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INTRODUCTION

Origin of Study

The writer became interested in Miss Jordan's speaking as a result of her visit to The Ohio State University in conjunction with the Jimmy Carter campaign. Rather than attempt a rhetorical study of a single speaker (which is somewhat obsolete), she sought another route. Consultations with her adviser about various approaches resulted in the decision to focus on Miss Jordan's keynote address at the Democratic National Convention and to compare it to the message delivered by Senator John Glenn.

Orientation

Bain describes the American National Nominating Convention as one of the "oldest quasi-political institutions of importance in existence." These conventions have been the source for each party's candidates for national offices, their platforms, national committees, etc. Political speaking is one of the classics from this period and throughout history, the addresses have been the phenomenon which most observers have related to conventions.

The address which has drawn the most attention at conventions has been the keynote. Since its inception, the keynote address has become one of the established customs of political parties; it has become an
institution. Typically, the address has focused on praise and blame or what speech critics and theorists from Aristotle to the present have referred to as epideictic oratory. According to Perelman, when an orator engages in epideictic speaking, his "sole concern is with what is beautiful or ugly. It is a question ... of recognizing values." It follows then that keynote speakers would rely heavily on dominant American value postulates as a means for achieving their goals.

The keynote address dates back to 1896 when the term was synonymous with temporary chairman of a convention. In 1972, however, a trend began in the Democratic party; the two functions were separated and they remain distinct today. The keynoter's sole responsibility became to deliver the address, rather than preside at intervals, as past temporary chairmen had done.

While the keynote address offers a grand opportunity for momentary glory and can push one into national prominence, as evidenced by Alben Barkley's selection as the Democratic Vice-Presidential nominee in 1948 following his performance, it can diminish one's opportunity for political elevation also. John Glenn's keynote address is believed to have weakened his chances for securing the Vice-Presidential nomination in 1976.

Purpose and Justification

Keynote addresses have not always been effective. Therefore, the specific purpose of this study is to evaluate the latest Democratic keynote addresses to determine if they were effective, which was more effective, and account for the difference. To facilitate the process,
the author examined past keynote addresses which had not been studied extensively as a means for determining the role which keynote addresses serve today. Consequently, addresses from 1960-1976 were examined to determine if there was a significant difference between them and pre-1960 keynote addresses.

The justification for such a study in a department of communication rests upon several premises: 1) Since the days of the ancient Greeks, rhetoric and politics have been closely associated; 2) the keynote address is a significant part of the political heritage of this nation—some of the most fiery debates at conventions have centered on who would deliver the address (the subcommittee's choice was rejected by the convention in 1896) and some of the most prominent politicians have been selected; 3) the media have used keynote addresses as a reading on convention themes and subsequent Presidential campaigns—the most salient of these was Martin H. Glynn's address in 1916 which was credited with setting the theme for the Democratic campaign—Keep America Out of War with Mexico; 4) this study will increase one's understanding and appreciation of rhetoric by providing insights on the means by which keynote addresses have served as a vehicle for uniting disparate elements of a political party; 5) make some addition to the rhetorical doctrine of how epideictic oratory works; and 6) keynote addresses for 1976 have not been subjected previously to rhetorical analysis.

The keynote addresses of 1976, however, have an added appeal for two reasons. For the first time in the history of the Democratic party, 1) the honor was shared by two speakers and a black and a
female (one in the same) addressed the convention as its keynoter.

Studies in communication have focused on females and blacks in a disproportionate manner in comparison to white males. The study, therefore, has the potential to contribute to theory building on the two groups.

Review of Relevant Literature

While the literature on political conventions is abundant, few studies have focused specifically on keynote addresses. The most comprehensive works are two studies which trace the history of keynote addresses. Ernest Neal Claussen's 1963 dissertation, "The Democratic Keynoter: A History," examined the origin and development of keynote addresses in the Democratic party, while Paul A. Barefield's 1964 study, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Keynote Speaking in Republican National Conventions from 1856 to 1964," investigated the qualities and qualifications of Republican keynoters. Both studies are valuable for their compilation of facts about keynoters and their addresses. However, criticism is minimal. The authors devote most of their attention to listing details.

More criticism is evident in Claussen's article which evolved from his dissertation. He argued that Glynn's keynote address in 1916 had been instrumental in keeping the United States out of war and in re-electing Woodrow Wilson. But Claussen's 1965 article and Barefield's 1970 article are of the same nature as their dissertations. Claussen recounts William's selection as the Democratic keynoter in 1904 while Barefield summarizes qualities and qualifications which Republican keynoters have possessed. Miles' 1960 study was of a similar nature.
Other theses have investigated the speeches of particular keynoters. In her master's thesis, Corley analyzed the three keynote addresses of Alben W. Barkley and Frank Clement's keynote was examined by Smith.

While theses have dominated the sparse literature on keynote addresses, a couple of independent articles have been published. In a 1968 article, Pitt discussed various facets of Walter Judd's 1960 keynote address before the Republican convention. Newell and King's 1974 article traced the development of Reubin Askew's keynote.

The literature on keynote addresses, although limited in academia, flourishes in magazines, newspapers, and other mass media. Lengthy discussions centered around the keynote as well as the texts and critiques of the messages have appeared in *Time*, *U. S. News*, *Newsweek*, *Chicago Tribune*, *Los Angeles Times*, and *San Francisco Chronicle*. Such articles have run the gamut from merely describing the keynoter's delivery to an extensive critique on the content and delivery.

Nevertheless, the interest shown by rhetorical scholars has been minimal. Studies conducted have dealt with keynote addresses in general or focused on a specific keynoter. None of the studies have investigated the two addresses in question.

**Research Questions**

This study will seek to answer the following questions:

To what degree do contemporary keynote addresses (1960 and after) conform to the traditional role of keynote addresses?

What strategies have contemporary keynoters utilized in effecting the role of keynote addresses?

What qualities and qualifications have contemporary keynoters possessed?
What factors influenced the selection of Glenn and Jordan as keynoters for the Democratic party in 1976?

What was the rhetorical situation to which Glenn and Jordan responded?

To what degree were Glenn and Jordan successful in fulfilling the objectives of a contemporary keynote address?

Why did Jordan's message appear to have more impact than Glenn's address?

Methodology

To conceptualize the many circumstances to which Glenn and Jordan's messages responded, the approach proposed by Lloyd Bitzer will be used. Bitzer suggested that because rhetoric was discourse which occurred in situations where solutions were wanted and where the exigences of the situation could be modified or changed by discourse, the critic should seek out and examine exigences for change. This approach requires that the critic recognize that 1) the humanly responsive entities in each situation are the speaker and the audience and 2) the situation as a whole brings into force opportunities and limitations within which and through which any rhetor must work to evoke change.

Within this framework, the speeches will be analyzed against a values criteria established by Redding and Steele. The keynote address belongs to the class of speaking known as epideictic and Perelman points out that the sole purpose of such messages is to recognize values. Therefore, the messages will be measured against a values criteria. Additionally, the messages will be examined in parts to determine their effectiveness. The judgment will be derived from standards set up by Arnold.
Chapter I: The Nature of the Study

Of interest to the reader should be the date when keynote addresses began, the conditions under which they surfaced, and the elements which have constituted the messages. In addition to providing this information, chapter one catalogues the manner in which keynote addresses have been perceived by the media and the public and identifies changes which the addresses have undergone since their inception.

Chapter II: Democratic Keynotes from 1960-1976

In a 1960 article, Miles identified the role keynote addresses play at political conventions. His analysis was based upon an examination of such speeches from their inception in 1896 through the electoral campaign of 1956. Miles did not concern himself with the rhetorical strategies keynoters employed. This chapter, therefore, serves a dual purpose. 1) It extends Miles' analysis through 1976, noting among other things the impact of television, and 2) it identifies the means by which keynoters sought to influence their listeners.

Chapter III: The Selection Process

Some of the most prominent politicians have competed for the honor of delivering the keynote address. With so many notables within the Democratic party and the opportunity being available only once every four years, however, some of the party's "big bosses" have been ignored. This chapter catalogues the criteria which has been utilized and examines the power which the chairman has exerted in making the final decision. Attention is devoted specifically to the manner in which the 1976 keynoters met the criteria and the circumstances surrounding their selection.
Chapter IV: Two Keynote Speakers

This chapter examines the rhetorical heritage of John Glenn and Barbara Jordan. Emphasis is placed on biographical data which helped to shape the ideas and delivery of the keynoters. Select phases of the speakers' lives are explored, including their background, childhood, college years, and their early career training. Additionally, attention is devoted to events and personalities which may have contributed to the speakers' development.

Chapter V: The Rhetorical Situation

Nineteen hundred and seventy-six was an ideal year to deliver a keynote address for the Democratic party. This chapter explains why by conceptualizing the rhetorical situation in which the keynote addresses occurred. Data about the audience and the setting are provided in an effort to locate the opportunities and limitations for rhetoric. The objective of this chapter is to present all information which will aid in locating the exigences which rhetoric must change and the constraints within which the changes must be effected.

Chapter VI: The 1976 Keynotes: Values Addressed

This chapter demonstrates that John Glenn and Barbara Jordan utilized traditional American value postulates as they tried to get their audience to adhere to the ideals and beliefs of their party. Illustrations of each value cluster are drawn from the speeches. Additionally, the roles of the addresses are pinpointed.

Chapter VII: The Rhetorical Response

The media called John Glenn's address a failure, but referred to Jordan's message as a success. This chapter examines the factors
which accounted for the difference in which the addresses were perceived. Each address is analyzed on the basis of its satisfying the requirements of a contemporary keynote address in general and its meeting the expectations of the 1976 convention in particular.

Chapter VIII: Summary and Conclusions

The final chapter provides conclusions and findings resulting from the study. The following aspects are addressed:

- The role of contemporary keynote addresses
- The qualifications of contemporary keynoters
- Factors surrounding the selection of Glenn and Jordan as keynoters for the 1976 convention
- The uniqueness of the rhetorical situation
- The manner in which the 1976 addresses conformed to other contemporary keynotes
- The effectiveness of Glenn and Jordan's messages
- Theory modification
- Possible avenues for future research
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CHAPTER II

DEMONCRATIC KEYNOTES FROM 1960-1976:
ROLES AND VALUE APPEALS

The keynote address' function has been an issue for writers since its inception. In 1944, the New York Times concluded:

The only remaining assumption is that the keynote address is not actually intended for serious consideration by the country at large, but rather addressed to the convention itself, and that its purpose here is simply to get things off to a good start by rousing the assembled delegates out of the heat and lethargy in which these gatherings so often meet.

1

In a later editorial, however, the Times concluded that there was no purpose for the speech and called for its abandonment:

Why should the time of the speaker and the delegates and the public be wasted in the absurd exaggeration and silly abuse that have become the hallmarks of the keynote address? The American people, we believe, are not so naive as to take this nonsense seriously nor will it change a single vote--except perhaps in the direction opposite from the intended.

2

The Times' sentiments were echoed by H. L. Mencken who described keynoters as individuals "plainly on furlough from some home for extinct volcanoes." Likewise, Mark Sullivan said the speech was nothing more
than a combination of "oratory, grand opera and hog calling," while the
St. Louis Post-Dispatch castigated the keynote for its classic manner of
such utterances--"full of rant and vituperation and flowery phrase and
absurd extravagance of statement." Mencken's view of the keynote,
while not positive, indicates that he saw a need for its continuation.
He described it as "something to be endured, but not taken seriously."

Other writers, however, have seen the keynote as being an essential
part of the convention. Barefield held that the "keynote speech is not
a purposeless vestige of the convention;" rather it was designed for a
particular purpose, "impressing the general public and maintaining the
enthusiasm of the delegates." The most exhaustive study of keynote
addresses is Claussen's history of Democratic keynotes. He concluded
that the purpose of the address was to "revivify ideals, instill a
belief about the importance of the gathering, inspire loyalty to the
party, and establish a mood which the remainder of the program required."
Miles' conclusions are broad enough to include the various labels which
the speech has gained and to account for its serious nature, as well as
categorize the functions in a succinct manner. Those claims, therefore,
serve as the framework for this chapter.

In 1960, Miles concluded that the purpose of the keynote address
was four-fold: 1) to praise one's party, 2) to blame the opposition
party for perceived inadequacies, 3) to stimulate the enthusiasm of the
delegates, and 4) to make a plea for unity. His analysis included
speeches from 1896 through 1956. This chapter will examine keynote
addresses since 1956 to determine if they, too, were cast from the
same mold. It is the writer's contention that while such speeches have followed the same pattern set by their predecessors, the advent of televised conventions in 1940, which reached maturity in 1960, added a new dimension to the address. A further contention is that in effecting the role of the keynote, speakers have embraced dominant American value postulates. A description of such values and examples of how they have been employed in keynotes are presented as support.

1960

Following Frank Church's delivery of the keynote address in 1960, commentators differed as to Church's performance. Articles in the New York Times and the Quarterly Journal of Speech stated that Church had failed in executing the traditional role of a keynote. While speech authors in the Quarterly Journal of Speech conceded that the speech was well structured and the argument was clear, they held that the speech "lacked impact." The New York Times attributed this lack of ineffectiveness to Church's abandoning of old appeals and concluded that he "relied too much on unsupported generalities, lacked the language, the turn phrase and the grand style which might be anticipated," and was, therefore, ineffective.

On the other hand, another editorial in the Times maintained that Church's speech had not been a "startling exception to the general rule of keynotes." Rather, the Times claimed that Church was quite successful in the traditional "give 'em hell speech" because he followed suit and called the Democratic party "god" while he referred to the Republican party as the "devil." In a similar manner, Claussen held that while
the speech was somewhat tame, it did not lack emotional proof. He argued that Church had utilized many of the customary stylistic devices including paraphrases, alliteration, and anecdotes to effect impact.

In forming a conclusion about the message, this writer examined the text of the speech and investigated the constraints of the rhetorical situation. In 1960, the Republicans had been in office two terms. Thus, Church was not given the luxury of singing praises of immediate past accomplishments of a Democratic administration as Pastore would have in 1964. On the other hand, the option of pinpointing the mistakes of the Republican party, which could be recalled quite vividly by the delegates, was available and Church used it extensively.

Among other things, Church charged the Republicans with floundering public education, neglecting urgent needs at home, failing to stop the growth of communism, and pushing big business while stifling the growth of farmers and other small enterprises. Therefore, he adhered to one of the traditional purposes of the speech. Additionally, he described Democratic administrations positively by recalling their achievements decades earlier. Church also praised the Democrats for their appropriate, but unsuccessful effort in trying to put the Republicans back on the right track. A second function of the keynote, then, was apparent in the message.

Church's keynote also involved a plea for unity within the party. While he did not explicitly state that members of the party should forget their differences and pull behind one candidate, such was implied. If we can get ourselves together, "...the Democratic party- true to its tradition- will lift this country once again on the high road of destiny."
Thus, a third function of the keynote was a part of Church's message. In his attempt to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates, Church employed some of the less desirable techniques of the elocutionary movement, relying on mechanical gestures and voice inflections. The Chicago Tribune castigated Church's delivery, saying:

Master Frank must have been tutored in the speech making art by someone who taught him all the gestures and inflections that are suppose to sway multitudes and in fact, merely advertise the speaker's insincerity.

Such was done because he wanted to move the listeners. An effort, therefore, was made to accomplish the final purpose of a keynote address. This is demonstrated further by Church's intense studying of past keynotes which provided him with a model to follow.

John Pastore's address in 1964 has been labeled "fiery," indicating that Pastore accomplished one of the traditional purposes of the keynote. The five thousand delegates roared throughout the presentation and on one occasion, gave the speaker a standing ovation. That response came during his pledge that the control of nuclear weapons would remain with the President, a direct slight against Barry Goldwater, the Republican nominee. Pastore charged also that the Republicans were extremists and had been inconsistent. These are only two of the examples which illustrate Pastore's use of the blame element. Throughout the presentation, he continuously painted the evils which lurked if a Republican administration were elected. Unlike Church, Pastore could turn also to the past administrations to laud the Democrats. Presidents Kennedy and
Johnson were mentioned frequently as he spoke of the accomplishments which had transpired during their years in office. Three of the traditional elements, then, were conspicuous in Pastore's address.

Pastore followed the fourth step also and made a plea for unity during the speech. The task was relatively simple because the candidate to whom the nomination would go had been determined prior to the convention. Johnson was the incumbent and no serious challenges had been raised. The only threat to the harmonious situation was a fight over credentials. Two delegations had arrived from Mississippi and both demanded to be seated. The threat of the situation was removed when the chairman of the committee announced that the decision had been delayed until the next day.

Pastore's address, however, referred to the situation. His plea was a strong one. He told the delegates that the true character of America could be exhibited only through the Democratic party and then challenged them to pledge themselves to becoming unified, stating, "... our times are too troubled to turn class against class, to turn creed against creed, to turn color against color, and to turn rich against poor."

A superficial glance at Pastore's message may lead one to believe that in one instance he actually praised the Republicans. He did acknowledge their cooperation in the passage of the Civil Rights Bill. Nevertheless, when the words are placed in proper context, Pastore actually added another laurel to the Democrats' wreath. He followed up the acknowledgment by saying, "We (Democrats) give credit where credit
is due." Again, a keynoter had utilized the traditional elements in his keynote address.

1968

Daniel K. Inouye had nothing but praise for the Johnson administration when he addressed the delegates in 1968. He pointed out that:

Since 1963, President Johnson has proposed and Congress has enacted more than 40 major new laws to foster education. Since 1963, our government has tripled its investment in education. The last 11 years have seen the passage of the five Civil Rights laws passed during the entire history of the United States and ... Lyndon Baines Johnson is the author.

Inouye was somewhat untraditional when he utilized the blame element for he directed it not only toward the opposition party, but also toward members of his own party who had picketed top Democratic leaders in public. The protests had been in response to United States involvement in the Vietnam war. Republicans and Democrats alike were chided for their role in demonstrations which later resulted in violence, "... poverty, discrimination, and deprivation as evil as they are, do not justify anarchy or violence, looting or burning... Law and order must be maintained."

Pleading for the unity within the party was a major task for Inouye. Many of the delegates believed that the Johnson administration should be denounced. They blamed President Johnson for failing to pull American troops out of Vietnam. Blacks and poor whites maintained they suffered
from the war because the rich had managed to escape the draft. However, Inouye pleaded with them to "put aside the hatred on the one hand and the timidity on the other." The request was just one of the many which he uttered during the message.

Inouye acknowledged his awareness of the spellbinder role of a keynoter, but asked to be excused from that mission. The speech indicated that Inouye, like his predecessors, had studied previous keynote addresses and patterned his remarks accordingly. Perhaps, he did not try to move the audience, but such is doubtful. What orator has not sought to gain a favorable response from his audience. Nevertheless, the other elements were salient in Inouye's speech and the message itself was true to form.

1972

It seems clear that Reubin Askew's purpose was to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates. Vietnam was still an issue, but the administrators had changed hands. The Republicans were in office and Askew's words about the war moved the audience so that they began to chant, "Stop the war." Askew utilized the strategy of blame when he declared:

We're told that there's no money available to pay for those higher security benefits, but we continue to spend 500 million a month on a war that should have ended long ago.

Additionally, Askew chided the Republicans for taxing the "working man's lunch of salami and cheese," but failing to tax the "business lunch of steak and martinis." Throughout his address, Askew cited the evils of the Republican administration.
The praise element was a part of the message also. Askew listed great leaders who had made exceptional contributions to the building of America. Somehow, only two Republicans made the list. But the bulk of Askew's time was spent pleading for unity within the party. The effectiveness of the Democratic party had been reduced substantially in 1968 by internal conflict and the dissension was still evident in 1972. Controversy centered on gay rights, abortion, credential challenges, and the candidacy of George McGovern. The most poignant plea came when Askew said:

> Let us remember that this nation was founded on diversity; that our differences can be a source of strength as well as weakness... if we can pool our strength and harness our energy... if we can work together, and, above all, if we can stay together, then nothing can stop us.

The words reminded the delegates that winning the election was their first priority. Such could be accomplished only if they were unified. Askew's message was an additional bit of evidence that the traditional keynote model was still being used.

1976

Unity and patriotism were the theme when the 1976 convention opened. Robert Strauss, the party chairman, controlled the meetings. To stress the image of diversification which the Democrats wished to portray, Strauss selected a black woman and a popular astronaut as speakers. Barbara Jordan and John Glenn were received warmly by the audience, but Glenn's welcome was short-lived. The loudest applause obtained came when he was introduced.
Glenn's message was a traditional address. His plea for unity was a direct one, "... and I say to you, tonight is the time to erase divisiveness and despair." While the attack on the opposition party was indirect, a blame element was included in the speech. Glenn told the delegates that there were doubters in the early days who said freedom would lead to anarchy and then reminded them that "... there were also our Democratic forebearers ... willing to risk greatly for a great cause."

Glenn lauded the Democrats, crediting them with shaping America. He refuted a statement by the Republicans which had charged that the Democrats had too many programs, making the allegation seem like a virtue. Quoting Franklin Roosevelt, Glenn said, "Better the occasional faults of a government living in the spirit of charity, than the consistent omissions of a government frozen in the ice of its own indifferences."

While Jordan began her message by saying that she was not going to praise the accomplishments of her party nor attack the opposition, she did so anyway. She lauded the Democrats for their innovations, heterogeneity, and belief in equality. Even when acknowledging that the Democrats had done some things wrong, Jordan justified their errors by saying, "... our mistakes were mistakes of the heart." She called attention to the number of bills which Gerald Ford had vetoed when she told the delegates, "...this we must do as individuals and if we do it as individuals, there is no President of the United States who can veto that decision." Blame, again, was placed on the Republicans.
The majority of Jordan's message focused on unity, which she called building a "national community." She challenged the delegates to lead the way in establishing the community, noting that they had always been leaders and it was natural for them to continue in that role. Insisting that every individual must play a role, Jordan said, "We must address and master the future together."

Audience response was evident as Jordan received round after round of applause. She was cheered on and on during the presentation. She had told them that the Democratic party was the best hope for the nation and they had relished in that glory. Once again, the traditional model was used. The contention that addresses since 1956 have followed the traditional pattern holds.

Impact of Television

However, keynote addresses assumed another role during this period. The advent of television affected the keynote in many ways. One of the constraints which the medium brought about was a mixed audience. No longer could keynoters address their remarks toward delegates only; the television audience could not be ignored. The trend began as early as 1924 when radio was first used, but it was not until 1958 that the significance of addressing the audience beyond the convention was emphasized. Kenneth D. Fry, radio director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee, made sure that speakers were aware of the new audience. He instructed the keynoters to address themselves not only to the delegates, but also to the television audience:
... naturally, we have some serious business at Convention Hall, and our business is the delegates. But we must not forget that millions of curious eyes are on us at all times, as well as more millions of ears tuned to the broadcasts. Our attention to these points means votes.

55

Through the years, several changes were made by publicity directors as they tried to maximize the potential of television. Keynoters received a number of instructions, but perhaps the most noticeable change was the tempering of partisan remarks beginning with the 1960 convention. In 1956, Bogardus polled viewers of the convention and found that they had reacted negatively to "repetition after repetition of denunciations of the opposing political party." In 1952, Paul Dever had spent a major part of his address criticizing three actions of the Republican convention and then proceeded to attack the platform and their Presidential nominee. The New York Times labeled his address as:

... old fashioned political speech as simple as a morality play in which the forces of good meet the forces of darkness, and thwart their plot to form atomic monopolies and maltreat widows and orphans.

58

Bogardus' study, however, had no impact on the 1956 keynote address which followed it. Frank Clement's chief subjects were what the Republicans had failed to do and what mistakes they had made. Again, the press castigated the keynoter. Typical of the comments was a remark by Newsweek which categorized Clement's message as "dripping with old-fashioned venom."
Bogardus' study also showed that viewers were displeased with "evangelical methods" which speakers were using. Clement ignored that, too. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said the speaker's style was "in the rounded period of the classic orator, with overt tones of the Southern camp meeting and the country jury lawyer." The Chicago Tribune painted Clement as a "spellbinder whose style of oratory went out of fashion 40 years ago" and the New York Times summed up what they believed to be the sentiment of the press, calling Clement's address, "rip-roaring political oratory, a hybrid of elocution and calisthenics," which was unsuited for television.

Aware of such criticism, Church made an effort not to make the same mistakes. He knew how important it was to project the right image on television. Although partisan remarks were still a part of the address, Church's message was "tame" in comparison to those of Dever and Clement. Ironically, the press criticized Church's address, too, but this time because some of the elements which they had insisted that keynoters rid themselves of were missing from the address. The New York Times held that Church "was more restrained in his denunciation of the Republican party and its leaders," but claimed he was ineffective because he had "junked the old appeals and the turned phrases which might be anticipated."

Church also tried to modify his delivery to comply with what the media thought was appropriate for television. But they attacked that, too. The New York Times said the address was not fervid enough because the "grand style" was missing and the St. Louis Post-Dispatch said that
by refraining from evangelicizing, Church had "failed to move the dele-
gates out of their seats."

What the press seemed to be asking for was an address which would
fulfill the functions of a keynote and yet be delivered in such a manner
that while the audience was moved by it, the style would be conducive to
television as well. Pastore's address in 1964 answered the request.
While the element of blame was present, it was not extreme. Addition­
ally, his delivery is said to have exhibited the desirable qualities of
variety, conversationality, and vocal characteristics which were neither
agitated nor dead.

Addresses since Pastore's have refrained from excessive vituper­
ation as well. Of the four addresses which followed, however, only
Barbara Jordan's has been acclaimed in the same manner as Pastore's.
Inouye and Askew's delivery received neither favorable nor adverse
comments from the media, but John Glenn's was chided as ineffectual.
Whereas critics had described Clement's style as evangelical because of
the high pitch and wide rapid changes, Glenn's was labeled as a
monotone because he used a low pitch and narrow pitch changes.

Another noticeable change has been the time constraint. Earlier
keynotes ran as long as two hours, but today's keynotes run no more than
thirty minutes. The extra minutes had to be cut so that the convention
itself would be kept within the prime viewing time.

In all, television has had three major effects on keynote speeches.
It has 1) tempered keynoters denunciations of the opposition party,
2) forced keynoters to refrain from evangelicizing, and 3) placed a time
constraint on the length of the address.
Strategy

A second concern here is the rhetorical strategy which keynoters used. Rieke and others assert that one of the most powerful means of gaining adherence is by attaching values to arguments. Responsiveness is inherent in a value system. That is, the degree of impact which a message has upon an audience is determined primarily by the speaker's ability to actuate the audience's values. The author posits that keynoters have recognized this strategy all along and embraced it.

Equally interesting is the tactic which keynoters have adopted in utilizing the value approach. Makay and Brown argue that names carry expectancies and that approach-avoidance suggestions are inherent in the names selected. The writer's claim, therefore, is that keynoters have employed the American value system as a basis for their arguments and in doing so, have equated the Democratic party with the preservation of that system while portraying the Republicans as destroyers; thus, they have created an approach expectancy in terms selected to describe the Democratic party, while positing an avoidance expectancy in terms selected to describe the Republicans. The Democratic party was made synonymous with "god" terms and the Republican party became a synonym for "devil" terms."

Dominant American values which keynoters have utilized in facilitating this strategy are presented. The selection of the values was based on the sixteen clusters which Redding and Steele identified as being pervasive in the American culture. From dissertation research which they conducted, Redding and Steele developed fourteen value
clusters. In later research, they added two others. This composite of value clusters has been used to assess the inclusion of values in keynote addresses.

**Applicability of Redding and Steele's Model**

A feeling pervasive in this society is that American values are changing continuously. Redding and Steele demonstrated their awareness of this uneasiness when they expressed reservations about their model being applied to periods other than the 1940's. However, recent studies indicate that Americans have some "bedrock" values which have remained constant. McEdwards examined value statements in popular writings from 1920-1970 and concluded that "We are still coming out the same door where in we went." Acceptance of that conclusion is evident in other writings of the day. For example, Heath's study on the poverty of values and McGuckin's value analysis of Nixon's campaign fund speech are just two of the many articles which have based their findings on the criteria established by Redding and Steele.

The values clusters identified by Redding and Steele include:

- Puritan and Pioneer Morality
- Value of the Individual
- Achievement and Success
- Change and Progress
- Ethical Equality
- Equality of Opportunity
- Effort and Optimism
- Efficiency
- Practicality
- Pragmatism
- Rejection of Authority
- Science and Secular Rationality
- Sociality
- Material Comfort
- Quantification
- External Conformity
- Generosity
- Considerateness
- Patriotism

A description of each cluster utilized by keynoters and examples from the addresses themselves are presented as further evidence that the model can still be applied. An examination of the addresses revealed that of the sixteen clusters, fourteen were
present in keynote speeches since 1956.

The writer is aware that the categories are not mutually exclusive. Consequently, the reader may question whether one statement should have appeared in another category. This ambiguity is minimal as most statements are easily identifiable. But where the problem existed, the statement was assigned to the category based upon values which had been reflected in statements prior to and after the statement in question.

Puritan and Pioneer Morality

Morality has been a value in the American culture since the beginning of this country. The ethical yardstick has often been used to determine which behaviors are acceptable. Virtues such as honesty, simplicity, cooperation, self-discipline, courage, orderliness, personal responsibility, and humility are still cherished by Americans. Pastore was most forceful in emphasizing the Democratic commitment to the lofty principles espoused by our ancestors. He reminded the delegates that while the Republican party had become a group of extremists, "... reason and respect and responsibility still survive." Jordan, likewise, voiced the Democratic pledge to be "responsible, cooperative, and accountable" to the American people. Inouye spoke of the party's effort to remove dissension and disrespect from the American scene. Honesty was tapped also by the keynoters. Church charged that the Republican party was selling the nation a "pitchman prosperity," while Askew assured the delegates that the Democratic party would always speak directly and would never lie to the people.
Value of the Individual

Keynoters also emphasized the value of the individual. Such a value posits the notion that every human being is important. The tactic has been to reinforce the delegates' belief that the Democratic party was doing everything it could to insure that the happiness and welfare of all individuals was being provided for, while the Republican party was resisting such reforms. Church went through a long list of reforms which had been enacted by Democratic administrations to upgrade the standards of living, while he charged that the Republicans were delaying such efforts:

Nearly everybody now accepts the liberal reforms hammered out by the Democratic party against determined opposition ... the Social Security Act, to give an assured retirement to our senior citizens; the minimum wage and hours law by which menial wages have been upgraded.

Askew restated the pledge of the Democratic party, noting that, "... no one person or group possesses the absolute truth; every person and every group have something valuable to offer." On the other hand, he charged that the Republican party believed that only certain groups and individuals were worthy of benefits and blamed the Republicans for failing to insure that every American had decent health and medical care. Jordan underscored "the feeling that the individual no longer counts" as a major force in America and assured the delegates that the Democratic party would work to correct that. Pastore pinpointed the Democratic commitment to the individual by citing numerous efforts to make provisions for every American.
Achievement and Success

The phrases, "self-made man," from "rags to riches," and "striver" are god terms in the American culture. Such concepts indicate that individuals have stepped over obstacles in order to acquire material wealth and make gains or contributions to society. Jordan called attention to her achievement in her opening remarks, "There is something different about tonight. There is something special about tonight... I, Barbara Jordan, am a keynote speaker (she was the first black and the first woman to have the honor). Church spotlighted the accomplishments of past Democratic administrations, "... we have advanced the cause of public health, ... we have broken a stalemate in the fight for full equality under law." He emphasized the size of the achievements, saying the Democrats had accomplished such "despite the threat of veto." Likewise, Inouye listed Democratic success stories under the leadership of Lyndon Johnson.

Change and Progress

Americans believe that change means progress. Nothing new can be accomplished with old methods unless something is done to improve them; even the best can be made better. Americans are forever plagued by the idea that "the best is yet to come," provided one changes with the times. This value has been a popular one with Democratic keynoters. They have portrayed their party as the instrument of change, while casting the Republicans into a stationary mold. Jordan reminded the 1976 convention that Democrats were "willing to suffer the discomfort of change in order to achieve a better future." Church held that it was
the Democratic party which deserved credit for effecting changes rather
than the Republicans, saying, "We are Democrats not because our party
has always done everything right, but because it has been the principal
party of progress."

The embracing of this value is evident in other keynote speeches, too. Pastore talked about the fruits which had been harvested because
the Democratic party was an advocate of change, "Never before in the
history of this great Republic have we known such prosperity."

Inouye identified the changes which had been brought about in the areas
of treaties and education, while Askew spoke of the days when the
Democratic administration would be able to change the policies of the
nation so that the dreams of Americans could be realized.

Equality

The American idea of equality is becoming more realistic as time
passes. Civil rights legislation has been passed to insure that every
American has equality of opportunity. Ethically, all men are created
equal. Democrats pride themselves for being the agents who have facili-
tated the realization of equality. Keynoters have shown that the
Democratic party is the agent of change. Church cited the many victor-
ies which Democrats had achieved in effecting civil rights legislation
as evidence that the party believed in equality. Daniel Inouye, a
Japanese American, recalled the plight of the Negro and the gains which
the party had made possible as an indicator that Democrats were fighting
to rid this nation of discriminatory practices. Barbara Jordan agreed;
she stated the feelings of the Democratic party were expressed in
Abraham Lincoln's statement, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not 
be a master." Askew pointed to the results of the Democratic en- 
dorsement of equality by saying, "... my children will be able to 
measure another in the light of truth."

Effort and Optimism

Americans believe strongly that anything can be done. No problem 
is too complicated, "no obstacle too big for determined, optimistic 
effort." Jordan captured the essence of this value when she said, "I 
have confidence that we can form this kind of community." Pastore 
reminded the delegates that "Our party has a clear challenge," 
but insisted that "... we are ready to accept it. Together we shall 
preserve the hard-won progress of a great people." That Democrats 
are optimistic was evidenced further in Glenn's message when he said, 
"... this experiment in freedom continues every day and it is a revo- 
lution we will continue to win." Pastore, perhaps, captured the 
essence of this value when he spotlighted John Kennedy's achievements as 
President.

Efficiency, Practicality, Pragmatism

Getting things done in an efficient manner and taking care of 
problems before they get out of hand are virtues in the American culture. 
Additionally, Americans believe in practical application in contrast to 
theorizing. These qualities are suggested by the terms, efficiency, 
practicality, and pragmatism. The efficiency component was expressed by 
Glenn when he told the delegates, "... we must correct any excesses and 
inefficiencies, and on a high-priority basis ..." Church reminded
the delegates of what had happened because the Republicans did not hold this value:

Indeed our economic vigor has been snapped to the point that urgent needs here at home have been left untreated like festering sores. Private slums spread in the rotting cores of our big cities, yet our urban renewal and public housing programs are ... too late.

Rejection of Authority

Anyone or anything which tampers with Americans' freedom is viewed negatively in this culture. Americans believe that they have the ability to make their own decisions without any outside interference and should be permitted to do so. On the other hand, the idea that one person's freedom ends where another person's begins has made it necessary to put constraints on everyone. Still, a minimal amount of control has been exercised because Americans desire to "do their own thing." Jordan demonstrated the Democratic willingness to maintain this value when she said the party would "heed the voice of the people and recognize their common sense."

Glenn's speech echoed the value further when he said American feelings of independence had been shaken, while "bureaucratic red tape" had increased as a result of the Republican administration. Glenn concluded that the Republican administration had gradually taken away the freedom of the individual, leaving him "feeling tiny and insignificant without control."

Science and Secular Rationality

Americans believe in a rational approach to life. Such a view is derived from their emphasis on practical knowledge, workable solutions,
and applied science. These tools permit them to manipulate their ex-
ternal environment in a manner which improves their condition. Pastore
embraced the value by listing "the sanity of America" as the security
of the world. Likewise, Church challenged his audience to "view the
world realistically" and rely on the "prevailing order" which has
enhanced this nation. Glenn told the delegates that their "knowledge of
the universe was increasing," but it was necessary to use it in a
sound way.

Sociality

Another value which is present in keynote addresses is sociality.
The importance of getting along with others is stressed because personalities
can facilitate or impede the completion of a task. Americans recognize
the power of the individual who is able to get along with others regard-
less of differences. This value has been used primarily by keynoters in
their pleas for unity. They emphasize that creating a united front is
essential to victory. Askew told the delegates that if they could put
aside their differences and band together, nothing could stop them.

Jordan admitted that working together was a difficult task, but
suggested a means by which the sociality could be facilitated. A spirit
of harmony can survive if "each of us remembers, when bitterness and
self-interest seem to prevail, that we share a common destiny." The
importance of getting along with each other was emphasized by Inouye
when he told the delegates that they must put aside their differences
for the sake of the party and to insure that they would "live ... as
full citizens and ... as brothers."
Quantification

Americans think in terms of bigness--bigger houses, faster cars, more land, etc. The Democrats fondness for this value is evident in Church's indictment of Republican leadership in 1960:

What has happened to American strength? Our army has shrunk from twenty to fourteen divisions. Our navy has lost scores of fighting ships. We concede to the Russians superior numbers in the intercontinental ballistic missile we ourselves describe as the ultimate weapon.
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Generosity and Considerateness

Americans have usually been willing to help those in need, especially in other countries. This quality heightens their ego because their aid makes them feel superior. The underdog, therefore, has always received attention. Glenn praised the Democrats for embracing this value. He reminded the audience that his party had always been concerned about those who were less fortunate:

... we can be thankful there were ... our Democratic forebears ... setting out to shape a future ... with concern for the common man and concern that those less able to compete not just be consigned to the slag heap of history.
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Pastore expresses his pride in the Democrats because of their compassion. He concluded that this virtue was what had made America a great country. Quoting Lyndon Johnson, he asked the delegates, "If a free society cannot help the many that are poor, how can it save the few that are rich?"

128 Frank Church also called the audience's attention to the Democratic endorsement of this value:
Long have we been known as a generous people. We have given freely of our treasure in an attempt to uplift standards in far-flung centers of the world. Everywhere our hand has been extended in friendship.

Patriotism

The final value which has been present in keynote addresses is patriotism; loyalty to one's country, its ideas, etc. is one of the most sacred values in the American culture. Citizens feel a responsibility to show reverence for the flag, the constitution, and other symbols of the United States. Nevertheless, the same type of devotion serves as justification for Americans to challenge or criticize their nation when they feel the principles need improvement. But the idea that their country is the greatest still remains. Askew expressed this value when he told the delegates, "... despite all its problems and deficiencies, ours is a good land, a proud land."

In times of turmoil, Inouye insisted that the Democrats had remained loyal to this country. Using himself as an example, he stated, "I have not burned my birth certificate and I will not renounce my citizenship." Jordan held that "We cannot improve on the government handed down to us by the founders of the Republic," while Glenn's entire speech centered on the theme of patriotism.

Summary

This chapter suggests that since 1956, keynote addresses have basically followed the same pattern as those which came before. They have 1) praised the Democratic party, 2) castigated the Republican party, 3) made a plea for unity, and 4) heightened the enthusiasm of the
delegates. Additionally, the findings suggest that the advent of television made it necessary for keynoters to reach beyond the convention and make an appeal to the television audience. Television affected the addresses in three ways. It 1) tempered keynoters' denunciations of the opposition party, 2) forced keynoters to refrain from evangelizing and 3) placed a time constraint on the length of the address.

An effort has been made also to discern the major rhetorical strategy keynote speakers prefer. This study indicates they have used the American value system as the basis for their content; Democrats preserve this system while Republicans destroy it.
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CHAPTER III
THE SELECTION PROCESS

Since 1896, writers have contended that the selection of the Democratic keynoter has been influenced greatly by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. While "he takes the initiative to feel out party personalities on their preferences," the final decision is his. In form, the term of office for the chairman of the committee is four years, but in practice, the time span has varied. Chairmen have usually served for shorter periods of time, but four chairpersons have served eight years or more.

While the committee as a whole elects the chairman, the act is merely perfunctory. The Presidential candidate usually exercises authority in selecting the chairman and the committee duly votes his choice into office. Once the chairman is elected, he has some key responsibilities. Obviously, he must remain on good terms with all party elements and raise enough money to keep the headquarters in operation. But the chairman's position carries considerable influence in other important functions. Just as the Presidential candidate exercises freedom in choosing the chairman, the chairman is at liberty in determining party matters, including choosing the keynote speaker for the convention. The importance of this decision becomes apparent when
one considers the power of a keynote speaker.

Until 1968, the keynoter served as temporary chairman of the convention. Thus, he had the opportunity to influence action in a direct manner; maintaining order, recognizing individuals during debate, deciding who to let speak, and ruling on points of order were just a few of the perogatives which combined to make the temporary chairman a powerful figure. The exposure which the keynoter receives while delivering his address is perhaps the greatest honor which the position provides today. Since 1948, the addresses have been carried on television by the major networks simultaneously.

Goodman refers to speeches as the "supreme means for a person to bring himself to the attention of the party and the public and to build himself up for whatever objectives he has in mind." Since nominating conventions are held only once every four years and since they bring the most influential party leaders together, and since the keynote address is "the" speech at a nominating convention, Goodman's claim may be modified to read: The keynote speech is the supreme means for a politician to bring himself to the attention of his party.

Although the chairman has the freedom to select the keynote speaker, the choice is not a haphazard one. Because the selection symbolizes various things about the party, careful consideration must be given to finding the "right" keynoter. In a recent article, the New York Times asserted that the choice of a convention speaker was often a way for repaying a debt or rewarding friends, but such can happen only if the recipient has met other qualifications. Three factors weigh heavily
in the selection process: 1) oratorical ability, 2) political prestige, and 3) geographical location.

Claussen noted that in earlier days, the individual's skill as a parliamentarian was the dominant factor in his selection because he functioned as the temporary chairman. That duty was eliminated in 1968 and so was the need for the individual to be skilled in parliamentary law. The major consideration now seems to be the individual's oratorical skills, particularly his ability to project well over television. The importance of speaking ability is evident in the responses by many writers on what qualities a keynoter should possess. Goodman insisted that the person selected should be an "able public speaker." Hinderacker believed that the individual should be a "lively public speaker." His sentiments were echoed by Ranney and Willmore who held that the keynoter should "have a reputation as a spellbinder." Of the same nature are Binkley and Moos' beliefs that the person selected must have "oratorical talents suited to whipping up the enthusiasm of the audience." Likewise, Lowry said the keynoter must have the "ability to make melodic noises" and Kenworthy went so far as to say that he should be "silver-tongued."

The observations outlined by the writers are in line with the requirements outlined by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca for speakers engaged in epideictic oratory:

... in the epideictic, more than in any other kind of oratory, the speaker must ... be skillful in the presentation of his subject ... if he is not to appear ridiculous.

A second qualification listed by Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca is that
the speaker must have a "high reputation." This means that the speaker must have qualifications for speaking on his subject. Thompson identified such an individual as one of "national experience and reputation who can speak authoritatively for the party." Barefield called this quality "political prowess" and divided it into two types: 1) men who have already achieved considerable prestige and power and 2) men who are being groomed by the party for future leadership.

In his dissertation, Claussen labeled keynoters in the latter category as "new faces." In defining them, however, he chose to say they were individuals who had never held national elected offices. During the period from 1944 to 1954, three of the four speakers were newcomers. However, during the period from 1960-1976, Reubin Askew was the only state official selected to deliver the keynote. The other speakers were United States Senators or Congressmen. While they had already achieved prestige, the grooming aspect may be applied to them, too. A case in point are the two 1976 keynoters, John Glenn and Barbara Jordan. Glenn was being considered for the Vice-Presidential nomination while a possible cabinet appointment was in line for Jordan.

Nevertheless, for the most part, being a member of Congress has been a pre-requisite for political prestige in the period covered by this examination (1960-1976). During that time, four senators addressed the assembly and one member of Congress, while Reubin Askew, governor of Florida, was the only non-Congress member to have the honor. The following table shows the breakdown:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>KEYNOTER</th>
<th>POSITION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Frank Church</td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>John Pastore</td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Daniel Inouye</td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Reubin Askew</td>
<td>Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>John Glenn</td>
<td>Senator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Barbara Jordan</td>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Geographical location is another factor which has influenced the chairman's decision. Church was selected because of his western residence. The Democratic party needed more strength in that area of the country. The mid-west was the section which the Democrats appealed to in 1976; therefore, John Glenn was selected as one of the keynoters. Geography has played a role in other ways, too. Democratic chairmen have tried to include individuals from various sections of the country on the program. Consequently, during this period, no keynoter, vice- Presidential or Presidential candidate was from the same state. Table II demonstrates this:
TABLE 2
KEYNOTERS, PRESIDENTIAL AND VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>KEYNOTER &amp; STATE</th>
<th>PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE &amp; STATE</th>
<th>VICE-PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE &amp; STATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Frank Church</td>
<td>John F. Kennedy Massachusetts</td>
<td>Lyndon B. Johnson Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>John Pastore</td>
<td>Lyndon B. Johnson Texas</td>
<td>Hubert H. Humphrey Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Daniel Inouye</td>
<td>Hubert H. Humphrey Minnesota</td>
<td>Edmund Muskie Maine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Reubin Askew</td>
<td>George McGovern South Dakota</td>
<td>Thomas F. Eagleton+ Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>John Glenn</td>
<td>James Carter Georgia</td>
<td>Walter F. Mondale Minnesota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Jordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Nominated by convention but resigned from ticket

* Named by Democratic National Committee

The selection of the 1976 keynoters was not an exception to the established practice. Robert Strauss, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, "handpicked" John Glenn and Barbara Jordan. Azie Taylor Morton, deputy campaign manager for the convention, noted the extent of Strauss' power in the selection process:
... as to the individuals who would participate on the program, members of the committee were not always aware of whom they would be. The chairman had absolute power in the selection of people and individual items on the program such as the invocation ... and the keynote address ... while he may have felt people out to see how they would respond, he did not get the approval, as such, from the full committee.
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Vince Clephas, director of Communications for the Democratic National Committee, confirmed that "the decision was really Bob's." Clephas' position dictated his inclusion in all activities of the party. He was in on every decision. Clephas was Strauss' link with Glenn and Jordan. He recounted the events which had led up to their selection. Jordan was the first choice. They had chosen her two years before the convention. Clephas cited several reasons why she was selected, but listed her ability to command attention as the factor which had put her into consideration for the position:

In our telethon in 1974, as usual we had great figures involved on the program which originated from Los Angeles. Jordan was one of the speakers. All of the VIP's were back stage talking as usual, rather than listening to the broadcast which was in progress. But then Barbara came on the monitor and everybody stopped talking. That told us she'd be effective at the convention.
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But Clephas admitted that the clincher came later that summer when Jordan drew national attention as a member of the judiciary hearings on Watergate. When she began her indictment of Richard Nixon, she had said, with the eloquence of Burke:
When the Constitution of the United States was completed ... I was not included in that, "We the people." I felt for many years that somehow George Washington and Alexander Hamilton had left me out by mistake.

Her final words, however, were the ones which individuals remembered and which the media quoted continuously:

My faith in the Constitution is whole, it is complete, it is total. I am not going to sit here and be an idle spectator to the diminution, the subversion, the destruction of the Constitution.

Jordan's oratorical skill was not the only factor which influenced her selection. Other reasons were she was black and female. Clephas explained why those two features were important considerations for the selection of the 1976 keynoters, "We had a broad constituency and we were trying to reach out as far as we could." The fact that she was a southerner did not hurt her chances either. "Barbara had so many things going for her," Clephas said.

The final factor which contributed to Jordan's selection was her potential for appealing to independent voters. Clephas noted that:

When people think of Barbara Jordan, they don't immediately think of the Democratic party. The process of association was in her favor. Try it and see what happens. Ask people to put some words with the name, Barbara Jordan. If you keep going long enough, Democrat will eventually show up, but I'm willing to bet it will not be at the top of the list.

Clephas' suggestion was an interesting one so the writer followed up on it. Ten individuals were polled and asked to respond
to the name Barbara Jordan with the first five words which came to their minds. The respondents were graduate students at the Ohio State University. Seven of them were enrolled in doctoral programs. The breakdown by departments included three from Communication (Rhetoric and Public Address), two from Political Science, one from Education, and one from Health and Physical Education. Master respondents included one student from Speech and Hearing, one from Fine Arts, and one from Chemical Engineering.

The survey was not intended to be a scientific one. The writer merely wanted to get a feel for the viability of Clephas' claim. The responses bore him out. Out of the fifty words listed by the respondents, "Democrat" showed up only twice and in both instances, it was near the bottom of the respondents' lists (fourth position). Table III categorizes the results:

TABLE 3
RESPONSES TO THE NAME, BARBARA JORDAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Congress</th>
<th>Innovative</th>
<th>Politician</th>
<th>Politics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>Keynote speaker</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great speaker</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual</td>
<td>Attorney General</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Congresswoman</td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Dynamic</td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>Hair style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>Democrat</td>
<td>Famous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educated</td>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>Keynote speaker</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Politics</td>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>Woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Lady</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Outspoken</td>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While Clephas did not identify any other factors, Table III indicates that another of the three traditional qualities was in Jordan's favor. In seven of the ten first place positions, respondents listed some form of the word politics or Congress, indicating that Jordan had built a reputation for herself as a legislator. This is remarkable because few people can remember who the representative from their district is, needless to mention representatives from other districts.

Jordan, then, possessed the three attributes— oratorical skill, political prestige, and geographical location—which are commonly found in keynoters. Additionally, she was chosen because the party wanted to appeal to a broader constituency. In past conventions, chairmen had sought to accomplish this goal by selecting keynoters from areas where the party was weak. Strauss followed up on the pattern. John Glenn was selected primarily because, "... we figured we stood to gain most in the mid-west," Clephas said.

The midwest had traditionally voted Republican. Ohio, in particular, had been identified as a critical state for the Democrats. The influence of Ohio was noted further by a Columbus Dispatch public affairs reporter. According to him, "Ohio did everything for the Democrats. If they hadn't carried Ohio, they wouldn't have won."

Because Glenn was a past astronaut, his potential for appealing to independent voters was even greater than Jordan's. "To most people, he's a space hero. Few of them know him as a senator from Ohio," observed Clephas. To the reader, Clephas' statement may infer that Glenn's reputation as a legislator was not considered. That was not the case.
In terms of being qualified to speak for Democrats, members of Congress would be most capable of determining such and they knew John Glenn. On the other hand, independent voters did not associate Glenn with a particular party. That made him more attractive than ever.

Even as a Democratic senator from Ohio, Glenn had maintained his independence. His non-partisanship has been noted by writers. Because of his "sterile, middle of the road stance," Glenn was called "the man without a party" by one lobbyist. Therefore, he had the potential to appeal to "die-hearts" who abhorred America's two-party political system.

Summary

This chapter has examined the general practice of selecting a keynoter. Evidence indicates that the chairman has had the final word in the selection process. A standard model for selecting the keynoters, however, has been employed. They have been chosen on the basis of their: 1) oratorical skills, 2) political prestige, and 3) geographical origin. This chapter specifically investigated the factors surrounding the selection of Barbara Jordan and John Glenn. The findings suggest that Jordan's speaking ability was the primary reason for her selection, while Glenn was chosen because he was from the midwest.

In addition to the traditional reasons for their selection, Jordan and Glenn were chosen because they had the potential for appealing to independent voters. Too, because Jordan was black and female, she was chosen as a means of unifying factions within the party as well as appealing to a broader constituency.
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CHAPTER IV

TWO KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

That chairmen of the Democratic National Committee applied standard criteria when selecting keynote speakers has been established. Additionally, the writer demonstrated that Barbara Jordan and John Glenn, keynoters for the 1976 convention, possessed the characteristics being sought. But they held the qualities in varying degrees. Their training and environment had made each distinct.

Barbara Jordan: Orator

The total impact of any message is affected by the intrinsic skills of the speaker. Responses to Jordan's message indicate that whatever the skills are, she has mastered them. Jordan has been cited continuously for her ability to move audiences. Vince Clephas, former director of communications for the Democratic National Committee, said that Jordan is so dynamic that "she could read the telephone book and people would still listen."  Bill Broyles, editor of the Texas Monthly, asserted that Jordan's voice, "... lifts her beyond region; it masks any fuzzy thinking or lowly ambition, and it scares hell out of people." Describing her reaction to Jordan's voice, one young woman said, "I turned on my television set and thought I was listening to God."
What is it about Jordan's voice that stimulates such responses? Individuals have tried to identify the qualities. Some have said that its "resemblance to a Shakespearean actor" is the factor responsible, while others have held that its "imitativeness of the Queen's English" is the magical ingredient. Nevertheless, all responses seem to tap that old quality which Sheridan called elocution, "the just and graceful management of the voice, countenance, and gesture in speaking."

Sheridan noted the Methodists effectiveness because of their dynamic delivery:

Sure I am that the advantages which the Methodist teachers have obtained over the regular clergy, in seducing so many of their flock from them, have been wholly owing to this. For were they to read their nonsense from notes, in the cold, artificial manner, that so many of the clergy deliver rational discourses, it is to be presumed, that there are few of mankind, such idiots as to become their followers; or who would not prefer sense to nonsense, if they were clothed in the same garb.

But elocution is not a quality with which Jordan was born. It was bred into her and the individual behind the nurturing was the Reverend Benjamin M. Jordan, her father. Rev. Jordan viewed correct speech as a mark of good breeding and class. He "prided himself on speaking correctly, in full rounded, unaccented tones and insisted his daughters speak correctly." Jordan recalls him as a strict disciplinarian who reprimanded her anytime she deviated from the high standards which he had set. To please him, she not only tried to meet his standards, but often, she tried to exceed them; "I always wanted to be something unusual," she said.
Jordan's training at home paid off. She developed confidence in herself and it was reflected in her voice as early as elementary school. Individuals remember her as the girl with the "doomsday voice." To others, the precise diction which was a part of Jordan, an overweight, young black ghetto girl, may have seemed phony, but to her classmates and friends, the doomsday voice was "just Barbara." They insist that "That's just how she was." Nevertheless, they realized that Jordan's voice was a priceless asset, "We always knew she was gonna be somebody," they said.

And her voice would play a major role in her getting there. Current Biography described Jordan as a "spellbinding orator." She got that title when she was a member of Texas Southern University's debate team. She joined during her freshman year, but was not permitted to engage in refutation. Her coach, Tom Freeman, told her she "wasn't able to speak extemporaneously." But Jordan took the criticism as a challenge. Before she left Texas Southern, Freeman had changed his assessment, "She was the best debater at refutation I ever had." Her forte for delivery was matched with various persuasive strategies and Jordan led her otherwise male team to an impressive record. They defeated everyone on their tour that year, including Harvard. Additionally, the team not only integrated the Baylor University Forensic Tournament, but astounded many by winning the contest three years running.

While the debate team provided the opportunity for Jordan to develop her speaking ability, the training was just one of the links in the chain which would eventually lead to the "making of Barbara Jordan."
Barbara Jordan has been called the "most powerful Black legislator" in the country. In the last Presidential election, she had been in Congress only four years; yet, she was better known than most Congressional candidates, black or white, and some of the Presidential aspirants. Her remarks during the Nixon impeachment proceedings in 1974 have been cited as the leverage Jordan needed to make her a public figure. But Jordan's career as a politician brought stardom to her long before there was a Watergate. Her selection as one of the 38 congressmen on the select committee was a reflection of Jordan's prestige as a politician. That distinction was created in Texas.

When Jordan returned to Houston in 1959 with a law degree from Boston University, she had dreamed about a political career in Texas. Therefore, she sought the best route for entrance into the political arena. For Blacks in Houston, the only admittance was through a coalition of labor minorities and white liberals who called themselves Harris County Democrats. In less than a year, Jordan had worked her way up from an envelope stuffer and stamper to a speaker for special rallies. A year later, she was named vice-chairman of the club; she has become one of its most prominent members. By 1962, Jordan was ready to reach for her dream.

With borrowed money for her filing fee, Jordan registered as a candidate for the state legislature. When the results were in, she had come in third. The defeat, however, did not discourage her because "I figured anybody who could get 46,000 people to vote for them for any office should keep trying." So she did. Her first step was to evaluate
her defeat. She realized that to win, she needed more than liberal support. Blacks made up only twenty percent of Houston's electorate and backed by Harris County Democrats, Jordan had gotten only 23 percent of the white vote. That was not enough to win; she had to expand her base. But how? Jordan provided the answer: "It was clear ... that if I was to win ... I had to persuade the monied and politically influential interests either to support me or remain neutral."

When the election rolled around in 1964, Jordan's name appeared on the ballot again. And again she was defeated. But the election was victorious for Jordan in one way--she had increased her white support by 50 percent. Nevertheless, Jordan was discouraged. She had lost two elections and the future promised even more defeats. To make matters worse, John Connally, then governor of Texas, vetoed her nomination to serve on the State Democratic Executive Committee. The weight of the losses and the veto took their toll on Jordan:

I considered abandoning the dream of a public career in Texas and moving to some section of the country where a Black woman candidate was less likely to be considered a novelty.

But she stayed. Why? Jordan was a Texan at heart and she could not shake that identity. She said, "I am a Texan. My roots are in Texas. To leave would be a copout." Happier days lay ahead. In 1965, the Voting Rights Act was passed. As a result, 25 percent more Blacks were registered. Additionally, the decision led to the creation of a new Texas senate district. Because Jordan was the known candidate in the district, she was given the nod to run for the seat. This time
when the results came in, they were in her favor. She had captured 66 percent of the vote to become the Democratic candidate. In the general election, she easily defeated the Republican candidate and became the first Black to serve in the Texas Senate since 1882.

Getting elected had been a triumph for Jordan, but greater feats were ahead. The Senate would only serve as a stepping stone for Jordan, but she capitalized on it to the fullest. During those six years, she established herself as a power to be reckoned with. About half of the bills which she submitted for consideration were enacted into law, including the establishment of the Texas Fair Employment Practices Commission, an improved Workmen's Compensation Act, and the state's first minimum wage law which covered workers who were not covered by federal minimum wage standards. She was behind the inclusion of anti-discrimination clauses in state business contracts. It was with her support and advice that the state created a department to respond to the problems of Texas' burgeoning urban areas. And she was the force that blocked the passage of a restrictive voter registration act which would have curbed the participation of minority groups in the electoral process. Additionally, she was named the outstanding freshman senator during her first year in office and was chosen senate president pro tempore. In March, 1972, she became Texas' governor in the state's traditional governor for a day ceremony.

The accomplishments are remarkable on the surface, but their merit increases tremendously when one considers the dynamics of the situation in which the acts transpired. When Jordan arrived in the Texas Senate
in 1967, it was "lily white" and a number of unreconstructed southerners wielded the power. How could Jordan deal with this constraint? She had made it to the chamber, but she had not been admitted to the "club" and her effectiveness was dependent upon her entry. Cognizant of such, she planned her strategy: "I singled out the most influential and powerful members and determined to gain their respect." The tactics included doing her homework, loving the institution, and making members feel that the Senate was the most important thing in her life. She became one of its leading parliamentarians within weeks. Additionally, she directed her attention to select subjects and became the Senate expert on them. Jordan also demonstrated that she had great technical skills.

Perhaps the most influential factor in her success, however, was her unwillingness to be typecast. Despite the fact that she was Black and female, no one could count Jordan's vote until she had cast it. According to one liberal Senator:

... You could never assume where she would be. If you had a real good bill, you know, that did everything right, that had in it all the sort of things she had been supporting, you still couldn't check her off your scorecard. You had to go see her, reason with her, make her understand what you wanted to do.
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In an analysis of Jordan, Broyles drew a similar conclusion, saying, "... she always ended up in the corral, but damned if she didn't have to be rounded up every time.

Jordan's strategy worked. Its effectiveness is demonstrated by the impact which she had on the Texas Senate:
She shattered stereotypes about Blacks; to racists, she wasn't shiftless and dumb and she didn't smell bad; to guilt-ridden liberals, who believed that all Blacks would be liberal, pure of heart, and anti-establishment, she proved to be a hard nosed politician who gave no hint she had suffered under segregation.  

An unprecedented resolution passed by the Senate at the end of Jordan's first session is further evidence of the success she had achieved. In addition to expressing the Senate's "warmest affection and regards," the resolution read: "She has earned the esteem and respect of her fellow citizens by the dignified manner in which she conducts herself."

From the Texas Senate, Jordan moved to the U. S. House of Representatives. As a Congresswoman from the 18th Congressional District of Texas, Jordan would leave her mark on Congress just as she had left it on the Texas Senate. When she took her seat in 1973, she became the first Black Congresswoman from the Deep South. In the House, Jordan did an instant replay of the same political gamesmanship which had worked so well in Texas in her effort to gain the respect of the House's members—courting the establishment, paying deference to leadership, demonstrating an unwillingness to be typecast, and exhibiting loyalty to the institution. Again, she wasted no time in establishing her credibility. George Mahon, a Congressman from Texas, commented on the short time it took Jordan to become a member of the "in's," saying, "I've never known anyone to capture so quickly the response of the House that she has."

They respected Jordan as a skilled and knowledgeable legislator. Her prestige is evidenced further by the advisory capacity in which she serves frequently. Broyles noted that Congressmen often turned to
Jordan for advice:

... Congressional patriarchs often seek her out as they come pouring in for a vote from their offices or the House gym. They know they can count on her ... to provide a cogent explanation of the bill or amendment.

Record wise, Jordan's major legislative accomplishments in the House include 1) amendments to the Voting Rights Act which expanded its coverage and provided for the printing of bilingual ballots, 2) repeal of federal authorization for state Fair Trade Laws which sanctioned vertical price fixing schemes, and 3) detailed mandatory civil rights enforcement procedures for the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and the Office of Revenue Sharing.

Jordan serves on the House Committee on the Judiciary and the House Committee on Government Operations. She is also a member of the Steering and Policy Committee of the House Democratic Caucus. It was her membership on the former committee which provided her the opportunity to serve on the impeachment hearings committee. The significance of that connection and Jordan's timed response have been alluded to continuously. Broyles' comments are indicative of them: "If there is any one moment when Barbara Jordan became Barbara Jordan, it was when the television cameras focused on her ... and she began her indictment of Richard Nixon." Jordan went on to say that she was not included in the Constitution initially. But, she countered, she still had faith in it and she was not going to let anyone destroy it.

Jordan had arrived. But how she got there must be examined in another way. In their rise to stardom, politicians are often accused
of "selling out." That the ends justify the means is a truism in the world of politics. Ambition has dominated principle for centuries. Yet some citizens still feel that certain politicians would not permit the world of political spoils to corrupt them in that way. When Barbara Jordan ran for elected office, people viewed her as someone who had their interests at heart. One of her supporters recalls:

Back then, we didn't question the motives of Blacks... it sounds naive, but then we thought, well, Blacks were better, more pure and honest, than white politicians, that they had a cause bigger than themselves. If she had been white, we would have seen her as just another ambitious politician.

Jordan's actions along the way, however, had caused them to change their minds. They accused her of turning into an "establishment Democrat" and using them for "her own ambitions." The accusations came primarily from Blacks who believe Jordan has not done enough to support their liberal causes. One critic went so far as to say, "I have known Barbara Jordan for ten years ... and I have yet to see any evidence that she is interested in anything beyond the advancement of Barbara Jordan."

Jordan's critics cite events which they say support their proposition. For instance, when Jordan decided to run for Congress, Curtis Graves, a prominent Black politician in Houston, was left with the impression that he would get her seat in the Texas Senate. Nevertheless, in a redistricting move, the "Senate district was so divided that no Black could possibly win it."

Graves and other Blacks blamed Jordan for the split, claiming that she had used "horse trading" to create a Congressional seat for herself.
In the process, they held, she gave up the only seat which a Black could have won. The trade was supposedly made with Ben Barnes, the lieutenant governor of the state who had his eyes on the governorship. Under Texas law, Barnes was the overseer in district reapportionments. Jordan and Barnes agreed that the Congressional seat would be carved out for her and in return, she would support him for governor and offer no resistance to the redistricting of her Senate seat.

One of Jordan's Senate colleagues believes that the trading was not necessary. He said:

If she had used her muscle to keep the Senate seat for Blacks, she could have had both. They would have cratered. That's exactly the kind of thing they are afraid of her about. But she didn't make a peep.

As a result, there is no Black Senator for Houston's 350,000 Black people despite the fact that each state Senator represents less than 400,000 people. Jordan, however, reacted by saying, "It just wasn't in the game plan."

Jordan's stance on the Vietnam war is another reason why her ethics have been questioned. Although she had opposed the war since 1966, she praised Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam policies in 1968. She admitted that, "That plank probably resulted in further killing and dying, ... but I felt it was important for Texans to be supportive of their man."

What disturbed critics most, however, was Jordan's agreement to testify as a character witness at John Connally's bribery trial. Connally was known for his dislike of Blacks. During his term as governor, he had fought to minimize voter registration and to rid Texas of the
"Great Society" program which aided minorities. In one television 
broadcast, Connally pledged that he would use all the power of his 
office to fight against a public accommodations bill which would have 
guaranteed Blacks access to public facilities. Yet Jordan took the 
stand for him. Critics explain Jordan's decision as the gaining of 
another political chip. She probably held no love for Connally as he 
had vetoed her nomination for the Texas Democratic Executive Committee. 
Perhaps the same rationale which she used to explain her support for 
Johnson's plank can be applied. John Connally is also a Texan and to 
Jordan, that means a lot. One of the Women's Movement members argue 
that Jordan is "a Texan first, a Black second, and a woman, third."

But Jordan's popularity indicates that she has a number of fans. 
Leland praised Jordan for her ability to "cut through many of the 
prejudices and barriers that we (Blacks) had to face," noting that "she 
proved that not all Blacks are stupid." Consequently, "we have been 
able to make other gains, like single-member districts." Blacks also 
applaud Jordan for her "staying power." They complain that too many 
Black politicians have been "kamikaze pilots who crash and burn against 
the warships of the establishment," but noted that "Jordan can hold her 
own with the toughest movers and shakers." Others contend that Jordan 
is a "serious politician who gets things done with a minimum of empty 
rhetoric and ostentatious posturing."

Glenn: Orator

While John Glenn has never been called an Edmund Burke, he is 
convinced that he can hold an audience. Glenn said, "I know from the 
polls and the ratings that I come across well ..." He has had
ample experience to base his assessment on. In his role as director of the Gilligan for Governor campaign, chairman of the fund-raising Buckeye Executive Club, and organizer of the Governor's Citizens Task Force on Environmental Protection, Glenn received innumerable invitations to speak. He addressed so many audiences that he concluded, "I don't think anyone besides the governor has spoken at more ... dinners or fund raising events."

Prior to that experience, Glenn had had other opportunities to develop as an orator. He was a host for a historical expedition television series in 1968. But several reviewers insisted that Glenn had not mastered the art. The first episodes had been on Project Africa and the trail of Stanley and Livingston. One critic praised the "artfully photographed documentaries," but complained that "Glenn's words were not quite up to his pictures."

Other critics, however, felt that Glenn's performance had been good. A review in Newsday held that Glenn had exhibited the ability to make words sound genuine and during such moments, he "pushed the travelog a notch above its genre." The producer, evidently, was satisfied with Glenn's performance because he selected him as the host for a new "Here Comes Tomorrow" series which followed the historical expedition run.

When Glenn was a student at Muskingum College (Ohio), he majored in chemical engineering. He left school during his junior year to pursue a career in aviation. His interest in aviation had developed when he participated in a government civilian pilot training program near the college. Glenn's major did not require him to engage in oratorical contests nor did he enroll in any speech courses. After achieving
success as an astronaut, however, Glenn became a public figure and was forced to address audiences. His speaking, therefore, developed through a "learn by doing" process. This view is shared by James L. Golden who was a member of the faculty at Muskingum during Glenn's matriculation. Golden also served on the committee which decided to award Glenn his bachelor's degree on the basis of his accomplishments in space since he had failed to complete the requirements at Muskingum.

Political Prestige

John Glenn's biography has been compared to a Horatio Alger novel. Glenn is an exemplar of the "rags to riches" value which is so deeply imbued into the American culture. His father was a plumber and Glenn grew up in humble surroundings. But from such modest beginnings, Glenn worked his way up. The millionaire's rise began when he became a pilot for the Marine Corps, flying combat missions in the Pacific. During the Korean War, he amassed 63 missions with the Marines and 23 with the Air Force as an exchange pilot. It was this experience which weighed heavily in his selection as a test pilot. One flight he launched during that period is in the record book. In a F-8U Crusader, Glenn flew the first supersonic coast-to-coast flight. In 1962, he made history once again when he became the first American to orbit the earth as a Mercury astronaut.

After Glenn resigned from the space program in January, 1964, he announced he would seek the Ohio Democratic Senatorial nomination. In 1964, he was forced to withdraw from the race because he injured his inner ear in a bathroom fall. When he entered the primary again in 1970, he was defeated by Howard Metzenbaum, a millionaire who had waged
"an efficient and well-financed campaign that spread his name outside of northeast Ohio where he already enjoyed strong labor support.

It was not that Glenn was not known by the voters. In some ways, his popularity may have worked against him; people knew him as an astronaut, not as a politician. Breaking that image would be his most difficult task. Glenn described the magnitude of the problem in a 1975 interview:

Rightly or wrongly, there was an air of the space program about me. I had studied the issues and prepared what I thought were good positions, but I'd walk into a meeting and the first question I'd hear would be, "Do astronauts really drink Tang?"

Glenn was successful, nevertheless, in getting people to view him in a different role. By working in other politicians' campaigns and becoming affiliated with political committees, Glenn found political strengths. In 1970, he directed a successful gubernatorial campaign for John J. Gilligan, became a member of the Democratic Executive Committee, served as chairman of the fund-raising Buckeye Club, and set up the Citizen's Task Force on Environmental Protection. By 1973, he had established himself as a political activist and announced his intentions to run for the Senate seat once again.

Glenn campaigned vigorously on the issue of his opponent's tax problems and attacked "bossism" by calling for the impeachment of Richard Nixon. The results were favorable. Despite opposition by the State Democratic organization and the leadership of the United Auto Workers and the Ohio AFL-CIO, Glenn was elected by the greatest margin in the state's history. He defeated Metzenbaum by more than 94,000
votes. Glenn then trounced his Republican opponent by a two to one margin in the general election, getting 64 percent of the vote.

When Glenn entered the Senate, again his image as an astronaut preceded him. Again, he had to convince his colleagues that he could pull his weight. Much of what is accomplished in the Senate is through committee work and it was there that Glenn found his niche. His background in science and research proved to be particularly helpful. With energy and national defense being two of the salient issues, Glenn found his talents in demand. During his first year, he co-sponsored an emergency natural gas bill which he credits with helping him learn Senate parliamentary procedures quickly. That was just a beginning, however. Within two years, Glenn's credibility as a Senator was so high that he got the nod as one of the three finalists for the Vice-Presidential nomination for his party.

Glenn's tactics in the Senate have puzzled a number of writers. One reporter referred to him as an "enigma." Nevertheless, most individuals have concluded that his basic asset is the independence he exudes which casts him as a non-politician. To categorize Glenn as a liberal or a conservative is almost impossible because he is both. One lobbyist held that "Glenn could be a great Senator if he would just choose up sides." But Glenn believes being neither works to his advantage and he is comfortable with his label as a "middle of the roader." He argues that such a position permits him to be more flexible and responsive to the needs of the people.
I don't like the idea of being pigeonholed into some ideological mold and then have people think I'm going to have a knee-jerk reaction. I never give it a thought whether my vote is going to be looked at as liberal or conservative.

Other factors which have ingratiated Glenn with his Senate colleagues are his good manners, moderation, and knowledge. Glenn is one of the few junior Senators who has received a stamp of approval from the Senate's elders. While he does not deny that his performance in the Senate has contributed to his acceptance, Glenn believes that another factor has been present also and that the image which preceded him this time worked to his advantage.

I arrived here a little bit better known than some of the other junior members and I had met most of them many times before becoming a Senator myself ... so perhaps that helped to ease the newness of my being there.

Not only is Glenn a member of the Governmental Affairs, Energy, Aging, and Foreign Relations committees, but also, he chairs the subcommittees on Nuclear Proliferation and Federal Services (Governmental Affairs) and East Asian and Pacific Affairs (Foreign Relations). Glenn's legislative achievements include authorship of:

1) the most extensive bill in the U. S. history to curb the export of nuclear technology to countries that might have non-peaceful intentions.

2) magnet schools concept for achieving integration by promoting voluntary enrollment and quality education.

3) legislation to consolidate all Federal assistance programs for minority businessmen under a single official.
4) the Sunset Bill which promotes government efficiency by mandating scrutiny of all existing programs.

Summary

This chapter provided a profile of the 1976 Democratic keynoters. Emphasis was placed on those factors which had brought each to the attention of the Nation and may have contributed to their image, as perceived by the audience.
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CHAPTER V

THE RHETORICAL SITUATION

To conceptualize the many factors to which Glenn and Jordan's rhetoric responded, Lloyd Bitzer's approach will be used. Bitzer suggested that because rhetoric occurs in situations where solutions are wanted and where the exigences of the situation can be modified or changed by discourse, the critic should seek out and analyze these exigences for change when making a decision about the rhetorical impact. The approach requires that 1) the humanly responsive entities in each situation are the speaker and the audience and 2) the situation as a whole bring into force opportunities and limitations within which and through which any rhetor must work to evoke change.

Nineteen hundred and seventy-six was an ideal year to deliver a keynote address for the Democratic party. The overwhelming degree to which it was utopic becomes apparent when one recounts the chaos which had dominated the two previous nominating conventions. Demonstrations centered upon Vietnam, Blacks, and homosexuals, but the salient issue was Vietnam. Greater resistance against United States involvement in Vietnam was being lodged by young people, intellectuals, and domestic welfare social program advocates. The student demonstrations became increasingly virulent and national guardsmen were called out to aid
the Chicago police in dealing with the protestors. The media televised
scenes which depicted policemen using excessive force. As a result,
anti-war delegates in the assembly hall were angered. The chaos in the
streets then spread to the assembly floor. Both sides began to treat
every vote taken as a moral issue.

A prime exemplar was the vote on credentials. A record fifteen
challenges to delegations from fifteen states were voiced. Only one
resulted in the unseating of the regular delegation; an integrated
"loyalist" Mississippi delegation replaced the all-white slate, but in
all of the other contests, the party reformers won. Nevertheless, the
damage had been done to the party as a whole. The media played up the
Democrats' divisiveness.

Things did not improve in 1972 for the Democrats. The major con­
troversy focused on the choice for President, but credentials fights
again dominated floor action. The dispute in 1968 had been over civil
rights-- that had been solved. As a result, the makeup of this con­
tvention bore little resemblance to that of the 1968 convention. The
percentage of women delegates had increased from 13 percent to 40
percent, Black representation had risen from 5.5 percent to 15 percent,
and youth delegates (under 30) had increased from 2.6 percent to 21
percent.

But another exigence was still in the air. This time the delegates
wanted party reform. An unprecedented twenty-three challenges from
fifteen states reached the convention floor. The most crucial contest
was a controversy over the fate of the California delegation. As
winner of the California primary, George McGovern had been given all of
the state's delegates. But supporters of Hubert Humphrey demanded that
the votes be split among the candidates according to their showing. The
credentials committee had ruled in favor of the Humphrey supporters; 151
of the 271 votes were taken away from McGovern and given to the other
candidates.

In distress, McGovern sought help from the district court, but the
court also upheld the committee's decision. McGovern then took the
matter to the court of appeals which reversed the district court's
decision and ordered that the votes be given back to McGovern. The
Supreme Court stayed the decision, but refused to rule on the merits of
the case and instructed the convention to decide.

Havoc on the convention floor was precipitated by the rulings. In
the end, however, the convention overturned the credentials committee's
decision and McGovern received the disputed 151 votes. Nevertheless,
that fight and others over credentials continued until 4:53 a.m. when
the first session of the 1972 Democratic National Convention was finally
adjourned.

But 1976 was not a rerun of either convention. Divisiveness had
cost the Democrats two elections. To win in 1976, they had to portray
themselves as a unified party. As a result, the overriding exigency was
unity. At the expense of everything else, the Democrats had to appear
to the American people as a party which had finally revamped and become
unified, despite their differences. Robert Strauss, chairman of the
Democratic National Committee, realized this as well as anyone. It was
his responsibility to engineer the unity.
When the convention met in New York City in 1976, unity was a virtual obsession. From the inclusion of different ethnic groups on the convention program to the appointment of convention officers, a harmonious chord was being programmed. The "Happy Days are Here Again" theme which played in the background during the opening of the convention reflected the mood of the convention for the first time in eight years. The convergence of unity and good feelings which resulted in this show of unaccustomed unity had its roots with Strauss who had effected the unity through carefully planned strategies. The groundwork had been laid months earlier.

Past credentials fights had centered on the delegate selection process. The basis for a challenge was removed somewhat by the establishment of a compliance review commission of the Democratic National Committee which had the responsibility for approving the selection plans of all states. The plans had included provisions for affirmative action. Therefore, the commission's job was merely to determine if state parties had followed through on implementation.

A second factor which curbed challenges was the credentials committee's decision which raised the petition requirement for convention minority reports from 10 percent to 25 percent of the committee's members. Party reformers argued that the presentation of minority views would be stifled by the lower percentage. But Strauss backed the proposal and urged the committee to "preserve prime time television for gut issues," countering with, "... those of you who saw George McGovern accept the nomination at 4:00 a. m. know what I'm talking about."
Strauss was mimicking the words of the television consultant he had hired to insure that the Democrats projected a positive image on the screen. In addition to wanting the Democrats to play to a prime time television viewing audience, Al Vecchione insisted that "rhetoric be reduced and candor be emphasized." His recommendations included shortening platform debate by postponing roll call votes until the end of debate and by having speakers make their arguments from convention floor microphones instead of the podium. Vecchione explained his reasons for these suggestions:

... during those four fateful days in July, you not only nominate a candidate, you elect a President. The convention leaves an indelible impression on the voters. The basic impression which they carry away has a very strong effect on what they end up doing four months later when they go into a voting booth.

Because of Strauss' move and other developments, Senator Alan Cranston of California predicted, "You won't be seeing the exciting political barrooms brawls of earlier years." Resultingly, although fifty challenges were filed when the committee met June 28-30, only seven were debated and each was resolved within the time frame. Therefore, when the convention met on July 12-15, there was no reason for a floor fight.

Another contributor to the harmony was Jimmy Carter's primary victory in Ohio on June 8. With that win, the majority of the major figures in the party moved toward Carter, thereby removing the possibility for a brokered convention. Because Carter's nomination was a certainty, individual delegate positions were largely honorary.
Carter's victory had been one of the "most surprising scenarios in political history." The unlikely Presidential aspirant from Georgia, referred to as "Jimmy Who?" when the primary campaigns began, "bent the mechanism of primaries and publicity to his will and knocked off the Democratic establishment" to become the Democratic nominee.

A unified party was further guaranteed by cooperation from other groups who were seeking changes in the party's rules. The percentage of Blacks and women selected as delegates had dropped rather than increased. Fifteen percent of the delegates in 1972 had been Black, but only 11 percent were Black in 1976. While 40 percent of the delegates in 1972 had been women, that number had dropped to 34.4 percent. Therefore, both groups had cause for dissension.

Nevertheless, Blacks decided that they could gain more from developing a comfortable relationship with Carter than through organized protest. Initially, more than 30 Black delegates formed a coalition to oppose Carter. But the decision not to challenge Carter or cause confusion during the convention was reached when the delegates met with Carter. The meeting was arranged by Congressman Andrew Young of Georgia and Maynard Jackson, mayor of Atlanta, after Carter had expressed a desire to meet with the groups when rumors began to circulate that he would be vindictive toward those leaders who had not openly endorsed him. However, that was a minor concern for the coalition; they had other demands which they wanted Carter to meet.

The meeting, nevertheless, was successful in garnering additional support for Carter. Gary Hatcher, mayor of Gary, Indiana, and chairman
of the coalition, said the group was "unanimous in its support of Mr. Carter." During the meeting, Carter promised to make a number of concessions. The promises included:

1) Retention of Basil A. Peterson of New York as vice-chairman of the Democratic National Committee. (The group had been upset by a rumor that Carter would replace Peterson with Ben Brown, a Carter supporter from Georgia).

2) Naming Blacks to high level jobs, including positions in areas where Blacks had never served.

3) Massive voters registration campaigns in Black communities which would be directed by Black organizations that had been funded.

Other leaders who expressed their satisfaction with the concessions and called for support of Carter, in addition to Young, Jackson, and Hatcher, included Representatives Charles Diggs of Michigan, Yvonne Burke of California, and Charles B. Rangel of New York. They were supported by Sterling Tucker, chairman of Washington, D. C.'s city council, George Brown, lieutenant governor of Colorado, and C. Delores Tucker, secretary of state for the commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

Feminists abandoned their threat for a demonstration for a quota system when Carter promised to work toward equal representation for them. The Carter commitment was accepted as "the best arrangement women can get at this time." Promises made by Carter included commitments to:

1) Promote equal division between delegate men and women starting with the 1978 mid-term Democratic conference, rather than the 1980 convention.

2) Facilitate incorporation of the representation goal on state levels through encouragement from the national committee.
3) Appoint women to cabinet positions and as ambassadors.

4) Have full representation of women on all party commissions and committees.

5) Appoint a woman to the first Supreme Court vacancy which became available after Carter was elected.

Representative Bella Abzug (Manhattan) said the demands of the group had "been met in full" and urged support of Carter. Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm (Brooklyn) also spoke in favor of Carter's position.

Thus, when the convention opened, the Democrats were unified. They "put on their best party manners and presented their best ... to the millions of Americans" who watched. The Atlanta Constitution characterized the opening as "a fair, a festival, and a field day."

More than 3,000 delegates and alternates were in their seats and the aisles at Madison Square Garden were garbed with red, white, and blue ribbons when the convention got underway. Other delegates had experienced difficulty trying to get into the Garden because "hundreds of thousands of commuters jammed the main entrance on eighth avenue."

But at 5:15 p. m. (15 minutes behind schedule), Strauss rapped the gavel to sound the opening note. The "lights were dimmed and the delegates lifted their voices together and sang the "Star Spangled Banner."

The festivities then began. The delegates struck up the old party song, "Happy Days are Here Again" and clapped to its beat. Strauss' opening remarks called attention to the mood. After noting that Democrats were fed up with "eight years of Nixon-Ford, eight long years of Kissinger, Simon, Morton, and Butz," he said the Democrats' time had come because they were "organized, vibrant, forward looking, and hell-bent on victory."
That the party was organized was conspicuous; unity overshadowed everything. The media characterized the convention's demeanor as "... the most harmonious atmosphere in twelve years." New beginnings seemed to be the order of the day after more than a decade of Democratic discord. The Congressional Quarterly noted that "... the emphasis on unity all but eclipsed the attention paid to the Presidential nominee."

In some ways, however, the convention was quite similar to previous ones. There were some limitations of the situations which even Strauss had not been able to control. Delegates were still wandering in the aisles, conversing with their neighbors, and engaging in other acts which distracted from the otherwise conducive atmosphere. Even the media, some 10,000 strong, and their equipment had not distracted from the convention. The steel structures, which had blocked delegates' viewing during earlier conventions, were gone. They had been replaced by modern structures and each network had its booth, away from the audience. So with the Democrats united, things on the rostrum working, the public address system functioning properly, and the delegates being able to see what was happening, everything was perfect.

The lack of debate and suspense had also laid the foundation for a dull convention, prompting the media to refer to it as "dead" and to call the audience "lethargic." Therefore, when the keynoters came to the podium, the overriding exigence was to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates and to bring the convention alive. Additionally, there was a need to reach beyond the convention.
Because the addresses were being televised, thousands of uncommitted voters were a part of the speakers' audience and the Democratic National Committee had made the speakers aware that the independents were an important part of the audience. According to Clephas, Jordan and Glenn's images as non-partisans had contributed to their selection as keynoters for the convention because they (DNC) thought the television audience would watch them. And "now that we had captured them, we certainly weren't going to ignore them."

In keeping with the tradition of the keynote, the speakers were expected to praise their party and blame the opposition. The dynamics of the situation, however, dictated that more attention be paid to the latter functions of the keynote, raising the enthusiasm of the delegates and making an appeal for unity. The delegates were lethargic and it was up to the keynoters to stimulate them. Additionally, the entire focus of the convention was on unity; therefore, the keynoters, more than at any other convention, had the the responsibility for perpetuating the harmonious atmosphere which was in the air.

While allegations have been made that certain members of the electronic media tried to project an image of divisiveness to the television audience, the efforts seemingly failed. Earlier in the evening, Dan Rather had reported, "Walter, there's bad blood in this California delegation." Additionally, Cronkite suggested that the convention might not be all "sweetness and light." But such isolated comments did not overshadow the act which Strauss and his committee had put together. What the television audience saw was an orderly
convention by a diversified party. The *Congressional Quarterly*
summarized the image which had been projected— "a show of unaccustomed
unity" and "the most harmonious (convention) in 12 years."
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CHAPTER VI

THE 1976 KEYNOTE SPEECHES: VALUES ADDRESSED

Findings in Chapter two suggested that the major strategy utilized by Democratic keynoters had been the actuation of the American Value System. They had contrasted its preservation by the Democrats with its destruction by the Republicans. In doing so, keynoters have itemized the manner in which Democrats have perpetuated the values and pinpointed the degree to which Republicans have stifled the growth of such values. Because names carry expectancies, approach-avoidance suggestions are inherent in them. Therefore, what keynoters have called the Republicans' actions have been more important than the actions themselves.

Glenn and Jordan's speeches were somewhat tame in contrast to previous keynotes. Nevertheless, a degree of partisanship was exhibited and the speeches were cast from the same mold as previous keynotes. Glenn and Jordan 1) praised their party, 2) blamed the Republicans, 3) made a plea for unity, and 4) attempted to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates. Additionally, an effort was made to reach beyond the convention.

John Glenn's Address

Glenn began his speech with historical references which reflected the value of freedom. He traced the origin of freedom back to the American Revolution and portrayed Democrats as leaders who had taken...
steps to insure that freedom prevailed. The audience was told to be thankful that Democrats like Jefferson, Jackson, and Madison had been around to shape America's future. It was not an easy task, said Glenn, but our Democratic leaders "... were willing to risk greatly for great cause." He then brought present day Democrats into focus by reminding the audience that just as their Democratic forebears had refused to buckle under to the pressures of their day and had emerged as victors, the Democratic party would continue to win the revolution in freedom.

This experiment in freedom continues every day and it is a revolution we will continue to win. There are doubters. There are those who believe that our nation, as a beacon -as the last best hope for mankind- will now fade as only a glimmer in history. But you will not accept that. I will not accept that ...

Effort and Optimism

With those words, Glenn had tapped a principal value cluster, effort and optimism-- the determination to succeed despite obstacles. That value surfaced again when Glenn outlined the responsibilities with which Democrats were charged. A series of challenges was presented and after each one, Glenn demonstrated his faith that the Democrats could meet them. Each part was similar in form. Glenn began by asking a rhetorical question which started with, "Can we ..." To each question, he responded, "We can and we must." Typical of the items in the series was the following:

Can we establish a framework-- involving capital and investment, business and labor, profit and wages-- guaranteeing that every American willing and able to work will have a job, a paycheck? We can and we must.
The value was brought into focus again during Glenn's peroration. He reminded the audience that they faced "great problems" as they tried "to build a nation of justice, a nation of equality, a nation of opportunity," but despite the hurdles, "... we can build that nation."

Equality

While Americans have professed that equality is a value, it has been limited to certain groups. Glenn argued that things should have been different. He said that the discriminatory practice had been a mistake which had had its origin in the Constitution of the United States, but had extended to present day situations:

... and for all their emphasis on equality and justice, they (framers of the Constitution) chose not to include all men and women ... And in particular, the failed commitment to strike the shackles imposed by race has continued even into today.

But, he said, the Democratic party, because of its belief in the bedrocks of the American culture, would work to insure that every man was treated as an equal; they would insure that equality meant equality for all, promising, "We stand firmly committed to a new day of equality and that equality not only for future generations, but in our time, now. The value reappeared when Glenn insisted that Democrats must "guarantee full equal opportunity, full advantage and protection under the law to every man, and to every woman...."

Generosity and Considerateness

Glenn emphasized the degree to which the Democratic party had been willing to help those in need or aid those who were less fortunate and then implied that such charity had been extended because in the
Democratic party, people were still important. Be proud, he told the
delegates, that we have had such programs. After responding to the
charge by Republicans and other unfeeling people, Glenn added more
credence for holding the value when he linked the program with one of
the party's most revered leaders, Franklin D. Roosevelt. He emphasized
Roosevelt's endorsement by reading a statement by him contrasting the
Democratic philosophy with that of the Republicans:

Governments can err, Presidents do make
mistakes, but ... divine justice weighs
the sins of the warm-hearted and the
cold-blooded on different scales. Better
the occasional faults of a government
living in the spirit of charity, than the
consistent omissions of a government frozen
in the ice of its own indifference.

Such compassion had made the Democrats great and it should be worn like
a medal, Glenn maintained.

Rejection of Authority

Glenn applauded his party's desire to maintain control over the
future, but warned listeners that important values were being threatened
by increased bureaucratic red tape. Since the Republican administration
had been in office for the past eight years, little argument was needed
to conclude that they were the culprit. Glenn added more data for the
claim when he insisted that a change had to be made:

... no American nurtured on the ideal of
freedom and proud of skills, abilities,
training, and judgment can feel comfortable
when his or her future slips more and more
into the hands of others.
Patriotism

Loyalty to one's country, its ideas and principles was not ignored in Glenn's speech; he treated this as the most salient value of all. More attention was devoted to patriotism than any of the other values. Glenn's remarks on patriotism constituted one-sixth of his message. He talked about what he called "mature patriotism," using contrast to define the term. Glenn stated that patriotism meant "not my country right or wrong, but my country when right to be kept right, when wrong, to be put right." This mature patriotism, according to Glenn, was based on participation and accomplishment.

Glenn's words became more significant when he drew attention to his own devotion to patriotism. He recalled his 1962 space flight which had taken him around the world. Through this anecdote, he demonstrated the manner in which he had shown his love for America. While all citizens could not become astronauts, Glenn reminded them that they, too, could contribute to the building of America. They were challenged to participate in some way because "the future is in our hands to shape."

Change-Progress-Future

Through the years, progress has been associated with change. Glenn expressed the pride he held for "keystones from the past" which had made America great. Nevertheless, he reminded the audience that progress had been made because of that "continuing typically American attitude of curiosity of how can we do it better?"
Puritan and Ethical Morality

Glenn inserted the ethical yardstick into his message when he contended that there were some principles in the American culture which society should be proud to hold on to, "... the old American ideals of honesty and decency and integrity, straight-forwardness and reliability." Such virtues, he said, were "fundamental for any free people able to live together in harmony."

Evils of Republican Administration

While Glenn alluded to the number of wrongs which had come to Americans under Republican administrations throughout the speech, he pinpointed a "lagging confidence" by Americans in their nation as the ultimate harm. Such doubt, Glenn argued, had the potential "... to limit and restrict what we can be." The doubt, however, was justified, he insisted. After all, it was the government which had engaged in "unnecessary secrecy," perpetuated "bureaucratic red tape," brought the "disgrace of Watergate," and continued the "tragedy of a war that divided us so terribly and for so long." And the government had been run by Republicans when these evils occurred, Glenn declared.

After that partisan analysis, Glenn followed up by saying, "...with all that has befallen us, a lesser nation might well have collapsed."

Nevertheless, he held that America had survived because of "the strength of our system and the good sense and stability of the American people." He had identified the Democrats previously as the leaders who had been responsible for the system. Additionally, the statement about the good sense of the American people followed his labeling of the Republicans as spoilers. Therefore, the only conclusion one could draw
was that the Republicans were excluded from the group of Americans who
Glenn said had held the system together. Glenn had played up the great-
ness of the Democrats again. He concluded by saying that it was time to
"put a stop" to the wrongs by the Republicans "once and for all." In
order to do so, he told the audience, "... we must select new leaders,
leaders with vision, leaders who will set a different tone for this
nation." With all of his other remarks, the party Glenn was talking
about was implied. Nevertheless, he spelled it out; only Democrats
could accomplish such salvation, noting that, "And when I speak of
leaders with the vision to take us there, I speak of a Democratic
President and the next Democratic administration.

Barbara Jordan's Address

Initially, Jordan acknowledged that she was aware that most key-
noters had sung the glory of their party and castigated the opposition,
but said she would refrain from doing such, "I could easily spend this
time praising the accomplishments of this party and attacking the
Republicans, but I do not choose to do that." While she did not attack
the Republicans by name, Jordan identified Democrats as the guiding
light and no credit was given to the Republicans for any progress in the
nation throughout the message. In one instance, Jordan implicitly
lashed out at Gerald Ford, the current President who was a Republican,
saying, "This we must do as individuals and if we do it as individuals,
there is no President of the United States who can vet that decision."
The remark called attention to the large number of bills which President
Ford had vetoed during that Congressional year.
For the most part, Jordan's message was a plea to protect the American Value System by putting a Democratic administration in the White House. She did this by emphasizing the importance of selected American values, which she deemed necessary for maintaining a "national community."

**Equality**

The majority of the speech was devoted to the value of equality. In 1976, the American idea of equality had become a bit more believable than in past years. Civil rights legislation had been passed to help insure that every American had equality of opportunity. Jordan began and ended her speech with an emphasis on equality. Calling it a realization of the American dream, she said, "... and I feel not withstanding the past that my presence here is one additional bit of evidence that the American dream need not forever be deferred."

Throughout, she demonstrated its growth. To the white delegates, Jordan was saying, unity in this party can become a reality; it has become a reality. Give yourselves a pat on the back for having the insight to see that all of us can work harmoniously toward a common goal if we put our prejudices aside. Be proud of yourselves for seeing the light. You've been the leader in setting an example for others to follow. And your efforts have not produced any horrendous results--I'm not doing badly up here at all.

For Blacks, Jordan's words were somewhat different. You've been fighting for equality for a long time. Yes, I remember when you were not permitted to take your seats in a Democratic convention or given speaking privileges on the floor. And while some changes still need to
be made, things have improved and the Democratic party has been the catalyst. Stay with this party to insure that the inequities which still exist can be corrected also. This is our most expedient route. It is our party which has been responsible for the passage of civil rights legislation. This party has recognized what an asset we (Blacks) can be and is willing to do more to make equality a reality in all ways.

In her conclusion, Jordan again reemphasized that equality must be practiced. Quoting Abraham Lincoln, she said, "As I would not be a slave, so I would not be a master." You are right for refusing to be anything less than equal was the message relayed to Blacks and to whites, her message was you are right for continuing to encourage equality for all. Sykes has said that a large part of persuasive communication is simply a repetition of what the audience already knows. By knowing, Sykes means believes. Therefore, repetition would serve to strengthen previously held beliefs. Jordan must have been familiar with this tactic. After reminding the audience that equality was a value that all of them cherished, she continuously said, we believe in this; therefore, we must do this.

**Change-Progress-Future**

Americans equate progress with change and believe that the best can be made better. Jordan was cognizant that her audience members valued change. She, therefore, equated her party with change, saying, "We are a party of innovation ... willing to suffer the discomfort of change" in order to make our society better. Again, the values of the audience were reinforced.
Value of the Individual

That every human being is important is underscored in the value of the individual cluster. Jordan reminded the audience that Democrats still believed that individuals counted. She underscored the "feeling that the individual no longer counts" as one of the major problems which faced the nation, but one that Democrats could solve if given the chance. As a party, they could make sure that obstacles which blocked individual achievement were removed. But she told her fellow delegates that Democrats must insure that opportunity for themselves and others by supporting their party. Democrats must unite and put a Democratic administration in the White House. The attention Jordan devoted to this value not only served as reinforcement for the audience's beliefs, but also, it drew attention to the task which had to be accomplished in November.

Puritan and Pioneer Morality

The value of puritan and pioneer morality came to the surface when Jordan listed the virtues associated with it-- honesty, cooperation, simplicity, self-discipline, courage, orderliness, personal responsibility, and humility. She maintained that the Democratic party had been committed to such virtues and had no intentions of forsaking these lofty principles which had been handed down by their forefathers. We are right to hold on to these virtues and must hold ourselves "strictly accountable" for their perpetuation. Again, the delegates had received more justification for their beliefs.
Patriotism

American love for country and belief in the Democratic way of life are two of the main components of patriotism. Jordan noted the greatness of America and expressed her pride and devotion to it. Most of the audience was aware of the manner in which she had defended the Constitution during the Impeachment Hearings; her fondness for her country was a part of the public record. She had been quoted extensively as saying, "I can still get goose pimples when I hear the National anthem." Listeners knew she loved her country as they did. She told the delegates, "We cannot improve on the government handed down to us by the founders of the Republic; there is no way to improve on that." But, she added, "...What we can do is find new ways to implement the system and realize our destiny." This time her words were complimentary also. We know what to do and we will do it because Democrats have always done things properly. In some instances, we have had to go back and regroup, but we did that, too. We are some marvelous people.

Generosity and Considerateness

Americans pride themselves on their willingness to aid the underdog. Minority groups, the aged, and the disadvantaged have always received attention. Jordan approached this value in a unique way. Rather than advocate that Democrats continue their policy of generosity toward others, she encouraged them to redirect it toward themselves, "Let's be generous with ourselves." What you have done has been good and now you are entitled to reap some of the benefits. Again, the element of praise was implicit in her remarks.
Rejection of Authority

Individuals feel that they should be able to control their lives and not be put under unnecessary restrictions. Jordan pinpointed this belief as one that Democrats cherished. We not only believe in your ability to govern yourselves; we want you to have the right to do so. We want to give you that power. This attitude was present in her charge that the Nation must "heed the voice of the people and recognize their common sense." She further noted that Democrats "... believe that the people are the source of all ... power" and that "the authority of the people is to be extended, not restricted." To the delegates, she was saying, there is nothing wrong with your wanting to make decisions on your own and be your own boss.

Sociality

Jordan used the value of sociality to reemphasize the theme of unity. Despite their differences, she challenged Democrats to become unified, noting that when factions develop, "... we cease to become a party and instead, become a collection of groups." We all share common goals; therefore, we should work together. As Democrats, we recognize that in unity there is strength. We are proving that now.

Summary

This chapter has sought to pinpoint traditional American value postulates present in the 1976 keynote addresses of the Democratic party. John Glenn and Barbara Jordan used these values to create an approach-avoidance dichotomy, thereby attributing praise to the Democrats and blame to the Republicans.
FOOTNOTES

1 All quotations from the speech were taken from the official copy obtained from Senator Glenn's office.

2 Quotations from Miss Jordan's speech were taken from Vital Speeches, August, 1976, 645-646.


CHAPTER VII

THE RHETORICAL RESPONSE

While both addresses contained similar elements, they were not received in the same manner. The *New York Times* held that "Mr. Glenn's remarks were blander than those of the second keynoter, the eloquent Black representative from Texas," the *Toledo Blade* concluded that Glenn's remarks were so unimpressive that they had weakened his chances of becoming a Vice-Presidential nominee," and the *Chicago Tribune* claimed Glenn received short shrift from his convention listeners." The responses to Jordan's message, on the other hand, appeared to be universally favorable. The *San Francisco Chronicle* credited her with bringing the convention "alive," the *New York Times* held that Jordan's message "established a tone of unity which had previously vacillated," and the *Toledo Blade* dubbed her as the only speaker of the evening who had been successful in arousing the otherwise "lethargic audience." Jordan was interrupted by applause twenty-four times during the twenty-five minute presentation and was brought back on stage for a final curtain call, while Glenn received "relatively mild applause generated largely by the Ohio delegation."

What accounted for this significant difference in response? According to Karl Wallace, the substance of rhetoric involves the advocate's
use of good reasons which are embedded in the value structures of his listeners. Neither Glenn nor Jordan was weak in this particular, as shown in the previous chapter. Like their predecessors, they had utilized traditional American value postulates. But other entities may have been responsible for the difference. Initially, the writer examined factors aside from the message itself—the speech introduction, media commentary, camera angles, speaking order—which may have caused the varied response.

**Speech Introductions**

Glenn and Jordan were presented to the audience via films following introductory remarks by Robert Strauss, chairman of the Democratic National Committee. On the surface, there appeared to be no significant difference between the two films. Both spotlighted the achievements of the speakers. But the effects may have been very different. Glenn's major accomplishments were related to the space program, while Jordan was pictured as someone who had gotten things done through her rhetoric. For viewers, the message which came from the film was this: You are about to hear two speeches, one from a famous astronaut and the other from an effective legislator.

Another factor was the manner in which Strauss presented the speakers. Before beginning Glenn's introduction, he said, "We're going to have two distinguished keynote speakers now." But the difference came when he introduced each film. On presenting Glenn's film to the audience, he merely said, "Our first keynote speaker of this Democratic Convention will be introduced by a short film." In contrast, he introduced Jordan's film by saying, "Would you please clear the aisles and be quiet for a
special—a very special occasion? He then continued and said, "May I have your attention as I present the second keynote speaker of this Democratic Convention who will be introduced by a short film." It seems unlikely that Strauss was trying to influence the delegates to favor one speaker over the other, but his words seemed to attribute more significance to Jordan than to Glenn. His remarks after the the films preceding each speaker, however, conveyed praise for both; Jordan was called "honorable" and Glenn was called "great."

Between the films and the remarks, however, there was another notable difference. "Deep in the Heart of Texas" began to play following Jordan's film clip and the audience began to clap and cheer. They were caught up in the rhythm of the music and the convention came alive; banners were praised. The crowd became so enflamed that Strauss chided them for their failure to compose themselves after he had requested order several times. "You're neither ladies nor are you gentlemen," he told them. One could question whether the delegates were reacting to the music or to Jordan when they cheered as she took the stage. However, the music was stopped and when Strauss called her name, again the cheering and applauding started. There was no doubt as to what the stimulus had been. The reaction, nevertheless, may have been stronger than it would have been had the audience not been stimulated previously by the music.

In contrast, Glenn's reception was restrained and orderly. The applause stopped shortly after it began. It was as if Jordan and Glenn were engaging in a popularity contest, with Jordan serving as the home candidate and Glenn the visiting.
Television viewers may have been affected by the manner in which media specialists commented on the speakers prior to and after their messages. Commentators have often been criticized because they interpret statements and events for viewers. The 1976 Democratic National Convention was no exception. Although viewers could see what was going on and hear it too, newscasters felt obliged to inform them as to what was really happening. It was as if the audience was not sophisticated enough to interpret the events which were transpiring. By doing so, media spokesmen drew particular attention to the fact that Jordan was their favorite.

During the cheering and applauding which followed Jordan's filmed introduction, Walter Cronkite made sure that the audience was aware that Jordan was not being received in the same manner as Glenn had been:

This is by far the biggest ovation anyone has received here in this opening session of the Democratic Convention. This time the convention has really come alive on this first night for Barbara Jordan, Congresswoman from Texas.

For Glenn, there were no such remarks.

Broadcasters made other comments, too which tended to give Jordan the edge in terms of how she was being perceived by viewers. The media interpreters used no adjectives to describe Glenn; he was just an astronaut turned politician who had "won a bitter primary contest over an incumbent." But Jordan was:
... the brilliant ... lawyer from Houston, Texas, elected first to the Texas legislature, the first Black ever so elected since Reconstruction, and then the first elected from Texas to the United States Congress, who we all saw during the Impeachment Hearings by the House Committee making her brilliant plea ...

Such encomia gave Jordan a psychological edge over Glenn at the start of her message. Immediately preceding her opening, Cronkite gave the viewers a yardstick to measure Jordan's remarks by and in the process, again reminded them that Glenn had failed as a speaker:

It'll be interesting to see whether this woman with her powerful oratorical style can command any better attention of this convention than did John Glenn. The space hero was unable to really keep the attention of the convention here.

Eric Sevareid's comments which followed Jordan's message emphasized her ability to hold the audience and Glenn's inability to do so even further:

Well, John Glenn had said earlier in the day that he had not-- he would not be making his keynote speech tonight with the listening ear of Jimmy Carter in mind, though Mr. Glenn would like to be on the ticket, no doubt. And perhaps, that's just as well-- he's an all-American hero, a very authentic hero, a wasp from the North, but he's been overshadowed, of course, by the Black lady politician from southern Texas.

Camera Angles

A widely accepted assumption in motion picture and television production is that there is a relationship between camera angle and communicator credibility. But in a recent study, Tiemens found that such a relationship did not exist. His investigation examined the effects of camera angle on communicator credibility with respect to
a single communicator. Nevertheless, because many stress the importance of camera angle, the writer examined the manner in which the cameras focused on Jordan and Glenn. If there were a significant difference between the way the cameras covered Glenn and Jordan, there was a possibility that the cameras contributed to the manner in which the keynoters were perceived by the audience.

The headshots, side profiles, and direct shots of the speakers were similar. Additionally, the switches to activity in the audience were equal during both presentations. This finding destroys the claim by some that Jordan's message came across as effective because the media did not focus on the activity in the audience as much as they had done when Glenn was speaking. But the writer did find an intrinsic focusing factor which may have contributed to viewers' perceptions. While the cameras focused on prominent individuals in both shootings, Carter's wife was shown conversing during Glenn's speech on two different occasions. The scenes could have been interpreted by the viewers as an indication that if the leading Presidential contender's wife was not paying attention to the message, it must have been boring. No such image was broadcast during Jordan's address.

A controversy still exists as to the influence a camera angle may have on the audience's view of a speaker. Nevertheless, because there was no conspicuous difference between the way in which both speakers were cast, the question appears to be insignificant in this investigation.
Speaking Order

Speakers are affected by the interaction which occurs between themselves and their audiences. The speakers' expectations and motivations about the rhetorical situation can be changed by audience feedback which provides situational cues. Investigators have studied the effects of such cues when successive speeches were made by two speakers, as was the case at the Democratic National Convention. In such instances, the second speaker's behavior is affected if the first speaker is received positively. Additionally, Miller found that second speakers were more efficient when they were given the same type of treatment as the first speaker and that any deviation in the direction of either positive or negative response resulted in a decrease in speaking efficiency.

The studies suggest, therefore, that by speaking first, Glenn had the advantage. If Jordan had spoken first and been received favorably by the audience, Glenn's fluency rate would have been affected. Glenn seems to have been aware of this possibility, as evidenced by his request to speak first. Because he had seen Jordan in action and knew that she could captivate an audience, Glenn told Vince Clephas, then director of communications for the Democratic National Committee, "There's no way I'm going to follow Barbara Jordan."

The findings suggest further that since Glenn spoke first and his reception was not favorable, Jordan's fluency rate should have been affected. Such was not the case. Her thoughts flowed exceptionally well. Three factors probably contributed to this: 1) Jordan was
received enthusiastically in contrast to the proper and polite response Glenn elicited, 2) her confidence was heightened by the thought that the best was being saved for last, and 3) Glenn's ineffective performance served as a release for stress because Jordan knew that she did not have a "hard act to follow."

**Style**

By analyzing the keynoters' verbal patterns, further reasons for different reactions to the speeches may be discovered. According to Terwilliger, listeners "set" themselves for different levels of grammatical subtlety and what they are "set" for determines what kind of grammatical structuring will seem clear and satisfying to them. Based on the rhetorical situation to which Glenn and Jordan were responding, most of the listeners were set for grammatical simplicity. The speakers addressed a mixed educational level of Democrats as well as television viewers. In such a case, Carroll Arnold contends, "... the critical norm becomes simplicity; simple structures are desirable; complexity is a stylistic fault." Thus, whether the keynoters compensated for longish thought units is the question.

The simplest English patterns are: noun phrase (NP)-verb phrase (VP) or noun phrase (NP)-verb phrase (VP)-noun phrase (NP) or noun phrase (NP)-verb phrase (VP)-predicate modifier (PM). These structures can be built in several ways. Any additions or modifications to the basic form makes understanding more difficult for the listener. In some instances, deviations from the basic patterns are warranted, but the speaker must make sure that such grammatical structures are "justified
by evidence that the resulting rhetorical gains are worth more than the clarity that was lost."

To determine the manner in which Glenn and Jordan used language in their keynote speeches, the writer sampled the five longest thought units, as recommended by Arnold. Both speakers adhered to the basic form relatively well. While they attached phrases to the form, they were not guilty of interrupting the form. The following sentences are representative of the keynoters' patterns:

**Glenn**

NP VP PM
But we can be thankful there were also our Democratic forebears, willing to risk greatly for great cause, waving security aside and setting out to shape...

**Jordan**

Throughout our history when people have looked for new ways to solve their problems and to uphold the principles of this nation, many times

NP VP NP
they have turned to political parties

The two speeches were similar in other aspects of style as well. The potential for force and directness was evident. Extensive use of figures of speech and parallel structures was present in each speech. The following sampling indicates speaker awareness of these devices'
potential to make their messages effective. Listed are ten of the most striking figures of speech.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Glenn</th>
<th>Jordan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>as a beacon</td>
<td>people in a quandry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frozen in the ice of its own indifference</td>
<td>bedrock of our concept of governing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as the last best hope for mankind</td>
<td>collection of interest groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>freedom would be anarchy</td>
<td>people in search of a national community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final awakening</td>
<td>people in search of our future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>days of drums</td>
<td>people bound together by a common spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slag heaps of history</td>
<td>like new puritans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people tired of drifting</td>
<td>sense of national community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people determined</td>
<td>dream need not forever be deferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shackles imposed by race</td>
<td>mistakes of the heart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stylistic beauty was exhibited also in balance, as evidenced by these five parallels cited from each message.

**Glenn**

Can we establish a framework-- involving capital and investment, business and labor, profits and wages
We can and we must

Can we see that the ability to provide homes for our families, food for the table ...
We can and we must

Can we finally guarantee full equal opportunity ...
We can and we must.
as bureaucratic red tape increases
as change upon change in the way we live sweeps over us...
as the very size and complexity of our institutions...

We are these people
We are America
We are strong

a time to harness quickly the spirit of renewal...
a time to incorporate that fervor in real citizen...
a time for citizens to accept their obligation...
a time to reestablish the people's faith in government

a people tired of drifting
a people determined to shape their own future
a people who will not have it any other way

Jordan

We are a people in a quandry about the present
We are a people in search of a future
We are a people in search of a national community

Who then will speak for America?
Who then will speak for the common good?

If we promise as public officials, we must deliver
If we as public officials propose, we must produce
If we say to the American people it is time for you to sacrifice, we must be the first to give
I have confidence that we can form this kind of national community
I have confidence that the Democratic party can lead the way
I have that confidence

I could easily spend this time
I could list the many problems which Americans have...
I could list the many problems which cause people to feel...
I could recite these problems

We must remember, however, that the audience was listening to these words, not reading them. In the latter case, they probably would have noticed the structural artistry and paid more attention to other stylistic facets of the content. But when a message is heard, Heinberg points out that delivery is almost three times as important as content. Therefore, despite the fact that special devices could add meaning and degrees of importance to the message, thereby making the audience receptive, such techniques could be impeded by the speaker's delivery, as evidenced by the audience's response to Glenn's message. Conversely, Jordan's delivery seems to have been influential in making the devices work for her.

Delivery

Empirical evidence has shown that listeners may infer facts about speakers' ethos from vocal behavior. Listener perceptions of speaker ethos can be modified by rhythmic and vocalic features of delivery. The writer investigated these factors to determine if they had influenced the manner in which the addresses were received.
Rhythmical Features

According to Arnold, "some speaking gains impact because rhythm defines, structures, and limits," while other speech lacks this particular kind of affective functioning. The question for us then becomes were there any prominent rhythmical patterns in either of the addresses which may have affected the audience's response? Recordings of the speech indicate that there were.

Jordan's message was superior to Glenn's because she had the ability to make the audience sense meaning and emphasis far beyond her words, whereas with Glenn's message, listeners were forced to rely on the assertive force of things explicitly said. Jordan's rhythmic pattern provided the audience with phrasing which carried them through a series of ideas despite its complexity. Through the music of prose rhythm, she was able to evoke meaning and feeling; yet, the pattern was not obvious enough to be distracting. On the other hand, little extra feeling was generated by Glenn through rhythm. The effect was dependent on the merit of his ideas alone.

Vocal Variety

For centuries, rhetorical theorists have held that messages are less effective when presented in a monotone than when vocal variety is used. Listeners interpret a singleness of pitch as a sign of the speaker's indifference not only to them, but also to the message. But when variety is used, it must be appropriate for the rhetorical situation to which the rhetorician is responding.

In determining what type of vocal inflections were appropriate for Glenn and Jordan, it is necessary to review once again the needs of
the situation. The audience was lethargic. Yet, the delegates expected to be motivated by the keynoters; that was their function. The exigence was a call for passionate commitment to party goals. Such a challenge was conveyed in Jordan's voice from the moment she began speaking.

Without evangelicizing, she managed to move the delegates through her use of inflectional patterns which communicated neither exceptional emotionalism nor indifference. Her technique was vocal rhythm variations within the speech itself. Through the rhythmical pattern, she was able to establish a working rapport with the delegates. Her voice exhibited enthusiasm, aggressiveness, sincerity, and a high degree of confidence. On the other hand, Glenn's words lacked variation. His inflectional features consisted of a low pitch level and a narrow range which suggested speaker indifference. Additionally, he lacked aggressiveness self-confidence and enthusiasm. As a result, he failed to establish a common bond with the audience.

**Introductions**

Winder found that introductions in effective political speaking were long, whereas they were short in ineffective speaking. A look at the 1976 keynotes revealed that Jordan's message coincided with the former while Glenn's speech was in line with the latter. Both addresses began with a purpose statement that was grounded in the historical significance of the occasion. Glenn described his purpose as carrying on the American Revolution which had started two centuries earlier. Jordan saw the meeting as a continuation of a tradition which had begun 144 years earlier.
But while Jordan followed up her purpose statement by calling attention to her significance, thereby establishing a relationship with the audience, Glenn proceeded directly into his message. She compelled the audience to note the fact that she had accomplished a remarkable feat by being chosen as one of the keynoters. Her ethos was further enhanced for she avoided castigating her party for failing to select a Black or a female to address its convention earlier, choosing rather to pinpoint the delegates' present action as an illustration that the American dream was working, and that it was the Democrats who had made it work. This compliment paved the way for strong rapport for Jordan, but Glenn was left without anything to build upon.

**Organization**

Both messages were logically organized. A core statement was evident also and the development followed a problem-solution pattern. Jordan's proposition was, "We are a people in search of a national community." After pinpointing that need, she illustrated how and why Democrats had been able to satisfy the need in the past and made the audience visualize how they could continue to be the answer in the future, provided they were willing to act. Glenn's proposition was that Americans would continue to win the revolution in freedom, despite doubt and a "lagging confidence in a nation deserving of our pride." He pointed out what Democrats had done in the past to facilitate the goal and posed a more viable solution for achieving the objective in the future.

Neither message was difficult to follow. In fact, the structure resembled the Monroe motivated sequence, one of the most frequently
used patterns of organization known to contemporary speech theorists.

**Topics Addressed**

Chapter VI demonstrated that both Glenn and Jordan identified with basic American cultural values to establish their ethos. The values testified to their good sense, good will, and good moral character. But to the audience members, some of the values could have been more salient than others. If so, then the audience would have responded more favorably to remarks which touched upon those values. What can we pinpoint about the convention which may provide some indication about thoughts which may have been salient because of the rhetorical situation? Again, the emphasis was on unity— it was a virtual obsession. Therefore, one could conjecture that any values which embraced the theme of unity would likely have drawn more response than other values.

Of the sixteen clusters, four of them can be tied directly to unity— puritan and pioneer morality, sociality, value of the individual, and equality. Unity could be perpetuated in a country whose citizens had a sense of responsibility, right and wrong, and honesty. Additionally, a harmonious nation was more realistic where there was 1) a commitment by people to get along with each other despite differences, 2) a belief that every individual was important, and 3) equality of opportunity.

A review of the speeches shows that the bulk of Jordan's message addressed the theme which was salient. The idea of unity was pervasive throughout. She challenged the delegates to come together and form a national community. The requirements for forming the community, as well as the rewards, were listed also. Jordan then followed up by warning
the delegates of the consequences for failing to unify, noting that America would "cease to be one nation and become instead a collection of interest groups." On the other hand, the central focus of Glenn's message was patriotism. While love for one's country was still important, at the convention the priority was keeping the party together—projecting a united front. Therefore, it is probable that the delegates would have responded with more fervor to Jordan's message.

Summary

This chapter has compared the rhetorical response to the two 1976 Democratic keynote addresses. The findings suggest that Barbara Jordan's message was more effective than John Glenn's address. Major factors which contributed to the difference in reception were Jordan's 1) selection of topics, 2) skill in establishing a personal rapport with her audience, and 3) distinctive delivery. Other factors which contributed to the success of the message were 4) the enthusiastic audience reception Jordan received prior to her message, 5) a favorable introduction by the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, 6) favorable comments by the media preceding and following the message, and 7) the order of speaking. The interaction of these variables produced a message and an atmosphere which drew the calculated response.

Factors which exercised little or no apparent influence were 1) speech organization, 2) language usage, and 3) camera angles. This does not mean that such factors are not important in the speaking situation. Rather, it suggests that both speeches were comparable or received similar treatment in these areas.
While an effort has been made to isolate those factors which may have influenced the manner in which the speeches were received, the writer is aware that others may exist. It is conceivable for example that Mr. Carter signaled key state chairpersons to cheer Jordan enthusiastically, but limit their response to John Glenn to polite applause as a means of de-emphasizing Glenn's public image as a Vice-Presidential possibility. The writer found no evidence of this, however. The foregoing conclusions represent those factors she did find operative at the New York Convention.
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CHAPTER VIII
CONCLUSIONS

The keynote address belongs to that class of oratory known as epideictic, messages which attribute praise and blame. Traditionally, such speeches have been grounded in the value structures of society. Speakers have activated the values of their listeners by appealing to commonly held values, thereby reinforcing such beliefs. Simone Weil explained the power inherent in this approach:

... expression either officially or under official sanction of some of the thoughts which before ever being publically expressed were already in the hearts of the people, or in the hearts of certain active elements in the nation ... If one hears this thought expressed publically by some person, and especially by someone whose words are listened to with respect, its force is increased a hundred fold and can sometimes bring about an inner transformation. 1

The goal of such messages, therefore, is "to increase the intensity of adherence to values held in common by the audience and the speaker. At national nominating conventions, the role had significance beyond comparison. Each keynoter had the responsibility for reinforcing the delegates belief that their party was the greatest. In doing so, a mode developed. Keynoters found that their audiences reacted positively when their party was praised and the opposition party was blamed. Such
demonstrates Weil's claim. Those beliefs were embedded in their hearers already and when a respected individual verbalized the beliefs, the utterance gave them more reasons to believe.

Additionally, the speakers impressed upon their listeners the importance of pulling together so that such values could be perpetuated. If they failed to unify, the values which they held deeply would be crushed by the opposition party. In doing so, they sought to bring about the inner transformation which Weil described; they raised the enthusiasm of the delegates. When audiences were broadened to include radio listeners and television viewers, the speakers appealed to their value structures, too, by telling the audience that the values which the Democratic party held were universal ones. These are the ideas which your fathers treasured and which your children will cherish if a Democratic administration is elected. To avoid alienating any viewers before they could get that message across, keynoters tempered their partisan remarks. Thus, as an epideictic form, the keynote message has played an important role because it has identified and intensified commonly held beliefs.

Perelman points out that the speaker engaged in epideictic oratory must have a high reputation and must possess qualifications for speaking on his subject because "... it is not his cause or viewpoint that he is defending, but that of his entire audience." Consequently, while several factors influence the selection of keynoters, two of the most essential qualities are prestige and oratorical skills. In some instances, the aura surrounding the speaker can compensate for the latter, but keynoters have been most effective when they have possessed both qualities.
Occasionally, the rhetorical situation has dictated the need for other considerations. If the party were weak in a particular area, geographical considerations became an important factor or if a certain group of supporters needed appeasement, a member of the group might be selected to deliver the address. Additionally, to implement particular themes, ethnic characteristics have been determiners during this period. Since the chairman ultimately determines what the needs of the situation are and selects speakers on that basis, being in good favor with him has been advantageous as well.

With that recapitulation, we can now pinpoint some of the major findings of this study. Contemporary keynote addresses (1960-1976) bear a close resemblance to their predecessors. However, in addition to performing the traditional functions -praising their party, blaming the opposition party, making a plea for unity, and raising the enthusiasm of the delegates- contemporary keynotes have been designed to reach beyond the convention and make an appeal to independents. Therefore, delegates are no longer the only audience to which the keynote address is directed.

Democratic keynoters since 1968 have functioned in only one capacity-- they have delivered the keynote address. The additional responsibility of serving as temporary chairman of the convention was removed in 1972 and the two functions remain distinct today. Therefore, the keynote has had more time to devote to the preparation of his message, rather than using some time to brush up on parliamentary procedures as his predecessors had done.

In effecting the role of keynote addresses, contemporary keynoters have relied on the American value system. This practice is consistent
with that of keynoters prior to 1960. Since the keynote address is an epideictic speech form, its objective is to reinforce rather than to convince. Consequently, the approach has been to actuate the values of listeners by appealing to values which they shared with the speaker. Because the speaker is an advocate for his value system as well as his listeners in epideictic speaking, he must be qualified to speak on his subject and possess oratorical skills. Keynote addresses are broadcast to millions of Americans today. Therefore, a "party name" which would be familiar to Democratic "die-hearts" only is not acceptable. Resultingly, contemporary keynoters have been individuals who were known nationally. Primarily United States Senators and Congressmen were privileged to address the convention during this period.

The 1976 convention was a critical one for the Democratic party. Its viability depended on winning in November. Convinced that what happened at the convention would be a determining factor in that victory or loss, efforts were made to insure that the convention projected the image of an organized, unified, and diversified party. Robert Strauss, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, engineered the formulation. Steps were taken to insure that the dissension which plagued the 1968 and 1972 conventions over credentials and party choices was nonexistent. Strauss squashed the former himself by getting the credentials committee to adopt new rules regarding the number of signatures necessary for an argument to reach the floor.

By taking a commanding lead over other Democratic Presidential aspirants, Jimmy Carter removed the possibility of a dispute over contested delegates. Finally, Strauss used his program to put the finishing
touches on the production. Geographically, the Democrats were weak in the Mid-west, so Strauss selected a "home-boy" to be the keynoter. However, women's groups and Blacks had been quite vocal in their disapproval about the limited role they had played in previous conventions. Additionally, Strauss wanted to hold the television audiences because that's where the thousands of potential independent votes were; a dull convention, therefore, would have been havoc. He chose Barbara Jordan as the solution to all three problems. Jordan had an additional edge over other would-be keynoters because she was a Texan, as was Strauss, and a good friend.

All rhetorical situations have constraints and a rhetor's effectiveness is dependent upon these opportunities and limitations for rhetoric. The 1976 Democratic National Nominating Convention differed drastically from the two previous ones. Keynoters did not have to concern themselves with friction among the delegates because little existed. Their mission to intensify the delegates' adherence to the precepts of their party could be accomplished in a conducive atmosphere. Additionally, while the remarks were being televised, the technical problems which had detracted from previous conventions were minimal. The industry had refined itself over the years and the improvements were noticeable. Consequently, the keynoters found a very receptive audience.

The messages of Glenn and Jordan were remarkably similar in structure. Both keynoters used traditional value clusters as the basis for their appeals. Then why was the response to the messages so different? The keynoters were on target when they relied on these commonly held values to intensify their listeners adherence to them. Both speakers had the
potential to be effective because the vision they dramatized had its roots in ideas inherent in American culture. But Jordan's message was filled with the idea which was salient at the convention--unity. As a result, the reaction to it was stronger.

But what else must be considered in epideictic oratory? Perelman argues that in the epideictic, more than in any other form of speech, the speaker must be skilled in his presentation. The best speech can have no impact until it is heard. Perelman seemed to be saying because epideictic oratory does not rely on the same type of arguments as other forms of discourse, a compensation must be made somewhere. In the epideictic form of oratory, "who" says what and "how" he says it become as important as "what" is said.

The keynotes of 1976 were in line with this contention. Both speakers were known nationally because each had made some achievements. Jordan became a more significant "who", however, because of contributing factors in the rhetorical situation. She was singled out as the individual to whom attention should be directed. While Glenn was an achiever, Jordan was an over-achiever. Glenn was a typical American hero and it was no novelty for him to address the delegates. On the other hand, because Jordan was Black and female, she had to have been exceptional to have received the honor of addressing the convention. Her ethos was overwhelming. That perception by the listeners was enhanced by her delivery. They wanted her to do well and Jordan came through. It was as if the delegates were listening to a recording by their favorite group and to them, nobody could sing any better than that group. On the other hand, Glenn had merely been a lead-in for the main attraction.
What does this say about epideictic oratory in general and about keynote speeches in particular? The findings imply that while content is still important in epideictic speaking, the reputation of the speaker and his presentational skills are as essential. The content must match the expectations of the audience. In such instances, praise and blame, based on cherished premises, are still the order of the day. But the best mediation occurs when the message plays up the issue which is salient in the listeners' minds. Consequently, keynote addresses which possess this quality will have an advantage over those which address American values in general.

Secondly, to intensify adherence to value structures, an individual must be well-respected. Two or three church members may pat an individual on the back for a particular achievement and the effect may be felt, but when the bishop pats the individual on the back, that action stimulates the transformation to which Weil referred. Therefore, any situation which calls for epideictic speaking requires a speaker with prestige. In the case of national nominating conventions, only a national figure will satisfy that exigency.

Thirdly, oratorical skills complement the speaker's prestige; they are the icing on the cake. They become even more significant when more than one speaker addresses the same audience. On special occasions which are usually traditional celebrations, audience members, no doubt, have become sensitized to what they call the "same old thing." The keynote address to many of the delegates is just another speech. Therefore, it is up to the keynoter/s to motivate them to the extent that they want not only to listen to the message, but also, they appreciate
it. Such can be accomplished only when the keynoter can hold the attention of his audience.

Additionally, when listeners have someone with whom to compare the message, it is even more important that both speakers be skilled orators. Because the individual engaged in epideictic speaking is a "hero" in his own right, listeners could want him to succeed so badly that they would respond on the basis of how they wanted him to come across, rather than how he did. Nevertheless, that conviction becomes more difficult when another speaker shows him up. If John Glenn's address had been the only keynote, the audience probably would have remembered the speech as a good one. But after Jordan delivered a keynote, too, a comparison became inevitable and a new set of criteria emerged. Therefore, whenever two keynoters appear, care must be taken to insure that their oratorical skills are comparable.

Discussion has been presented as to the merit of keynote addresses. That they perform a vital function at national nominating conventions has been demonstrated, but the true significance becomes apparent when we consider the addresses as a means for preserving epideictic oratory. According to Perelman, an orator who seeks to strengthen established values through speaking "may be likened to the guardian of dikes under constant assault by the ocean." Therefore, any society which prizes its own values will "promote opportunities for epideictic speeches to be delivered at regular intervals." Since keynote addresses serve as the forum for perpetuating traditional American values, the need remains.
Recommendations

Conclusively, the recommendations of this study are:

1) Keynote addresses should be continued as a means for presenting epideictic oratory.

2) The substance of keynote addresses should be embedded in traditional American values. However, to achieve the maximum effect, the topics selected should coincide with issues which are salient at the convention.

3) Keynoters should possess political prestige on a national level and be skillful speakers. If two keynoters are scheduled to speak, an effort should be made to choose two whose appeals and abilities are comparable.

4) In addressing the convention, keynoters should refrain from evangelizing, but an additional effort must be made to stimulate the audience through vocal inflections and a demonstration of sincerity.

5) As befits public communication in the age of television, convention keynote speeches should be temperate in their denunciation of the opposing party and a half hour or less in length.

Future Research

This study has identified factors surrounding and inherent in the selection of keynote speakers and their subsequent messages. Additionally, the role of contemporary keynoters has been compared to addresses before 1960. While the scope of this investigation has been broad in several aspects, in other ways it has been limited. Additional research, therefore, is necessary and should focus on the following:

- Republican keynote addresses since Barefield's study should be updated to see if they reflect similar values and patterns.

- Keynote addresses should be monitored continuously as indicators about society's values since writings reflect the values of a culture.
- Experimental studies should focus on listener responses to keynote addresses, independent of media commentary. Delegate responses could be compared to those of television viewers to determine the influence of the media.

- More studies on keynote addresses should be conducted to increase the body of literature in the area so that scholars may draw from the findings.
FOOTNOTES


3 Ibid.

4 Ibid.

5 Ibid.

6 Ibid.
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