explain to me how you expect the people to vote for you when you've said no to them all the time you've been in Congress"? Although, I have written the essence of the questions asked by Senator Hartke, the actual questions of each man went beyond that which I will offer. For example:

Mr. Roudebush, you have as one of the themes, as your principle theme in your campaign, the proposition that you want to go to Washington to help President Nixon. Yet you have supported President Nixon only forty per cent of the time in his foreign policy issues. You have supported the President only fifty-five per cent on his domestic issues. I, Vance Hartke, have supported President Nixon eighty-four per cent of the time on his foreign issues--more than twice as much as you did. Will you please explain to the people of Indiana why you have given so little support to the President?

One can see in this first typical question asked by one of the candidates of the other that it was loaded with partisan information. The typical question throughout was similar to the above example. In evaluating
the program, television columnist Richard Shull succinctly expressed a sentiment about the debate which I have heard time and again. Shull wrote in his article, "First Senatorial Debate Was Verbal Megatonnage," that "it seemed the questions lasted five minutes, compared to the three minute answers."30 Because the response to a question permits the responding individual to directly clash with the questioner, in the analysis which follows, I will offer only the inquiry portion of the question and assess the response of the candidate. Where there is partisan information which is necessary to the understanding of a response, I will present it.

Congressman Roudebush's response to Senator Hartke's first question, "Would you please explain to the people of Indiana why you have given so little support to the President"? consisted of accepting the data upon which the question was based; shifting the question to counter a Hartke campaign charge; and asserting that he did support President Nixon. The question was based on a set of figures offered by Senator Hartke which indicated that Congressman Roudebush supported President Nixon forty per cent of the time on foreign affairs policies and fifty-five per cent of the time on domestic matters. Roudebush's response did not address itself to the "factual" nature of the Hartke figures but rather to assuming the initiative against the claim advanced by Hartke in the phrasing of the question that he had supported President Nixon more than did the Congressman.

Roudebush said in response to the question:

... First, I don't know where your figures come from and I won't question their accuracy. I have been called a rubber stamp by you during this campaign and I think that you just gave a perfect answer to the people of Indiana that I'm certainly my own man and I certainly represent the viewpoints of our people and not necessarily just the President of the United States. I read some figures just today where you rank ninety-fifth in the U. S. Senate on support of our President... And the only man that even approaches that (position) is Senator George McGovern. So I would say Vance, that I don't know how to answer your question except that I do support the Nixon policies... (The remainder of the answer is assertion of Roudebush support of Nixon policies in Southeastern Asia.)

When placed in the Toulmin scheme one argument from circumstantial evidence to a hypothesis quickly emerges. The argument looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Q. Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>First, I don't know where your figures come from and I won't question their accuracy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I have been called a rubber stamp by you during this campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The figures you have cited demonstrate that I have not always supported President Nixon. (Implied)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Congressman Roudebush's answer to the Senator's question posed an alternative hypothesis based on the "facts" presented by the Senator. Only

31 In his discussion of argument from circumstantial evidence to hypothesis, Dr. Hastings fails to mention the rich potential for the study of such arguments in question and answer (interview) media programming. The analysis offered by Hastings is of detective work and legal argumentation. Hastings' relied heavily on the account of Daniel Webster in the White Murder Case.
two of the test questions for such reasoning may negate the impact of
the response: 1) "Is there any contradictory evidence?" and 2) "Are
there other hypotheses which would be equally more probable?"

The contradictory evidence had been offered throughout the cam-
paign. The theme "Dick Nixon needs Richard Roudebush in Congress" had
been emphasized throughout the summer and fall of 1970. On the other
hand, Roudebush had criticized President Nixon's visit with Marshal
Tito in September. Roudebush appeared to have wanted the issue both
ways. In the final analysis, I think the actions of the Congressman
did more to suggest that he was a conservative rather than a Nixon
"team player."

The question, "Are there other hypotheses which would be equally
more probable?" must lead to speculation about the mood of the "debate"
and the audience who viewed it. Because the Hartke-Roudebush debate
was aired during prime evening entertainment hours,32 one might assume
that the audience33 which viewed the debate was primarily partisan in
nature. In the Allen County portion of the Fourth Congressional
District, viewers who were bored with politics and politicians were
enticed by such alternative programs as "National League Football,"
"Mayberry R. F. D." and the "Doris Day Show." When politicians appear
in an entertainment media they must appear to be more entertaining than

32 The Nixon-Kennedy Debates were aired simultaneously on each of
the three commercial networks.

33 The size of the audience for the debates has never been esti-
mated to my knowledge. The task was just too difficult.
adroit at close argumentative distinction. I suspect the alternative hypothesis supplied by the non-partisan viewer was that the response was one of typical hair splitting by the candidates. From an argumentative point of view, Roudebush's answer was a practical one; from a practical point of view it probably appealed more to his partisans. The bulk of the Congressman's response to the question consisted of a counter claim that Hartke had not supported President Nixon and an assertion that the Congressman supported the President in foreign affairs. Both segments of the answer were tangential to the original question.

The second question put to the Congressman was: "... would you please explain to me how you expect the people to vote for you when you've said "no" to them all the time you've been in Congress?" From an argumentative point of view, Roudebush disintegrated in responding; he never answered the query. The Congressman responded with a series of partisan underdeveloped counter claims on Hartke's ability to say "yes" to legislation; or which of the candidates was approached first by the Fraternal Order of Police seeking assistance in trying to legislate on an increase in the salary of police officers; and Hartke's campaign attack on the Administration of Governor Whitcomb. Since a cogent response to the question was not offered, we will not consider it further.

The two questions put to the Senator by the Congressman were:
1) "What is the change (on the issue of law and order) of this new Hartke in 1970?" and 2) "Would you please tell me what the real Vance
Hartke believes in and is he for school bussing or against it--yes or no?"

In asking the first question, Roudebush ran overtime and was interrupted by the moderator. The Congressman never clearly asked the question but Senator Hartke responded to the spirit of the question.

Hartke said:

No I understand the question. I mean it's very simple. As far as crime is concerned there's no question about it. I'm a lawyer. I've been a prosecuting attorney and a mayor. I've supported every major crime bill in Congress: the Safe Streets Act; the Omnibus Crime Act of nineteen hundred and sixty-eight.

Now let me point out that (in) the Omnibus Crime Act of nineteen hundred and sixty-eight we provided 700,000 dollars in crime fighting funds for your supporter Governor Whitcome who helped put you in the nomination. Now, I never did hear you criticize the Governor for failing to use that money to fight crime. I did. The Urban Coalition criticized the State of Indiana nationally for failing to use the 700,000 dollars to fight crime.

In addition to that, let me point out that the Fraternal Order of Police has come to Vance Hartke to support a bill to help increase the policeman's salary. I'm the sponsor of that bill. I don't see your name on such a bill at all. I've never seen you make one statement in that regard about making sure that policemen be paid decent salaries so that as far as they're concerned they don't have to moonlight and so they can be well trained.

Now on the omnibus Crime Bill, you have another supporter here, the Mayor of Indianapolis (Richard Lugar), who's the head of one of the organizations, the American Municipal League, the League of Cities, the two organizations support the Hartke amendments to the Crime Bill of 1968 which would make it possible to really fight crime.

Let me say to you, when you endorse five and one-half per cent unemployment Mr. Roudebush, you're making a great contribution to the potential for crime.
The Senator's response to the question contained one major argument from examples to descriptive generalization, and one counter-claim from example to descriptive generalization.

The first Hartke claim can be diagrammed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm a lawyer.</td>
<td>I've supported every major crime bill in Congress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've been a prosecuting attorney and a mayor.</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since my experience has been directly related to the law, I've been supportive. (Implied)</td>
<td>Since</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I supported)</td>
<td>(such evidence as the following confirms the support) ... the Fraternal Order of Police has come to Vance Hartke to support a bill to help increase the policeman's salary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Safe Streets Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I supported)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Omnibus Crime Act of nineteen hundred and sixty-eight.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hartke was on strong ground in his response concerning his support of legislation designed to curb illegal activity. The question provided the Senator with an excellent opportunity to offer biographical information to the audience while detailing his strong record in support of measures designed to assist law enforcement officers. On October 24,
1970, at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO, in Indianapolis, Indiana Senator Hartke was endorsed by the International President of the Firefighter's Union, Howard McClinton, and International President of the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, John Casses. Although Congressman Roudebush probably meant to focus on Hartke's support of anti-Vietnam activities and group those activities under the heading "law and order," he asked the question in such a way as to allow the Senator to emphasize his accomplishments in the area. The question as it was phrased was ill advised.

Congressman Roudebush's second question was on a subject which troubled many Americans in 1970. We have already seen that according to public opinion polls most Americans opposed bussing of school children for the purpose of securing a racial balance in schools. When Roudebush asked, "Would you please tell me what the real Vance Hartke believes in and is he for school bussing or against it--yes or no?" he knew he was asking a potentially embarrassing question.

Senator Hartke answered the question in the following way:

My position is very clear on school bussing. It's the same as it's always been. I am opposed to bussing for racial purposes; for integration or segregation.

34In his endorsement Howard McClinton referred to Hartke's co-sponsorship of the 1968 Fire Research and Safety Act and his efforts to strengthen the pension plan for firemen as particularly meritorious; John Casses emphasized the Senator's co-sponsorship of the Omnibus Anti-Crime and Safe Streets Act of 1968 and the Police Salary Supplement Bill authored by Hartke in 1970. The endorsements were recorded by the author at the Annual Meeting of the International Association of Machinists, AFL-CIO, Indianapolis Hilton Hotel, October 24, 1970.
I believe in the neighborhood school concept. And I try to make it work which is more than you can say Congressman because I have voted for the bills which have made it possible for the elementary and secondary school systems to continue their neighborhood schools. I've voted for these measures. I've worked for them. And I've been quite successful in getting them passed.

Now let's take the facts. What your ad agency, I don't know if you know what they're doing to you, but what your ad agency is talking about—the so called Witten (James L. Witten of the Second Congressional District of Mississippi) Amendment. Now I'm very familiar with the Witten Amendment. What happened on the Witten Amendment? The key vote on the Witten Amendment was introduced by Senator Hugh Scott, Republican leader of the Senate. And he added the words to the Witten Amendment "as provided by the Constitution." Now I believe in the Constitution of the United States, and I believe in that amendment. And so did a lot of the Senate because practically everyone of the so-called conservative Republican Senators voted to support that measure. And that was the measure that was passed and that was the key vote.

Let me explain the third paragraph of the Senator's response first, then we will consider the first and second paragraphs.

On March 24, 1970, President Nixon pledged that his administration was going to stand by the Supreme Court Decision on school desegregation of 1954. The method to be employed by the President in honoring the obligation was that of asking Congress to appropriate five hundred million dollars for fiscal year 1971, and an additional one billion dollars for the fiscal year 1972. The money would have gone to

upgrade the quality of poor schools which meant upholding the neighborhood school concept and repudiating using school busses for integration purposes. The bill passed the House of Representatives but not the Senate. The apparent reason for the failure of the Emergency School Aid Act of 1970 was a conflict over the question of tax exemptions for the private white academies which were rapidly appearing all over the South. Although an early ruling of the Internal Revenue Service permitted donors to such academies to deduct the contributions from the income tax on July 10, 1970, Randolph Thrower, Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service, revoked the tax exemption status of such academies. Further Jerris Leonard announced that 100 Justice Department lawyers were ready to go into the South in the Fall of 1970 to police desegregation activities.

The picture presented to the Congressman from south of the Mason-Dixon Line was that of a sell out. Many northern liberals like Vance Hartke found themselves voting against the measure and ultimately having their vote come back to haunt them as the case in point in this question. This portion of the Senator's answer illustrates one major problem in the format; to allow two minutes to respond to a question should not be interpreted by the candidate to mean that he had to take two minutes to answer the question. Unfortunately both Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush failed to realize that on some questions a brief answer might be best. In the current example had Senator Hartke stopped answering

36See: Evans and Novak, *Nixon In the White House*, pp. 172-175.
after his explanation that: 1) he was "opposed to bussing for racial purposes. . ." and 2) that he had supported "many bills which make it possible for elementary and secondary school systems to continue their neighborhood schools," it seems to me that he would have been in a much better strategic position. Much of Hartke's campaign had been devoted to those actions of his in support of better schools, social security, and medical benefits. For the Senator to go into why he voted as he did in this particular case was unnecessary and confusing for the audience. Hartke did not develop an argument in his response; the narration he chose to offer really did little to clarify the stand he explained at the outset in answering the question.

After Hartke and Roudebush had each asked two questions of the other, the panel of journalists were permitted to ask their questions. Each candidate was to answer each question. A total of nine questions were asked by the panel. Let us consider each question and the response offered to it by each candidate.

The Questions From the Panel of Journalists

The nine questions asked by the panel of journalists resembled those earlier questions of the candidates to each other in that a great deal of information was provided in the process of asking the questions. With the exception of one question, the information provided in the lead into the inquiries was not as controversial as that provided in the lead into the questions asked by each candidate. The questions asked of Hartke and Roudebush by the panel were: 1) "For the benefit of a somewhat confused electorate, I wonder if you would clarify and
explain just exactly how you voted on the pieces of legislation (i.e. bills concerning trade with Communist nations which were the subject of the controversial Roudebush ad);" 2) "Our effective (military) power has been cut back some forty per cent in the last five years due to reductions in our defense budget. Russia today has a six to one superiority in missile megatonnage. So from each of you I'd like to have a position or statement report on past or current status, then on what if elected, you intend to do about this situation, if anything;"
3) "... the Russians have been reported as having denounced President Nixon's cease-fire standstill plan for Vietnam in Southeast Asia. Do you see such a response by a world power such as Russia as meaning that the President's plan is blocked;" 4) "In your opinion just how should these problems (bombings of public buildings and airports) be dealt with;" 5) (Because both of you are using television extensively) "... is the electorate getting a true picture of what it is buying in a candidate or is all we're getting a slick part of Madison Avenue merchandise;" 6) "Do you anticipate an effort among your colleagues to override this veto (by President Nixon of the campaign spending act which would have set limits on the amount either candidate could spend during the campaign) and what do you think the outcome will be;"
7) "The line between peaceful dissent and acts which may ultimately lead to violence is often a difficult one to place and determine. What kind of guidelines would you recognize as best to be used in dealing with these situations;" 8) "Will you (Congressman Roudebush) back the President's economic policy;" and 9) "Do you favor ending the
draft and replacing it with an all volunteer army?" Let us consider each
question and the candidate's individual response to each.

The first question was directed initially to Senator Hartke; it
dealt with the factual base of the Roudebush television advertisement
which suggested that Hartke had voted for trade with Communist nations.

Senator Hartke's response was:

... I have consistent record of opposition to trade with
Communist countries for strategic material. I want to
point out that there is no president that is opposed to all
trade with Communist countries. The fact of the matter is,
neither does President Nixon. At the same time my vote has
been consistent every step of the way for the entire twelve
years that I've been in the Senate. It's a long list of
votes, ... some of them specifying very specifically that
the President must make a finding. And that finding, as
least as far as he's concerned, must be that unless it is
in the best interests of the United States then that trade
would be terminated with such a country.

To imply that Vance Hartke is un-American, to imply that I
would want to do something that would harm my country, to
imply that I would want to point a gun at a fellow American,
they just don't understand Vance Hartke. I have seven
children. I've opposed violence in the streets; violence
on the campus. Everyone knows I've opposed the violence
in Vietnam long before it was popular to do so.

The Senator developed two arguments from examples to descriptive
generalization in response to the question. When diagrammed the argu-
ments look like the following:
Hartke's knowledge of his past voting record on trade with Communist nations. (Implied)

I want to point out that no President (Nixon included) is opposed to all trade with Communist countries.

Because I have voted for those strategic material-trade bills which gave the President the right to terminate trade with a Communist country if such trade is not in the best interests of the country. (Implied)

The audience member might have quickly noted that the Senator did not offer data which consisted of specific votes on specific bills. The audience member may not have had intimate knowledge of Hartke's voting record but certainly any successful Hoosier politician could predict that if the President had investigative and veto power over trade with a country which was not in the best interest of the United States then the audience would support his voting record. The key to the Senator's claim was that he had a consistent record of opposition to trade with Communist countries for strategic material. The Roudebush commercial never clearly stated that Hartke had voted for a bill which provided strategic material to the enemy but the implication was there. Had the first paragraph of the answer been the only response offered by the Senator it would probably have been a weak response. The second paragraph of the response was directed at the Hoosier bias toward home, family and country.
The second paragraph of Hartke's response is presented in the following diagram:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have seven children.</td>
<td></td>
<td>To imply that Vance Hartke is un-American, to imply that I would want to do something that would harm my country, to imply that I would want to point a gun at a fellow American (Q), they just don't understand Vance Hartke.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've opposed violence on the streets; violence on the campus.</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone knows the violence in Vietnam long before it was popular to do so.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I've opposed the ad is unbelievable. (Implied)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

The question allowed the Senator to provide biography in such a way as to demonstrate how unfair the television commercial was. The Senator's response to the question was probably his most effective one of the evening.

By comparison, Congressman Roudebush's rejoinder to the same question was incredulous in part and partisan throughout. Roudebush commented:

First, I saw this ad for the first time the other night, I'll have to admit this. And I saw no gun pointed at anyone in the ad. That's one thing I want to clarify. Secondly, we can talk about who did or who did not vote for foreign aid to communist nations. And I might say that the Senator has accused me on various occasions of voting for trade with Communist nations. I think the most . . . damnable or the most convincing evidence is the fact that Senator Hartke has sponsored or co-sponsored a Senate joint resolution which would lower the requirements under the export-import bank act for nations trading
with North Vietnam. Now these are facts and this Senate joint resolution is readily obtainable from the document room of the United States Senate.

Now I never accused Vance of being un-American; I never intended to. The purpose of this (sic) spot announcement was to illustrate a basic difference in philosophy. Now I do not believe in trade with Communist nations. I never have. I'd like to say that I've signed a petition to Congress against trade with Communist nations and this has become an issue in this campaign. The first day I was nominated, the Senator spoke out about my association with organizations that are extreme in nature because I signed a petition against trade with Red Nations and to support our fighting men in Vietnam. I just regret that this campaign has taken this particular turn.

The portion of the Congressman's response that indicated he saw the disputed spot commercial for the first time "the other night" and that he "saw no gun pointed at anyone in the ad," was incredulous. The advertisement had been released in mid-September and had been challenged by Hartke before the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. Moreover, lawyers for both Hartke and Roudebush scampered about the State of Indiana advising television stations on the legal consequences of running the ad. Yet Congressman Roudebush asked the Hoosier audience to believe that he had seen the ad for the first time "the other night."

The remainder of the first paragraph above constitutes an argument from signs to unobserved event. When diagrammed the argument is:
Data

D Senator Hartke supported a Senate joint resolution which would have lowered the requirements under the export-import bank act for nations trading with North Vietnam.

Claim

I think the most... damnable or the most convincing evidence is the fact that Senator Hartke sponsored or co-sponsored a Senate joint resolution which would lower the requirements under import-export bank act for nations trading with North Vietnam.

Because (W)

I think any support of nations which trade with North Vietnam indicates support of our enemy. (Implied)

The bill to which Congressman Roudebush referred was the Trade Expansion Act. It was a very complicated piece of legislation which attempted to cover United States trade activities on the world market. Interestingly, Senator Hartke either was not present to vote on the specific amendments which dealt with trade with Communist nations or voted against such amendments. Senator Hartke's Administrative Assistant and Campaign Manager for the Senatorial Race in 1970 wrote:

The legislation in question was the Trade Expansion Act and amendments thereto. At least one amendment dealt with trade with Communist countries. We discovered that Senator Hartke had either voted against those particular amendments (sic) or was not present for the votes. (sic) He did, I believe, vote for the final and complete bill. Anyone with rudimentary knowledge of the legislative process understands that a vote

37 Joseph Napolitan, The Election Game and How to Win It (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1972), p. 86. Napolitan wrote: "The (Viet Cong) spot claimed that Hartke had voted for legislation that helped provide arms for the North Vietnamese. It was a dirty spot, because it wasn't true. It turned out, incidentally, that Hartke had voted against the bill in question and Roudebush had voted for it."
cast for final passage of a bill does not necessarily mean that a legislator agrees with every word and provision of the bill. It is a matter of compromise. . . .

To say that Vance Hartke was putting weapons into the hands of our enemies simply because he voted for a comprehensive, complex trade bill (also voted for by at least a majority of other Senators present and voting since it did pass), is stretching the facts a bit.

The Roudebusch claim is invalid by its substantive inaccuracy. It was designed to elicit an emotional reaction to the devil term Communism.

The remainder of Congressman Roudebusch's rejoinder consisted of an attempt to explain the intent of the commercial and did not develop an argument as such.

The second question was initially addressed to Congressman Roudebusch. Because the premise upon which the question was based was disputed by Senator Hartke when he responded to it, I will present the question in full:

The question of basic policy then perhaps on foreign policy gentlemen. The United States according to all figures is now number two in strategic military power. Our effective power has been cut back some forty per cent in the last five years due to reductions in our defense budget. The Soviets have increased their's by some 400 per cent. Russia today has a six to one superiority in missile megatonnage. So from each of you, I'd like to have a position or statement report on past or current status, then on what if elected, you intend to do about this situation, if anything?

Congressman Roudebusch responded to the question by offering examples of his support of the military in order to develop the claim: "So I am in favor of spending whatever money is necessary to keep our country free."

The argument can be diagrammed in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D &quot;... the Congress of the United States during this 91st session reduced defense expenditures by about eight billion of dollars from roughly seventy-one to sixty-three billion. . . .&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;So I am in favor of spending whatever money is necessary to keep our country free.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D &quot;... I also support (the proposed) ABM program (anti-ballistic missile).&quot;</td>
<td>Because (W) &quot;... I think we're a long, long way from that position (in which the country needs no defense) at the present time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Congressman's answer was a good one. It really did not advance a "Roudebush Plan" to meet the situation outlined by the questioner, but it did let the moderate to conservative voter know that Roudebush had voted for a stronger defense program in the past and suggested that he would continue such support in the future.

When Senator Hartke responded to the question he did so by aggressively challenging the factual basis of the question. The Senator's challenge caused embarrassment for the moderator and panelists.39 Apparently the question and his response so unnerved the Senator that the next day in an interview with Larry Allen of the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, the Senator mentioned the military strength question and his confusion over if he would speak last or not as the two major "incidents" of the debate. Larry Allen credited Hartke

39 The non-verbal attitude conveyed by the Senator's voice simply cannot be presented on paper.
with saying:

The question was based on an American Security Council statement... and everyone knows that the American Security Council is a radical right-wing organization. It wasn't based on fact.

I felt that to rely on a known right-wing organization as a basis for facts is unfortunate... It's wrong to rely on any group that has a tendency to exaggerate or misrepresent the truth. The fact is that the U. S. is ahead in missile power.40

The significant portion of Senator Hartke's response to the question was:

... But the question you asked is not based on fact. (Fred Heckman tried to clarify the question) And this disturbs me very much that you would ask a question that is not based on fact. Because Mr. Laird himself, who is Secretary of Defense, said that we still hold a four to one advantage in this field. I do not know. I'm not going to question the Republican Secretary of Defense in his figures. We still have the power to destroy everything that is is Russia and China. And I am really shocked, utterly shocked that a irresponsible question would be asked on a program of this kind.

The response constituted an argument from testimony which negated the premise upon which the original question was based. It looks like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D Mr. Laird, Secretary of Defense, said that we have a four to one advantage in this field.</td>
<td>But the question you asked is not based on fact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Republican Secretary of Defense said we have a four to one advantage, I'm going to believe him.

40 Allen, "Hartke For More 'Depth' in 2nd Roudebush Debate," p. 1D.
Had the Senator pointed out when and where the Secretary of Defense made his statement the audience might have shared his indignation. Unfortunately, popular news accounts of the statements of the Secretary, or statements by those who were preparing for the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks (SALT) with the Soviet Union did not refer to comparative strength of either.

Hans J. Morgenthau provided some insight into the overall question of the strength of the United States and Soviet Union when he wrote:

Five factors have transformed the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union: the rejection of nuclear war as an instrument of national policy; the ideological decontamination of foreign policy at least with respect to each other; the failure of competition for the allegiance of the third world; the implicit recognition by the United States of the status quo in Eastern Europe; and the Chinese threat to the Soviet Union.41

The Nixon Administration had pushed for the SALT meetings; the United States has never been inclined to negotiate from a position of weakness.

A direct observation of the relative strength of United States and the Soviet Union was provided by the nuclear physicist, Ralph E. Lapp, in his New York Times article, "Can SALT Stop MIRV?" Mr. Lapp observed that primarily under Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara the United States in 1970 had a total throw power in each missile category of

more than 2,500 warheads to the Soviet total throw power of about 1,700 warheads. Those figures suggest a power ratio in favor of the United States which was slightly less than two to one.

The immediate effect of Senator Hartke's handling of the question was to cause the moderator to be confused. The long range effect, if I can judge based on comments made by people in the two or three days following the debate, was that of disgust on the part of many Hoosier voters. Hoosiers with whom I spoke about the debate pointed to the rudeness they thought Senator Hartke displayed in handling the question in nearly the same breath as the one in which they disapproved of Roudebush's attempt at being "folksy." I will discuss both reactions in detail later.

The third question to the candidates came from Hortense Meyers, Indianapolis Capital Bureau Chief for the United Press International. Miss Meyers asked: "Do you (Senator Hartke) see such (a negative) response by a world power such as Russia (to President Nixon's Peace Proposal) as meaning that the President's plan is blocked?" Senator Hartke responded to the question with a narration of his support of the Nixon plan; his belief that the Soviet response was not an absolutely negative response, and offering the testimony of Republican Secretary of State, William Rogers, as support for his belief. Senator Hartke used narration and description to respond to the question.

---

Unlike Hartke who was charitable in his treatment of the opposition in responding to the question, Congressman Roudebush used his rejoinder to Miss Meyer's question to launch a partisan attack of the Hartke position on the War in Vietnam. After endorsing the plan and suggesting that the plan has an excellent chance for acceptance by the Soviets, Congressman Roudebush said:

I endorse it (the plan) because it is a continuation of the previous Nixon policies . . . and I hate to say this because it will sound rather trite . . . but I think it takes an exercise in mental gymnastics as I said up in Logansport (Indiana) the other evening to see any comparison between Senator Hartke's previous recommendations and those recommendations of Richard Nixon.

Let me tick off a few things here. First Senator Hartke has repeatedly denounced the Cambodian government. He's denounced the South Vietnam government. He has, through (his support of) the Hatfield-McGovern amendment,—wanted to set a deadline on the withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam. On (sic) the Cooper-Church amendment he opposed the attack on the privileged sanctuaries of the Viet Cong in Cambodia. Now when you take all these things into consideration, plus the fact that the Senator has opposed Vietnamization, plus the fact that the Senator has said that it's not working, I see no correlary at all between those remarks of Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana and those plans advanced by President Richard M. Nixon.

The argument is from examples of the past behavior of Senator Hartke to the implication of an attitude which accounted for those examples. The argument is from signs to unobserved events; it looks like this:
D Hartke has denounced the Cambodian government.

D Hartke has denounced the government of South Vietnam.

D Hartke supported a measure which would have set a deadline on the withdrawal of United States troops from Vietnam (Hatfield-McGovern amendment).

D By voting for the Cooper-Church amendment, Hartke opposed the invasion of the United States into Cambodia in 1969.

The signs were accurately presented; the attitude could have been seen by the members of the audience. The Nixon Administration and Senator Hartke sought peace; the means each were willing to employ were different. The argument ought to have had optimal impact with Roudebush partisans. In his rejoinder to the question, Congressman Roudebush affirmed his support of President Nixon's foreign policy in Southeastern Asia and pointed to examples of Senator Hartke's lack of support and he did it well from a partisan viewpoint.

In responding to the fourth question put to them by the journalists, Senator Hartke took the opportunity to make a strong statement on how to deal with violators of the law, while Congressman Roudebush took an uncharacteristic stance of calling for more federal legislation.

The question dealt with bombings of airports and public buildings and
specifically, "in your opinion just how should these problems be dealt with?"

Congressman Roudebush affirmed that he did not think "that there's any question but what further federal legislation is needed in this case." The remainder of the Congressman's response was unusual for this program in that it was brief and unpartisan. Although Roudebush did not offer a specific solution, his response was appreciated for its brevity.

Senator Hartke said in response to the question:

Crime is crime and should be dealt with as crime. Violence is violence and should be absolutely eliminated from the American scene. How to eliminate it is not alone a problem of the federal government: it's a problem of the state government; it's a problem of the local government; and it's a problem of each and everyone of us.

In my opinion the United States of America has the solemn obligation to somehow reconcile our differences. We must have more emphasis on peaceful solutions. This means that as far as the law violators (are concerned) that they're going to have to be treated as law violators. That those people who incite and those people who stir up these individuals... are also accessories to the fact. In other words if you go around the country, pitting one group out against another, then the ultimate result is that eventually somebody will take action.

I think that it's necessary now for us to rededicate ourselves to a position of reconciliation. This means a whole change in national attitude. Not the use of force, but the use of love. The use of force by law violators must be dealt with by the police as law violators. And that's a very simple explanation of a very difficult human problem.

The Senator managed to use his narrative description to outline an approach to the solution of the problem which appealed to Hoosier beliefs in justice and faith in the ability of each person to have a
role in solving the problem of violence in America. When one compares the two responses together, Senator Hartke's answer was that of a statesman while Congressman Roudebush spoke like a bureaucrat.

The fifth question for both candidates raised the issue of the role of television in political campaigning. Because the lead into the question itself revealed the extent to which both candidates employed assistance in integrating television into their campaigns, I will present the entire question. Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush were both approached in the following way:

Both of you gentlemen have brought in top flight talent: Roger Ailes for Congressman Roudebush, and "Concept Films" from Philadelphia for Senator Hartke. These men and these concerns in effect design campaigns to sell the candidate as a commercial product. So (to) both candidates, is the electorate getting a true picture of what he is buying in a candidate or is all we're getting a slick part of Madison Avenue merchandise?

Senator Hartke answered the question by pointing out that he had been in favor of limiting campaign expenditures on radio and television throughout the campaign. Throughout the spring and summer of 1970, Democrats in Congress labored to pass a law which would have limited campaign spending. When the bill was passed President Nixon vetoed it. The only other course left open to the Democrats was to take their case

---

43 "Hartke Says Poll Gives Him Lead," Indianapolis Star, August 30, 1970, Section 2, p. 4. In the article the following was reported: "Hartke again requested Roudebush, the present Fifth District Congress­man, to limit his television and radio advertising to regulations outlined in legislation now pending in Congress. It would amount to about $144,000."
for limited campaign spending to the people; Vance Hartke did just that. The second line of response advanced by the Senator was that the people of Indiana could use the televised debate itself to judge the candidates. The first portion of Senator Hartke's response constituted an argument from examples to descriptive generalization; the second portion was narration.

In developing his argument from examples to descriptive generalization, Senator Hartke said:

Well, let me say that as far as Vance Hartke is concerned we don't have that much advertising and that I wanted to limit it to 143,000 dollars but my opponent refused to do that. I've been perfectly willing to abide by the pending legislation which incidently was vetoed by the President of the United States today. I think campaign spending is all out of hand. I think that the people are tired of seeing all that--143,000 dollars spent on a Senatorial campaign for radio and television ought to be enough.

When the argument is diagramed it appears as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>&quot;... we don't have that much advertising.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&quot;... I wanted to limit it (advertising) to 143,000 dollars but my opponent refused to do that.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I think campaign spending is all out of hand.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | "I've been perfectly willing to abide by the pending legislation.

The argument was a sound one.

Congressman Roudebush's response to the question was a defensive one. The first portion of the response was a narration in which Roudebush pointed out that his make-up man was a native Hoosier and his television advisor, Roger Ailes, was a native Buckeye. The second
portion of the response took the form of an argument from examples to descriptive generalization. Roudebush said:

I don't think anybody is trying to sell me as a hunk of balony, or a piece of cheese, or a can of coffee. I honestly try to be myself. And the first understanding I had with the group who are handling my television programs is that—please don't try to change me. I'm just an ol' farm boy from Hamilton County. I'm delighted to be recognized as such. I'm delighted to be recognized as a Republican of rural background and I don't think that there's anything that can be done to change my image and I won't have it happen, Fred, for the world.

The argument fits our schematic form as is seen below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I honestly try to be myself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I don't think anybody is trying to sell me as a hunk of balony, or a piece of cheese, or a can of coffee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I'm a farmer from Hamilton County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>I'm a Republican of rural background.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>&quot;... the first understanding I had with the group who are handling my television programs is ... don't try to change me.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I believe that Roudebush spoke the truth in his answer to the question. First I think Congressman Roudebush actively opposed being "packaged." Second, Roger Ailes' philosophy of campaign management is such that image change is foreign to his approach. On November 23, 1970, Roger Ailes and John Glenn, Jr., appeared on the "Phil Donahue Show" in Dayton, Ohio. The subject for the call-in interview program was the tape recording of the program was provided me by Dr. P. Dale Ware, Section of Communication, Purdue University, Fort Wayne, Indiana. The Ailes quotation is from that tape.
role of television in political campaigns. On that show, Roger Ailes offered a great deal of information about his philosophy. Specifically, Ailes said:

I don't believe in telling a candidate what to do. I'm there as a consultant. I'm there to advise him on what the pros and cons of certain approaches are and what my recommendations are. But if a man can't make that kind of decision, then he certainly shouldn't be in the United States Senate.

Roudebush ignored the Hartke claim that he had been unwilling to set a limit on campaign spending because, as we have seen, he thought of himself as being behind in recognition across the State. Because he did use television more extensively than the Senator, the Congressman addressed the question of the "quality" of the image as had been intended by the questioner.

The sixth question was a follow up on the topic of television campaign spending. The question was: "Do you anticipate an effort among your colleagues (in Congress) to override the veto (on campaign spending limitation) and what do you think the outcome will be?" Both candidates used their response to the question to advance a partisan position. Congressman Roudebush used narration to say that an overriding of the veto would be impossible; that the House version of the bill differed from the Senate version in that it was not intended to be employed during the 1970 campaign; and that the bill the President vetoed could not have been enforced for campaign 1970 had it been signed into law on October 12, 1970, because of the contractual agreements which both candidates had already entered for the remainder
of the campaign. Finally the Congressman pointed out that such a bill would favor an incumbent and disfavor an unknown challenger. The Congressman relied on narration and description of the process of the use of television in politics to advance his answer.

Senator Hartke also used narration and description to disagree with Roudebush; he never directly addressed the question. Hartke spoke to the importance of television and radio in campaigning; the background of Roger Ailes; the drafting of the legislation which would have limited campaign spending; and his own preference in the whole matter of limitations on spending.

Neither man effectively launched an argument in responding to the question. Tempers flared but the responses conveyed attitudes rather than direct answers. Almost as if he were saved by the limitation placed on the length of answers the moderator called for the next question.

The seventh question which was put to the candidates allowed each to draw upon well rehearsed "set pieces" which they used throughout the campaign. The question was directed first to Senator Hartke. It was states as follows: "What kind of guidelines would you recognize as the best to be used in dealing with these (violent) situations . . . (which have occurred throughout the country?)"

The Senator's response took the form of a description of the Constitutional guarantees of civil liberties as being the guidelines he would ascribe to. The answer was such that it was non-controversial, descriptive, and "safe." Most of the Hoosier audience would have
agreed with the Senator for he expressed their belief in the rule of law. Because his response consisted of a descriptive endorsement of the legal system in America, we need not concern ourselves further with Hartke's reply.

Congressman Roudebush responded to the question in a manner similar to Senator Hartke's, except the Congressman managed to work in his emotional line "... where you start killing, or burning, or maiming, or destroying, then you are no longer dissenting you are a common criminal and should be treated as such." Those who had followed the campaign recognized both the "set piece" of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush for what they were; an affirmation of their individual belief in the rule of law. Neither answer constituted a "new" expression of a point of view on the subject. One might note that Senator Hartke did answer the question from the point of view of suggesting guidelines; Congressman Roudebush merely implied his guidelines.

The eighth question was put to Congressman Roudebush in such a way as to preclude a direct response by Senator Hartke. Roudebush was asked the following:

Congressman, one of the themes behind your campaign is in effect, "Elect me so that we might give the President a chance to carry out his platform." So we can assume that you would back many of the Administration proposals to reform the welfare system, Medicaid, etc. The editor of the New York Stock Exchange says the "... the economic policy that the United States has been engaged in is winding down the economy ... The results are extremely non-conclusive in fact without conspicuous success." Will you back the President's economic policy?
Congressman Roudebush's answer to the question was "yes." In explaining his answer, Roudebush developed an alternative hypothesis which accounted for the circumstantial evidence. Roudebush said:

Well, yes, I will continue to do so, Fred. And I realize that here is a marked difference between my opponent and myself. I can see many economic indicators despite the article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal as you said. I see many economic indicators that indicate perhaps we have bottomed out; perhaps we are on the road to economic recovery. Your gross national product is up. Your housing starts are up. So many things: your interest rates; your prime interest rates recently was (sic) reduced. Money is freer and this can be found by any businessman.

Unemployment, well it's up. But I think that we have to analyze those unemployment figures. I think that statistics can confuse. . . . But for the first time (in September) we used college students in determining the number of unemployed. When you look at the record, you will find that the people twenty-five years old or older, the unemployment rate is 3.4, or perhaps 3.5, and I would say that the bulk of your unemployment is in the range of sixteen to twenty-four (years old). Now please don't feel that I have anything against labor of sixteen to twenty-four, but it simply supplies and since these statistics were gathered during the week of Labor Day, many of these students have now returned to college and I'm sure that the next report will be better is the point I'm trying to make.

When diagrammed the argument takes the following form:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Claim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D The Gross National Product is up.</td>
<td>I see many economic indicators that indicate perhaps we are on the road to economic recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Housing starts are up.</td>
<td>Because (W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D The prime interest rate was recently reduced and money is freer to the businessman.</td>
<td>I see many positive economic indicators despite the Wall Street Journal article you refer to.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

unless unemployment continues its upward trend which I don't think it will.
The Congressman did a reasonable job of advancing his hypothesis to account for the evidence. The major weakness in the attempt was Roudebush's descriptive explanation of the misleading high unemployment rate. In September and October, 1970, the unemployment rate was the contradictory factual evidence which tended to negate the Congressman's claim that "perhaps . . . we are on the road to economic recovery." Actually the economic plight of America in 1970 was such that few politicians, and certainly not Richard Roudebush, had acceptable answers to the problem.

Senator Hartke was permitted to offer his rejoinder to the comments of Congressman Roudebush; not a direct answer to the question but a rejoinder. The Senator's rejoinder took the form of pointing out that Congressman Roudebush had changed his position on what constituted an acceptable level of unemployment; developing the claim: America ought to provide an opportunity for people to go to work; and a pledge to do all he could in the Senate to work to eliminate unemployment.

In the segment of his rejoinder where he developed his claim, Senator Hartke said:

... Unemployment is up seventy per cent over what it was when the Republican Administration took over. As far as the people who are out of work in this state, there are over 90,000 people who are out of work in the State of Indiana alone. There are over 5,000 people in the automobile parts manufacture who do not have a job, prior to the time the strike went into effect.

The longest unemployment line in the history of Green-castle was the one I visited in one of my recent trips. I met Royce Sandy there and I asked him where did you work? And he said, "I haven't had a job since I came back from Vietnam." Now I say that a nation as rich
as the United States of America, as powerful as we are, and as humanitarian as we're supposed to be can do better than that. We ought to provide an opportunity for these people to go to work.

The argument is from example to descriptive generalization. The specific topic the Senator chose as his target was the one issue the Democratic Party felt was in its favor. When the argument is diagrammed it takes the form of:

Data | Claim
--- | ---
"Unemployment is up seventy per cent over what it was when the Republican Administration took over." | America ought to provide an opportunity for these people to go to work.
"... over 90,000 (Hoosiers) people are out of work..." | "... I say that a nation as rich as the United States, as powerful as we are, and as humanitarian as we're supposed to be can do better than that."
There were over 5,000 people in the automobile parts manufacture who were out of work prior to the GM strike (which ran throughout the 1970 campaign). |  
Royce Sandy of Green-castle could not find a job when he returned from Vietnam. |  
For most of the Hoosiers in the audience, their belief that an able bodied man ought to work should have forced them to agree with the Senator's claim. By focusing his rejoinder on the problem of unemployment the Senator not only directly confuted the Congressman's interpretation of the evidence, but also he appealed to a cherished
Hoosier bias. Hartke handled his rejoinder well.

The final question by the panel to the candidates was: "Do you favor ending the draft and replacing it with an all volunteer army?" Senator Hartke responded to the question in an affirmative fashion by describing why he favored a volunteer army. Congressman Roudebush also relied on description in advancing his position in favor of a volunteer army. Since neither man developed a significant argument in favor of his position, we need not consider the question further.

The nine questions had been asked. In responding to the questions each man further developed the image he set out to develop in his opening remarks; Hartke was aggressive; Roudebush was "folksy." Both men continued their image strategy in offering their concluding statements.

Senator Hartke concluded his portion of the Hartke-Roudebush debate by describing the differences between himself and Congressman Roudebush by listing various "people" programs and legislative acts he had worked for in the past and promised to continue to work for them in the future.

Congressman Roudebush used his closing three minutes to thank the panel, to promise to support the Super Sonic Transport proposal, and to promise to support research into cancer. The Congressman's final comment was one that he had made at the end of every appearance during the 1970 campaign: "I promise every citizen of the state (if you elect me) that you will never have occasion to be disappointed or ashamed of this United States Senator."
The program ended with moderator John Scott thanking the candidates, panel, the judges, and reminding the audience that the second Hartke-Roudebush Debate would be televised on Thursday, October 20, 1970.

Reaction to the Debate

The fortunate aspect of a statewide political campaign is that a poor showing on one specific occasion is unlikely to cause irredeemable harm. Fortunately for Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush their first, and only, debate occurred in early October, a date which allowed both to recuperate from their inconclusive showing.

The reaction of the press was uniformly negative. Such headlines as, "First Senatorial Debate Was Verbal Megatonnage,"45 "Hartke-Roudebush Debate Is 'Bland,'"46 and the neutral headline "Hartke, Roudebush Agree To Disagree in TV Debate."47 Although both candidates claimed that they had no way of telling48 if they won or not, each candidates' campaign staff claimed victory.49 Those who professed to know something about television performances, Richard K. Shull and Roger Ailes

45Shull, "First Senatorial Debate Was Verbal Megatonnage," p. 15.
47"Hartke-Roudebush Agree To Disagree In TV Debate," p. 1.
48Ziegner, "Debate is 'Bland,'" p. 2.
of the Roudebush staff, gave the edge to the Congressman for smiling
more and being relaxed. But I think that the youthful comments of
Skip Wollenberg, News Editor of The Purdue Exponent succinctly
characterized both the debate itself and the general reaction to it.

Skip Wollenberg wrote:

It was a quick-witted incumbent who vied verbally with
an opponent intent on creating a home-grown image of
himself in the minds of Hoosier voters when Indiana's
two candidates for the U. S. Senate clashed in a tele­
vised debate Monday night in Indianapolis.

Jim Swanson expressed the reaction of most of those whom I heard comment
on the debate in his humorous comment that "watching the Hartke-
Roudebush 'debate' on T. V. Monday night gave me the impression that I
was viewing a fourth-rate version (of the television comedy show)
Laugh-In."

To Senator Hartke's embarrassment one Fort Wayne television news-
man asked Hartke on October 14, 1970, what the station ought to tell
people who called the station to complain that the debate was broadcast
instead of their regular show. The Senator was reported as having
shrugged and commented, "you just have to tell them that's their

50 Shull, "Verbal Megatonnage," p. 15.
51 Skip Wollenberg, "Hartke Vs. Roudebush: Senate Candidates
52 Jim Swanson, "Associations," The Purdue Exponent, October 14,
1970, p. 5. One wit told me that after having watched the performances
of Hartke and Roudebush in the debate he was inclined to vote for the
dowdy Hortense Meyers of the United Press International.
privilege. If they would rather see something else, they're entitled to their opinions."53

In the final analysis the first Hartke-Roudebush Debate did not have much chance for success for two reasons: voter apathy toward non-Presidential campaigns and the fact that the structure for the debate was a poor one for television. Voter apathy toward the campaign in 1970 was overwhelming. Although some people were unemployed, although some people were concerned with inflation, although some people were wrought up over campus unrest and lawlessness, although some people were bitterly opposed to the continuation of America's involvement in the war in Vietnam, the vast majority of Hoosiers were employed, relatively unaffected by inflation, pleased with the quiet on Hoosier campuses and convinced that President Nixon was doing his utmost to end the American involvement in Vietnam.

The second factor which mitigated against the Hartke-Roudebush Debate being conclusive in resolving candidate differences on issues, or even good television, was the format for the debate. In the effort to be fair in the allocation of the amount of time either of the candidates had "on camera," restrictions were so confusing that neither candidate had an opportunity to develop a line of reasoning to any extent. Further, by insisting that each candidate respond to every question of each journalist, the formulators of the format increased the possibility that few questions would be thoroughly answered. The

result of the Hartke-Roudebush debate demonstrated that any candidate who does not have a show business background or familiarity and who agrees to debate another candidate on television is a fool. Television is an entertainer's medium not a medium for serious political debates.

Other Television Appearances

As we have noted above the second Hartke-Roudebush debate which was scheduled for October 20, 1970, was cancelled because President Richard Nixon campaigned on that date in Fort Wayne, Indiana, in behalf of incumbent Congressman E. Ross Adair and Congressman Roudebush. Further I have traced the number of appearances which conceivable could have served as a basis for the second statewide television broadcast; in each instance Congressman Roudebush found that he had an engagement elsewhere. Senator Hartke quickly exploited the Congressman's reluctance to honor the commitment. During an appearance in South Bend Congressman Roudebush left Hartke challenging him from the stage of a proposed joint appearance. The occasion was a forum hosted by the South Bend Chamber of Commerce. The program was to have consisted of an hour of questions to both candidates from a panel of local newsmen. Congressman Roudebush's staff requested that each man be given one half hour by himself before the panel. As Eli Miller, one of the coordinators of the program, said, "they (Roudebush's staff) kind of insisted they wanted it that way, and we figured it was that way or

---

not at all." To my knowledge the only joint appearance of the two candidates which followed the October 12, 1970, statewide debate occurred on the evening of October 27, 1970. Both Hartke and Roudebush appeared on a half-hour call-in question and answer program which originated at WNDU-TV at the University of Notre Dame.

Although both candidates were willing to appear individually on local news-interview programs, only Senator Hartke expressed an interest in joint efforts after the October 12, 1970, debate. Two such individual appearances, one each by Hartke and Roudebush, were in the Fourth Congressional District of Indiana. Both men met a common panel of local journalists on "News Conference '70" over WANE-TV, Fort Wayne, Indiana. Senator Hartke's "News Conference '70" program was telecast on October 25, 1970. The "News Conference '70" on which Congressman Roudebush appeared was telecast on November 1, 1970. Because both programs were "aired" near the end of the campaign the questions asked of each candidate and their answers were essentially the same as the ones I have recorded the individual appearances of the two candidates. The Senator appeared after Congressman Roudebush had finished the half-hour of taping and had left the stage. When asked what he thought of the Congressman's refusal of a joint appearance, Hartke requested that the Congressman be invited back to share his half hour before the newsmen. The Congressman was nowhere to be found.

I have included transcripts of each of the "News Conference '70" in Appendix F.

55Robert P. Mooney, "Senate Nominees Battle In Same Building But Not Face To Face," Indianapolis Star, October 28, 1970, p. 1. I recorded the individual appearances of the two candidates. The Senator appeared after Congressman Roudebush had finished the half-hour of taping and had left the stage. When asked what he thought of the Congressman's refusal of a joint appearance, Hartke requested that the Congressman be invited back to share his half hour before the newsmen. The Congressman was nowhere to be found.
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already analyzed in this work. Although we need not analyze specific questions and answers asked during these particular programs, we ought to offer the following observations on the nature of the image projected by each candidate.

A political campaign is a unified sustained presentation of images, themes and variations on each. Television is a natural tool for a political campaign because images, themes and variations of themes is the basis of the bulk of its programming. For example, few would question that entertainment is the chief mode of television programming. Of the more popular forms of programming, situation comedies and western adventure shows dominate. Most situation comedies and westerns are written around a half dozen basic ideas; they are predictable. A political campaign is usually built upon one theme and three to eight basic ideas which develop that theme in order that by the end of the campaign people will be able to predict what a candidate will say about a theme or basic idea. On some occasions, broader societal issues like campus unrest, inflation, and unemployment will force a candidate to accommodate his campaign theme.

In the 1970 campaign Richard Roudebush's theme was "He thinks the way you do." To develop that theme variations such as "Dick Nixon needs him in Washington," and "If you elect me, never again will you have to be ashamed of your Senator," were employed. Coupled with the "He thinks the way you do" was the conscientious effort to project the image of a friendly, nice, "folksy" Hoosier.
Because of the positions he had taken on the war in Vietnam, military spending, and campus unrest, Senator Hartke had to emphasize that he was "In Step With Indiana." The development of the variations of that theme included the presentation of the Senator's strong legislative record in the social area; Hartke maintained that he had supported "people programs."

On each television program, both candidates continued the development of their campaign themes by projecting the images they had established earlier in the statewide television broadcast. Senator Hartke was alert, aggressive and tough in answering questions. On the other hand, Congressman Roudebush was slower, more inclined to appear friendly and more diffuse with his answers. Consequently by actual count of the number of responses to the questions put to each candidate on his WANE-TV "News Conference '70," Senator Hartke responded nearly twice as often as did Congressman Roudebush: Hartke responded forty-one times; Congressman Roudebush managed twenty-four responses.

In terms of the physical appearances of the two candidates on television, the physique of each man tended to reinforce the overall image he wanted to project. Congressman Roudebush was about six feet one inch and weighed about 230 pounds. Senator Hartke was about five feet seven inches and weighed about 165 pounds. The Senator lost about twenty pounds prior to the campaign.

In summary both men appeared consciously to project a total image throughout the campaign. The images Hartke and Roudebush presented were developed by the way they presented their positions before
partisan audiences, non-partisan audiences and on television. Both Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush knew what their supporters expected of them and did an outstanding job of meeting those expectations. The result of the Hartke-Roudebush campaign was the closest election victory in the history of Senatorial campaigning in the State of Indiana.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Denouement: In the Nation

On November 3, 1970, 1,700,000 Hoosiers braved cold and damp weather to register their votes; slightly over half for the Senator and slightly under for Congressman Roudebush. Hoosiers cast their ballot for one of the two candidates who had waged, perhaps, the bitterest Senatorial campaign in the history of the state.\(^1\) On the evening of November 3, 1970, many Hoosier voters had the opportunity to watch on national television a last minute call for votes by President Nixon. The Presidential address\(^2\) culminated his vigorous campaign efforts for candidates in over twenty states.\(^3\) Following the address by the President, Senator Edmund Muskie appeared on television in behalf of Democratic candidates.\(^4\) Whereas President Nixon called on "the great

---


silent majority of Americans of all ages, of every political persuasion, to stand up and be counted against the appeasement of the rock throwers and the obscenity shouters in America," Senator Muskie characterized Republican campaign efforts as designed "to turn our common distress to partisan advantage, not by offering better solutions, but with empty threat and malicious slander." Further Muskie added that "this attack is not simply the overzealousness of a few local leaders; it has been led, inspired and guided from the highest offices in the land." Both leaders succinctly summarized the major thrust of the off year election of 1970.

Many political observers had warned that the election had succeeded in generating apathy. I think that such an evaluation is inaccurate. The campaign effort in 1970, resulted in astute judgment on the part of voters. Perhaps the television commentator who suggested that it was a pity that "voting machines didn't have one little extra lever labeled, "underprotest," was more accurate in his view. I think that the fact that nine days after the vote had been cast five of the contests around the nation had not been resolved meant that voters

__________


around the country exercised keen judgment. James Reston of the New York Times emphasized the view when he wrote:

The voters refused to be bamboozled by the President and the Vice-President, or persuaded by the Democrats or the commentators. They picked their men across party and ideological lines. They gave everybody a chance, conservatives and radical liberals alike, warning them all not to take people for granted, but repudiating neither party, and giving commonsense another chance.®

When President Nixon and Vice-President Agnew viewed the results of their effort, they could point to one fact: their effort accounted in part for a reversal of a trend in politics in the twentieth century where the party which did not control the Executive branch lost on the average thirty-five seats in the House of Representatives. On the whole the Nixon-Agnew campaign efforts were rewarded: the Republican Party gained two seats in the Senate; and the Party lost only nine seats in the House. But out in the heartland of America, the Nixon-Agnew effort fared less favorably. Eleven Republican governorships were lost and the complexion of many state legislatures which had been strongly Republican changed.® Although President Nixon claimed a working majority,® few objective observers could find cause for real joy on his part.®

8James Reston, "Election Analysis," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne) October 6, 1970, p. 4A.


The Denouement: In the State

Although the final outcome of the Hartke-Roudebush campaign was not to be known for approximately two years after the election, both men knew that Hoosiers were not responding predictably to their efforts. Throughout the campaign neither man managed to affect significantly the ominous quiet with which Hoosiers met their efforts. As political columnist Edward Ziegner wrote:

The crowds at most political rallies, whether they be Republican or Democratic affairs, seem almost mechanical. The speaker does his bit, the applause comes although it is often perfunctory, and people go home.12

The ominous quiet of the Hoosier voter was such that at least one political columnist, Jack Colwell, pleaded with voters not to allow political dissatisfaction to prevent them from voting.13

Both candidates were seasoned veterans of Hoosier campaigning; both men knew what they had to do. Both men did the job well. For example, in order for Roudebush to win the election, he knew he had to carry Marion County, (Indianapolis) by at least 20,000 votes. L. Keith Bulen, Republican national committeeman and leader of the Marion County machine, had predicted that his organization would deliver 30,000 votes for the Congressman.14 Congressman Roudebush managed only a 21,500 vote


margin in Marion County. Senator Hartke knew that his victory margin in Lake County (Gary-Hammond-East Chicago) could not fall below 20,000. Although the Senator carried Lake County by 29,000 votes, Congressman Roudebush managed to do better by 4,000 votes in the county in 1970 than the popular Republican William Ruckelshaus did against Senator Birch Bayh in 1968. In short, Roudebush had done well in an area which was viewed as a Democratic stronghold. In fact, according to the analysis of the Republican Attorney General Theodore Sendak:

Roudebush did better than Ruckelshaus in virtually all the counties of Indiana with the major exception of Marion and Allen Counties. . . .

When viewed from the perspective of party effort the area of the state which may have made the difference in the election was the Fourth Congressional District and specifically Fort Wayne and Allen County. It was the city of Fort Wayne which was chosen by President Nixon as the place to go in Indiana in order to endorse Republican candidates in Indiana. The Fourth Congressional District was the District which had been represented for ten terms by Republican Congressman E. Ross Adair. Allen County and the Fourth District had been viewed across the State of Indiana as a Republican bastion. Congressman Roudebush had hoped to

15 "Vote Tally Breakdown for Marion County," Indianapolis Star, November 7, 1970, p. 16.

carry Allen County "by 9,000 or 10,000" votes. On the day after the election the fact became clear that not only had Fourth Congressional District Republicans lost their House of Representatives for the first time in twenty-two years but also that Senator Hartke had carried Allen County by 915 votes; the Republican bastion had cracked. Congress­man Roudebush had counted on the Fourth Congressional District and Allen County, but he lost in the county by 915 votes and the District by 747 votes. The analysis suggests that the Fourth Congressional District and Allen County played a significant role in the 1970 Senatorial Campaign.

The Denouement: The Role of Rhetoric in the Campaign

From the beginning this work was conceived as an attempt to explain the role of rhetoric in the final outcome of the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana. The basic premises from which I proceeded were several in number. I commenced with the idea that rhetoric functioned to adjust ideas to people and people to ideas. Not only does rhetoric


20The District figure is based on a calculation of the vote in each county found in the article, "2 Races Listed By Counties," p. 16.
function in order to adjust, but also rhetoric as it applies to political campaigns, does not necessarily conform to logical validity but rather it serves to match the speaker's perception of his audience's understanding, beliefs, values, and actions with his own. In short the special species of persuasion that is political campaign rhetoric has as its goal to entice the voter to vote for the candidate who is closest to his own self-image. The political candidate through the primary expression of his own self-image, his message, seeks to assure his constituents that he and they occupy the same mental presumptions, concepts, images, attitudes, and perceptions. When two astute politicians like Vance Hartke and Richard Roudebush clash in such an image building attempt the campaign period will become, as it did in 1970, a period in which attitudes are reaffirmed.

The Function of Rhetoric In Any Campaign

Because the role of rhetoric in the 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana intimately involved the selection and arrangement of symbols into messages which formed themes for each candidate and because each candidate obviously did well in so selecting, arranging, and structuring his message so that nearly half of those who voted voted for one or the other candidate, I conclude that both men understood, not only, the mood of the nation, but also, the mood of Hoosiers. Both men understood national attitudes as well as Hoosier attitudes toward political concerns of the day. Because of my consideration of both candidates' messages to partisan, non-partisan audiences in an important swing
district in the election, and to the state as a whole, an analysis of attitudes toward widespread concerns of national importance, Hoosier attitudes, attitudes in the Fourth Congressional District was undertaken in this study. Let us review those findings and prepare a summary of political concerns which both men had to address and did address in the campaign.

National Political Concerns

When the analysis of national political concerns was undertaken public opinion polls during the summer and fall of 1970 were consulted. In general the political concerns of most Americans during the period, in rank order, were: the war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, inflation, and unemployment.

During the months of August and September the majority of those people surveyed thought that the war in Vietnam was America's priority problem. Further most thought that the Democratic Party was better prepared to resolve the conflict. Most Americans wanted to bring United States troops home from Southeastern Asia by the end of 1971; yet most insisted that while troops were in the field they must be supported. Throughout the 1970 campaign, President Nixon engaged in a phased withdrawal of American forces from Southeastern Asia. In early October, 1970, President Nixon neutralized the Vietnam War issue by offering a new peace proposal at the Peace Conference in Paris. I think it safe to say that the Vietnam War was not the major concern of voters on election day.
The second and third major concerns of voters during the 1970 campaign frequently were considered together although they should not have been. The concerns of campus unrest and crime and lawlessness were developed by some politicians under the heading of law and order; frequently voters responded to a mention of any of the three as if it were synonymous with the other two. In 1970, the United States emerged from a decade of general unrest which had led to demonstrations and disorders from the streets of her major cities to the commons of her college campuses. Further, the same decade witnessed a steady increase in political assassinations and crimes against property and persons. One should not have been surprised by the October, 1970, public opinion poll findings that Congress should vote more money to help police deal with crime or that federal aid to colleges which fail to expel students involved in a campus riot should be withheld. Because much of the turmoil of the nineteen-sixties was related to civil rights for minorities and the usage of school busses as an instrument of racial integration, the finding that the majority of Americans said that racial integration should not be speeded up nor should children be bussed should not have surprised the public opinion canvassers.

The fourth concern of most Americans in 1970 affected all citizens. As a result of the expenditure of vast sums of money for space research and the Vietnam War the beginning of the seventh decade of the twentieth century was accompanied by rampant inflation. No matter what the federal bureaucracy did to abate inflation most Americans viewed it as one of the top four problems facing the country. For instance an
overwhelming majority of Americans said in November, 1970, that they favored a wage and price control program. Although few middle class Americans had been severely affected by inflation in 1970, more and more of them were becoming aware of the effect of inflation on their materialistic standard of living.

Coupled with inflation was the fifth major concern of unemployment. The policies undertaken by the Nixon Administration to end the war in Vietnam and control inflation had the effect of increasing unemployment. During the height of the campaign a majority of those polled in October, 1970, felt that more people would be out of work in their communities in the next six months. The protestations of the Nixon Administration to the effect that unemployment was going to be alleviated simply did not counter the voter concern with unemployment.

Statewide Political Concerns

For the Hoosier voter across the state, each of the five national concerns were their concerns. The war in Vietnam had gone on for six years and thousands of the State's young people had either been maimed or killed in it. The Senior Senator from the State of Indiana had been very outspoken in his attacks against the war. Many Hoosiers were not pleased with Senator Hartke's record on the war.

A second concern which was related to the war in Vietnam was campus unrest. Although the college campuses around the State of Indiana were not noted for their student activism over the Vietnam War, enough demonstrations with their accompanying damage of property
occurred at Indiana University and Indiana State University so that when the Hoosier taxpayer placed it in the overall picture of disorders on other college campuses there was honest concern over campus unrest.

Campus unrest in Indiana may have been minimal but the other phase of the law and order cluster of social items was of concern. Crime and lawlessness in general had grown at a slower rate in Indiana than the national average, but it had grown nonetheless. With the Hoosier belief in the ownership of property and hard work in order to acquire property one need not look very far for the cause of their concern on the crime and lawlessness issue.

Every Hoosier had felt the effect of inflation in the prices he had to pay for fewer and fewer goods and services in 1970. The areas in the State which were particularly hard hit by inflation were the areas where unemployment was highest. For instance in August, 1970, the South Bend area was designated by the federal government as one of those areas in the county where unemployment had reached the critical level of 7.5 to eight per cent of the work force. The South Bend area, I might add in passing, comprises St. Joseph's County which in addition to Lake County and Allen County were attributed by Congressman Roudebush as being the primary areas where he lost the election. Another major unemployment factor around the state was the fact that
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from September 14, 1970, throughout the campaign, 16,000 workers were on strike against General Motors Plants in the cities of Anderson, Muncie, Marion, Bedford, and Indianapolis. By election day those workers were keenly aware of the effect of the combination of high inflation and being without a pay check. Both Hartke and Roudebush had to design their messages with the above issues in mind as each affected the state.

Political Concerns In The Fourth Congressional District

We might ask at this point what the general thinking of the voter in the Fourth Congressional District was on the concerns. I think it safe to say that on the questions of Vietnam and campus unrest, residents of the Fourth District were similar in their thinking as were other Hoosiers. Because the District resident tended to live in an urban homeownering area dominated by caucasians with high employment, there was concern for the control of crime and lawlessness. Although the rate of increase of crime in the Fourth District was not as great as the national rate, it still was on the rise. Crime and lawlessness was of concern to the voter in Northeastern Indiana.

24"Auto Workers' Strike Idles 16,000 In Indiana," Journal-Gazette (Fort Wayne), September 16, 1970, p. 16A.
25"Local Crime Rise Is Below National Average For Entire Nation," p. 8A.
Inflation affected Northeastern Indiana in the same way as it affected other parts of the state and country. Although on November 3, 1970, the employment in Allen County was reported as being up by approximately 16,000 over mid-September, 1969, cut backs in jobs were also reported. Later in the month of November, 1970, the Bureau of Labor Statistics demonstrated that the layoff rate in the United States had hit an eight year high, while the Indiana Unemployment Insurance Claims Office announced that jobless pay claims had reached a seven year peak.

In summary, when Senator Hartke or Congressman Roudebush addressed Hoosiers anywhere in the State of Indiana his message had to incorporate his views of the war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, inflation, and unemployment. If either candidate had ignored those five issues he would have committed a serious error. After we consider the basic attitudes of Hoosiers toward life, politics and the country, then we shall undertake an assessment of each candidate's message as he responded to concerns over the Vietnam War, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, inflation, and unemployment.
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Dominant Hoosier Attitudes

The only determinants of voter choice which a candidate can manipulate during a campaign are the message units which detail his stand on and the relative emphasis he gives to an issue. A political campaign is a dynamic communicative process. In order to insure that the voter will perceive a candidate as representing his best interests, the candidate must understand how the voter perceives, understands, and feels about the major political concerns of the day. The candidate must analyze his audience in order to present better his message so that the audience will identify with him. In short, the candidate absolutely must understand, not only the traditional, but also, the recent beliefs, attitudes, and predispositions of those whom he calls upon for support.

When I evaluated the beliefs, attitudes, and predispositions of Hoosiers in 1970, a clear picture emerged. A description of most Hoosiers as friendly, easy-going, conservative, white, Protestant, home owning, materialistic, and economically comfortable was in order. Such was the case in Indiana as a whole, and such was certainly the case in the Fourth Congressional District. Traditionally, Hoosiers were found to have believed in the ownership of property, a free enterprise system of economics, loyalty flowing outwardly from family to town, state and nation. I found that as a result the Hoosier faith in the Protestant Ethic of hard work as ultimately leading to progress, Hoosiers were more taken with average rather than spectacular accomplishment. A further consequence of Hoosier belief in the Protestant Ethic
was a sublime belief in the ultimate progress of individuals and of society as growing slowly. On the social issues of the day the conclusion was advanced that Hoosiers were patriotic toward their country; conservative toward expansion of government programs; and believing in the ultimate success of the country in resolving problems. To summarize, the messages which were advanced by the candidates ought to have reflected being average, a faith in slow growth and progress, a belief in the right to own and the protection of property, a belief in the free enterprise system and a measure of loyalty, patriotism, and moderation or conservatism.

With the above conclusions concerning dominate national, state, and local issues plus the consideration of the Hoosier perception as a guide, I analyzed the campaign rhetoric of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush in matched settings: before partisan audiences, before non-partisan audiences, on statewide television in a debate. Let us now turn to an assessment of the arguments advanced by the two candidates on the issues of the war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, inflation, and unemployment.

The Adaption of the Candidates' Messages
To Dominate Hoosier Political Concerns and Attitudes

Senator Hartke was well known in Indiana: he had been Senator for twelve years; he had established a record of accomplishment which he could rely upon in developing his campaign. Although Congressman
Roudebush was better known in the central part of Indiana as a result of his ten years in service of the House of Representatives, he considered his lack of recognition across the state to be a major drawback. The Congressman had established a record for himself as being extremely conservative. Senator Hartke was known to have taken a great many liberal stands on several pieces of legislation. Because of the political experience of the two candidates and the virile nature of the political parties they represented, one can conclude that neither candidate was likely to have made a major mistake in analyzing the stances he would take on political issues before Hoosier audiences. The campaign themes bore witness to the fact. The arguments advanced by each candidate in the development of his theme bore witness to the fact. Finally the response of the voters on election day bore witness to the fact.

From the very beginning of the contest the Roudebush campaign theme emphasized the vulnerability of Senator Hartke. Both Roudebush themes of "Dick Roudebush--He thinks the way you do," and "President Nixon needs Richard Roudebush in Washington," emphasized two areas of weakness of Senator Hartke. As far as many Hoosiers were concerned, Vance Hartke did not think the way they did on the war, on federal spending, and on the question of campus unrest. In addition, Hartke had criticized Nixon Administration policies. Hoosiers liked Richard Nixon and many of his policies. Congressman Roudebush capitalized on the general discontent by including in every speaking appearance two lines which not only conjured up concern about Vance Hartke, but also,
permitted the listener to fill in with any negative reaction he may have toward politics in general. Speech after speech, Congressman Roudebush built his message to the climactic lines, "I've made only one promise to anyone, anywhere concerning this election. If you elect me, never again will you have cause to be ashamed of your Senator."

Senator Hartke employed three major approaches to counter the negative image of himself as it was portrayed by the Congressman. First, the Senator advanced as his campaign theme: "Senator Hartke—In Step with Indiana." Second, the Senator used his strong record of support of social legislation by emphasizing that only by taking care of people through the implementation of people programs would social concerns be alleviated. And third, the Senator attacked Congressman Roudebush by specifically listing the many programs to which Roudebush said "no" by voting "no." The Senator concluded that Congressman Roudebush was a "no" man; an abominable "no" man.

The two men sought to project two distinct images of themselves as candidates in order to get Hoosiers to identify with them. Throughout the campaign, Richard Roudebush sought recognition as a patriotic, rural, conservative, friendly, neighborly Hoosier; Vance Hartke sought to be identified as hard working, aggressive, and concerned with the problems of people. Consistently, we have seen the two images of the candidates emerge as they addressed audiences.

Upon turning to a consideration of the major political concerns of 1970—of war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness,
inflation, and unemployment—we continued to see each candidate developing a consistent image through his handling of the issues.

On the question of the war in Vietnam, Senator Hartke had but one choice; he had to point to his previous actions concerning Vietnam with pride. In approaching the issue as he did, the Senator was able to point to the fact that many Hoosiers had disagreed with him in the past on Vietnam. The Senator never suggested that Hoosiers continued to disagree with him, that he started questioning the war when only 300 Americans had been killed, and that he was proud of his independent record on Vietnam. The Senator always topped off his Vietnam argument with the assertion that if Richard Nixon were to end the war in time to win the election for Roudebush, Hartke would be right at Nixon's side, "because I am an American." I think many Hoosiers responded to the Senator's Vietnam argument by reluctantly accepting that the Senator was his own man on the issue. Hartke's record with the military and military organizations was too strong for anyone seriously to conclude that he was unpatriotic. The furore over the Roudebush Viet Cong television advertisement was a reaction to an unsupported claim that Hartke was unpatriotic. The ad was not only unfair it was not true. Many Hoosiers view the attempt to discredit the loyalty of the Senator with disgust.

Congressman Roudebush responded to the Vietnam War concern of Hoosiers by merely asserting that President Nixon was an honest President who had undertaken a courageous act by invading Cambodia and trying to wind down the war. Roudebush affirmed that President Nixon's
foreign policy was working and that he supported Dick Nixon in his foreign policy "without any equivocation, (or) without any reservation."

For a man addressing Hoosiers who had supported Nixon and who were patriotic, such an approach as the one chosen by the Congressman indeed did coincide with the theme that "Dick Nixon Needs Him in Washington."

Although Vietnam was a concern during the election of 1970, I doubt that anything either of the candidates said or did on the issue affected the outcome of the election; that point was strengthened when President Nixon defused the issue in early October, 1970. People wanted out of Vietnam and Richard Nixon did his utmost to accommodate them.

On the issue of campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, Congressman Roudebush would not allow Senator Hartke to address each separately. By virtue of focusing on campus unrest, ignoring crime and lawlessness and generally covering both issues with a strongly worded statement on law and order, the Congressman effectively assumed the initiative by defining the issue in such a way as to dictate to Senator Hartke the response he had to make. In meeting after meeting Congressman Roudebush would address the issue of campus unrest through an argument from definition. The Congressman started his argument by defining and defending the right of dissent as being the right to disagree with another person. After establishing his dissent argument, Roudebush always further defined the current situation as being productive of bodily harm and destruction of property, which was not dissent but rather criminal activity. Finally, the Congressman was warmly received
when he concluded, "when you start throwing bricks at policemen, . . .
burning buildings, . . . doing bodily harm, or killing people or maiming people, regardless of where this act occurs on college campuses or in the streets they're committed by common criminals and should be treated as such." The line of reasoning always was approved by hard-working, conservative, property owning Hoosiers. After a decade of rioting, looting and burning, the expression of the reassertion of law and order was welcomed by Hoosiers.

Senator Hartke was clearly on the defensive on the law and order issue not because he had in any clear-cut fashion encouraged unlawful activity, but because he had been an early outspoken opponent of the war in Vietnam. As a result of his stand on the war in Vietnam, the Senator was frequently asked during the Fall of 1969, to address various anti-war rallies attended by young people. After the Cambodian incursion in the Spring of 1970, with its accompanying loss of lives on the Kent State University and Jackson State College campuses, many Hoosiers ascribed guilt to Senator Hartke because of his associations. When the Nixon Administration isolated and hung the label radical liberals on its antagonists, Vance Hartke was quickly labelled. In order to counter the law and order issue, Senator Hartke argued in a variety of ways. In each argument the Senator emphasized his experience as a lawyer, prosecuting attorney, mayor, and legislator with a strong record of support for legislation designed to assist policemen and firemen. The Senator's efforts in behalf of policemen and firemen did not go unrecognized for the unions of both groups endorsed him.
Further, the Senator emphasized that he had always spoken for peace; on the campus, in the streets, and around the world. In his own way Hartke consistently made as strong an appeal for law and order as was that of Congressman Roudebush. The difference between the Hartke and Roudebush appeals on law and order was that the Senator's was not constructed in such a way as to provoke the emotional response Congressman Roudebush sought. Senator Hartke's specific statement on law and order was to the effect that he had pleaded with college audiences around the State of Indiana after the Cambodian--Kent State--Jackson State disgrace that "we cannot condone criminal action, that violence must be treated as absolutely in non-conformity with social justice. That crime must be treated as a crime. And if you commit a crime you must pay the penalty."

Drawing as he did upon his experience in the legal as well as legislative fields, employing as he did references to his experiences speaking on college campuses around the State of Indiana during the difficult days in the Spring of 1970, Senator Hartke labored to state his position on law and order in such a way as to give a balanced account of his actions. I think he was probably most effective in his argument with his own partisan supporters.

On the issue of the war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, I think both Hartke and Roudebush battled to a standoff. Neither man seriously discussed the rising crime rate as such. Both men presented a partisan view on the other issues. If an independent voter were influenced by the positions taken by the two men, Senator Hartke appeared to have the edge in terms of that which he had already
accomplished while Congressman Roudebush appeared to have the edge in that which he promised: the support of the Administration in the White House.

On the last two major political concerns in the 1970 Campaign, the rising rate of inflation and the rising rate of unemployment, I think Hartke assumed the offensive. Both inflation and unemployment were daily physical realities which neither Richard Roudebush nor the Nixon Administration could counter. In one way or another, Senator Hartke consistently reminded each of his audiences that in 1958 when he first campaigned for his office, a Republican Administration led a nation in which inflation and unemployment were economic facts of life. The Senator quickly followed his observation with a comment like "I'll be doggoned, twelve years later we got another Republican President and here we are again trying to cure the (economic) ills of the Republican's once more." The argument was the classic appeal to the idea that whenever a Republican Administration was in the White House an economic downturn occurred. Such an approach omitted a consideration of the role of the excessive spending of the two Democrat Administrations which preceded the Nixon Administration in contributing to that inflation and unemployment. Voters are not concerned with economic theory when they are either out of work or paying a great deal more for less.

The way in which Congressman Roudebush countered the Hartke offensive on the issue of inflation and unemployment consisted of following the arguments propounded by the Nixon Administration. The
first line of argument was that the Nixon Administration inherited inflation from earlier Democratic Administration policies. Later the national party line shifted to the assertion that we were withdrawing from Vietnam and cutting back on spending for military production which in turn lead to domestic unemployment. Congressman Roudebush asserted that we were in a transitional period and although unemployment was increasing the increase was temporary. As the campaign progressed the argument from Washington became that housing starts were up. At that point Congressman Roudebush pointed to the items as signs that a reverse was in process in the direction of economic growth. At one point the Congressman even argued that the unemployment figures were misleading because they reflected the under twenty-five year old group who would be leaving their jobs to go back to school. The Congressman maintained that the over twenty-five year old age group had had a consistent unemployment rate of about 3.25 per cent to 3.5 per cent. What the Congressman realized, I think, was that although the bulk of the population was under thirty years of age in 1970, the bulk of the voters were over forty years of age. The argumentative game which was played of offering an alternative hypothesis concerning unemployment and inflation may have been more effective with those people who actually voted than with the age group most likely to have been confronted with the effects of both. On election day inflation and unemployment both were on the increase. Senator Hartke maintained his offensive on both issues throughout the campaign, but I doubt that inflation and unemployment were significant factors across
the state; they may have been significant in St. Joseph's County.

In summary, we found that the role of rhetoric in the Indiana Senatorial Campaign of 1970, was that of presenting messages in development of themes which carefully confirmed the traditional Hoosier values of being friendly, hardworking, patriotic, faithful, moderate, and respectful of law and property. Generally the response sought by each candidate differed in that Congressman Roudebush made a concerted effort to elicit an emotional reaction against vaguely defined concepts, groups, and events; Senator Hartke sought to be aggressive by presenting what each candidate had or had not done on a given issue.

Congressman Roudebush campaigned in a leisurely, friendly manner by giving two or three addresses a day. On the other hand, Senator Hartke set a pace which younger members of his staff found tiring; Hartke worked very hard during the campaign. When the votes were counted, it appeared that both men used their corporate efforts and their individual efforts to get about half of those who voted to identify with them. I conclude that both men used rhetoric effectively to highlight and to emphasize the values, beliefs, attitudes, and predispositions of Hoosiers.

I do not think that there was a significant difference in the way each man developed his campaign themes and arguments which may have provided one or the other with a clearer plurality. I doubt that the personality of Richard Roudebush could have permitted him to be anything but a friendly, rural Hoosier; he may have exaggerated
his personality traits, I do not think he would have denied them. Perhaps Senator Hartke might have been less Partisan and more of a statesman in his appeals for people programs and peace. Had Hartke taken a stance of a statesman, the campaign would have been different. But taking the stance of a statesman during a campaign would have been as foreign to the Senator's personality as being overly aggressive would have been to Richard Roudabush's personality. Hartke had experienced the roughness of Hoosier politics as he made his way from the Mayor's office in the City of Evansville to the United States Senate. The Senator had always been known to be a hard working opportunist. In short, Senator Hartke epitomized the professional politician in the State of Indiana. The ideal professional politician in Indiana is not a statesman. In sum the image of each candidate in this campaign was inseparable from his personality, his style of campaigning, and the arguments he developed on the major political concerns of the day.

I think the implications of the Senatorial Campaign in Indiana are four in number. First, major national political issues are likely to be unimportant factors in statewide elections unless those issues are clearly at a crisis. Both the Republican and Democratic Parties proved to be too virile for any of the five major national concerns to be decisive in the campaign I studied. That is not to say that one or a combination of the stances taken by the candidates on the war in Vietnam, campus unrest, crime and lawlessness, inflation and unemployment were not decisive factors upon which some individuals did vote; that is meant to say that little evidence exists that any one or
combination of the five were clearly operative. Second, Hoosiers are a group who are imbued with a strong ethic which emphasizes slow growth and progress, moderation verging on conservatism, hard work, and an ability to judge based upon performance. Any future candidate in a statewide campaign is going to have to reflect the Hoosier Creed in his words and deeds. Third, any statewide candidate in Indiana who does not have a record of achievement will be passed over by the voters. Fourth, the role of television debates in future campaigns will be minimal. The Hartke-Roudebush debate was so lacking in entertainment value and in elucidation that it ought to have prejudiced political operatives against future encounters for at least the next twenty years.

The Place of This Study in the Literature of Political Campaigning: A Problem and A Suggestion

This work was conceived with the hope of making a contribution to the study of the role of rhetoric in political campaigning. The emphasis has been threefold: The corporate campaign efforts of two Senatorial candidates as a case study; the analysis of the argumentation used by each candidate as he developed his positions in light of an assessment of the attitudes, beliefs, prejudices, and predispositions of the electorate; and the role of rhetoric in the development of an image with which voters in Indiana could identify. The 1970 Senatorial Campaign in Indiana was selected as a case study in which corporate efforts, argumentation, and images ought to be analyzed. Such a comparative case study had been recommended to fill the void in the
vast literature on individual speakers or groups of speakers in support of a cause. The difficulty in such a comparative attempt is the quantity of information to be digested. This case study could have profited by an interdisciplinary team of researchers working on it as the campaign progressed. Voter panels might have been established to evaluate which values of the Hoosier Creed were operating for or against the image and arguments of each candidate. Such an approach ought to have produced ongoing, quantified assessments of the efforts of the candidates. Obviously, such an approach would have been ideal and beyond the resources of a single investigator.

In the final analysis, this rhetorical analysis of the campaign for the office of United States Senator from Indiana is one man's view of the ever changing efforts of two candidates, restrained by changing societal pressures, at a given point in time. Because the off year election of 1970 represented a total effort to change American society by a few men in the Executive Branch of our government, the election was important to the nation. Because Vance Hartke, as much as any candidate, appeared to represent a position opposite that being fostered by the White House, the election in Indiana was important. A rhetorical criticism of the Hartke-Roudebush campaign was imperative because as Wander and Jenkins have indicated, "criticism at its best, is informed talk about matters of importance."29 In 1970 across Indiana and America

voters voted for candidates in such a manner as to suggest that they realized the significance of their effort.
A Note on Textual Authenticity

A major problem in rhetorical criticism is the authenticity of the speech text which is to be analyzed. As Thonssen, Baird, and Braden have noted the problem is both historic and current for all critics.\(^1\) In a study of a campaign of lecture platform speaking, the problem of accurate speech texts can become an acute one. Thonssen, Baird, and Braden have commented that in a campaign:

Oftentimes the orator speaks extemporaneously. Even if proficient at shorthand, reporters may have difficulty in hearing and recording what was said.\(^2\)

The seven speech texts which serve as the basis for critical analysis in this study were selected from twenty-four speeches which were audiotape recorded as they were presented by the author. Each of the texts was transcribed by my wife who holds a Masters Degree in Speech Pathology and is a Certified Clinician by the American Speech and Hearing Association. After each transcript had been completed, it was compared to the tape with the manuscript in hand to confirm it. Prior to the analysis of each, I again listened to the selected speech with manuscript in hand in order to confirm it.

The manuscripts which follow represent an attempt on my part to parallel closely the "oral punctuation" of the speaker as he delivered his address. Because I agree with the comment of Clevenger, Parson,

\(^1\)Thonssen, Baird, and Braden, *Speech Criticism*, p. 323.

\(^2\)Ibid., p. 330.
and Polisky that "the best text of a speech is what the audience heard". I have preferred to include as far as possible, vocal pauses, pauses for emphasis, interruptions of a thought with another thought, etc. Where the audio-tape was unclear the words (unclear at this point) appear. Where it has been necessary to complete a thought for the sake of clarity such additions are identified by brackets ( ).

I do not profess that these manuscripts represent precisely what Senator Hartke, Congressman Roudebush and their speech advisors intended, but I do maintain that since each man relied heavily on his ability to extemporize, these manuscripts probably reflect what the audience heard more clearly than would manuscripts provided by the speaker.

In summary, the manuscripts which follow represent the speech making of Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush before live Hoosier audiences as recorded and transcribed by me.

---

Thank you so very much my dear friends. Certainly I want to first acknowledge the presence of our Reverend Father and our distinguished Mayor, Harold Zeis; and to Marie Nagle; and to il Duce, Mein Fuehrer, my leader of Allen County, Orvis Beers. (applause) Still I must say this about Lee. You know when he took over as chairman of my committee, he, he said, "Rudy, there is a lot of soul searching to do. You know your dear ol' opponent is a good Lutheran," and I'm not I'll say that. (laugh) But I'm delighted, so delighted to be here to undertake this tremendous responsibility of trying to get me (elected). Let's take all the votes in Allen County. You know uh, it's good to be in Allen County again in Fort Wayne, especially with my good friend Ross Adair. You know uh, I said many times in many different forms and at many different rostrums where I have appeared with Ross, if I ever picked the nicest guy in the whole Congress of the United States, I wouldn't have any mental reservation. I would indeed respond that great guy from Fort Wayne, Ross Adair. And I mean that sincerely. (applause) I certainly would say one of the finest Congressmen in the House of Representatives is without question, one of the finest and most dedicated men in our Foreign Affairs Committee and and in our operation in foreign countries and the assistant to the President of the United States and certainly a great friend to the veterans of this nation, my good friend Ross. And I say this to them, even if I don't make that Senate race and I'm going to, let's get old Ross back to the House of Representatives. (applause)

I've been here in Allen County so many times in the recent weeks, I've asked Orvis Beers today if he could register me to vote. (laugh) You know it's a a terrible thing I heard before I come up here, and I was talking to Sam, Sam Armstrong here who has done such a wonderful job of keeping me busy today. I said, Sam what took place here at the Chamber of Commerce building this afternoon? He said, "Birch Bayh was here." (Boo) And he thought this would give me inspiration. (laugh) I understand that Birch paid you a visit. But you know that he's been too busy running for the Presidency for the last few months (laugh) he's been making speeches all over the United States with large honorariums, that it's the first time you've heard of him since the 1968 election. And I'm delighted that Birch was here appearing for my opponent this afternoon.

I also see by the newspaper tonight that Larry O'Brian, that distinguished National Committeeman or National Chairman of the uh uh Democratic Party has got into the act on behalf of my opponent. He's spread a great deal of error today, I think in a press conference, he has entered in Republican affairs and Republican finances. But I might say that he has continued a tradition started by my opponent and then
Gordon St. Angelo in being completely inaccurate in his figures and I don't think that he should be that concerned. For after all when he ran the post office department as the Postmaster General, he ran a billion dollar deficit. (applause)

You know I, I wrote these remarks after reading the newspaper tonight. Frankly I was a little peeved when I did. I read about Mr. Hartke, my opponent. You know he hasn't had much of interest to say lately. He's saying that we're spending too much money; we Republicans, we're trying to buy the Senate seat here in Indiana. Of course this is completely ridiculous. Let me again emphasize my friends as I did twice today in press conferences here in Allen County and one previously in Delaware County where I appeared this afternoon; the figures being quoted are entirely inaccurate. The total budget of the Republican Party is less than one million dollars; it's about 900 thousand dollars and that's for all the candidates that are running statewide. Now, Orvis knows this. (unclear) knows this, we all know it that are in the official party of the Republican Party. Now the press continues to print that we are going to spend 3.2 million and once in awhile Vance has it up as high as 4.5 million. (laugh) I don't know where the money's coming from. But one night this past week here was Gordon St. Angelo in one location saying we were going to spend 2.5 million; down the road thirty miles was Vance saying we are going to spend 3.5 million. (laugh) You can see the inaccuracy of these statements. May I say to you that we have released to the newspaper certified copies of our bank account. And it somewhat grieves me to say this that the Republican Central Committee of Indiana and the Roudebush for Senate Committee now has something like fifty thousand dollars in the bank. So all of this is a lot of hog wash. But I say that Vance hasn't been saying much of interest lately. He and Martha now spend most of their time spreading vicious rumors about me and about my family; and after all when you don't have an issue, you got to have something to talk about. (laugh) (applause)

Now tonight at this joint meeting of, I understand the first joint meeting or most of, all the Republican Clubs of Allen County. I think that this is sort of a kickoff in a little late kickoff, let's say a kickoff in a final plan of our 1970 campaign. Now I want you to know, regardless of what club you belong to regardless of whether, what part you played in this meeting, like these girls, these wonderful girls, these Adair girls, singing that fine little song. (applause) I thought they were going to break out with "Have a care for Ross Adair." (laugh) You know this is a sort of a kickoff campaign, I would say the kickoff of the Allen County campaign. And I mentioned this was a kickoff meeting and I think that maybe we ought to correct the title just a bit, but let's make this a kickout meeting. Let's say let's kickout old Vance Hartke. (applause)

I guess I aggravated him a little bit, I tied the title of "big spender" on him. I said that he has been a thorn in the side of President Nixon. I think that he is a man who has done more to fan
inflationary fires than any person who has served in the Congress of the United States from the State of Indiana. And I say let's replace him, he and his kind, with men who are willing to give our President a hand. Is it too much to ask to give Dick Nixon a hand? (applause) I say to you this, I think our President is making a determined effort to halt inflation that erodes your dollar. A dollar that is worth just a fraction of what it was when he became the United States Senator twelve years ago. And what a cruel hoax it is to wish on our old people for example, our pensioners, our civil servant annuitants, people living on fixed income, yes our old soldiers living on pensions, living on these fixed incomes, menial in amounts that each day that income they receive from their government providing less and less of material things. Yes, this is a man who has said that he wants to debate the issues and I want you to know that I am happy to afford him that opportunity. (audience member: "Lay it on the line.") Roudebush: "I'm sure going to." (laugh)

You know he said he wanted to talk about our foreign economy and unemployment. You know I never knew a man who so desperately wanted to have a depression. Why he must go to bed every night on his knees praying that a depression will come on this country. I want to say this too, I never knew a man who needed one worse in order to win this election.

Now (laugh) we're going to talk about economy in these debates, I'll say that, we're going to talk about many things in these debates. We may even talk about Speigels and leased automobiles and out of state ad men. We might even mention some of some of the speeches he made before the peace moratorium where he said that this was the "greatest political demonstration of the country."

You know our Senator has certainly been generous with your money I might say, in this session of the Congress. Why I, I made an analysis of the bills that he introduced during the 93rd Congress. Do you know that they have a price tag of 22 billion dollars during the lifetime of the legislation? And do you know for the twelve years that he served in the Senate, I was unable to find one single instance where he's taken any action of cutting expenses during the twelve years he's served in the Senate. And oh yes, he's complained about defense costs and he's constantly attacked these expenditures, so now he talks about unemployment. Unemployment in the industry of Indiana, my good friends, is largely in need of defense oriented industries. And we are reducing defense expenditures, I wonder who is responsible. Certainly, inflation is not new. During the years of 1960 to 1970, your government spent nearly 60 billion dollars more than it took in. And I'll say this, this Senator that I hope to replace willingly took one of the primary places in the orgy of expenditures. We certainly, what I'm saying my good friends, is that we simply can't afford to keep Rupert Vance Hartke in the Senate another six years. (applause)
Now I'm constantly asked as I appear around the state, "How's the campaign going?" I, I want to say that the campaign is going very well. I have twenty-four county fairs behind me. (laugh) I did a little mental calculation, Orvis. I feel that I have consumed about four thousand steak sandwiches and 2,800 foot long hotdogs. And up in Clinton County in Frankfort the other night, I I wrestled a bear. The bear won. (laugh) I bought two trotting horses at the fair. I bought a few 4H Club calves and hogs. And on two occasions I crowned 4H Club queens. And on one occasion, Miss Congeniality and one of my staff said, I hope in levity, we've finally found something that you can do well. (laugh) But you know as I travel around the state of Indiana, mostly I just talk to the people. I talked to the good old Hoosier and I've listened to his complaints. I've listened to the things that have disturbed him.

Well, you know, down in my part of the state, there's more talk about the corn leaf blight for example, probably that doesn't bother you at all up here. It's playing havoc with our farm crop in southern and central Indiana. Yes, I talk about farm prices. The cost of things that farmers and businessmen must buy. About inflation and the decrease in the purchasing power of our dollar. Yes, what we are often asked the people are still most interested in the war in Vietnam. And those tremendous problems that our President is face with in the case of the Middle East. Yes, there are plane hijacking, and ecology, and pollution and drug control, crime in the streets and the disturbance on our college campuses. You know in the ten years I've been in the Congress, my good friends, I have never found a better way of finding out what's bugging our people than coming back to Indiana and talking to the people uh just as I'm doing here in Allen County tonight. And I want to say that when I become your state Senator, and I will be, I intend to continue to do just that. (applause) I might add parenthetically that this is not campaign oratory, it is a firm promise.

Now the election is less than two months away. Actually about six weeks away. Election Day November 3rd what a wonderful day this is. Oh I know that some of us are old pros in politics and so so involved in things, so much a part of election day probably thinking about "Oh gee, it's a long hard day's work down in my precinct or my polling place." But I want to say what a wonderful day election day is. It should really be a national holiday, I think. A day when the bands are playing, the flags a flying and a day to rejoice--that we possess the greatest government, the greatest government ever devised by man. And yes, I'll say Reverend Father, a government inspired by the hand of God Himself. A government that gives us more individual freedom, more material things, more wealth, more good things of life, than any ever recorded in the annals of the history of mankind in any place that I have studied history. Can you imagine anyone who enjoys these benefits wanting to change our type of government? Just think if you will, November 3rd that fifty-five to sixty per cent of the people of this country will vote. Just think what they would give to have that right in Czechoslovakia or Poland or Soviet Russia or Red China. Oh my
good friends, yes, election day is a great day for our nation. But you know that there are those who would substitute this great democracy this great republic of ours for the proven failures of socialism; the guaranteed way of life, the government ownership, the Communist thought that provides according to the needs of the individual. Yes, or uh some of the groovy plans like facism or Nazism. Yes, they would substitute these outlandish forms of government in favor of a system such as ours that is providing so much for our people. Yes, getting back to election day, I think it's most important that that this is a time on November 3rd that you will select those of us who will represent you, here on your local government and your county ballots, in your state of Indiana through your state legislators, all all of whom are up their seats this year, some of our state senators and certainly on your national level. There are so many good things about this land of ours.

There are so many good things about America. Why do we always have to talk about the bad things? I'll say to you that I think that Dick Nixon is doing a wonderful job as President. (applause) Like Ross Adair said just a moment ago, I think that he'd do a better job, if he had the help of a friendly or at least a cooperative Congress. Let me make one thing clear, I want to say this to any Democrat who may be in the audience tonight or who may read these remarks tomorrow. Neither party, the Republican Party or the Democrat Party has any monopoly on intelligence or patriotism. The Democrats and the Republicans alike want honesty in government. They want sincerity in their representatives. They want good government. And I think Ross will agree with this remark, I'm sure he will. Some of the greatest patriots I've ever known, some of the most dedicated public servants I know are seated on the other side of the political aisle. Oh I could name names tonight but that would serve no purpose. And I might say with some sorrow that some that I disagreed with are seated on my side of the aisle and some are seated on the other side of the aisle. Now I want to help President Nixon. And I hope that you will give me that chance. I know that the fellow that I'm running against says what's the use of sending Dick Roudebush to the Senate he will be a rubber stamp, but this is not true. But I want to assure you one thing, while I won't be a rubber stamp, while I will analyze each piece of legislation that comes before me for a decision, and will use the whatever intelligence I have to decide what is right for my country, I'll never be the blindly partisan stumbling block that Mr. Hartke has been during the twelve years he's been in the Senate. (applause)

You know I, I could discuss many of the problems that plague our nation. This horrible little dirty war in Vietnam that has gone on for so long. Cambodia, Vietnamization, that popular new term of making it possible for South Vietnam the Republic to take care of her own defenses. May I say without any equivocation, without any reservation I support Dick Nixon in his foreign policy. I think that his winding down the war in Vietnam is exactly what we must do at this time. I think that his intrusion into Cambodia (applause) I think that his
intrusion into Cambodia to knock out the privileged sanctuaries was a
courageous and honest act by a great President. And I think that
Vietnamization is working. You know, my opponent has opposed the
President on all these matters.

Let's talk about campus unrest. I have two educators here with
me tonight. Perhaps they'll agree with me, perhaps they won't. But
I want you all to know that there is no stronger defender of the right
to dissent than Dick Roudebush in the Congress of the United States.
The right to dissent is a right guaranteed to us by our Constitution.
You don't have to agree with Ross and you don't have to agree with Dick
Roudebush, Harold Zeis, or with Governor Whitcomb or anyone else.
That's your right to dissent. That is your right guaranteed by law.
But let me tell you this, regardless of where this act occurs on the
college campus or in the streets, when you start throwing bricks at
policemen, when you start burning buildings, when you start doing
bodily harm, or killing people, or maiming people, you're not dissent­
ing. You're a criminal and you should be treated as such. (applause)
(biggest so far)

I mentioned not long ago that my opponent has been a stumbling
block to the President. Let me give you just two or three quick
examples. Bill Cramer that young man, that fine young man, a dear
friend to Ross and myself, who has just been nominated by our party to
run for the Senate down in Florida actually introduced basic legisla­
tion, which made it a federal crime, a federal offense to cross a state
line in order to incite a riot; cause a riot. May I say Dick Roudebush
supported this legislation; Mr. Hartke voted against it. You know that
there is another bill, that on numerous occasions has been put in as a
rider or as amendment on basic legislation, which would eliminate any
type of federal aid to a student, remember convicted of inciting a riot,
or causing damage, or assault or battery on a campus. Yes, federal aid,
from our taxpayers dollars going to people who would do this. I want
you to know that Dick Roudebush supported those amendments. (applause)
Vance Hartke voted against them. I want you to know and I know I have
been criticized here, in Allen County and otherwhere, (sic) for being
a sponsor of a petition of Congress that supports our fighting men in
Vietnam and opposes trade with Communist nations. (applause) I don't
know of two higher purposes or objectives that any member of Congress
could have. May I say that Mr. Hartke voted against the legislation
that would restrict trade with Communist nations. Now I could go on
and on, Orvis you know me.

But you know the President's legislation on crime control has been
stalled. Twelve bills have been tied in committee, only one has passed! The D. C. crime bill. The problems on pollution, and ecology which the
President has sent down, has now been requested that the legislation
become law. These have been tied up in committees; forty-one pieces of
major legislation. But perhaps I have already made my point.
May I say to you of Allen County, the President of the United States needs your help. He needs a friendly or at least a cooperative Congress. Oh I know it's so easy to sit back here in the wealth and luxury and the great refinement, Harold, of Fort Wayne and say, "Oh Washington is such a long way off. Dick Nixon is just some image that we think about or a candidate that we hear about or see on our television or our broadcasts." But let me say that this county, this county of Allen will have a great deal to do in the November 1970 election. It will be this county of Allen that keeps Ross Adair in Congress (and the President wants him badly, I want you to know this). The strong arm of the President is the foreign affairs department. And it will be Allen County that will play a great part in my election as your United States Senator.

Now I must quit now, but before I do I do want to tell one story, Orvis, I may have told this up here before I don't know. So many things have happened on these campaigns. But one of the funniest things--I'm going to write a book one of these days, Ross. I'm one of the few Congressmen that never wrote a book. (laugh) I'm not going to brag about the Inside of the New Frontier, or Vietnam an American Tragedy, nothing as maudlin as that. I'm going to write about the funny things that happen along the campaign trail. And I think that the funniest thing that ever happened to me happened at a little town of Bainbridge. Maybe some of you heard me tell the story before, but I'll repeat it. It was in 1964. That was the year when old Barry Goldwater was running for President. In my heart I still know that he was right, but we (applause drowned out the rest of the sentence). And I know that Ross has cause to remember that campaign too, don't you Ross, eh? (little laughter) We sort of sneaked by. Gee, I had a tough opponent. I had the meanest cuss running against me that I ever had. (laugh) That was Dr. Carl Lester. And he was a professor of political science at the Wabash College. He was just eating me alive. Anything that I had done wrong over the last four years of Congress, he was letting the voters know about it. And I was feeling mighty low. And I had been over in Clark County that night before elections. (And it was an unusual meeting.) I don't believe I ever attended a campaign meeting the night before elections. The county chairman, Harry Ray Dettler, who you know Orvis, was quite excited, and we had our meeting over in Rockville, Indiana. On our way home we were coming through the little town of Bainbridge. And there I stopped at a stop light (my wife, Marge, was driving). I said, "Honey, see that old fellow standing over there by the Marathon filling station." I said, "Pull in there, I want to talk to him." I said, "This thing's tough. Maybe that will be the vote that will get me by." (laugh) I got out of the car. I walked up to him and I told him about my political philosophy. I told him how I stood and how I felt about things. The conversation went something like this: He said, "Young feller, I like you. I like the way you talk. I like what you stand for. I'm going to vote for you." Well, there wasn't a Republican in all of Bainbridge, so I knew I may have won. He said, "Give me a package of your matches, so I'll be
sure to remember you down at the poll tomorrow." Then came the clincher, he said, "After all, anything would be better than that windbag we've got over there now." And I was running for my third term. (great laughter-applause)

Now I think that's enough out of me for tonight. That's enough oratory for one spell. I gotta get back to Nobelsville. I gotta to speak at a big meetin' at Indianapolis tomorrow. And another in Tippon and another in Pike Township of Marion County. And by gosh, haven't got a thing to say. (laughter) I wrote this over in the parking lot, Ross, before I came over. Of course you tell by the neatness (laughter) and adeptness of the remarks. I just want to say something to you in a serious vein. You know I've only made one campaign promise to anyone anywhere in Indiana. I made this to Orvis Beers when he said he would support me for the United States Senate. I made just one little simple promise. If you elect me your United States Senator, I say to the people of Indiana, never again will you have cause to be ashamed of your Senator. (applause)
APPENDIX B
Thank you Ed Roush. There is the next Congressman from the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Indiana is Mr. Ed Roush. Let's say "Hi." (applause) There is the speech I was going to give to you. The black book. It's got the wretched record of Richard Roudebush on it. (laughter--applause--Hartke held out the r's.) Oh that's good to hear. It's good to see so many good faces. You know Fort Wayne is a good city. It's a wonderful place, right? (applause) I'm going to tell you that I am wide awake tonight. I thought I'd be asleep when I got here. We've been in twenty-seven counties in four days and that's not bad for a beginning of this campaign. We get warmed up we'll show you how it really goes, all right? (applause) Martha was here yesterday, right? I'll have to catch up with her one of these days. (laugh) (applause) I was just uh downstairs visiting with some of the news people. They didn't all show up. I wish that they would all show up once, I'd like to give them a full ear full. I've nothing against news people. I think that they are great people, especially this one. (a photographer took Hartke's picture) (laughter--applause) I understand that they are going to have to give me some more equal time down here in one of these stations. I just was told about it--they're trying to be fair to me by giving all that spare space to my opponent. Thanks a lot. You know what Alben Barkley used to say when they gave him water like that he'd never touch the stuff. (laugh)

I want to visit with you a few moments tonight. Nineteen hundred and seventy is a very important year in your life. A very important year for a simple reason; nineteen hundred seventy is going to be the decision year for the seventies. Nineteen hundred and seventy and this election is going to make the difference in which way America is going to turn. That message has to be delivered loud and clearly. It has to be delivered in a fashion which can be heard all the way from Fort Wayne, Indiana to Washington, D. C., and over to Belgrade in case he is listening over there. (applause) I want to say one thing to you. I do not feel that it is my place as United States Senator to make a statement about the President of the United States that I find it distasteful for him visiting in Yugoslavia. That's what my opponent said about the President of the United States. He found it distasteful for the President to visit Yugoslavia. I think that he's damned lucky that he got to go! Most places Nixon tried to go in this world, he got chased out before, remember? (laughter--applause) I remember nineteen hundred and fifty-eight, President Eisenhower, who was revered throughout the world couldn't even go to Japan. (aside: That's right, you remember that don't you?) A young fellow riding with me said, "You know I remember when I was a child back in the Eisenhower days" (laugh) I'll tell ya, times do change. (laugh) Times are changing. 1970 is a big year for
you young people. I want to make one thing clear to every person here. If there is a student that wants to participate in my campaign, I want him. Very clearly, I don't care. And I'm not worried about how long his hair is and that's all right, I've found some girls with long hair and they're very attractive. (laugh—applause) I want their minds, those minds, who are clean. I'll say one thing, I don't want the dirty minds whether they're young, middle aged, or old. This country has had enough of that kind of trouble. I want to make something else very perfectly clear; if there are black people in this country, I want them on my campaign. I want them to participate and I want them working with us. If if there are organized labor people who want to work in my campaign, I want them there. I'm not ashamed of my association with the organized labor movement of this country, I'm proud of it. I'm darned proud of it. (applause) If the small businessman or the large business man or the farmer want to be a part of my campaign, I want you to know that I'm a United States Senator, uh United States Senator from the State of Indiana. There are over five million people in this state and I want to represent every one of them even including Governor Whitcomb and he needs a lot of representation. (applause) Nineteen hundred and fifty-eight, we came out to this country and we said that it was high time to end the high cost of living and to end the unemployment. I'll be doggoned, twelve years later we got another Republican President and here we are back again trying to cure the ills of the Republicans once more. (applause) You know a fellow told me the other day, he said you have to have a Republican elected Governor of the State of Indiana and President of the United States every once in awhile just to appreciate how good it was under the Democrats. (applause) I said I might agree with that statement but I don't think we have to do it quite so often. (applause) (laughter)

I wish the governor would run against me, he tried that in 1958. I kinda like to have him out there in his own right instead of dumping that other man, you know how he mysteriously, mysteriously disappeared; just like the will-of-the-wisp. He never even knew that he had been double crossed by the governor. That's the Republican Party today. Oh, the Republican Party today here in Fort Wayne is . . . Ivan, I want you to know, I don't know which faction is going to be on our side, but I think that both of them prefer our side than their own. (laugh) I really believe that. They are really dissatisfied. I don't blame them.

Ed Roush is right. Let me just say something about Ed Roush, most of you people here in this room, there's a few of you who have come over from some of the country which he had represented then. You don't know what a fine outstanding servant he has been. Why, Ed, I was down there in Roudebush country, that's Hamilton County. Never had a ticket since nineteen hundred thirty-two—they got a ticket this year. We had 350 people there Saturday night. We gave them old Ned. But I just asked them one simple thing, I said, "What's he ever done for Hamilton County?" You know there wasn't a soul in the room who could think of a thing he had ever done for them. That's right. But Ed Roush, I was
in Logansport, day before yesterday, and you know as well as I do, that you were there and I was there during the flood of Logansport when we saw them putting the sand bags on the river trying to keep the water from coming into the business places of downtown and into the homes in that city. But that's been all over now. No more floods. Because there were three reservoirs that the two of us were able to work together with a Democratic President to bring on that Wabash River: Huntington Reservoir, the Missisinewa Reservoir, and the Salamoni Reservoir. Of course I want you to know that we have been accused of big spending because we invested into the idea that flood need not be.

You young people, let me say to you that we invested in the young people. And I think that it's a tremendous investment. We say that this country had been built on the idea that it has a free elementary and secondary educational system. And yet my opponent had the gall to vote against the effort to try and make sure that that educational system is continued.

We say that this country is built on the idea that there shall be no society which is going to control us with ideas which are radical or extreme. And yet my opponent went on the television night before last, in Louisville, Kentucky, and finally admitted, after he constantly denied it for days and days and days, he finally admitted not only that he was a member of TRAIN, but he finally admitted that TRAIN is a part of the John Birch Society. Well, you know this is a peculiar thing about this man, he never is quite sure what he is going to stand for. They asked him whether he endorsed the philosophy of the John Birch Society, and he hummed and he hawed. (And I'm repeating now what they told me he said down there.) He finally said, "Well, let me just say that I'm not in favor of any extremist groups." I'm going to tell you here and now that my opponent is a member of TRAIN which is an ad hoc committee of the John Birch Society. I'm going to tell you here and now that he delivered Robert Welch's book called, The Politician under his name to the Indiana State Library at Terre Haute. That book is the handbook of the John Birch Society. He gave it to them in nineteen hundred and sixty-four. I'm going to tell you here and now that it was Thruston Morton, the Republican National Chairman, who made this damnable indictment of the John Birch Society, when he said, "There are three organizations that I fear: The Communist Party, the Klu Klux Klan, and the John Birch Society." And then Thruston Morton made this statement, he said, "I resent the fact that the John Birch Society is attempting to use my party, the Republican Party as its instrument to try and gain control of this country."

Now folks, I said that nineteen hundred and seventy is a very important year to you, because the course of this country's future destiny is going to be decided in this election. If Vance Hartke were defeated, which he certainly is not going to, I'm going to win this election. You might as well know that. (applause) But if there is a voice which is heard throughout this country, which gives any kind of
support to a negative philosophy, just as Ed Roush says, which says that Medicare is a thing which is really not for people, which says that rat control is really not for the people, which says that the National Lakeshore Park is not for people, which says that conservation generally, is not for people, which says that elementary and secondary education's support from the federal government is not for the people, which says that higher educational support from the federal government is not for the people; it's that philosophy which is a negative philosophy of my opponent. He has said, "No," "No," "No," to every single piece of progressive legislation that's been submitted to the Congress in ten years. This man has a negative philosophy of government. He was fifty years behind the time when he was elected in nineteen hundred and fifty, (sic) and he's never moved a step forward since. This man says no to you. He says no to young people. He says no to anybody who wants a job. He said at Lafayette, Indiana, a week ago last Sunday that five and one half per cent unemployment is satisfactory. I say that's sheer nonsense. I'm saying to you quite honestly that the turning point will be in 1970. The message that has to be delivered to President Nixon and to this country, is the fact that we want to return to that spirit which was just overriding this country of the John F. Kennedy days, if you remember. Remember the statements of this man, remember the spirit of the nation: the young were given hope; the young at heart were given hope; the aged were given hope. The country was looking forward to a great and glorious future. It was a time in which the majesty of America was being re-established. Partners in Progress for South America, the Peace Corps, all of those idealistic ideas which really are the foundations of a great and wonderful, rich, prosperous, powerful America were embodied into the spirit of John F. Kennedy. You know when his life was taken from us, that that we'd lost something which we'd never regain, and never will, unless we dedicate ourselves with renewed strength and vision.

Lyndon Johnson took over the helm of the government. And he took those ideas and those legislative organs of John F. Kennedy. And with the help of Ed Roush and Vance Hartke, and we say this with pride, we enacted the most progressive legislative program that the country has known since Franklin Delano Roosevelt's presidency. (applause) If I speak to you about these accomplishments of the Democratic Administration in that period, if I talk to you about the fact that we did as we sat in the Congress, and Ed, you were on the space program as you well know. We sat there and listened to the President of the United States, when we didn't even have a chimpanzee up in space yet, and listened to him say that we shall put a man on the moon, and return him safely, by the end of the decade. And I don't know about you Ed, but I know that Vance Hartke really wasn't sure that could be done. But we dedicated ourselves to a purpose. We established the willpower, the willpower to get that job done. We had dedicated our resources, our brains and our technology to the idea of accomplishing the stated purpose of the President of the United States. We put a man on the moon and we brought him back home safely, a year ahead of schedule. Now I say to you that
any nation that can do that can certainly match the agony and the terror
of disease, crime and despair which exists in the nation yet today.

So when I talk to you about the glories of those periods, I also
want to remind you that it's not all been happiness and light. There's
been agony, there's been sorrow. There's been tragedy. There's been
a great tearing apart of the country. The question of the races which
we thought we settled one hundred years ago in a great Civil War has
now reared its ugly head in an entirely different form and new form and
it has to be settled. And let me remind you of one thing and I say this
to you from the depth of my heart, and I would tell you this whether I
was running for election or not: this is a noble experiment in America
of whether we can take a society and put together the races and live in
harmony. And I tell you, especially those of you who are younger, that
if this experiment fails in America, then chances of it being a success
in the rest of the world are very, very minimal. And let me remind
each and every one of us who are white here tonight that we are a
minority in the world. I'm not planning to leave this earth so fast.
And I have seven children who I expect will be here a lot longer, the
youngest of which is eight. But I'm saying that if this experiment
fails in America, then we can look forward to racial wars throughout
the world in a terror which is not within the distinct understanding
to man. This is what this is all about. Where this country is going.
Is it going to dedicate itself to a policy of solving the problems of
the world?

Oh, they talk about the campus unrest. And I'm going to talk
about that tonight. Oh they tell me, don't talk about the war; don't
talk about campus unrest. I say poppycock. Look, we're going to talk
about the problems of America. They're not Democratic problems, they're
not Republican problems, they're people's problems. And we're going to
do the best we can to solve them. That's our job. That's been the
Democratic Party's responsibility and its been our great success story
throughout the history of the United States. That's what's made us
great. Not everyone in this room has always agreed with Vance Hartke.
I'll say probably a lot of you. There may be times when there's been
a great majority, and maybe a few do yet today. I'm personally proud
of my independence. I'm proud of my record. I come to you completely
proud of that. I'm going to talk about the war just a moment. I want
to tell you quite honestly, that fifty thousand of America's finest
young people died in that war. When I first raised questions as to where
we were going, less than three hundred had died. And now my deepest
fears have been confirmed and I'm not happy about it. So I come to you
with a sad heart on that. And I think that all of America is sad and
frustrated with me. But I come to you with a clear conscience. That's
an important thing to Vance Hartke. And I'm interested in President
Nixon doing what he said he was going to do to end the war. And I'll
tell you, I'm not one who is going to chide him if he settles the war.
Even if he settles it on October the 25th, 1970 just in time to try and
win the election. That's alright with me, you'll find Vance Hartke
right by his side if he gets a stand-still, cease-fire. Because I am an American first.

You talk about the campus unrest; the Democrats didn't cause the campus unrest and the Republicans didn't cause the campus unrest, it's there. And so President Nixon after the tragedy which happened on Kent State—when I visited the campuses of this state at the request of the President, and spoke against violence—when very few people could go onto a campus—I don't mind telling you, at some personal danger to myself, I might tell you. I appeared on the campuses here and I said to these individuals, that we cannot condone violence, that we cannot condone criminal action, that violence must be treated as any other violence is treated as absolutely in non-conformity with social justice. That crime must be treated as a crime. And if you commit a crime you must pay the penalty. And I said that violence was counterproductive. And I said then to those people who thought that there was no other answer, that the best they could hope to get with violence was to go to jail and that the worst they could hope to get was to go to the coffin. That was the voice of Vance Hartke then. Speaking for peace on our campuses, speaking for peace in the world, speaking for peace in our streets, speaking for the peace for the brotherhood of man. And if I'm going to be condemned for anything, I don't mind being condemned for being in love with my brother, all mankind. (applause)

So then the President decided that he had to listen and I say that he does listen. (I remind you again let's have that voice of ours heard so that he can hear it on November the third with that tremendous victory.) Because he did listen after Cambodia. He went to the American Bar Association, he asked them: "What'll I do?" For which I commend him. The American Bar Association said that we should have an independent commission, free of all political domination, investigate the cause of campus unrest.

President Nixon appointed that Commission himself. It's not like the one on obscene literature and pornography which he wants to blame President Johnson for and that's another story. But all I'm telling you is, he has no excuse on this, he appointed it himself. And he named a Republican by the name of William Scranton former Governor of Pennsylvania, his envoy to the Middle East, as the chairman on campus unrest. That commission has reported. What did that commission report? The most remarkable report in the history of the United States of America. Because this is what I spoke about earlier when I said that 1970 is the challenge date. It said that President Nixon failed the country to provide that moral leadership that was necessary to end the violence on the campuses of the United States of America.

Now the challenge is up to him. Will he accept this, this criticism of his own commission, and treat it as he should, as constructive criticism, asking the President of the United States to assume the position of leadership which a President should and is obligated to do.
After all, he's not just the administrator of the laws in this country, he's not just the chief executive, he's not just Bebe Robozzo's friend with the White House in San Clemente, and Key Biscane, and up in the mountains, and on occasion in the White House. He's the President of the whole United States of America and it is a tremendous responsibility. He is our political leader. He is our governmental leader. And this commission report makes it very clear that the moral standards of this nation are going to some extent be judged by the way he leads this nation. So I say to you tonight, if you want to have a better country, if you want peace overseas and want that war in Vietnam ended like I do, if you want peace here at home in the streets, on the campuses, if you want disease and research which he vetoed, if you want the veterans to have their money in the hospital, which he vetoed which was a Vance Hartke amendment, if you want to have a better and brighter America, then you put that message to him now. And that message must be from here on in to elect Democrats in such overwhelming numbers, in such overwhelming numbers, that he'll understand that in the next two years of his Presidency he has to start being the President of all the people of these United States of America. (applause)

I don't come to you tonight asking for pity. I don't come to you singing the woes of the naysayer. I've always thought that the naysayer, that he is divisive in his rhetoric and that he tears the country apart. I really believe that the President's own cabinet officer told us the truth the other day when he made this statement, his name is Wally Hickel, and he said, "You can't tear the country together." You can't tear the country together, and I agree with that. There's a play on Broadway which I just absolutely, the whole tone of it is to me what I would like to think of America. It's called "Pearly." And one of the songs of "Pearly" has this little phrase, it says, "They say my friends that the world is coming to an end, but I say that the world is coming to a start."

And out of all this, out of the unrest that we have had, out of the turmoil, out of what appears to be tragedy, what appears to be despair, we have the ingredients of an optimistic America, of a country which has its basic heritage built again as I say upon that philosophy of life which believes in the brotherhood of man. Which believes that you pray for your enemy. And that's tough. Which believes that you turn the other cheek. Which does not any longer go for the idea an "eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," or that power and might makes right. Which does not believe that we can force our way of life upon someone else. Because each and every individual not only has his own body but has his own mind and he is entitled to that as an individual. That's the greatness of America. That's the optimistic nature of America. And that's the America of which Winston Churchill said, he said, "This is a remarkable nation. It has demanded neither tribute nor ransom from friend nor foe. And it has been the most generous of nations that have ever been on this earth." Just think, they are talking about you. They are talking about all of us. That we are the most generous nation
in the whole world. Certainly the most significant contribution we could make this year, nineteen hundred and seventy, is to demonstrate that generosity by establishing a society which is the envy of the world. Not for its might, not for its rockets, not for SST's that can go from New York City to Paris three hours quicker, but for a society which can say that we can cure cancer if we'll put as much money into that as we did into the moon program--we put one hundred times as much into the moon program as we did into cancer research. If we want to find a cure for heart disease, for arthritis, if we want to go ahead and provide as we did today in the Finance Committee, for at least one hundred dollars a month minimum on social security, another ten per cent on social security, an opportunity for young people to educate themselves.

What I'm saying to you simply is this: this is yours to do with as you please. You live in a free country. You live in a country where you can exercise your rights and privileges. Go about and do it. Don't be ashamed to be a democrat. You ought to be the proudest people in the land. (applause) They've always tried to be on the side of right. Not always right, but we try to be right. The fact that we are wrong sometimes, only demonstrates that we are human. And there's nothing wrong with that either.

So I'm asking you tonight, in this meeting in October, to give us thirty days--thirty days of the most inspirational Democratic spirit that Ivan Lebamoff can summon: from you. (applause--large)
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Thank you Jim, to the guests who are here, to the wonderful people of Fort Wayne, I might say that I've had breakfast this morning with Jim Kelly and with Allen Steer. And I come out of that all right because in the first place, uh, Jim said that the General Motor strike was on and you can't buy a car anyway if you even want to. Allen Steer had Henry Rube in London and he said he didn't dare try to sell me an insurance policy until he had the doctor check me out. Now I want you to know about those Bun candy bars, I still think that they are the best candy bars in the whole United States. (laughter) If that cost you money, God bless you. The fact of the matter is, you'll find one of those in my car right now. I didn't do it especially 'cause of the people of Fort Wayne.

This is an election year, and of course in an election year you'd (clear throat) expect a person to talk about elections. I do not come to visit with you about elections I really just want to visit with you for a few moments and hopefully if its satisfactory with you, to give you the chance maybe to visit with me about some of the things you're concerned about. Back in the early days, a fellow named Watson said that the liberty that God gave us we've taken. I think that within the framework of humanity America has indeed done just that. The liberty that God gave us we've taken. I think that basically most Americans would say, by in large, we've done very well with it. We are a remarkable group of people. I do not know how much you know about your ancestors, but I will tell you that when I go back to Germany I have as much trouble finding my relatives as Nixon is finding his in Ireland. (laughter) But the point simply remains, that we did not come over here, by in large, as the descendants of the kings and the hierarchy. We came over here, uh, sort of I suppose you'd say, a mixed bag. We've got along very well. We've taken a nation which was raw and had a lot of resources, but we've utilized those resources, by in large, for humanity. Winston Churchill made this statement (ah) about America, he said, uh, "It's a remarkable country, it demands neither tribute nor ransom from friend or foe." And that's us. He's talking about us. He's talking about all Americans. We have, by in large, used the liberty God gave us to uh, in a fashion which at least is commendable to mankind. It is true that along the way we have made some mistakes. And I suppose that is only indicative of the factor that we're human. Certainly, I think that all of us would say, that if we would measure our own failures, that instead of finding those who we live with being able to catalogue the list of items upon which we have failed mankind, that they would fall far short of those which we could list for ourselves. In other words, inside of each man, is that feeling that somehow he has
not met the type of perfection which God really sought out for man. All of this has to do with (with) the nation.

We've come a long way. We've developed an airplane that can go faster than the speed of sound. We've developed a country which, by in large, can produce more food than we can eat; more entertainment than we can enjoy. I suppose of all the people in the world, we have been the most blest. And yet I do not believe it takes an expert in social analysis to look upon America today and say, somehow, someplace there is a great anxiety about where this nation is going. Some people have asked a question have we lost the way. Some people have said well we've reached the zenith and that's the end. I refuse to subscribe to that negative philosophy. I personally believe that we have just touched the edge of what could be a great and glorious time. Not alone for those of us here, but through the example, possible we could create a great and glorious world for all of those who are on this little planet which moves out through the universe. We now have successfully taken ourselves out into space. And there is no reason to expect that man being the inquisitive and experimental animal that he is—that we're not going further out. How far I don't know nor do you. And I suppose that the Biblical prophecy is still true, "That whatever (the) mind of man can conceive, that he can do." And so the conception of the mind certainly is not without limits.

In this nation of course I see things, and you do too, which disturb me. There are poor people. But by in large most people are not poor. And that's not right. There are hungry people. But by in large most people are not hungry. And that's not right. There are people who are denied an opportunity to go to work. But still, by in large, most of the people of this nation, some 95 per cent roughly, still are gainfully employed. And yet there are those who are out of work and that's not right. There's anxiety and there's frustration.

In a political campaign, I would hope that we would talk about those things which are not Democratic problems and not Republican problems, but which are people's problems. They're America's problems. They're yours and they're mine. And when I lay the blame of guilt at the Republicans, whether he's my Republican opponent (and you don't expect me to treat him with just complete kindness I hope) but when I lay all the blame of the world at his doorstep, I do myself a greater disservice than I do him. Equally well, if he does the same to me. If I were to come and tell you that President Nixon is responsible for all the troubles that this nation suffers tonight, I think you'd just plain bypass me and say, "Well it is just another political campaign." But its equally wrong for President Nixon to say all the troubles of this country belong to President Johnson or Vance Hartke. Now I've had my differences with President Johnson as you well know, and they came on several fronts.
When I went to the Senate in nineteen hundred and fifty-eight, I was confronted with a situation which put me on a committee, of which I no longer am a member because we worked. The committee went out of existence: the committee on unemployment problems. I spent more time on field trips than any other United States Senator. We did formulate some programs, not alone to criticize the cause of unemployment, but to perfect hopefully for people an opportunity to go to work. And by in large it worked. In that, for example, was the idea that we must modernize the American plant and equipment. And that we did in nineteen hundred and sixty-two with the tax revision act of that time and the accelerated depreciation act. I was in the forefront of those who advocated the investment credit. In nineteen hundred and sixty-five, President Johnson because of the need for additional revenue, came to the Congress and asked for a suspension of the investment credit. I objected. I said that they would have the investment credit back within one year's time, because no nation can continue to increase its productive capacity, if it cannot stay modern. And in this society today, a businessman has to have enough capital or otherwise he can hardly afford to keep modern. Less than nine months later, President Johnson came back and asked for the reinstatement of the investment credit. In nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, President Nixon came to the Congress and asked for the repeal of the investment credit. And all those Democrats and Republicans except Vance Hartke on the (Senate) Finance Committee went along with him--and its on the books. I stand before you here tonight to tell you of the day that something along that line is going to be back on the books. There is no way, in my opinion unless you provide for an investment capital, that this nation can truly remain competitive industrially with people like Germany and Japan. That's a simple fact of life and the quicker we realize it--that it is not an expense of government or a loss of revenue--but an investment into the future of this great American democracy.

When I went to the Senate in nineteen hundred and fifty-nine, we had some problems concerning the elderly. I personally believe that the programs which were passed during the days following John F. Kennedy's assassination were good programs. They were not implemented. I'm not one who is going to defend the bureaucratic operation, but I will say one thing: there are just as many damnable, inferior incompetent bureaucrats in most the businesses than there are businesses themselves. And you'd like to get rid of them in your own business as well as we would in the government. And that's not a unique situation among people either. The fact is you're dealing with people. But what I'm saying to you is, that unless we meet the unfinished business of America and get on with that business soon, the liberty which God gave may be taken away from us in a fashion which will be more severe and more cruel than anything most of us have experienced in our lifetime. You see all the many young persons today have not experienced some of the things such as the depression of the thirties and World War II as I did, or maybe, if some of you are old enough, that you did. (small laughter) A young man riding with me in the car the other day,
working on his doctorate, taking time out from his doctoral thesis to be working in my campaign. Talking about these things (I told Jim Kelly about this this morning,) that makes you understand when you are moving along in your lifetime. He said "when I was a young boy in the Eisenhower days," it makes me understand because I understood what he meant: that I'm getting a little bit older.

In nineteen hundred and sixty-five when I saw this country taking what I thought was a wrong turn, I said, then, publicly, what most Democratic politicians in my state and the nation said was utter suicide. I wanted to know where we were going in Vietnam; what we intended to accomplish there; what the end result would be; what would happen if we didn't go in; and where this was all going to lead. And the answer to that was, "Vance go home and be quiet. Don't criticize President Johnson." I wasn't very welcome in very many places around the State of Indiana for awhile, I don't mind tellin' you; but only 300 Americans had died when I said that. Now my worst fears have been confirmed. We were lead down one of those cunning corridors that sometimes people take in the course of history. Somehow we have to get back on the main track. I hope that we'll take those steps which will have to be taken to get back on the main track. That basically means simply that we have to change our course of action. We must realize that we may be the most powerful nation in the world; that we do have the power to destroy everything on this planet, (doesn't surprise you did it?) but we can't end a war against a little fifth rate country. That shows you the limit of power. That's not very encouraging. That is a fact with which no man has ever lived with before—except our generation. We live in that generation. They can talk all about the troops we have in Germany or in Berlin, yet anyone who is a military general knows very well that, if the Russians wanted to move in, or the East Germans wanted to move into Berlin tomorrow, our troops would be overrun there overnight. It's not our troop personnel there that keeps those Russians at bay or the East Germans at bay, it's that nuclear capacity and never forget it. And we all know also, that if (God save us from this) that catastrophe should arise that in a half an hour it's all over, everything, us and them. We may save the bomb sights, but we'll not save the people. Then that prophecy of Job, in the third chapter, the 21st verse will really be true. What is that? That those that are living envy the dead.

Here at home, I do not believe in the doctrine of austerity. The alternatives which are being presented—I say were not presented in my view under the Democratic administration which have been accelerated under this administration, is (sic) that you have austerity in your economic philosophy or you perish. Now I'm just going to tell you one thing. If I told you that either you're going to take this course of action or you're going to go out of business—you'd take the course of action which would keep you in business. I don't believe that. That's not Americanism. That's not the American economic theory. There's not such a thing as a constant pie in America, never has been. The great genius of America has been that we have always been able to accommodate,
not alone an expanding population, but an expanding opportunity to enjoy. Not alone the quantity of life, but the quality of life. And the quality of American life is better today than it was before. Just as Bob Barringer who is my coordinator down in Columbus said when he picked me up at the airport, he said, "Vance, I don't want to go back to those good old days. I'll tell you what the good old days mean to me. They meant that I studied with a kerosene lamp. They meant that I chopped wood where my mother cooked in a wood stove. I've got a nice house, and I'm carrying you in an air-conditioned car now. That's what I don't want to get away from."

On the social structure the same sort of dilemma is presented to the American people. They tell you either you're going to have anarchy, or you're going to have repression. And both are lurking there just willing to take over if we permit them to. But that's not America. The great genius of America in the political structure has been the fact that we've been able to take a diverse population, mold them together, put them together, live side-by-side with not having in any room hardly any two people agree with each other. Let alone five or six hundred. And that individuality is the trademark of Americanism. The right for you to go ahead and say, Vance Hartke I disagree with every damn thing you say. I disagree with everything you've done in the Senate; I'm going to do everything I can to beat you in the race for this office. Or on this other side, you can go the other way and say I agree with you and I'm going to try and help you. Or anyplace in between the whole spectrum.

Now this is what I think is creating the anguish and the anxiety, frustration and despair which I see in America today. I've travelled this state. I've seen people who, frankly, walk with tears in their eyes. A mother came to me and says, "Vance, what can I do? I have an engineering student who has his Master's degree and can't find a job." A Royce Sandy at Greencastle in the unemployment line, I said, "What do you do?" He said, "I just came back from Vietnam and I can't find a job." Surely a rich nation like America, surely this greatest of all nations in the world, surely this powerful industrial machine that we have here could be put back into gear. And that's what I want to do. To put it back into gear, to change this course. To change our idea away from the fact that we have to be interrupting every single cocktail operation or dictatorial fight over in Timbukto or any place else in the world. You know that surprisingly everyone told us if we did not get involved in the Congo that the Communists would take over. How many of you people have heard about the Congo lately? We didn't put anybody there.

This is some of the things I'm talking about. I'm not talking about surrender. I'm not talking about moving out of the mainstream. I'm talking about going back to the traditional American values. That is to make this country a shining example for the rest of the world; economically, politically, and morally. I don't need to ask the members of the clergy. They'll tell you their church knows they're in trouble.
The trouble with some of the other institutions, they don’t know that
they’re in trouble. But the church recognizes it, they know they’ve got
a tough time pulling themselves out of this hole. They recognize quite
honestly that it’s not just enough to have a Sunday morning service.
And damn few youngster, pardon me, damn few youngsters, strike that
Reverend, (laughter) damn few of the youngsters are there anymore. And
they’re searching at least, and they’re grappling with this problem.
And they’re dealing with it trying to determine how again they can re-
create in these people in America (which has such a rich religious
heritage) how they can come back to it again and make it something real
for them; instead of going ahead and getting the imaginary trip on the
drugs that escape from realism. That idea that there is something out
there. You see this is, this is not going to be solved simply by crack-
downs. It's not going to be solved by just ignoring the situation.
It's going to be solved by action—concrete action by people who have
brains and thought and the best minds of this country ought to be
dedicating themselves to that proposition. And it has to start in the
White House.

I say this kindly to President Nixon, for whatever else it is, I
do not, I have not seen his reaction to the Commission on Campus Unrest.
I know that he is a political personality and aware that he cannot al-
ways just turn a deaf ear to the people. If I say there's one thing
that's happened somehow in this country we've taken the government from
the people. The way to return it to them is to make them understand in
high places, that the people must come first. And what the Commission
on Campus Unrest says to me more than all the details about the bullets
and the guns, or who's at fault in the universities, or whether the
National Guard is at fault, is the fact that they said to the President,
"You must lead. You must lead." And in what field? Moral leadership.
That's the challenge. And I hope and pray that when the President comes
back from his visit, that he'll accept it in the good graces in which
it was offered to him; as constructive criticism for the future of
America.

These are some of the things that I've done. That's why I criti-
cize the President; criticized our involvement in Vietnam. We have some
difficult problems, race problem. We thought we solved the race problem
a hundred years ago. Now it's reared its head in an ugly fashion just
completely unknown to most of us. We can't fathom it, we don't under-
stand how to deal with it. But it must be dealt with. This is a great
experimental ground for all the world. And you must and I must recog-
nize that the white people are a minority in the world. If we cannot
solve, by example, the race problem in America, then our children will
be faced with racial war after we're gone. That's what it's all about.

So it's a philosophy. It's a philosophy which must be met with
specifics. The specifics must deal with each individual problem. That
is with Royce Sandy getting a job instead of an unemployment check for
his service in Vietnam. Gentlemen, I've talked a little longer than I
intended to, but if you have any questions I'll be glad to try and answer them. (applause)

Question-Answer

Q. (What is your view on the Vietnamization program for Vietnam?)

Hartke: The question is on Vietnamization. The Vietnamization program as far as all intent and purposes in the middle of fighting war is useless. It's useless under the Democrats, I can show you so. It's useless under the Republicans. Useless under all Americans. We're bombing, we were bombing out every time they get it started. Oh, they claim to have a Vietnamization program that's worth anything to the people there. And after all, that's what it's all about not control of the land. The only Vietnamization program would be one which ends the killing, killing of the children. You see this is what bothers me about them when they prosecuted those people, you know, for going ahead and throwing bombs and shooting children and women. But you see you teach people to kill and then you say you can't kill under certain circumstances. You tell them it's alright to bomb at thirty thousand feet, bomb a whole village, for the extinction of babies, women and children, all of them. But it's wrong when you shoot them with a rifle. No! No, human being can understand that distinction. It's impossible. What they understand with Vietnamization is if you're going to stop killing first start the building. That's what's going to count. We can't do that. Cambodia, Cambodia was, now two-thirds of it is being bombed to non-existence. Vietnam was the third largest rice exporter in the world prior to this. But now it's a rice importer. I just don't believe that you can build by tearing things down. I thought Wally Hickel, the President's own cabinet member, really put his finger on it when he said, "You can't tear the country together." I don't believe you can either. I think, that is in essence is a thumbnail sketch of what I've said today. And that comes from President Nixon's own cabinet officer.

Q. (What's your opinion of the Soviet Union's involvement in the Middle East?)

Hartke: The Middle East, the Middle East crises is, and always has been one which has been explosive. As far as I'm personally concerned, we must recognize Israel is a democracy surrounded by dictatorial countries. It has been basically aligned with our political philosophy. And the general idea for Israel: they would like the right to exist. That's their sole request: that they be given the right to sovereignty and to have the sovereignty respected as it was given to them by the United Nations. Now the question of Soviet foreign policy. I did
praise President Nixon's cease fire proposal. I warned at
the time, that without adequate inspection that it might run
into serious difficulties. Unfortunately, that's what
caused part of the trouble. I do say that I think
President Nixon's visit to Tito was a good diplomatic move
at this time for the very simple reason that (for anyone who
understands what he was doing) among other things, understands
that he was going to a man who was basically aligned with the
anti-Israel forces. And he was trying to get a reception to
him to make sure he would stay neutral. And thereby to en-
courage at least, uh, the possibility of the peace program
working out. And, also, knowing at that time that Tito was
a friend of Nasser, that possibly could go and talk to Nasser.
Unfortunately, Nasser died in the interim. Unfortunately
that's not one of the foreseeable items. And I think that the
trip was well worth it. To say he went and visited a Communist
country: we have a diplomatic relations with them; we have
given them foreign aid; they come over here; he went to Romania
too. Personally I feel that more people ought to visit more of
each other. I believe in the bringing of people together,
talking with each other, not the fighting, squabbling and
terrorizing. I find most people are pretty good, once you get
to know them. It's only if you don't know them that you really
hate them. Then you don't hate them you just hate what they've
been represented to be.

Q. (What can we do to pull out of Vietnam without giving the land
to the Communists?)

Hartke: I think that the people there want peace more, right now, than
anything else. They'd like to have an end of killing their
children, uprooting the villages and everything else. Now this
has been a whole generation twenty-five years of fighting with
them. There are children growing up to age twenty-five and
never knowing anything else. The Vietnamization program deals
with an attempt to rehabilitate those people in the civilian
capacity. If you have, if you studied this at all, you know
that the government in Saigon is a corrupt dictatorship.
Mr. Eisenhower said it to them when he stated, when he made
the statement in nineteen hundred and fifty-six he said, this
is his commitment, talk about commitments to Vietnam,
Mr. Eisenhower's commitment, "We'll provide economic assist-
ance to you providing you clean up the corruption." That
wasn't a bad suggestion. I'd endorse that. Now, I think that
the President is going to come forward (and I'm mentioning it
here today in another news conference). I mentioned this (oh
this shocked the Chicago Press Core there) that he's going to
come forward with a standstill cease-fire peace proposal to
put on the table at Paris. I suggested that in August and
the news people said to me said, "Well, we've tried that."
Quite the contrary even the President will admit that we've
never tried that. Never have. And I think that he's going
to do just that. And even if it takes him, if he's doing
it for the election well be it, that's alright with me. If
it takes an election to get that kind of results fine. I
just want to see us stop spending a million dollars every half
hour in a no-win no-lose war. President Nixon says we're not
going to win. Can't win militarily? I just think that you're
on that type of treadmill economically, morally, we ought to
try to settle it as politically quickly as possible. Gentlemen,
I'd like to spend more time with you today. I do have to go.
And I want to thank you for your kind attention and certainly
for the fact that I was allowed to speak. You know, nowadays,
when a person gets up in front of a group, frequently, you're
never sure when you start out whether you're ever going to
finish. (laughter--standing ovation)
Thank you very much, Bill, for those very kind remarks and that generous introduction. You know, there is an old cliche—it's a hard act to follow—and this makes it my consternation as I stand before this great group today and follow the Secretary of Labor and know the President of the United States is coming tomorrow. I guess that Fort Wayne is sort of the center of things. But I will try to keep my remarks very brief and give you the chance to ask any questions you will. I do have my eye on the clock, I will say, and I will certainly live within the time given me.

May I say that in the dozens of press conferences that a person who is running for the Senate is faced with, probably the most asked question is, "What are the issues of this campaign?" and you know, I usually respond by surprising the newsmen by saying, "What is an issue?" Then I answer my own question, this rhetorical question I ask, with this definition: I think an issue is something that troubles the people at a given time in a particular area. And for that reason I think you have to categorize issues according to time, and place, and occurrence. What troubles the people who live in one part of Indiana, let's say along the Ohio River, or perhaps over in the Wabash Valley, might be entirely different than those things that would be troubling or would occur to a person who is a citizen of Allen County. And this is likewise true, I think on the national scene. You recall some of the past national campaigns, and here I don't bring any personalities into that, I have no one in mind really. For a discussion to be held before a group on subject matters that weren't of the slightest interest to that group (would be useless). For example, you could talk about flood control in Nevada and I think that would be of very little interest. Therefore it becomes necessary that we categorize issues and be able to discuss matters that are let's say interesting and informative to a particular audience.

And perhaps this illusive issue could be categorized and catalogued as follows. First, I think of strictly local issues, let me give you some examples. A week ago I was down in Spencer County, that's Abe Lincoln's old home county along the Ohio River. And I stopped in a little town there on the banks of the Ohio. You know what they wanted to discuss with me as I walked up and down the streets? The great interest to those people was on the bank erosion by the Ohio River eroding the banks along the little town and what the Corps of Engineers could do about it. And this was of real importance to them because it meant their livelihood and their homes. Then I think a second category we could talk about are items of general interest and that would be things that interest everybody to a degree. And of course there is always the special issue that interests a select group either by education or trade or profession or by some special interest group.
Now you may be interested in knowing how we who make our living from politics arrive at what are the issues, what do we talk about. And I would say we have really three ways of doing this. First we have our professional pollsters whom we send out who actually poll the people to find out what is interesting—here I am going to go on a tangent for just a moment. The main purpose and the most interesting thing about political polls isn't who is ahead in a particular campaign but the issues. That's what we really spend these thousands of dollars polling for. To find out the issues and what interest people in certain parts of the state, therefore we pay attention to our letters we receive and I receive, I expect, two hundred letters a day both in my Indianapolis office as well as in my Washington, D. C. office. And I say third and perhaps most reliable is the personal contact as we travel around the state. Now you might be interested in knowing what I think are the main issues of this election of 1970. Well certainly and I don't mean these in order of preference, I must say. I'm just giving you a list of the ones that occur to me. First the war in Vietnam. And I would say this would include the recent proposal by Richard Nixon on the peace offensive. And certainly the riots and disorders that have affected many of our cities and many of our campuses. The economy that our Secretary just talked about including the level of inflation. Drug usage. You'd be amazed at the amount of interest there is in this percentage of drug usage that we have now. And certainly the associated crime with that usage. Another newcomer and a figure that has become intensely popular showed on our last poll—I think, twelve per cent of the people felt it was the most important issue of this campaign. And that is the environment. The human environment or the ecology. And now beginning to heat up again the Middle East, that's another issue of the campaign especially Nasser's death. A few weeks ago, wherever I went, everybody wanted to talk about airplane hijacking and that was of great interest. And I think it emphasizes what I said in my opening remarks about time and place and occurrence. Or we could go on and on about wage and price controls that the Secretary didn't talk about today but did in his breakfast (speech) this morning. But these are all the main issues. And of course to that you could add many many things and categories that I haven't discussed like civil rights and women's liberation movement and all these other things.

Now I think perhaps it might be of interest in about five minutes to attempt to cover these issues and my position on each of them and I will attempt to do so. First I want to say that I support without any mental reservations at all the plans advocated by Dick Nixon in regard to Vietnam. And I very violently oppose the numerous efforts made to hamstring our President: and here I cite the Cooper-Church Amendment, the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment, another amendment whose name I—the maker of whom of which I forget his name—an amendment that offered to prevent the use of draftees in Vietnam, the Hart-Cooper Amendment which would limit the ABM sites to just two in number. I would say to you that I very strongly support our President in his planned peace offensive that he discussed by nationwide television just recently. And I
regret so much that there hasn't been more, let's say, more indication of acceptance.

On riots and disorders I am strictly a law and order man. I believe that the written law is for everyone to obey. I don't believe you can excuse the violation of the law for any cause of any purpose. I don't think anyone has the right to interpret what law they're going to obey and which one they are not going to obey. I would say that when someone does break the law he should be very quickly apprehended and speedily prosecuted. And I would say in the case of college disorders, that certainly I am one of the strongest supporters of the right to disagree or dissent. I think anyone has a right to disagree with our President, our Governor, our Senator, our Congressman, or anyone else. But when dissent crosses that line of demarcation and people start throwing bottles or bricks or burning buildings or causing injury or death to other people they're not dissenting. Of course they aren't; they're common criminals and should be treated as such under the criminal code.

In regard to the economy the Secretary has already discussed this. I would say there are some happy indicators in the economy and it presents a mixed outlook of course. He mentioned the fact that the gross national product was again showing gains. And this I think is good. He did mention the fact that new housing starts, and this is one of the best indicators in regard to the economy, has finally shown an increase. And I would say too that the total number of people employed in our country even now (and here I am not talking about those men on strike but those who are actually unemployed) the total number of people gainfully employed in the United States is at its highest peak in the history of our nation. The Secretary also did mention the fact the breakdown of the Bureau of Labor statistics indicate that most of our unemployment today and, the really the critical area, is in the age bracket of 16 to 24 while those age 25 and above on our labor force really has remained the unemployment has remained almost constant. Actually I think the level is about 3.4 to a high of 3.5 however, the under 25 is where we find the real radical unemployment and the real radical numbers of unemployment. Here I think there are many things that must be done and I am sure if there are educators present that they might take exception to what I am saying. I am a great vocational rehabilitation man. I think that the failure of employment of our youth is unique in the United States. Actually no other country in the world that I know of has this similar problem that we have here in the United States. So instead of answering the question let me ask a rhetorical question. Don't you think it's quite possible we may be educating our youth in the wrong direction? Don't you think it is quite possible we would have a much lesser unemployment rate among young workers if they were given a skill such as a building trade, such as in automobile mechanics and things of this type? This punctuates my belief in vocational rehabilitation.
In regards to the drug usage and crime, of course I think it is rather redundant to say we're all against crime. Of course we are. In regards to the drug usage the big problem we have in this country is the tremendous consumption of heroin. Heroin is the main drug that causes our big problem. And really it's very difficult to control the illicit trade in drugs and the illicit traffic in drugs. I have talked to the people at the Bureau of Narcotics and they have estimated that with the very best police surveillance with the use of electronic listening devices which we are now authorized to use and have used with great success that still only about 10 per cent of this illicit supply of drugs can be stopped cold. Recognizing this the Nixon administration has worked very quickly toward attempting to dry up their drugs at their source. And the source of the opium poppy for use here in the United States is chiefly Turkey and the opium poppy is created—I mean is a manufactured and the narcotic is manufactured from I should say—the opium poppy particularly in the Republic of France. And we are working very closely with both Turkey and France now to not only discourage the planting of the opium poppy but the manufacture of the illicit drugs in these clandestine type laboratories mostly in the Montsy (Montasi) area. Typically, France has always been most as—well let's say, permissive in the case of drugs. They never have been too concerned about drug usage. They never had a real problem in France and ah for the first time we see the employment of more and more agents in France; I think this is good. Our marijuana problem is mostly with the Republic of Mexico. And I'm very happy to tell you that Mexico too is cooperating. I don't think there's any way to cure all the drug problems from the standpoint of illicit trade within a year or two years. I think it's going to be a matter of—of several years duration. I think that government is making great steps and great strides in this regard. I might say too, that I don't think there's any way the government can solve the whole problem. We can ah—render the supply at best by good police measures, by stopping the drugs at their source, but a great deal of this will depend on education—the informing of our young people. May I say I think our present young generation, if I can call them that, are a highly intelligent group of young people. They're well educated, probably the best educated group we've had in our history. And I would think that if somebody would sit and explain to them the dangers of playing Russian Roulette with drugs; the playing with rattlesnakes, and that's what it amounts to, because the average life of a person on hard drugs is five years—I think these young people are intelligent enough not to experiment and I think that could be greatly solved by education.

Getting on to environment and ecology may I say that I want to compliment the— the business ah segment of our country. (ah) According to some figures I just received for private business—without any ah regard to tax rates or otherwise—has spent over a quarter of a billion dollars this year in trying to clean up the air and water in regard to their own industrial operation. I have a bill in Congress which has been strongly supported by the chamber. I do want to quickly mention it, this
bill would provide a tax incentives to hasten industry in complying in regard to air pollution. Ah again on environment and ecology this has become a throw-away society. I know it's irritating to me, the amount of air containers that are practically as lacking in destructable qualities, the plastics, the aluminum containers, and I worry about these things. Ah--I know each American creates seven pounds of junk per day ah now that's a staggering figure when you think about it. And of course uh I--I've always always irritates me when I go down (gee, I hope there's nobody in this audience) who the (grammar unclear) Flair pens I love. I buy a Flair pen for 49 cents, I've got about a five or six inch wide piece of plastic over the top. I'd just like to be able to buy a Flair pen without all this ah creative packaging let's say. I think this would ah this and other ah industries could greatly reduce the amount, ah, of throw-away materials. The aluminum can causes a problem because it was not subject to oxidation like the old tin can or iron can--the plastic containers are practically indestructable. And these things are ah a real problem to us. I guess the point I'm trying to make is, the individual is largely re­ sponsible for our pollution.

In the case of the Middle East, I'm very familiar with this area. Ah I ah used to live there, by the way, I go so I mastered ah to a degree Arabic. And ah I lived--I was out there with the Army I might add, I did become familiar with the Middle East area. And ah some people have asked me ah concerning the effect of Colonel Nasser's death, which occurred about two weeks ago. And I would respond by saying that in my opinion ah Colonel Nasser was not the radical as that he was pictured by many ah of our newspaper and in many of our different news media. Ah I would say actually, that he was ah rather a moderate man despite his hard rhetoric. And he certainly (had) done something for the Arabs that no other leader ever had--he's given them a sense of Nationalism. Now you have to live in the Middle East to understand that an Arab recognizes, or did, no nationality because many of them who are, let's say, the Beouin tribesman, they live in one country during the spring, in another country during the summer and another country during the winter--not recognizing any nationality.

Now how do I feel about arms to Israel? I very definitely support continued a su-su supplying ah of military material to the Israelis. Ah simply because I realize that parity must be maintained between the Arab and ah the Jew if we'll ever have a meaningful peace in the Mid East. If we allow the Arab block nations or the Israelis to attempt to go to the peace table strictly from a position of strength, I don't think we'll ever have a meaningful peace.

Now, I think that ah covers very quickly--outside of wage and price controls the issues I've mentioned. I must agree with our Secretary I--I'm not in favor of the wage and price controls simply because it would never work. I--I've done a great deal of research on this--I had the Library of Congress do it--the only area I've ever
found wage and price controls to work was in Nazi Germany. And it did work pretty well there temporarily. Of course they had certain expediencies that aren't available to our government—thank God—that is lining somebody up against the wall and shooting him. So ah ah in that case the fear was so strong that ah they did stop most of the black marketeering—but I say typically in the economic history of nations that the ah that wage and price control has not worked. I don't think it's necessary and I wouldn't be in favor of invoking it at this time.

Now I talked longer than I meant I said (I would). I see I still got five minutes left. I will say I can't speak with you (any longer) and I'll welcome your questions at this time.

Any questions—Yes sir.

Q. (How do you feel about legalizing marijuana?)
Roudebush: I'm absolutely opposed to the legalization of marijuana. It's the first step to hard usage (drug) without question—next question?

Q. (You said the young are being educated in the wrong way, would you want us to revert to vocational rather than math and science education?)
Roudebush: No sir, I'm glad you asked that. If I illustrated to that point I didn't mean to. I merely said this, in many cases I think that the direction of our education is wrong. I'm going to be even more blunt now with you now that you brought it up. I think that there are just one whole hell of a lot of kids in college that who (sic) would do much better in vocational rehabilitation. I really mean that. And I think most people would agree with that. Ah, I don't want to say who should go to college and who shouldn't. But I would say that some young man with a great mechanical aptitude ah without, ah let's say, the other faculties and the thirst for academic knowledge with it; I would say he would be much better off in vocational rehabilitation, and vocational ah education as he would be in college. That was the point I was trying to make.

Q. (Then you seek a vocational education which is a more broader or more open education?)
Roudebush: Yes, this is correct, I think it should be a much broader spectrum and I-I-I certainly I visited your new ah automotive ah rehab--ah automotive vocational center this morning out near North Central High School and I think ah Fort Wayne is certainly a hallmark in this. I think they have done a great job and I-I certainly think that more money and more Federal support should go to ah that the vocational technical schools. I think it--it offers a wonderful field. You know
it's it's ah ironic thing when one ah realizes how many jobs are going begging in fields of highly skilled employees. And I-I just would like to see trade schools in this regard.

Next.

Q. (Would you favor paying farmers in Turkey not to grow poppy?) Question quite broad.

Roudebush: No.

Q. (Would you be prepared to back national legislation for the removal of aluminum cans which are non-deteriorating?)

Roudebush: Ah, would I be willing to back legislation making it unlawful to use aluminum cans?

Q. (continued: Yes— that's the question.)

Roudebush: No, I wouldn't be willing to go that far, but I certainly would be willing to back legislation that would encourage the return of containers, or something of this type. Really, I'm not real clear in my thinking as to how far I'm willing to back legislation making it illegal to go that far. That's a tough one that you threw at me there (laugh) but I would think there should be some sort of legislation concerning throwing garbage away in state or national parks.

Q. (When will you next appear with Senator Hartke on a televised debate?)

Roudebush: I'm not real sure— but it will occur I'm I'm rather sure of that. I ah I regret very much— that will have to be my last question 'cause I promised I'm honored to 1:30 time limit and I've got twenty seconds to say this. I just regret that some statements have been made that that the President of the United States is coming to Indiana to take me off the hook on the television. This is ridiculous, this is so asinine— that it really doesn't deserve comment. The President of the United States, is probably, I would say, was completely unaware that we had a televised debate in Indiana (laughter). And this is so stupid. I had no part in trying to get out of the second debate. I don't know why I should. I think I won the first one. (laughter)
APPENDIX E
Scott: Good evening. About a month ago Senator Vance Hartke challenged Congressman Richard Roudebush to a series of televised debates to be carried by all Indiana television stations. Congressman Roudebush promptly accepted. The Indiana Broadcasters Association was asked to coordinate the technical arrangements and negotiate the debate ground rules. This was done in a series of meetings attended by representatives of both candidates and Indiana broadcasters. The candidates agreed to share equally in the cost of transmitting this program to every city in Indiana that has a television station and to Chicago and Louisville. The Indiana Broadcasters Association agreed to produce the program. Individual television and radio stations made their own decision to carry the program. Stations that are carrying the program are donating the time. Well, these are the ground rules agreed to by the candidates. There is no studio audience. Each candidate will make a three minute opening statement. The order of appearance was determined by flipping a coin. After the opening statements, each candidate will ask two questions of his opponent in alternate order. A panel of newsmen will then question the candidates. Both candidates will reply to each question. Both candidates will have a three minute closing statement at the end of the program. All questions asked by the candidates and the newsmen are limited to thirty seconds. Answers by the candidates are limited to two minutes. The candidates agreed that the questions they asked would not be personal in nature. They asked that two referees be appointed to preview questions of the newsmen and eliminate those of a personal nature. The candidates also asked that the referees time the length of their reply and they agreed that the moderator would interrupt the candidate if he exceeded his allotted time.

The Indiana Broadcasters Association selected the referees. They are Judge Charles White of the Indiana Appelate Court and Judge Richard Giffin of the Indiana Supreme Court.

The panel of newsmen was selected in the following manner. Each candidate and the Indiana Broadcasters Association proposed a list of three names. Each candidate and the Indiana Broadcasters struck one name from the other two lists. The three remaining newsmen then constitute our panel. They are: Harry Fry, News Director of WTHI Television, Terre Haute; Fred Hickman, News Director of WIVC, Indianapolis; and Hortense Meyers, United Press International, Indianapolis. I was selected by the Indiana Broadcasters Association as moderator.
Well, now we're ready for our opening statements. Senator Hartke, you won the flip of the coin and you will speak first.

HARTKE: My friends in Indiana, this election nineteen hundred and seventy, will be a crucial one for each and every one of us. It's important not alone that we decide the individual that is going to the United States Senate, it's important that we decide upon what basis that decision is going to be made. The future for our children, the future for America, depends upon whether that intelligent decision which has been the backbone of America, is going to be again repeated in the State of Indiana. Necessarily (necessary) for making such a decision, the individuals themselves—what they stand for, what their record has been, and what they propose to do is one of the elements that must be considered. Let's take the record, I've been in the Senate of the United States for twelve years. During those twelve years, I've been active in practically every facet of government which concerns people. I've been in the position which, I think, that the people of the State of Indiana recognize that my concern is for them: for their problems, for their happiness, for their children.

On the other hand, my opponent, Richard Roudebush, has been in the House of Representatives for ten years. His concern has primarily been one of saying no to people. And I say that as an objective person looking at the record. And I think it's important for you to look at that record too. I would like to look at the record of education, where the adult education act is the Hartke Adult Education Act. Where the elementary and secondary education bills bear the Hartke name and consistently opposed by my opponent. Where we have the situation for medicare. Where I am a staunch supporter of medicare, voted for, worked for it and made it livable for our senior citizens. He opposed it. These are examples, only examples of the concerns. My concern for people, his concern for things. Where are we going in the future? I think what we've done in the past is only the beginning. There's a lot to be done. We have an administration on the national level which has increased unemployment; increased the cost of living. We have an administration in the state which has increased property taxes and all over has been an increase in the violence and tempers of America. Certainly, reconciliation is the need of our time. Peace. Peace overseas. Peace in America. Prosperity for America. These should be the hallmark of America and that's what Vance Hartke stands for. And upon that I ask for your support.

Scott: Thank you Senator Hartke. And now Congressman Roudebush we're ready for your opening statement.

ROUDEBUSH: Well, thank you very much Mr. Moderator. First I want to thank the many people and the many institutions that makes this program possible. First our panel and then I think of Eldon Campbell of the Indiana Broadcasters Association. The facilities of Channel 6 and the many stations that are carrying this program throughout Indiana.
I appreciate all their efforts. I might say that I'm well aware of the fact that I am best known in central Indiana where I've represented twenty-nine counties in the House of Representatives over the past ten years. And I'm also completely aware of the fact there's many parts of Indiana where Roudebush is not exactly a household word. For the benefit of those folks who live in areas that I have not represented, I would like to uh uh just do a very brief biography. I was born in 1918, fifty-two years ago on a farm near Noblesville, Indiana. I still live in that immediate vicinity. I went through the community schools of Noblesville township. Graduated in 1941 from Butler University with a Bachelor of Science in business administration. And went almost immediately into the armed forces of the United States and prior to Pearl Harbor. When I returned from the armed forces, after three years service, two years of which were overseas, I became quite interested in veterans organizations. And uh I believe my activities were recognized by my comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars by my election as State Commander in 1952 and 1953. Later, I my activities in the state with the Veterans of Foreign Wars gained national attention when I became the National Commander in 1957 and '58. I believe that this service with the great veterans organization that I've mentioned wetted my interest to public life. So in 1960 I made my first run for public office. And in May I received the nomination and in November I was elected the sixth district Congressman. I served three terms in the sixth district, one term in the tenth, and I currently represent the fifth district of Indiana.

Very quickly I'd like to tell you about my family. I have a wonderful wife, Marge, who is now in Muncie, Indiana watching this show I'm sure with a Republican group. And a very wonderful daughter who is also attending a Republican meeting tonight, and my little boy Chip at home who is watching the show too. I love them all very much. My wife has been my constant companion during my years in public life. And I would say tonight that I want to represent the people of Indiana simply because I feel that my opinions more closely resemble those of our citizens than does my opponent.

Scott: Thank you Congressman Roudebush. And now our ground rules permit Senator Hartke to ask a question of Congressman Roudebush.

HARTKE: Mr. Roudebush, you have as one of the themes, as the your principle theme in your campaign the proposition that you want to go to Washington to help President Nixon. Yet you have supported President Nixon only forty per cent of the time in his foreign policy issues. You have supported the President only fifty-five per cent on his domestic issues. I, Vance Hartke, have supported President Nixon eighty-four per cent of the time on his foreign issue more than twice as much as you did. Will you please explain to the people of Indiana why you have given so little support to the President?
ROUDEBUSH: Well, I'm delighted to do so Vance. First, I don't know where your figures come from and I won't question their accuracy. I have ah been called a rubber stamp by you during this campaign and I think that you just gave a perfect answer to the people of Indiana that I'm certainly my own man and I certainly represent the viewpoints of our people and not necessarily uh just the President of the United States. I also remember some other figures that may be of interest. I read some figures just today where you rank 95th in the United States Senate on support of our President--95th out of 100. And the only man that even approaches that is Senator George McGovern. So I would say Vance, that I I don't know how to answer your question except that I do support the Nixon policies. I do support the Nixon policies overseas and I think that my stand behind the President on his peace offensive as well as uh uh the former policies concerning South Vietnam are well established both in the press and the news media in this state. I support the President in South Vietnam. I support the Vietnamization program. I supported the attack on the Cambodian sanctuaries. I support the withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam and now I support with all my soul, his peace proposal for a generation of peace.

Scott: Congressman Roudebush thank you. And now you have a question to ask Senator Hartke.

ROUDEBUSH: Yes. I I'll try to ask ask Vance one about like he gave me. Vance, uh you know my stand on law and order is well defined and well known. I believe in the written of the law. I don't think that's there's any cause or excuse for disobeying the law. And still your record is somewhat different. I think of uh the various watering down amendments of the Omnibus Crime Bill of 1968 that you voted for. Now we have a new Hartke of November 1970 (moderator asked Roudebush to state his question). What is the change of this new Hartke in 1970?

HARTKE: What happened--I don't understand.

Scott: The question wasn't complete--he ran out of time on the question. He's now directed it to you Senator and it's your reply.

HARTKE: Oh, well, I can reply--I just thought something happened to the rules.

ROUDEBUSH: If you want me to repeat. . .

HARTKE: No, I understand the question. I mean it's very simple. As far as crime is concerned, there's no question about it. I I'm a lawyer. I've been a prosecuting attorney and a mayor. I've supported every major crime bill in the Congress. The Safe Streets Act, the Omnibus Act of nineteen hundred and sixty-eight. Now let me point out that in the Omnibus Crime Act of nineteen hundred and sixty-eight we provided 700,000 dollars in crime fighting funds for your supporter
Governor Whitcomb who helped put you in the nomination. Now, I never did hear you criticize the Governor for failing to use that money to fight crime. I did. The Urban Coalition criticized the State of Indiana nationally for failing to use the 700,000 dollars to fight crime. And I wondered why you did not speak up and say that the money which the federal government gave the State of Indiana should not have been used to fight crime. In addition to that, let me point out that the Fraternal Order of Police has come to Vance Hartke to support a bill to help increase the policeman's salary. I'm the sponsor of that bill. I don't see your name on such a bill at all. I've never seen you make one statement in that regard about making sure that policemen be paid decent salaries so that as far as they're concerned they don't have to moonlight and so they can be well trained. Now on the Omnibus Crime Bill, you have another supporter here the mayor of Indianapolis who's the head of one of the organizations, the American Municipal League, the League of Cities, these two organizations support the Hartke amendments to the crime bill of 1968 which would make it possible to really fight crime. Let me say to you when you endorse five and a half per cent unemployment, Mr. Roudebush, you're making a great contribution to the potential for crime.

Scott: Senator Hartke, we now go to you and you may ask a second question of Congressman Roudebush.

HARTKE: Congressman Roudebush, you've been in that Congress for ten years. During that time you have consistently opposed every program which is of benefit to people. You opposed the social security increase in nineteen hundred and sixty-five, you opposed the Medicare Bill of 1965, . . .

Scott: Ask the question please, Senator.

HARTKE: You opposed the minimum wage bill of 1961 in fact you've said no to the people. Would you please explain to me how you expect the people to vote for you when you've said no to them all the time you've been in Congress?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I I'll be happy to answer that question and I don't think I've said no to the people. Senator, there are times when I have dearly wished that you'd had said no when you said yes, because you have said yes to permissiveness on the college campuses. You have said yes to the bill ah a or to the amendment that would have uh cut off a federal aid to colleges who have who permitted permissiveness on the campus. And there are many times that you have said yes that I wished you had said no. You know I read a piece in the paper tonight that ah a politician's image sometimes like a lady can be enhanced by saying no. And I think that this is quite true. I think that sometimes you are being very positive by saying no. If I if I could go back to a question you just brought up, you mentioned the fact that I had never done anything for the police officers, why before Jack got to your office with
the bill to sponsor for the Fraternal Order of Police he had already
been to my office Vance, and I had already introduced the more far the
most far reaching bill concerning uh the dependents of police officers
and firemen who are killed in the line of duty as far as uh providing
educational benefits for those children that has ever been introduced
in the United States Congress. And do you know that forty of my
colleagues have already introduced that bill. So I don't know why
you make these irrational statements. That I have never done anything
for the police officers of this country. Certainly I think that some
of the things that I have done in support of our police departments is
well known. You mentioned the fact that I've never criticized
Governor Whitcomb for spending money that the federal government made
available, well, well, Governor Whitcomb called me uh to tell me that
your your figures were highly inaccurate. Now I don't want to get into
a party fight or a family fight this is between you and Ed Whitcomb.
You're not running for Governor and neither am I, Senator, we're running
for the United States Senate.

Scott: Congressman Roudebush, now you have your final question to
ask Senator Hartke.

ROUDEBUSH: Yes. I'd like to ask a question that puzzles me very much.
I've, I know that on two occasions you voted uh you weren't present to
vote for school bussing. And I know that on one occasion that you did
vote for school bussing for children. I know that you've told your
constituents that you're both for and against school bussing. Would
you please tell me what the real Vance Hartke believe in and is he for
school bussing or against it, yes or no.

HARTKE: My position is very clear on school bussing. It's the same
as it's always been. I am opposed to bussing for racial purposes, for
integration or for segregation. I believe in the neighborhood school
concept. And I try to make it work which is more than you can say,
Congressman. Because I have voted for the bills which have made it
possible for the elementary and secondary school systems to continue
their neighborhood schools. I've voted for these measures. I've worked
for them. And I've been quite successful in getting them passed. Now
let's take the facts. What your ad agency, I don't know if you know
what they're doing to you, but what your ad agency is talking about the
so called Witten (James L. Witten of the 2nd Congressional District,
Mississippi) Amendment. Now I'm very familiar with the Witten Amend­
ment. What happened on the Witten Amendment, the key vote on the Witten
Amendment was that (unclear) introduced by Senator Hugh Scott,
Republican leader of the Senate. And he added the words to the Witten
Amendment "as provided by the Constitution." Now I believe in the
Constitution of the United States, and I believe in that amendment.
And so did a lot of the Senate because practically everyone of the so
called conservative Republican Senators voted to support that measure.
And that was the measure that was passed and that was the key vote and
I think that if you made that same accusation against some of your
Republican colleagues, they would say, you know Mr. Roudebush, I think that that is the lowest form of campaigning that I I have ever heard of.

Scott: Senator, Congressman, we may get back to that subject during our discussion, but now we turn to one of our newsman, Harry Fry from Terre Haute with the first question.

Fry: I'd like to direct my first question to Senator Hartke. The basis of the controversy over the use of a particular television commercial supporting the candidacy for Congressman Richard Roudebush for the Senate seat was the issue of your voting record on measures concerning trade with Communist countries. For the benefit of a somewhat confused electorate, I wonder if you would clarify and explain just exactly how you voted on these pieces of legislation.

HARTKE: Mr. Fry, I have a consistent record of opposition to trade with Communist countries for strategic material. I want to point out that there is no president that is opposed to all trade with Communist countries. The fact of the matter is, neither does President Nixon. At the same time my vote has in this regard been consistent every step of the way for the entire twelve years that I've been in the Senate. It's a long list of votes, each and every one of them, some of specifying very specifically that the President must make a finding. And that finding, at least as he's concerned, must be that unless it is in the best interests of the United States then the trade would be terminated with such a country. To imply that Vance Hartke is un-American, to imply that I would want to do something that would harm my country, to imply that I would want to point a gun at a fellow American, they just don't understand Vance Hartke. I have seven children, I've opposed violence in the streets, violence on the campus, everyone knows that I've opposed the violence in war in Vietnam long before it was popular to do so. So this type of inflammatory, derogatory, libelous, untrue ad is below the dignity of the United States Senate race. But let me point out, that's not the issue in this campaign. The ad agencies are not going to win or lose this campaign. The people want to know what's good for them, what's good for the future of America. And I don't care how slick that ad was, it's not going to change people's minds about Vance Hartke.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush, would you care to speak to Mr. Fry's question?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I'd be delighted to. First, I saw this ad for the first time the other night. I'll have to admit this. And I saw no gun pointed at anyone in the ad. That's one thing I want to clarify. Secondly, we can talk about who did or who did not vote for foreign aid to Communist nations. And I might say that the Senator has accused me on various occasions of voting for trade with Communist nations. I think the most or let's say damnable or or the most convincing evidence is the fact that Senator Hartke has sponsored or co-sponsored a Senate joint resolution which would lower the requirements under the
export-import bank act for nations trading with North Vietnam. Now these are facts uh Senate joint resolution is readily attainable from the document room of the United States Senate. Now I have never accused Vance of being un-American, I never intended to. The purpose of this ad uh uh spot announcement was to illustrate a basic difference in philosophy. Now I do not believe with trade with the Communist nations. I never have. I'd like to say that I've signed a petition to Congress against trade with Communist nations and this has become an issue in this campaign. The first day I was nominated, the Senator spoke out about my uh association with uh with organizations that are extreme in nature because I signed a petition against trade with Red Nations and to support our fighting men in Vietnam. I-I just regret that this campaign has taken this particular turn. I further regret that some of the smut that has been thrown about my family and my personal character too has come into this campaign.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush, now we'll turn to Fred Heckman from WBIC.

Heckman: The question of basic policy then perhaps on foreign policy gentlemen, the United States according to all figures is now number two in strategic military power. Our effective power has been cut back some forty per cent in the last five years due to reductions in our defense budget. The Soviets have increased theirs by some 400 per cent. Russia today has a six to one superiority in missile megatonnage. So from each of you I'd like to have a position or statement report on past or current status, then on what if elected, you intend to do about this situation, if anything.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush.

ROUDEBUSH: Well, that's a rather lengthy question, I might say, Fred. I'll address myself to it as best as I can. Well, first the Congress of the United States during this ninety first session reduced defense expenditures by about eight billions of dollars from roughly seventy-one to sixty-three billion as I recall the figures. And I might say that for the first time in many, many years more money is being spent on the humanities than on the Department of Defense. I think that it would be an ideal situation when this country needs no defense, but I think we're a long, long way from that position at the present time. So I am in favor of spending whatever money is necessary to keep our country free. To keep our people safe. And I also support the ABM program of our President, which does give this country the right uh ability to retaliate our country in case of attack, and doesn't tie our President's hands in diplomatic talks to reduce arm limitations. I very strongly support our defensive effort. I want to spend every cent that is needed to keep every person in this country safe. I also believe in such things as Civil Defense which my opponent had voted repeatedly to reduce.
Scott: Senator Hartke, do you require that Mr. Heckman repeat his question?

HARTKE: No, but I will say this Mr. Heckman, I don't know where, I'll (cough) address myself to your question not to a rambling discourse on a bunch of other things. I'll be glad to talk about anything that Congressman Roudebush talked about. I voted against the ABM, he's right. I still am not in favor of not wasting money on that project. But the question you asked is not based on fact. (Heckman trying to clarify-justify) And this disturbs me very much, that you would ask a question that is not based on fact. Because Mr. Laird himself, who is the Secretary of Defense, said that we still hold a four to one advantage in this field. I do not know, I'm not going to question the Republican Secretary of Defense in his figures. I don't know what else to say to you. We are ahead. We still have the power to destroy everything that is in Russia and China. And I am really shocked, utterly shocked, that a irresponsible question would be asked on a program of this kind.

Scott: Mr. Heckman, do you want to explain your question in any further detail?

Heckman: I . . .

HARTKE: I do not think Mr. Scott that that is necessary. I think that we ought to have fairness in these questions, they ought to be based on fact.

Scott: Well, . . .

HARTKE: If he wants to explain it, go ahead, I don't care. Let him explain it.

Scott: No, if this is the way you feel Senator, we will . . .

HARTKE: No, Mr. Scott, I overrule myself. Go ahead. I'm not worried about it. I just like to talk about facts. There's so many, so many uh . . .

ROUDEBUSH: Mr. Moderator, I must ask for regular order here. We're violating the rules of the debate right now.

Scott: I think that we will proceed to Hortense Meyers of United Press International for a new subject.

Meyers: Yes, I think it's time for another subject. (Laughter--John Scott) Senator Hartke, the Russians have been reported as having denounced President Nixon's cease-fire stand-still plan for Vietnam in Southeast Asia. Do you see such a response by a world power such as Russia as meaning that the President's plan is blocked?
HARTKE: The President's plan for a stand-still cease-fire is in my opinion a good one. I've saluted it. I think that it's one which could work. The mere fact that you have some statements from Russia indicating that they took an initial response which is adverse to that proposition, in and of itself, is not conclusive. After all, the President has taken the position here which puts him into solid ground in my opinion; that is that he has laid the foundation for negotiations. It's a proposition which I have advocated for five years and I certainly approve of the fact that he has turned this country 180 degrees and moved it toward a position of peace. Now, I want to stop the killing. And the President said he wants to stop the killing, and then do the negotiating. I do not believe that there is enough difference between that proposition and some of the other conversations on the other side; that it is a complete impediment to the settlement of an international dispute. And let me say that I hope the President will proceed—and I listen to Secretary Rogers, I quite agree with Secretary Rogers when he said that he did not consider the reply of the Russians as an absolute no. It's one of the unfortunate problems that we have in international diplomacy that sometimes the words don't always seem to always say exactly what they mean. But I think that's true here. So I hope and I pray that the cease-fire proposal of the President will be pursued with diligence, that it will be successful, and that the killing in Vietnam will come to an end.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush would you care to speak to Mrs. Meyer's question?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I would be delighted to do so. First immediately on the announcement of the President's peace offensive, I strongly endorsed this peace offensive. I endorse it because it is a continuation on the uh on the previous Nixon policies. And I really, and I I hate to say this because it will sound rather trite I guess, but I think it takes an exercise in mental gymnastics as I said up in Logansport the other evening to to see any comparison between Senator Hartke's previous recommendations and those recommendations of Richard Nixon. Let me tick off a few things here. First, Senator Hartke has repeatedly denounced the Cambodian government. He's denounced the South Vietnam government. He has through the Hatfield-McGovern Amendment, he wanted a which he supported in the Senate—he wanted a set a deadline on the withdrawal of troops from South Vietnam. On the Cooper-Church Amendment he opposed the attack on the privileged sanctuary on the Viet Cong in Cambodia. Now when you take all these things into consideration, plus the fact that the Senator has opposed Vietnamization, plus the fact that the Senator has said that it's not working, I see no no correlary at all between those remarks of Senator Vance Hartke of Indiana and those plans advanced by President Richard M. Nixon. I heartily support the plan. The fact that the Russians have first said that they cannot accept it, in my opinion means very little. I would agree with the Senator there. I still think there's still an excellent chance of its acceptance by the Soviet Block. Now I mentioned at one
time, I would say the chance is one in four for success. I'm very hopeful and I pray each evening that the plan will be accepted.

Scott: We turn now to Mr. Fry with a question for Mr. Roudebush.

Fry: Congressman, if we might turn to a domestic subject uh the nation's airports were recently threatened by militant groups. Bombings of public buildings appeared to be on the increase around the country. In your opinion just how should these problems be dealt with?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, Harry, I don't think that there's any question but what further federal legislation is needed in this case. I would say that uh because really there's been very little limitation on the sale of high explosives, the transfer of explosives from one state to another, and I think that it is a proper area for the federal government to enter. I am hopeful that the legislation will be signed by the President that is on his desk now and that additional legislation will be passed by the Congress which will stop this horrible bombing. I understand that there were eight today. And I think that it's a tragedy in our nation a sickness that these revolutionaries go around in their destruction. And and I do think that it will take federal legislation to solve this matter and it shall have my support.

Scott: Senator Hartke.

HARTKE: Crime is crime and should be dealt with as crime. Violence is violence and should be absolutely eliminated from the American scene. How to eliminate it is not alone a problem of the federal government. It's a problem of the state government. It's a problem of the local government. And it's a problem of each and everyone of us. In my opinion, the United States of America has the solemn obligation to somehow reconcile our differences. We must have more emphasis on peaceful solutions. This means that as far as the law violators, that they're going to have to be treated as law violators. That those people who incite and those people who stir up these individuals, some of them for probably no good reason whatsoever, certainly are also accessories to the fact. In other words if you go around the country pitting one group out against another, then the ultimate result is that eventually somebody will take action. I think that it's necessary now for our us to rededicate ourselves to a position of reconciliation. This means a whole change in national attitude. Not the use of force, but the use of love. The use of force by law violators must be dealt with by the police as law violators. And that's a very simple explanation of a very difficult human problem.

Scott: Senator Hartke, our next question is addressed to you from Fred Heckman.
Heckman: Both of you gentlemen have brought in top flight talent, Roger Ailes for Congressman Roudebush and Concept Films from Philadelphia for Senator Hartke. These men and these concerns in effect design campaigns to sell the candidate as a commercial product. So both candidates, is the electorate getting a true picture of what he is buying in a candidate or is all we're getting a slick part of Madison Avenue merchandise?

Hartke: Well, let me say that as far as Vance Hartke is concerned, we don't have that much advertising and that I wanted to limit it to 143,000 dollars but my opponent refused to agree to do that. I've been perfectly willing to abide by the pending legislation which incidently was vetoed by the President of the United States today. I think campaign spending is all out of hand. I think that the people are tired of seeing all that 143,000 dollars spent on a Senatorial campaign for radio and television ought to be enough. I think that it's a whole lot better to do what we're doing here. Here I am. Here he is. Judge us for what we are and for what we say. How we look and what we do. Judge us by our records and not by the way some package of cigarette is going to be displayed and wrapped up in a fancy package. I'm all for the change.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush, will you answer Mr. Heckman's question.

Roudebush: Well, I don't have any Madison Avenue talent despite all the comment that's appeared in the newspaper. Actually, the man who handles my make-up chores, and sometimes I wonder how good a job he does when I see myself on camera, uh is from Indiana, a native Hoosier. Roger Ailes is a native of Ohio. My television and my radio commercials are not completed as the Senator's is by an out-of-state firm--by a city, by a firm here in Indianapolis. So I don't think that the charge applies to me. I don't think anybody is trying to sell me as a hunk of baloney, or a piece of cheese, or a can of coffee. I honestly try to be myself. And the first understanding I had with the uh group who are uh handling my television programs is that please don't try to change me. I'm just an ole farm boy from Hamilton County. I'm delighted to be recognized as such. I'm delighted to be recognized as a Republican of a urban--uh rural background and I don't think that there's anything that can be done to change my image and I won't have it happen, Fred, for the world.

Scott: The next question will be asked by Mrs. Meyers.

Meyers: I'd like to return to President Nixon's veto of the bill that would limit spending for broadcast commercials. Do you anticipate an effort among your colleagues to override this veto and what do you think the outcome will be?
ROUDEBUSH: Who does this go to? Me? I think.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush.

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I think that the Senator and I can agree very quickly that at this late date in the session, it would probably be impossible to override it. And frankly I wouldn't support an overriding of the veto myself; although I would agree philosophically, as Vance has said that there is too much money spent on these campaigns. It puts a terrible strain on the candidate just getting the necessary money together. And it puts a terrible strain on his party. But I would say that there are several holes in this bill. You see this restricts only television and radio advertising. What about newspapers? What about billboards? What about the handouts? The novelties? The things of this type. Wouldn't it just take money out of the television and media and radio media's hands and place it in other medias? I think that these are some of the things that the President was thinking about. Something else I want to say uh my opponent said a few minutes ago that I was unwilling to restrict myself to pending legislation before the Congress. Well, remember that the House bill and the Senate bill were two different bills altogether. The House bill had absolutely no effect on the campaign of November 3, 1970. The Senate bill, I understand, did; but the House bill didn't. And I would say that when anyone is familiar with the television and radio the contracts that must be signed would simply know that it would be impossible to live up to that bill even if the President had signed it and even if it did affect this year's uh uh campaign. Finally if we ever pass a bill of this type, your incumbent will have a built in advantage over any challenger. A person whose name is not a household word believe me, would never unseat an incumbent United States Senator or a re-un incumbant U. S. Congress-man. I believe that everyone should have a chance.

Scott: Senator Hartke.

HARTKE: Well, I just couldn't disagree more with the man. I just really I am utterly amazed that a man would come here and say that you do not believe that you're going to limit the spending of television and radio which is the most effective media in the field of campaigning. You talk of having out of state talent: you have Roger Ailes. You mentioned his name; I didn't bring it up. He just happens to be President Nixon's television advisor. The subject of a book written by Mr. McGinnis, The Selling of the President. Now I helped write that bill. I know all about it. I'm the ranking member on the Communication sub-committee of the Congress Committee. I sat in the Congress. I tried and tried to get them to make sure that that bill would be passed and applied to this election. The House of Representatives agreed in that conference committee. They agreed in that conference committee and that was the bill which finally passed with an effective date which was too late to apply to this election. Now the President has vetoed that bill. All I'm saying is very simply is that I would like to see it
overridden. I would like to see us not have President Nixon or anybody else spend twenty million dollars to try and affect the outcome of the election in nineteen hundred and seventy-two, the Democratic nominee or either one. I would prefer that we would have some arrangements with the networks whereby they could present the candidates much as they did in the Kennedy-Nixon debates. And I played a leading role in writing that legislation. I think they're good. I think that the people are entitled to something better than a package of advertising, an attempt to sell it like soap or cigarettes. I think that they're entitled to know where the people stand. And a lot of people are fed up with this kind of campaigning; and the net result is only twenty-eight per cent of the population of Indiana voted in the primary. In other words, I want to get the election back to the people.

Scott: Senator Hartke, Mr. Fry has a question for you.

Fry: Let me return to the ideas of both of you in the handling of violence for a moment. The line between peaceful dissent and acts which may ultimately lead to violence is often a difficult one to place and determine. What kind of guidelines would you recognize as the best to be used in dealing with these situations, Senator?

HARTKE: I think uh, this is to me, I think that you're dealing with an age old problem of trying to read a man's mind. And I don't think you can read any man's mind and tell anyone what he really intends to do. So we have a history in this country. The Constitution guarantees the right to petition the government. That's an elementary principle of the Constitution. And that right to petition is the right to express his opinion. And if he doesn't like his Senator or his Congressman, he has a right to do that as long as he doesn't violate any law; as long as he does it peacefully. Now, that in the essence is the way it is. When he violates the law, I think he should be treated as a criminal. But until he violates the law, he should be entitled to the full rights of an American citizen entitled to the full protection of the Constitution.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush.

ROUDEBURSH: Well, Harry, I think that's an excellent question. And may I say that there is no one in the House of Representatives that will fight more hard or stronger for the right to dissent than I will. Because this is a written law of our land in our United States Constitution. Anyone has the right to disagree with the President, with his Senator, with his Congressman, with his governor. And I think that our citizens do very vocally demonstrate this. And I certainly agree and I defend to my very death the right of any citizen to disagree and I mean that sincerely. But when a peaceful dissent goes across that line of demarcation that you remarked; where you start throwing bottles at people and causing bodily injury; where you start killing, or burning, or maiming, or destroying, then you are no longer just dissenting
you are a common criminal (criminal) and should be treated as such. And you should be treated as such and should be punished to the full extent of the law.

Scott: Mr. Roudebush, Mr. Heckman has the next question for you.

Heckman: Congressman, one of the themes behind your campaign is in effect, elect me so that we might give the President a chance to carry out his platform. So we can assume that you would back many of the administration proposals to welfare system, medicaid, etc. The editor of the New York Stock Exchange uh says the stop-gap the the economic policy that the United States has been engaged in that is of winding down the economy is undergoing a severe test. The results extremely non-conclusive in fact without conspicuous success. Will you back the President's economic policy?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, yes I will continue to do so, Fred. And I realize that here is a marked difference between my opponent and myself. I I can see many economic indicators despite the article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal as you said. Uh I see many economic indicators that indicate perhaps we have bottomed out; perhaps we are on the road to economic recovery. Your gross national product is up. Your housing starts are up. So many things: your interest rates, your prime interest rates recently was reduced. Money is freer and this can be found by any businessman. Unemployment, well, it's up. But I think that we have to analyze those unemployment figures. I think that statistics can confuse. I used to have a professor in college who says, figures don't lie but liars figure. I'm not trying to say that the Department of Labor is a liar in this case. But for the first time, we used college students in determining the number of unemployed. When you look at the record, you will find that the people twenty-five years and older, the unemployment rate is 3.4, or perhaps it's 3.5, and I would say that the bulk of your unemployment is in the range of sixteen to twenty-four. Now please don't feel that I have anything against the labor of sixteen to twenty-four, but it simply supplies and since these statistics were gathered during the week of Labor Day, many of these students have now returned to college and I'm sure that the next report will be better is the point I'm trying to make. May I say that I that the Senator said a few minutes ago that I said that 5.5 was a successful or allowable amount of unemployment. I think that as long as one man who wants a job is out of work that this is above the allowable limit as far as I'm concerned.

Scott: Senator Hartke.

HARTKE: Well, let me take that statement. You changed then since you were at Lafayette, Congressman Roudebush, 'cause when you were at Lafayette with the managing editors, and John Scott was there, you said that a 5.5 per cent unemployment rate was acceptable. If you want to change your mind, I can understand that. I think that's perfectly
alright. But I do not accept the proposition. Unemployment is up seventy per cent over what it was when your Republican Administration took over. As far as the people out of work in this state there are over 90,000 people who are out of work in the State of Indiana alone. There are over 5,000 people in the automobile parts manufacture who do not have a job, prior to the time the strike went into effect. The longest unemployment line in the history of Greencastle was the one I visited in one of my recent trips. I met Royce Sandy there and I asked him where did you work. And he said "I haven't had a job since I came back from Vietnam." Now I say that a nation as rich as the United States of America, as powerful as we are, and as humanitarian as we're supposed to be, can do better than that. We ought to provide an opportunity for these people to go to work. We ought to provide an end to the highest interest rate policy. An end to the tight money policy. The end to wasteful spending on goldplated military gadgets and start going back to the business of taking care of people's problems. Housing. We could put every unemployed person in the United States to work just building houses, to take care of the housing slack. I say that this country needs to be turned around. Put back on the path toward prosperity and full employment. This is my goal. I worked at this once before when I was on the unemployment committee in nineteen hundred and fifty-nine and sixty, and we worked ourselves out of a job and disbanded the committee. I don't mind going back again on the unemployment committee, but I'll work again to end the committee. I want people to have an opportunity to work to support their families and their children.

Scott: Gentlemen, before you make your concluding remarks we have time for one more question from Hortense Meyers.

Meyers: I believe that this is addressed to Senator Hartke. Do you favor ending the draft and replacing it with an all volunteer army?

HARTKE: I certainly do favor ending the draft. I'm a strong supporter of the volunteer army concept. I'd say that such a diverse of people such as Senator Mark Hatfield and Senator Barry Goldwater are co-sponsors of that measure. We only got thirty-nine votes last time. I think that the draft is unfair. I think that we ought to have a volunteer army as we've had through-out most of the history of the United States except since nineteen hundred and thirty-nine. I believe that this would provide for a better attitude among our young people and a fighting force which is fit, lean, and trim. One which could be trained to use the new technological methods which are the elements of making sure we have an adequate defense. It's a waste of manpower to put a man in military service now for two years. Because then he just has the basis of training and then he leaves. I want somebody there who really knows how to use those gadgets and use technological machines when the test comes and I pray that we'll never need it.
ROUDEBUSH: Kind of surprises me Vance, just a minute ago you were against buying these uh gadgets and these gold-plated technological devices for our military. I might say I also very strongly support the theory of an all volunteer army and the end of the draft. I've spoken to this many times throughout Indiana. I will simply say that when this legislation comes before Congress I will support it. I think that this can be recognized by anyone that this will probably have to be supplemented if we ever go into another war. And I think we all realize this. And in peace time especially, I support the theory of an all uh volunteer army and I also support the discontinuation of our draft.

HARTKE: Can I ask a question. I understood that it was to be the other way around.

HARTKE: It's alright. Let me say this, I'm glad we've had a chance to visit. I want to visit with you again. Not only here, but throughout all the streets of all the state of Indiana. I do like people. I'm interested in people. I'm concerned when they're unhappy and when they have problems. And I share with them the joys and happinesses of better tomorrows. That's what I'm looking forward to. The big difference in this campaign is whether you, as individuals, want to take this country down a road of prosperity with full employment, or whether you want to continue the present unemployment policies. Whether you want to bring the prices down, or whether you want to keep them skyrocketing as they are at the present time. Whether you want to take money and spend spend it on things like the ABM--which Congressman Roudebush supports--and the SST--which Congressman Roudebush supports--to take the jet set across the ocean three hours faster and things of that kind, or whether you believe that we should spend as much money on cancer research, heart disease research, on arthritis, whether we should really make automobile safety an item which will work to reduce the death toll on the highways. Whether you really believe that people who created legislation like the Hartke Railroad Safety Bill, the Hartke Railroad Passenger Bill, the Hartke Adult Education Bill, these measures which bear my name--of which I am extremely proud for the very simple reason that they meant a better life for people. I am a Senator who is concerned with people. I want to make very sure that as far as I'm concerned that I keep that public trust. In the final analysis there is more to political campaigns than all the hoopla and the advertising ads. In the final analysis what is left for each and every one of us is
Thank you very much Senator Hartke for your closing remarks. And now for the closing remarks of your opponent the United States Representative Mr. Roudebush. Mr. Roudebush, will you conclude your part of the debate please?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I'm going to use some of my valuable time to thank the panel for being here tonight. I think that you were intimately fair and I appreciate so much your awareness and the quality you showed to the two candidates. I also appreciate the facilities of this fine station and the other stations that are carrying this debate throughout Indiana. I think that it's a great advantage to us who seek the United States Senate seat to have this forum to talk to many, many people. You know I was surprised at one remark Vance made and that was concerning cancer cure. I thought he was off that kick after what he said in Covington, Indiana that was quoted in the Commercial News that he would promise a cure for cancer within four years if he were elected to the United States Senate. I don't know if this is a correct quotation or not but the newspaper swears that it is. I also dislike very much the emotionalism of a campaign the construction of the SST for the jet set to run around. The Senator knows full well that the construction of SST or a supersonic transport, whether you agree with it or not, has other economic features besides furnishing plush transportation for the jet set. It has one of the biggest salable items in our foreign trade is the sale of aircraft. We all know that. Nearly every airline abroad uses American aircraft in their transportation. He also didn't tell you that Russia has developed the supersonic transport or it's pretty well along now. Also the French and the Germans have gotten together, the French and the English have gotten together and developed the Concord which will put our airlines practically out of business. The Senator gets up on the podium and says why doesn't the American airline companies and the American manufacturers of aircraft go ahead and foot the bill themselves? Why should it be a responsibility of government? And I say...
that this would be ideal, if it were possible. But we know that the amount of expenditures needed on this aircraft would make it impossible. I I reluctantly support the SST myself. I know the need of cancer research, the research of heart disease. I have religiously supported this legislation in the ten years I have been in the House of Represen­tatives. I shall continue to re... support the research for these horrible killers of mankind. May I say in helping closing my remarks now that uh I want to make one simple campaign promise. Should you feel inclined to support my candidacy, when I do become your United States Senator, if that be your desire and the selection by your ballot. And when I enter the hallowed chamber of the United States Senate that historic chamber of the national capital, and I raise that right hand and I take that oath of office, to uphold our Constitution and protect this nation, from it's enemies. I promise every citizen of this state that you will never have occasion to be disappointed or ashamed of this United States Senator.

Scott: Congressman Roudebush and Senator Hartke we thank you very much for appearing on this historic debate tonight. We thank also Judge Charles White of the Indiana Appelate Court, and Judge Richard Given of the Indiana Supreme Court. And I would like to also thank my colleagues in news business, Mr. Harry Fry from WTHI television in Terre Haute. Mr. Fred Heckman, News Director from WIBC, Indianapolis. Hortense Meyers, United Press International in Indianapolis. And I would like to remind our television viewing audience and our radio audience that this debate will be carried over fifteen television and fifteen radio stations throughout the State of Indiana. Consult your local newspaper or television directory for the time and place of this broadcast. The next program, the second in a series of debates which will feature Senator Vance Hartke and Congressman Richard Roudebush will be televised on Thursday, October 20th. Again we urge you to consult your local newspaper or television directory for the time and place of this broadcast. All of us agree no matter which political party we're in that one of the most important exercises of our free franchise is to go to the polls on election day. On behalf of the candidates, the panel, and all of those who are interested in furthering progress in good government in Indiana, in your communities, and throughout the United States, I urge you to go to the polls and vote on election day 1970. And now on behalf of the Senator Hartke, Congressman Roudebush and our panel members, it's been my pleasure to serve as moderator of this debate between Senator Hartke and Congressman Roudebush. We thank you for tuning wherever you are and good night.
Welcome to a special program in our News Conference 1970 Series. Today we begin a series of two programs dealing with the Indiana race for the United States Senate. Our guest on this first program is the Senior Senator from Indiana, Vance Hartke. Now serving his second term in the Senate, Mr. Hartke is a Navy and Coast Guard Veteran of World War II, a lawyer, and a former Mayor of Evansville, Indiana. Senator, joining me today as they will one week from today to talk to your opponent are Larry Allen, political and legislative reporter for the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette, Bill Furgeson who reports similar stories for the Fort Wayne News Sentinel with emphasis on government and politics, and Bob Gore, State House reporter for our sister station, WISH-TV, Channel 8 in Indianapolis. Senator, I'd like to start off by asking you what you consider to be the main issue in this campaign.

HARTKE: The main issue in this campaign is the question of leadership of a nation and leadership of a state. The State of Indiana, of course, has a governor that has absolutely defaulted in his obligation to the State of Indiana. It's so bad, that even twenty-one months after he's gone into office he has even failed to appoint a state Mental Health Director for the State of Indiana. And the rest of the pattern of state government is in similar default and the result of all this is the highest property taxes in the State of Indiana. He is one of the people who helped pick my opponent and that's evidence enough of the type of do nothing government that they intend to try to put off onto the people in Washington, D. C. On the national level, President Nixon had the promises of 1968: the promises to end the war in Vietnam; the promise to end inflation; the promise to bring prices down; the promise to bring interest rates down; the promise to bring the country together; and in this field again, we know all the other things are true. The war continues, unabated. The interest rates are the highest they have ever been since the Civil War. The cost of living has gone at a sharper rate than any time since the Korean War. And on top of all of this, unemployment has increased seventy per cent--seventy per cent increase in unemployment in twenty-one months deliberately caused by the policy of the Nixon Administration. What we have to do is turn the country around; put it back on a path of peace overseas, peace here at home and prosperity for our nation and the peace and prosperity we can enjoy.

Allen: Senator, you've been campaigning so far on the--and hitting away at--you have termed the negative aspects of Richard Roudebush's record in Congress. And likewise, Roudebush is campaigning, saying that he is needed in Washington with President Nixon. How do you fit Roudebush's record together with his campaign stance with running with Nixon as a team? Has Roudebush supported the President's program or hasn't he?
HARTKE:  No, uh, my opponent has not. On foreign policy he has supported the President only forty per cent of the time. I think that the most recent evidence of that was when the President went to visit in Yugoslavia. And here for the first time he had an opportunity to demonstrate to the state the type of support he would give to the President in an area which is explosive, which is tension ridden, and where the President is attempting, hopefully, to bring around some relief to that tension and avoid a war. The first thing he did, he said that the President's visit to Yugoslavia was distasteful to him. I don't think that is the kind of support the President of the United States needs. I think that the President should go wherever it is necessary, wherever he thinks it is necessary to try and bring about peace in this world today.

Bill (Fergeson):  Mr. Hartke, I'm I'm still on the foreign scene. How about Vietnam. Do you favor a complete and immediate withdrawal from Vietnam?

HARTKE:  No, I never have. The fact of the matter, let's put the record straight. I favor a ceasefire, that is, an end to the killing. And then let's go about the political negotiation. First let me point out that one-third of those who have died, more than one-third now, of those who have died in Vietnam, have died since President Nixon has taken office. President Nixon says that we cannot win a military victory and will not win a military victory in Vietnam. President Nixon has unilaterally withdrawn some troops. I think that it's high time we stop the killing and go about the political settlement. This should have been done a long time ago. I think that most people believe and that I think that most people believe that when President Nixon said that "I have a plan to end the war" that he was talking like President Eisenhower in 1952. And that he would end the actual shooting, end the war. And of course, that didn't happen.

Fergeson:  Do you think that it is possible at this time to have a ceasefire?

HARTKE:  Well, we're taping this one day and I'm hoping that when this is shown which is some days off, that the ceasefire has been put into effect.

Kurtz:  I should point out for our viewers, we are taping this program in early October for later play back date and that's always the risk we run that some of the things we'll talk about will be outdated. The way the campaign is going, I hope not. Bob (Gore) you have a question.

Gore:  Senator, the campaign issue of the 1950's seemed to have been soft on Communism. If this campaign is any indication of the 1970's, the issue will be stop "soft on student dissent." In Indiana we have had little violent student dissent. Is that a viable issue in the 1970 campaign here in Indiana?
HARTKE: I don't think that there's any question that violence in the whole context of America is an issue. It's not a Democratic or political issue. We want to end the violence in the streets, an end to the violence on the campus, an end to the violence in Vietnam, uh, but you're not going to have an end to this violence simply by going ahead and tearing people to pieces. I think that Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Hickie who happens to be in President Nixon's cabinet put it very well, he said, "You can't tear the country together." And that's exactly what I believe. I think that we need reconciliation. The bringing of these people together. The lowering of the voices, not the divisive rhetoric and inflammatory ads and the type of skulduggery in campaign techniques that my opponent stooped to in this campaign.

Kurtz: Do you favor the campus authorities taking more responsibility for keeping the campuses quiet?

HARTKE: I think that the campus authorities have a primary responsibility for the keeping the campuses quiet. Because after all, that's their jurisdiction. They have the responsibility and if they need help from the local communities then they should ask for it. But the primary responsibility is with the authorities on campus.

Allen: How much do you feel that the President's commission Report on the Campus Unrest was in fact, partially aimed directly at Agnew? And in included in the phrase "moral leadership?"

HARTKE: Well, the significant factor about the commission on unrest by the President is not necessarily that part which deals with the total variety of responsibilities. They put the responsibility on the campus authorities, on the students, on the National Guard, but the significant point: President Nixon appointed this commission, it was headed by a Republican, the former Governor of Pennsylvania, Mr. Scranton. There isn't any question in my mind that to have that commission criticize that lack of moral leadership on the part of the President is a unique and very unusual statement. It was a constructive criticism. At least intended as such. And I'm hopeful that the President will take it as such. And start to be the President of the United States of America and bring the people together, including those young people who are in the Universities and Colleges.

Allen: What is your understanding of the term "moral leadership" and what are it's implications?

HARTKE: Moral (little laugh—whispered) that is not to call to call kids bums.

Allen: Are we talking about Agnew then?
HARTKE: You're talking about the President. They named the President of the United States. They didn't name the Vice-President. They named the President of the United States. They put the blame at his doorstep. And they said, Mr. President, you have failed to exercise that type of leadership which is necessary to prevent this violence.

Allen: We're talking the President and we're not talking about the Vice-President?

HARTKE: Well, I suppose that you, I mean you can say that the Vice-President is included. But the point still remains that after all he is the President. President Truman used to say that the buck stops here and he's talking about the President not the Vice-President.

Allen: What I'm asking I think is, do you believe that Nixon has the responsibility for what Agnew is saying?

HARTKE: Well, I don't think that the Vice-President says anything that the President doesn't believe.

Gore: Senator, another foreign issue that is that the President has returned from his Mediterranean tour. Whereas he has said in certain countries that he will be withdrawing American troops, he has said that in the Mediterranean area, especially the Mid-East area, we will be increasing our troop commitments. Are we finding that this is a danger signal for another Vietnam or possibly an even greater brush fire war with American involvement?

HARTKE: It's a danger place. There's no question about that. The Mid-East has always been a tinder box and very explosive. Uh Vietnam is a different operation. The whole question as far as the Mid-East is concerned is whether Israel can contain its enemies sufficiently to preserve its sovereignty which was granted to it by the United Nations. Now how that's going to be accomplished is very difficult. Let me make it very clear. I see no circumstance in which American troops should be used there in that conflict and Mrs. Meir, the Prime Minister of Israel, has said that she does not expect American troops to be used that all they want is the right to defend themselves. But let me point out again, we are taping this program so far in advance that I hope we are not dealing with current events in a context which is so completely out of date by the time it reaches the people in the latter part of October.

Gore: Let's talk about something then that has been forecast by the Labor Department by the time this program may or may not be seen may be a reality. They have forecast by the beginning parts of November we will have an unemployment rate of about 6.8 per cent. It will increase. It will get worse before it gets better. How, besides political rhetoric do we change the economy, do we bring it back to a full employment, non-inflationary economy? How can that be brought about?
HARTKE: The simple way to change the economy is to turn the country around. The way to get the country turned around is to have a tremendous Democratic victory for Vance Hartke who believes in full employment. And that's the change the whole idea of how you run the country on economics. I do not believe in the constant pie. I do not believe that there's just so many jobs. The history of America has been that we've always expanded to meet the population; we've always expanded to a better way of life, a fuller life and better salaries. And all of a sudden here President Nixon says we have to slow the economy back: to have tight money; high interest rates; all of those "no" things which make sadness in the home. Which make the Royce Sandy, the man I saw in the unemployment line in Green Castle, I asked him what he did, and he said, "I'm unemployed. I've been unemployed since I came back from Vietnam." The richest, most powerful, greatest nation in the world to say to a returning fighting man from Vietnam, the best we can offer you is unemployment compensation check. I say it's time to turn the country around and put that man to work.

Kurtz: I don't think that the Republicans are going to go on record as not favoring full employment so that...

HARTKE: Let me stop you Ken, if I can. My opponent has endorsed a five and a half per cent unemployment rate. Now just put that right where it is. He has endorsed the present unemployment rate. So don't say that they're not going to do it. He's already done it. I don't know if he'll do it in this program.

Kurtz: But you're favoring a less... smaller unemployment rate than he?

HARTKE: I do not believe that any man who wants to work should be denied the opportunity to find a job.

Kurtz: Ah, but that means, the program, how do you accomplish this?

HARTKE: We, we turned over the lowest unemployment rate in the history of the United States since World War II to President Nixon at 3.3 per cent unemployment in January, 1969. Two million people have been added to the unemployment roll since then. That's two million people out there drawing unemployment compensation checks instead of payroll checks. They're not even paying taxes.

Allen: How many of those have been in Defense (Department) and Space cut backs?

HARTKE: Oh, now you know, I'm glad you brought up--this is really something. Do you remember what Lenin said? He said that America could not keep its people employed without being involved in a war. And those people who advocate that like my opponent, to keep the
defense business going in order to keep people employed are falling into Lenin's trap. I don't believe that. Let me show you something. Housing is a social disaster. There are not enough houses being built to hardly count. If you took all the defense industries and closed them down tomorrow, you could put those people to work building houses and you'd have absolutely everybody still fully employed. Put them to work building automobiles, put them to work building refrigerators, put them to work going in here and repairing the downtowns of every major city of the United States. There is plenty of work to be done.

Allen: Who provides the retraining?

HARTKE: The retraining has to be done through two sources: one, through the private industry, and one of them through the government through the man the man power training bills. Of course my opponent will never support any of these programs of retraining. He says that it's alright to go on the unemployment line, then to the welfare department. That's his philosophy.

Ferguson: Senator, what are the critical needs right now? To put it another way, the amount of tax money the federal government has is limited to an extent . . .

HARTKE: Can I interrupt you Bill. You see, "the amount of tax money the federal government has is limited," now I don't believe that. The reason, now I don't mean to interrupt you but I just want to get the premise straight. What I'm saying to you is that the reason that the deficit in the federal government is not caused by the spending, it's caused by the failure of revenue to come in from the lack of corporate taxes and the people who are unemployed are not paying personal taxes. So now, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you.

Ferguson: Well, OK, if you say the revenue is not unlimited, do you mean that spending is unlimited also?

HARTKE: The revenue is certainly not unlimited because we went from a one hundred billion dollar budget in 1965 to the largest budget in the history of the United States under President Nixon to a two hundred billion dollar budget in five years. We increased the revenue of the government by almost 100 per cent in five years. And it wasn't done by increased taxation because we voted for a tax cut for every corporation. I voted for it. I was the sponsor of the bill. I voted for a tax cut for you and everybody out there. I just want to name another one from 600 to 750 your exemptions. I voted another one whenever we refuse to extend the Surtax, the five per cent Surtax went right in your paycheck and you didn't have to pay those taxes.

Ferguson: The question I'm trying to get to here is that you have been called a "big spender" by some people. If you have your choice of where the money from the federal tax dollar would go, where would you put it?
HARTKE: In the first place, I'm not a big spender.

Fergeson: Well, I didn't call you that. I said you had been called that.

HARTKE: I know, I do have to correct that because I voted to cut eight billion dollars from the President's budget. That's at a rate of one million dollars every hour of the day 365 days a year. That's the record. When you talk about the big spenders let's have Mr. Nixon carry that label not Vance Hartke. Where would you put it? On the unfinished business of America. On health... the very day I'm doing this I was at the Veterans Hospital. I want to put more money in the Veteran's Hospitals to take care of those people who have been injured as the result of war. The Hartke-Cranston amendment does just that. President Nixon vetoed it. Cancer research? President Nixon vetoed it. Heart research, arthritis, research for stroke, the whole field of health and the whole field of education we need to do more. Milk prices for children has gone up three cents to seven cents for their milk. It may not seem like an awful lot to you but that's a big difference to a large family. All I'm saying to you, is that I'd like to do for people here at home: to take care of their needs, to take care of building highways, to take care of building homes and to take care of building a better society and a better place for them to live.

Gore: Senator, on that basis of being a big spender, the commercial being used accusing you of being a big spender says last year you introduced bills if totaled, would have cost the American government twenty-two billion dollars. What kind of bill cost twenty-two billion dollars?

HARTKE: Well, that depends on how you look at it. I'm the sponsor of the increase in social security for at fifteen per cent. That increase brought to the American people about ten billion dollars, that went to the elderly. Now that's right. That was the Vance Hartke amendment. But the fact is that there is a thirty billion dollar surplus in the Social Security Fund. The fact is that in 1967, I pointed out on the floor of the Senate that they were over charging people for the benefit they were giving. And we didn't have to increase the tax one bit in the Social Security Fund to provide that fifteen per cent increase in benefits. When I talk about these programs, almost every person who has done anything in the Congress proposes measures for dams, reservoirs. I have to admit that my opponent probably has never sponsored a measure like that in his life. I don't know if he knows what it is all about. The but I just know that they don't get done in the House of Representatives they come to the Senate, they ask me to come for the Big Blue, for the Wildcat, for the Tippecanoe. We did it for the Huntington, for the Salamoni, for the Pakacotoka. These projects are necessary.
Kurtz: Senator, you touched on something that I would like to get into that's what's generally called the farm scandal. What can we do to cut down the government support of some of these grains and other farm products that we are horribly overstocked on in our warehouses now?

HARTKE: In the first place, let's talk about paying people over twenty thousand dollars a year not to grow anything. Vance Hartke introduced an amendment, we passed it in the Senate, to say that you could not collect over twenty thousand dollars. I think that any farmer who collects over twenty thousand dollars, that they ought to make to have a limit. Now my opponent and the President said that they want it unlimited or at least not cut below fifty-five thousand dollars. But you have a corn blight, and here is a lot of big questions. The big question of did the Agriculture Department really tell the American people the truth about how bad the corn blight was. Or did some of these farmers sell their corn at a price that permitted the speculators to make a big killing. All I can tell you is I think that farmers are entitled to know how bad the corn blight really is. There have been estimates that it is as bad as forty to fifty per cent. Now there's information coming out of Purdue now saying that next year is going to be even worse. The poor farmer, he's got the corn blight and the Nixon blight on the farms, between the two it's pretty rough.

Kurtz: What about the taxpayer blight supporting all these surplus commodities? Let me exempt the corn blight for a minute because I realize the blight is a technical situation.

HARTKE: I just said if you ... I'm interested in cutting back the subsidies to the farmer to a maximum of twenty-thousand dollars to any one farmer. There's millions of dollars that does go some corporate farmers now. But my opponent will not agree to that.

Allen: Senator, a number of Democratic candidates are beginning to have been pulling Governor Whitcomb into this year's election. How big a factor do you think he might be in the outcome of the election?

HARTKE: I think that the failure of leadership here on the state level is is tragic. We've had a governor here who just has not met the responsibilities of a state government.

Allen: In what way?

HARTKE: In the field of crime prevention for example using the funds which came from the Omnibus Crime Bill which we passed in 1968. We poured money uh down here 700,000 dollars came to the State of Indiana. They've had three crime directors in that year. Very little of that money went to where the crime was in the streets.
Kurtz: What would you do if you had the choice of saying what the law an order program or Indiana crime prevention program might be? What would you propose?

Hartke: I would propose that they would follow the recommendations of the National Justice Department which criticized and was criticized in Washington, D.C. and Indiana was pointed to as one of the examples of misuse and political misuse of crime prevention funds and crime enforcement funds. National criticism of it. This endorsed a statement I made three months before. The second thing is that we ought to go ahead and supplement policeman's salaries so that they won't have to moonlight. I think that policemen ought to have enough to live on, I would suggest ten thousand dollars a year. And provide that they supplement that amount of money that comes from the city by paying them that amount from the federal government in a tax sharing program. I think that they ought to do two things. They ought to provide that they have certain amount of education necessary for those policemen in such a program. And second they cannot moonlight. By moonlighting I mean work two jobs. I think that a policeman ought to work his eight hours and then get his sleep and rest so that he's ready to go the next eight hours in proper law enforcement.

Gore: Senator, on law enforcement, in 1968 "law and order" was the big campaign issue and yet in 1970 we see crime rate statistics from the FBI showing it still increasing at an alarming rate. What can be done? It is from the President down or is it from the Governor down or isn't it really in the local areas from the mayors to their local police chiefs and their local policemen?

Hartke: I think that's it's all of them combined. But I may point out to you that in 1968 President Nixon said that we don't need any new laws, although now my opponent says they need new laws, said that all we need to do is enforce the laws that we have on the books. And I think that's right.

Gore: Do you think then, we are not enforcing them in a strong enough manner?

Hartke: I think that a lot of the laws are going unenforced. I certainly do.

Gore: Would you suggest better training for the police would you . . .

Hartke: I said better not only better training, better education and better pay. So that you have the incentive to be a good police officer. So that you don't treat a police officer as a second class citizen.

Gore: Then in the area of crack down are we speaking again are we speaking of preventative detention, no knock policy . . .
HARTKE: No, when I I do think that there's a big area we could do a lot, that's drugs. I think that in the drug field the drug pusher, the peddler, should be dealt with severely. The user should be treated as we do an alcoholic as a medical case. They should be treated differently. The drug education act which Congressman Brademus and I introduced which will hopefully become the law very soon, would provide a lot of benefit to the people. It should be that not alone the young people but the older people know really the disastrous effects drugs has upon people. In addition to that, I think that there's no question about it that that we need to have the proper penal systems in the state. Not one which educates criminals, you know sometimes they say you send a man to a penal institution, he comes out, he may not have been a very good criminal when he went in but he comes out pretty well trained. What we need is the whole doctrine of Robert Dale Owen who was one of the people who helped to formulate the constitution in 1851, when he said really the penal institution should be of the purpose of reformation not vindictive justice.

Fergeson: What can Congress do about all this?

HARTKE: We've done a lot. We passed the Omnibus Crime Bill.

Fergeson: But the problem is still growing.

HARTKE: Well, it's growing here in the state of Indiana because the Governor has had three directors, two of them quit in disgust said that the whole agency was politically dominated and was not interested in crime prevention. It was interested in promoting the political bureaucracy on a regional and state level.

Fergeson: Do you think that Congress has gone far enough to get this done?

HARTKE: Oh, no. I have two amendments endorsed by the League of Cities and the American Municipal Association which provides very simply that an incentive in the change of present formula so that the money which is coming to the states will go to the cities under an incentive program so that the city of Fort Wayne would really benefit. The city of Fort Wayne is going to have to enforce the law in the city of Fort Wayne. That's the mayor's job. I think that the mayor's a fine man. I'm just saying to you that if he's going to get any help from this type of legislation which we passed in 1968, and the money that's been given to the state of Indiana to help the cities, some of it is going to have to come to the city of Fort Wayne. Doesn't do any good to keep it down there in some bureaucratic office and buy furniture and fancy desks for bureaucrats.

Fergeson: Is there any way to force it through Governor Whitcomb if he is the stumbling block?
HARTKE: If my amendment, yes, if my amendment which I said which has been endorsed by the American Municipal Association and the League of Cities would do just that.

Ferguson: Would it force it through the Governor?

HARTKE: That's right, it would be a force through. That's right, an incentive force through.

Kurtz: Senator, we have about two minutes left. Larry (Allen)?

Allen: I'll ask you one quick question. What do you feel that the line up will be as far as a shift in the balance of power in the House and the Senate as a result of this election? Are you getting any feeling of how it might turn out?

HARTKE: Do you mean the state of Indiana?

Allen: No, nationally.

HARTKE: I think the Democrats are going to have a tremendous victory and deliver a message to President Nixon to get on about the business, the unfinished business of America and end that war. To start realizing that social security for example is not sufficient at sixty-four dollars a month and at least 100 dollars a month we need. To realize so far as the individual is concerned that he's going to have the right to have a job. That the tight money should be brought to an end. That high interest rates should be brought down. That we need to go ahead and have a prosperity and not a recession.

Allen: How are you clarifying a tremendous victory, how many seats is that?

HARTKE: In Indiana? I refuse to concede any of them to the Republicans.

Allen and Gore: In Congress, in the Senate, House--how will the Democrats do?

HARTKE: I think that they will do very well and I think that Vance Hartke has a record which is one in which the people of Indiana are extremely proud and I think that they'll demonstrate that on November 3rd. It's an independent record, not wedded firmly to any political party. It's wedded to the benefits of the people.

Kurtz: Senator, there's some feeling that we have a fairly apathetic electorate and that we may have a very low turn out on election day. Do you get that feeling on your swings around the state?
HARTKE: No. I certainly don't. If you would visit the people as I do, and go out and see the warmth of the reception, I think that you would understand that the people of the state of Indiana are pretty good people. They respond very well to someone who is concerned and cares. And I am concerned and I do care.

Kurtz: Sorry, we are out of time. Thank you Senator. My thanks also to my colleagues, Larry Allen, Bill Fergeson and Bob Gore. These last three will join me one week from today on Sunday, November 1st, at twelve noon when our guest at that time will be our GOP candidate for the Senate, Richard Roudebush. We hope that you will join us then. Thank you for listening and good afternoon.

News Conference 1970 is a pre-recorded presentation of WANE TV News. October 25, 1970.
Good evening. This is a second presentation of the two candidates for United States Senator from Indiana. Richard Roudebush of Noblesville is a ten year veteran of the House of Representatives and holds the distinction of being the only Indiana Congressman ever to represent three different Congressional Districts. He is the former Commander of the VFW and active in Veterans Affairs. Congressman, joining me this week, as last, are Larry Allen, political and legislative reporter for the Fort Wayne Journal-Gazette; Bill Ferguson who reports on similar stories for the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel with emphasis on government and politics; and Bob Gore, State House reporter for our sister station, WISH-TV, Channel 8 in Indianapolis. As usual, I'll start the questioning, and I would like to start very generally by asking you what single issue you think the major issue is of this campaign. (Ken Kurtz)

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I guess that's the question that we're asked most often. Ah, I would say that the main issue of this campaign is my contention that I feel that I represent the viewpoint of the people of Indiana much better, more completely, and more accurately than does my opponent.

Kurtz: Larry.

Allen: Congressman you have been called about everything by ah Democratic candidates and Party officials in the state. What has happened to the debates and the scheduled joint appearances between you and Senator Hartke?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, it's been blown all out of proportions, I'll say that. First, we agreed in committee, and a committee represents myself as well as my opponent, neither of us, to my understanding, ever appeared at these committee hearings and we agreed on two days, the 12th and the 20th, I think they were. And of course we have had our now famous great debate on the 12th. On the 20th, President Nixon came to Fort Wayne as you know, and this required my cancellation. I might say that I am well aware of the charges that are made by the Democrat State Chairman as well as my opponent that the, and I'm quite flattered with those charges to think that the President would come to Indiana to the sole purpose of doing away with the second debate. I might add that I had the pleasure of riding with our President from Baer Field over to the new Mariott Inn and I was with him about let's say thirty minutes by myself in his limousine. And I mentioned to him, I said to him, Mr. President, do you realize that you stand accused of putting a stop to the second debate?" And just said, "Mr. Roudebush, I wasn't even aware of the first one." So of course, President Nixon was completely unaware and we were so desirous of having President Nixon here in
Indiana of course we took the date he had available for us. And this is the reason that the second debate was cancelled. Now, I understand that a great story had hit the wire today that I had uh, refused another appearance. And I'm not sure of where the locale of this second appearance or or it's timing. Now I understand that this appearance now being complained about was an appearance that was called in about a week ago to my office to see if I could go, and this is according to my staff. My staff said that it's absolutely impossible for Congressman Roudebush to take any more appearances before the end of the campaign. So we now stand charged of refusing to appear again. And this is completely ridiculous, I have no uh reluctance to uh appear with with my opponent in another state wide television debate. However I think that anyone who is familiar with one of their campaign schedules realizes that it's a most difficult thing to arrange. It's not near as simple as two men sitting down and saying here we are going to appear in Fort Wayne or Indianapolis on a certain date. I know that a great deal of conversation arose out of the President's visit, but believe me I think that I was entirely proper in being in Fort Wayne that evening for the most magnificent political rally I ever witnessed.

Allen: Have you cancelled any other previously scheduled joint appearances since the debate?

ROUDEBUSH: Not to my knowledge, no. I uh understand that I am appearing with Senator Hartke tomorrow in South Bend, I think on two occasions. Uh, in fact I'm driving from Fort Wayne, and when I say tomorrow of course I realize uh I realize that this is a film to show. But the day after I leave here I will be in South Bend for an appearance before the South Bend Chamber at which the Senator Hartke will also appear. And that night we are together on a call-in type television show where anyone in St. Joe County or as far as that goes anyone in Indiana can call in and ask questions of my opponent and myself. I might say that I think that this is a much better format than a debate an uh the debate uh caused a lot of conversation, a lot of different opinions among the news media. I might say that I have been asked many times, do you think that you won the debate or do you think that your opponent did? I uh usually respond that I don't know. I think typically and to be absolutely fair that people who favored me before the debate felt that I did the best and those that favored my opponent probably felt that he did the best. And a great number of people said that they didn't think that either one of us won. So uh it's a really confusing mess.

Kurtz: Bill.

Fergerson: Congressman, on this same program last week, uh Senator Hartke said that one of the reasons he should be elected is that in the past years he has supported programs dealing with people, like programs that help people. I suppose implying that you had not. He cited as example of those, one of his support of social security and the cost of living index tied to it.
Roudebush: Well, I can comment on that very quickly. Uh, first, I strongly support the raise in social security uh tied to a cost of living index. And I have uh I guess uh commented on this on a great number of occasions, uh favorably. The President also recommends this type of program. But in turn I must say that Senator Hartke voted against this exact same formula on three occasions. And there are recorded by record vote in the official Congressional Record, and I can't give you a specific date, but in 1964, 1967 and 1969. Now I do think that it is very necessary in deference to our old people to some way tie their cost of living, what their groceries cost them at the grocery store, to the amount of checks that they receive as annuitants of our social security system. And I strongly support this. I'm aware also that my opponent has said that I have voted against social security and I I just want to say that uh I think that uh as I said last week at a rally before senior citizens in Indianapolis, I have carefully analyzed the record, I had the Congressional Library analyze the record, and I find no record of my ever casting a vote against increase or expansion of the social security system.

Ferguson: Could I ask you how you voted on the three instances you cited that Senator Hartke voted against it?

Roudebush: There were no votes in the House at that time, these were votes in the Senate.

Gore: Congressman, on that subject, uh on an interview that you and I did at the (unclear) Temple in Indianapolis on the cost of living clause, you said at that time that you felt that also would have to mean a tax increase on the social security benefit. Do you now feel that if we pass a cost of living clause that we will have to increase the taxes as well?

Roudebush: Yes, Bob. Unquestionably we would. Because the cost of the Social Security program now pretty well approximates what we take in. In other words, we are paying out just about what we take in with this last fifteen per cent increase which was granted about I think December 15th, 1969. Therefore a cost of living index increase would also imply a cost uh uh increase in withholding taxes. It would have to in order that the program would remain fiscally sound. I might add to in response to your earlier question, that I want to once and for all clear the air and tell you that I voted for the fifteen per cent increase in Social Security. And I was just completely dismayed the other night and this was only just about three days ago, when the Chicago Tribune called my office and said that the statement was again made by my opponent that I had opposed the increase in Social Security. And this is simply not true, I don't know how to get this across, but I assure you that on two occasions, once on a final passage in the House, once on a conference report, I did vote for the fifteen per cent increase in social security.
Congressman, President Nixon has recently made pretty much his annual welcoming address to the United Nations. In that address he strongly supported an increase in trade between the United States and the so called Communist block of nations. Would you support him in that policy if elected to the Senate?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, actually, I make no secret about the fact philosophically as I I guess that I have expressed to all four of you gentlemen on past occasions. I oppose trade with Red Nations. However, I I recognize the very essential need of keeping communications open with the Communist Block nations. and I hope that most of the uh rhetoric between those representing our nation, the President or his designates with Communist leaders, would be uh let's say around the point of arms reduction such as the SALT talks which I strongly support and uh trade with Communist nations with any material that could be used to enhance their war making ability I would have to be opposed. Any trade at all I would say I would give it consideration, but it would be with great reluctance that I approve the same.

Gore: What's the philosophical basis for your objection to it?

ROUDEBUSH: I think that the purpose and goal of world Communism is the destruction of Capitalistic form of government such as we have here in the United States. And I don't think a Communist changes his thoughts. I think that whether he is in Poland, Yugoslavia, or Russia, or Red China, the goal the essential goal of world Communism is the same. It's the destruction of the type of government that we have. I don't want to do anything to enhance that destruction of our government.

Gore: Congressman, on the point that you made with trading, you would agree I believe with extreme reluctance with the trading of non-strategic goods, ones that would not build up their military.

ROUDEBUSH: I would say that's a fair statement, Bob, Yes.

Gore: Isn't that really saying you would support what you accused Senator Hartke of supporting in the gun commercial?

ROUDEBUSH: Oh, I don't think so. And uh first uh I think the point in the infamous gun commercial was uh that Mr. Hartke had stedfastly supported trade with Communist nations. But the main point I make here is his authorship and co-sponsorship of a joint Senate resolution which will amend the export-import bank act to actually lessen the barriers under the benefits of the act to nations who trade with North Vietnam. Now remember the gun commercial did not state with Communist nations as I recall but was with our Communist enemy and North Vietnam, and uh that as the basis of this particular commercial. But Bob, that commercial has not been used now for over a month. And uh we have no intentions of renewing its use. It was not withdrawn by me as was reported by some of the media; however, had run its course. Just
like any other ad you specify for a certain length of time. And I would like to add further I know that the conflict arose among many of the television operators, television station operators as to slander or deception and so forth and to my knowledge the only television outlets in Indiana who carefully studied this commercial through their legal departments there wasn't a single positive response that it was slanderous. Every station that did make this study—to my knowledge—agreed that there was nothing slanderous about the editorial or about the commercial. I might say that the Democrats prepared one against me that was almost exactly similar they never aired it. It was reported in the newspapers. I uh see uh many of my opponent's commercials that aren't personally pleasing to me but I don't intend to wire any of you fellows in the television business and tell you that I hope he will withdraw 'em, that I think they are slanderous to my character. I don't object to people and claims made as long as they are willing to put their names and addresses and committee numbers—committee members and people who sponsor that type of advertising. The type of advertising that riles me the most Bob, is the type of advertising that is in complete violation of Indiana election laws handed out such as the comic book that ridicules the President as well as myself. I don't know if you've seen this or not, some of the things handed out as uh uh allegedly for an organization called the Volunteers for Hartke, no names, no addresses or anything of this type, completely slanderous in their contents, and still I'm not going to howl foul or say that I'm being badly treated. I just regret, and I got a hide like a rhinocerous, I guess, most of us in public office do, and I don't resent until they are taking members of my family, then I get pretty aggravated.

Kurtz: Bill.

Fergeson: Congressman, still along the campaign line, not too long ago you were complaining about Senator Hartke going outside the state to raise money for his campaign.

ROUDEBUSH: That is correct.

Fergeson: In the last week and in this week, we've seen just an influx of people from out of state coming in to support you. What's the difference between this?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, I think that there's a vast difference. The people who come in to support me are members of the official body of our President of the United States, Richard Nixon, he appeared as well as Spiro Agnew our Vice-President, and I'm sure that you are aware of the fact that Mr. Agnew will make a second appearance. Senator Dole for example is here from Kansas, is here in Fort Wayne now. But I see no corrolary between that and money from companies outside the uh area of Indiana. Now, we have had no fund raisers at all outside of Indiana.
Now at one time uh my committee did talk to me about the possibility of a fund raiser in Washington, D. C. and I I've never stated this before, but this was quickly vetoed and I refused to participate in that type of fund raiser.

Ferguson: The Republican National Committee made quite a point in the fact that it was payin' a great deal of the President's tour expenses while he was on tour. Certainly all that money did not come from Indiana?

ROUBEBUSH: No. I would say that the, I don't know what percentage of the President's trip here was paid by the Republican National Committee, but really I couldn't comment, I don't know and I really don't know the source of that money that would pay his expenses in here. I couldn't really comment on it.

Gore: Congressman, what about Senator John Powers' letter that was sent throughout the United States that was soliciting funds for your campaign. He is the Chairman of the Republican State Senatorial Campaign Committee. Isn't this the same thing, soliciting out of state funds for your campaign from independent sources?

ROUBEBUSH: I don't think so Bob, I think that there is a great deal of difference when a bonifide and prominent organization such as the Senatorial Campaign Committee or in the case of Ross Adair, the House Campaign Committee, makes solicitation of old and dedicated party members throughout the United States to assist a candidate. And by the way that money is stood up according to the committee and it isn't earmarked for individuals as I understand it.

Gore: This one letter specifically asked for aid for you and your campaign.

ROUBEBUSH: Yes, but I still think that the money is allocated according to the dictates of the committee itself, Bob, and here I'm not trying to beg the point but I think this is true and I think you'll find this is true. And I I can only say to you, I think that there is a great deal of difference between that type of activity of voluntary solicitation and a cocktail and dinner in Chicago, or perhaps in Washington, D. C., or I believe a third one in New York City where an appeal was being made directly to businessmen businessmen doing business in many cases with the government. And I think that there is a big difference, however, again I would say that this depends on one's individual interpretation. To me there is a difference.

Allen: Congressman, the President is making a rather obvious attempt to not only win a Republican but a conservative control of the Senate in the election and uh we all I think we all understand you are part of that effort. Would you prefer to see and I'm not speaking of
any individual basis, but would you prefer to see a good quote "conservative Democrat" Senator elected over a Republican liberal Senator?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, this is quite a, this is quite a question to ask a candidate and uh it's a very difficult one to answer, and I'm not going to try to beg the point. Uh may I say first, during this entire campaign, if I were ever use the term liberal or conservative, it's been a slip of the tongue. Now perhaps I have, but I have intentionally stayed away from categorizing myself as either conservative or liberal. I personally would say by my self analysis, I would say that I am a moderate conservative. Now would I prefer a conservative Democrat to a liberal Republican? Here again I suppose it would bring up again personalities rather than, you it's difficult to discuss this hypothetically, like for example, Senator Charles Goodell of New York. May I say in the case of Charley Goodell, I know the man most intimately. I served in the House of Representatives with him and am quite fond of him. And he's up for election November 3rd. And I think that this is a decision for the people of New York to make. I personally feel that in the case of Senator Byrd of Virginia, Charley Goodell of New York, that the people of their respective states should make that decision. Uh I uh don't think that I could comment any more fully than that.

Kurtz: You wouldn't go in to support one side or the other, yourself?

ROUDEBUSH: No, that's the point that I was trying to make. I would think that it's a decision for the voters or electorate of that state to make. I would have my own personal preference but would leave such buried in the crannies of my mind.

Allen: You classify yourself as a moderate conservative, who would you classify as a conservative conservative?

ROUDEBUSH: I would say in in the Indiana delegation, I would say Earl Langree of the Second District is much more conservative.

Allen: What about Ross Adair?

ROUDEBUSH: Ross Adair and myself, I would say were somewhat similar in our voting records. I know that there's been years, and these rating agencies they can probably prove about whatever you want proved by whether it's liberal or conservative. I would say that through the ten years that Ross Adair and I have served together, that if you would add the total per cent up on all the votes cast you would find us very similar on our political philosophy.

Gore: Congressman, two weeks ago, President Nixon made the statement in response to the question; the question was, 'Is our foreign
policy of Vietnam tied to that of the Viet Cong?" In other words if
the Viet Cong do not accept our five point peace plan, can we get out?
The President in response said in essence that we would like for them
to accept it, but we are not tied. That we are withdrawing American
troops and that we will continue to withdraw American troops. Isn't
this, even though it is not called it as such, isn't this unilateral
withdrawal of American men and forces from Vietnam?

ROUDEBUSH: Bob, on definition, I don't know how you define the differ­
ence between the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese. In the first
place, most of the Viet Cong with was a revolutionary and allegedly a
civil group within South Vietnam, in recent years has been shorn up and
manned by North Vietnamese people. So I I don't think that you can
categorize or divide the Viet Cong and North Vietnam. I think that
they are one and the same.

Gore: That however, was not my question. Are we not unilaterally
withdrawing from South Vietnam at this time even though we do not have
a peace agreement?

ROUDEBUSH: We are in a sense partially withdrawing from the unilateral
sense. There's no question about it. We have as you know, and if I
may recapitulate it just a bit, the President first announced a 25,000
troop withdrawal that was without any agreement; and then his next
withdrawal as I recall it was 50,000; and the third one was 100,000;
and I think that a lot of these first three allocations that I have
discussed have been accomplished. Therefore I would say that if a
person wanted to argue academically and would say that these three with­
drawals were made without a peace agreement, it could be considered
unilateral withdrawal, with one exception, Bob; remember Vietnamization
was much a part of withdrawal. So I would say that if we are able to
build the South Vietnam army to the standpoint that it can carry the
load itself and maintain only tactical type forces there, we haven't
actually withdrawn we have removed troops that aren't needed. Now
this may be a finite point of distinction.

Gore: We are dealing in semantics. But if that is the case here
I believe even as late as the night of the President's speech, the news
conference in Indianapolis, you said at that time you are opposed to
unilateral withdrawal. Aren't aren't you in supporting the President
also endorsing unilateral withdrawal?

ROUDEBUSH: Again I think we are exercising semantics. In my opinion
uh, Bob, uh if we withdrew all of our troops and there was the capability
of the South Vietnam army defending their freedom then we are withdrawing
which is true, but we are leaving a stable force there to maintain our
position. So I think there is a difference, however, I certainly say
to you that I think that there could be an honest difference of opinion
here.
Gore: It would say is a stable force then?

ROUDEBUSH: I think that a stable force in South Vietnam is being very rapidly achieved and I think the stable force would exist when they are able to defend their government and their people. It's not to well defined I will admit it.

Gore: Another question in that area is that it has now been revealed that that the United States Government has been keeping secret American combat deaths in Laos. Uh there was an agreement on March 10th that the Saigon Embassy would freely give this information with all other casualty reports. I'm wondering your response to the fact that it has been discovered that we have been keeping them secret. We have not reported any. Today it was revealed that there have been several hundred.

ROUDEBUSH: Well, Bob, my only knowledge of the fact that there has been combat deaths in Laos was the news release that you quote. I had not been previously aware that there had not been full disclosure, if this be true.

Kurtz: Mr. Roudebush, you said on occasion recently of President Nixon's visit to Yugoslavia that you regretted it because you just didn't like to see that kind of close ties with the Communist government. Now I I'm curious, if you regretted it also the same Nixon visit to Spain the dictator that was involved and the dictatorial government that was involved there?

ROUDEBUSH: Well, actually, I I am going to have to clarify my quotation just a bit. What I said was this, "I regretted the fact President Richard Nixon saw fit to visit with a Communist dictator, and that's what Tito is, a Communist dictator."

Allen: Did you use the word distasteful? That was the words that was...

ROUDEBUSH: I think that the word was regrettable. However, I I simply don't remember. "Distasteful," "regrettable," I think would be perhaps the same. I think I said, "distasteful," no, I think that's too strong, I'd rather use the term "regrettable." I think that's the way it was. However, I did say that I thought that it was regrettable that he did visit with Tito. And that I I however, I do recognize that the lines of communication must be kept open and that I hope that any rhetoric that developed between Tito and Mr. Nixon would have as its purpose, arms limitation. Now it's a surprising thing and you put your thumb right on it here, the surprising thing as read especially Eastern press was not the condemnation with President Nixon's visit with Tito but with Franco, or any other dictator that we we are more or less required to give them official visitation. I would say in the same case the
same of Franco as I did of Tito. I think that this is a regrettable situation. However, I do realize that with our armed forces bases in France, with the need of keeping communication open, but I do hope that our conversations with Mr. Franco would be limited to the same thing as it was with the Communists: arm limitation and the security of our United States.

Kurtz: We have a little more than two minutes.

Gore: Congressman, Robert J. Brown, a special assistant to President Nixon last week said in Indianapolis and if I can I will quote into a question, "for racial balance does he (the President) favors some bussing. The answer was (I'm quoting still) for racial balance I would assume that where some bussing reasonably and where some bussing might be necessary and where it might be desirable most assuredly I would say that the President favors that." I'm wondering if you are in agreement that for some racial balance there should be some bussing?

ROUDEBUSH: Bob, I saw this particular film that you're referring to with Bob Brown. And I know that he gave two or three different answers, I think. And I believe that whoever wrote the newscast whether it was you or someone else I don't remember, you kept probing at the man to try and get this definite answer from him and here I'm not faulting you on that. No, I I'm just opposed to school bussing. And I find that most of the people of Indiana, black or white, are. And I believe in the integrity of our neighborhood schools. Now I would fight literally to the death to see that every single student and pupil has exactly the same physical facilities, the same excellence of faculty, the same fine curriculum as does any other school. But I cannot be a part of hauling a child all over the county or all over the city, black or white, to maintain any sort of some hypothetical racial balance. I think that President supports my point of view.

Kurtz: That will have to be it Congressman--Bob. We've run out of time. My thanks sir and my thanks to my colleagues, Larry Allen, Bill Fergeson, and Bob Gore. Tuesday I would remind our viewers is election day. I hope those viewers will take time to exercise one of their greatest rights as Americans by voting for the candidates of their choice. Well, I also hope that they will join us too on Tuesday night as CBS News and WANE TV cover the election returns all night long. Thank you for being with us and good afternoon.
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