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PART I:
THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

INTRODUCTION

We have one great moving process to study, and of this great moving process it is impossible to state any part except as valued in terms of the other parts.

The process approach to the study of political phenomena enjoys a rich heritage of thought ranging from Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian war through Machiavelli's expositions on "Princely" behavior to Nimmo and Combs' review of "mediated political realities." To these writers, the systematic study of political actions must go beyond attempts to "extract 'causes,' 'motives,' and other single-dimension explanations" to the point of concentrating on "what people do, without reference to alleged universals or deductive propositions."

The process approach assumes a political world which is bound by space-time, irreversible in nature, and subject to the symbolic constructions of the political actors of a given moment. The dynamic qualities of such a framework require the student of politics to focus on the "actions" of political entities as they occur in specific contexts in the hope
of "capturing" that event, gaining insight as to the nature of that happening and, eventually, noting that activity's relationship to other actions.

At the core of the process approach is a concentration on the communicative behaviors of political actors. As Arthur F. Bentley noted in 1908: "Language is surely a technique of fundamental importance." Indeed, Bentley went on to comment:

Language must be regarded as a differentiated form of activity, and the only way we can handle it with any approach to scientific accuracy in studying social phenomena is by valuing it, not with reference to some theoretical idea or feeling content, but with reference to other activities directly.

Thus, as James Combs pointed out, "to understand a political process requires the study of the communications which define the situation for those involved." Subsequently, as political actors engage in political activities they offer constructions of the "remembered past, the immediate present, and the anticipated future" for their audiences in the process of organizing their means in order to achieve political ends.

Yet, students of process research often disagree on the specific nature of the "process" under examination. Combs reviewed several different perspectives regarding the conceptualization of process. First, the author cited the "cyclical" version of process in which events are viewed in terms of history with a concentration on identifiable patterns
which appear during specific time frames. Another outlook involves the "rhythmic" idea which, while it does not consider events in terms of cycles, does posit the notion that events occur in sequential patterns over time.

Combs also discussed two polar concepts regarding the nature of process: the developmental-progressive view and the developmental-nonprogressive view. Both perspectives argue in favor of a political world which evolves over time; however, as their titles suggest, the two positions differ on whether such change leads to "improvements" in the system as a result of the change. Finally, Combs reviewed Machiavelli's notion of "random" process in which events occur in a processual manner, but no pattern of development or causal chain can be identified. Hence, the political observer can only chart the flow of events in a specific field of action while noting the roles played by "fortuna, necessita, and virtu" in that context.9

Thus, one may note that while each of these frameworks involves the conceptualization of a dynamic process, they differ on fundamental grounds with regard to the assimilation of what is observed. Perhaps an example of one of these five forms will offer some insight as to the nature of this theoretical frame of reference.

In 1983, while lecturing as a distinguished visiting professor at The Ohio State University, Dan D. Nimmo offered what he described as the "seasonal metaphor" for the study of
presidential campaigns. This "seasonal metaphor" posited a cyclical process through which the events of the presidential campaign could be organized. Nimmo suggested that the "spring" season involved the pre-primary campaign events which could be described in terms of a form of "spring training" for the participants. The next season, "summer," involved the individual state primaries in which "weeds pop up and are weeded out" as the campaign grows more intense and the competition "heats up." The "fall" season, according to Nimmo, brings with it a "cooling off" period in which the parties settle on two presidential nominees through the national conventions; moreover, these two combatants engage each other in the general election during this "season" of the campaign "year." Finally, the "winter" season sets in once the election is over. This final "season" reflects that period where the reporters and the "pols" go into "hybernation" after a long and demanding campaign "year." Nimmo concluded that all of these "seasons" occur in a cyclical pattern during the "campaign year;" yet, they do not necessarily involve any form of "progressive development" or any of the fundamental characteristics present in the other conceptualizations of process. Simply, Nimmo had presented the notion that presidential campaigns reflect certain basic characteristics which manifest themselves at specific points during the election period and are, therefore, subject to the forms of metaphoric classification expressed in that analysis.
This project involves a review of a portion of one "season" in the presidential campaign of 1984. Yet, I argue that this particular facet of the "campaign year" may be viewed in terms of what Combs described as the developmental-progressive version of process. The national nominating conventions change with each presidential election as the national parties attempt to improve that vehicle for the promotion of party objectives. Hence, this study will attempt to examine these events from a processual frame of reference and, in turn, note how these gatherings have developed in a progressive manner over time.
NOTES


3Combs, p. 49.

4Bentley, p. 181.

5Ibid.

6Combs, p. 62.

7Ibid., p. 59.

8Ibid., p. 40.


10Lecture delivered by Professor Dan D. Nimmo at The Ohio State University, October 18, 1983.
CHAPTER ONE:
OVERVIEW OF THE STUDY

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE PROBLEM

The national nominating convention is a dynamic political event reflecting a long, often fascinating, evolution. Its importance to the maintenance of American Democracy is a central thesis of this work which attempts to chart the development of this assembly, assess its current status, and contemplate its future. However, it is instructive to note that the basic function of the convention has remained constant throughout its growth and development. The national political conventions are strategic devices designed to consolidate electoral power under the rubrics of the nation's two major political parties and, as a consequence, preserve the doctrine of separation of powers.

Upon reflection, the introduction of the nominating convention represents a significant innovation within the American political system as originally conceived by the Founding Fathers. Indeed, the Constitutional Convention operated under the assumption that a "natural elite" existed in the country and that those individuals would emerge as the occupants of the "Office of the Chief Magistrate." However,
the emergence of the two political parties of that period revealed that such a "natural aristocracy" could be divided over specific questions of ways and means. Hence, some form of modification was in order if the doctrine of separation of powers was to survive through the preservation of the Executive Branch's independence.

Initially, the problems concerning the peaceful transfer of executive authority did not directly feature the nomination function in that a series of popular men ascended to power. The election of 1824 altered that situation as Andrew Jackson extended the notion of participatory democracy to the point where popular input into the nomination of candidates for the nation's highest offices became desirable. As a means of relieving the confusion over the electoral process, the system turned toward a nomination device which featured a more "democratic" means of selecting national candidates: the nominating conventions.

The essential functions of the nominating conventions were quickly established and remain to this day. However, the means through which the various political messages were expressed (i.e., types of speeches, rituals, use of media, and so forth) have evolved in a progressive manner. The introduction of the national broadcasts of the conventions expanded the potential audience for the two parties in a powerful way; therefore, these political organizations began adjusting their rhetorical strategies in order to appeal to
that audience. At first, the national television networks were eager to broadcast these quadrennial gatherings; yet, as time passed they began to express concerns that they were being "manipulated" by the two organizations. As a result, the 1984 national conventions received much less "air time" than any of the previous assemblies.

Nevertheless, during the 1984 conventions the national television networks continued the practice of broadcasting the keynote addresses and the acceptance speeches to the nation in prime-time. Clearly, this offered the parties the optimal opportunity to address the nation in an unedited fashion. Therefore, I maintain that these orations reflect, take into account, and adapt to all other communication events within the convention process. Thus, this research concentrates on these six prime-time speeches in its evaluation of the 1984 version of the nomination-through-convention process.

The 1984 nominating conventions offered a dynamic field of action for consideration by the critic of political communication. The pluralistic nature of American Democracy presents a complex system of interdependent elements in operation on a variety of levels at various points in time; therefore, the national convention emerges as a unique opportunity to study the strategic processes of political mobilization "in action" on a national scale. Consequently, this work seeks to assess critically such activity in an effort to
gain insight into the rhetorical strategies evidenced within that specific field of action.

RESEARCH QUESTION

This project seeks to evaluate the 1984 national nominating conventions by responding to the following research question:

How did the Democrats and Republicans use their 1984 national nominating conventions in the process of mobilizing their diverse constituency groups for the 1984 general election?

This question is oriented toward an assessment of the ways in which the two major parties employed their respective conventions in the process of consolidating the diverse constituency groups within those parties behind their eventual nominees. Consequently, a synthesis of the events which occurred inside the convention hall (podium speeches, video presentations, etc.); those events projected to audiences outside the hall (principally, what was reported in the national/local media); and events which occurred outside the convention hall, but involving convention delegates (social events) is required. This synthesis will manifest itself in the form of two narratives which depict the growth and development of each of the 1984 national conventions during the four-day gatherings.
In my view, such a synthesis will facilitate the identification and evaluation of the various rhetorical strategies employed by the two parties and, as a result, contribute to our discipline’s understanding of such dynamic processes.

**METHODOLOGY**

This research venture employs Kenneth Burke’s notion of “the representative anecdote.” Such an idea is predicated on the premise that an act which is a “selection of reality,” a “prototype,” or a “summation” of a larger drama is a useful segment for critical evaluation.

Burke described this concept as follows:

Men seek vocabularies that will be faithful reflections of reality. To this end, they must develop vocabularies that are selections of reality. And any selection of reality must, in certain circumstances, function as a deflection of reality. Insofar as the vocabulary meets the needs of reflection, we can say that it has the necessary scope. In its selectivity, it is a reduction. Its scope and reduction become a deflection when the given terminology, or calculus, is not suited to the subject matter which it is designed to calculate.

The author continued:

Dramatism suggests a procedure to be followed in the development of a given calculus, or terminology. It involves the search for a “representative anecdote,” to be used in conformity with which the vocabulary is constructed.
As an example, Burke discussed the work of the behavioral scientist who used his experiments with animals as a means of discussing traits associated with humans. Burke argued that the behaviorist's anecdote, though informative, is in no way representative "since one cannot find a representative case of human motivation in animals." Therefore, Burke concluded that "if the originating anecdote is not representative, a vocabulary developed in strict conformity with it will not be representative." Interestingly, Burke asserted that the notion of the representative anecdote is "itself so dramatic" that it could be considered to be a "dramatistic approach to dramatism: an introduction to dramatism that is deduced from dramatism, and hence gains plausibility in proportion as dramatism itself is more fully developed." 

Burke continued by arguing that "a given calculus must be supple and complex enough to be representative of the subject-matter it is designed to calculate" since the anecdote is "a reduction of" that "subject-matter" (the Burkean "calculus" will be more fully developed in the theoretical literature section of this chapter). Thus, representative anecdotes are "summations" that contain "implicitly what the system that is developed from it contains explicitly." Moreover, the representative anecdote may involve acts which are considered to be "the ultimate act," or "the most complete act," or a "pure" act in which case the anecdote may be called a "prototype" of that subject-matter.
Hence, Burke has argued that in order to capture the complexities which entail human behavior some form of reduction is required that is reflective of "reality." Bentley posited a similar notion in 1926 and described that concept as the "representative activity." Bentley defined the "representative activity" as follows:

The characteristic of any cross-sectional activity by which it can be defined only in terms of other cross-sectional activities, involving all their anticipatory features, and involving all and more than is meant when the vaguer term purposiveness is used with reference to them.

Bentley argued that certain types of activities "can be set apart for special consideration" which, in my view, appears to be in fundamental agreement with Burke's claim on the basis that both writers seek some form of reduction through selection as a research tool. Simply, as one attempts to study a dynamic, complex action for evaluative purposes, one may systematically reduce that field of action in a responsible manner through the use of these notions.

This critical review of the 1984 national nominating conventions is predicated on such a research strategy. Borrowing from Burke, this research offers an introduction to the 1984 conventions that is deduced from the 1984 conventions, and hence gains plausibility as the 1984 conventions are more fully developed. Subsequently, this effort will offer narratives of the San Francisco and Dallas assemblies which are designed to develop the subject-matter from which
the reader may consider six specific pieces of discourse which are viewed to be both a "summation" of the larger drama as well as "the most complete act" among the many acts rendered within that field of action.

As Thomas Farrell noted in his 1978 piece on "Political Conventions as Legitimation Ritual:"

The optimal convention ritual begins with the statement and demonstration of theme, progresses to the clustering of roles and generic personae, and culminates in the anointing of the person who condenses, symbolizes, and enacts the theme. In addition, the author argued that the "statement and expression of theme" is of prime importance and that, "traditionally, such a statement has been the responsibility of keynote and guest speakers." Correspondingly, the "anointing" of those chosen to "enact the theme" occurs on the last evening of the convention through the acceptance speeches. Thus, the keynote and acceptance speeches would appear to represent "ultimate acts" which embrace the larger drama of the convention through a "selection" which is a reflection of that reality. I will advance the specific story line of the anecdote once the Burkean framework has been fully developed through the review of the relevant literature section of this chapter.

I collected data for the construction of the two narratives through a variety of research techniques. Principally, I gathered information via my on-site observations
since I was able to attend both national conventions. As a former intern in the United States Senate Press Gallery, I was able to secure press credentials for both assemblies from the Superintendent of the Gallery. The fact that I was able to obtain these credentials allowed me to enter press conferences, move about the convention floor, collect copies of speeches and official publications, as well as attend social gatherings which occurred outside the convention hall. Furthermore, these credentials allowed me to enter areas restricted to members of the press and, as a result, converse with veteran reporters and other experienced individuals.

In addition to my on the scene observations I recorded the national network coverage (ABC, CBS, NBC, and C-Span) of the two conventions, clipped the convention coverage from the San Francisco and Dallas newspapers, and clipped the convention coverage of several of the nation's more prominent newspapers and news magazines (e.g., The Washington Post, The New York Times, Chicago Tribune, Los Angeles Times, Christian Science Monitor, Time, Newsweek, and U.S. News and World Report). Moreover, I collected information disseminated by the respective parties such as the advanced texts of speeches, press kits, biographies, and other such materials. The goal of this effort involved my attempt to synthesize data relevant to the construction of two narratives which would constitute the subject-matter from which a representative selection could be drawn. In my view, the research
goal of presenting a representative anecdote of the larger drama that was the 1984 national nominating conventions would have been difficult to realize without the use of the diverse source material cited above.

REVIEW OF THE RELEVANT LITERATURE

The following section presents a review of the resource material which is considered to be relevant to this research venture. First, this review offers an overview of the subject-matter under consideration with a later emphasis on communication-related research on national conventions (a more thorough review of the nomination-through-convention process appears in Chapter Two). Secondly, a review of the theoretical framework through which the subject-matter will be critically evaluated is presented. Thus, the goal of this review centers on a presentation of the viewpoints of either those who have studied national nominating conventions or those writings which appear to be conducive to an evaluation of the same. Clearly, in order to conduct an evaluation of the 1984 conventions which will be accepted by the scholarly community, I must present a review of that community's work in this area.
Subject Matter

As James Chase noted in his book, *Emergence of the Presidential Nominating Convention, 1789-1832*, the evolution which produced the national nominating convention as a vehicle for the selection of a party's presidential and vice presidential nominees was slow and suggestive of a form of trial and error process. Once these events emerged as an institution in American electoral politics their reputations as rowdy, often acrimonious, happenings grew to the point of legend. Pendleton Herring described these uniquely American forums as follows:

The value of the convention lies in its permitting the rank and file of the party to participate physically and emotionally in a common enterprise. Here are the men who must carry the brunt of the campaign. Here they have the chance to meet, to shout together, to act together, to feel together. The excitement and the turmoil of the convention fulfill a useful purpose. The relationship of follower and leader is seldom an intellectual bond. A common bond of sympathy, a common symbol, is easily grasped and equally binding.

James W. Davis offered support for Herring's conclusion as he described the functions performed by the national nominating conventions. Davis described six manifest functions conventions serve:

1. They nominate the presidential and vice presidential candidates and, if a deadlock occurs, the convention serves a "brokerage" function which is designed to reconcile and reintebrate the party.
2. They serve a unifying function for the party since they are the only means of gathering the divergent elements of the party together for the purpose of rallying behind the nominee.

3. They are central to the vice presidential nomination process since the presidential nominee may wish to "consult" the various elements of the party prior to the selection.

4. They serve to consolidate the diverse elements of the party through the party platform process.

5. They serve as a form of campaign rally mechanism for the national parties.

6. They serve as the supreme governing body of the national party.

With these six functions in mind, one may recognize the vital role performed by the national convention as one considers the pluralistic nature of American Democracy. Dye and Zeigler discussed the pluralistic nature of the American system by stating: "Pluralists recognize that in a complex, urban, industrial society, individual participation in decision making is not possible and has inevitably and necessarily given way to interaction--bargaining, accommodation, and compromise--among leaders of institutions and organizations in society." The authors continued by noting that "pluralism stresses that power is fragmented throughout society and, therefore, presents the hope "that the power of diverse institutions and organizations in society will roughly balance out and that the emergence of power monopoly is unlikely." Charles McCall supported this notion as he argued that "the acids of pluralism guarantee the stubborn
recurrence of opposition in American party politics. Bentley also endorsed the pluralistic foundation of the American system as he dismissed notions such as the "public interests" (a mere "slogan and a rallying cry") in favor of a concentration on the activities of groups. In other words, the American approach to democracy is predicated on a "natural state" of competition among diverse groups. However, as the young nation evolved a two-party system developed which attempted to embrace these diverse elements for the purposes of electoral gain. Thus, the national nominating convention emerged as a primary means of overcoming this "natural divisiveness" among groups in the conduct of national politics.

A survey of the literature regarding the national conventions indicates a rather strong emphasis on the political/institutional functions of these assemblies. Davis has produced two works on this topic; The Brookings Institution published three books in 1960 addressing the history and development, platform content, and the 1952 television coverage of the conventions (respectively); Byrne and Marx offered a lively work on "types" of conventions; and Thomas Marshall's book on convention reforms represent several of the more acknowledged efforts on this subject. In addition, Richard Reeves, Paul Tillett, and several others have produced books on individual conventions. These works provided valuable insights as to the history and development of these political institutions.
The field of communication offers a variety of works on this subject with a few of these writings addressing the conventions through processual frameworks. Farrell's 1978 piece on the conventions as "legitimation ritual" is one such effort; William R. Brown's article on the television coverage of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago borrowed Boorstin's notion of the "pseudo-event" and is reflective of process-oriented research; and Charles Fant's overview of the television coverage of the national conventions are all thoughtful reviews of these dynamic events. Moreover, J. Leonard Reinsch; Elmer W. Lower; David L. Paletz and Martha Elson; William R. McAndrew; and Herbert Waltzer have all studied the television broadcasts of these quadrennial affairs. Again, I shall borrow extensively from these works in Chapter Two of this work which traces the evolution of this uniquely American institution.

One should also acknowledge several of the more traditional studies of convention discourse rendered by writers in our field as evidenced by Paul Barefield's 1970 piece; Ernest Claussen's 1960 writings; and Edwin Miles' 1960 effort addressing the role of the keynote address in the nominating convention. Linda L. Jenkins' 1982 survey of the literature in the field of political communication revealed several dissertations and masters theses that address the conventions from a variety of perspectives. For example, G.I.T. Oberstar's 1975 dissertation on "Coalition
Formation at National Party Conventions; W. U. Scheibal's 1978 dissertation comparing newspaper and television coverage of the 1976 Democratic Convention; J. H. Boyett's 1975 dissertation regarding delegate perceptions at the 1972 Democratic and Republican assemblies; P. E. Glover's 1979 dissertation on black delegates attending the 1976 conclaves; and Ohio State's Cliff Zukin's 1978 dissertation regarding a uses and gratification study of the 1976 conventions and presidential debates represent a cross-section of the research cited in Jenkins' survey. In addition, in the late 1950s and early 1960s The Quarterly Journal of Speech dedicated space for overviews of convention discourse in its quadrennial section on presidential elections. While I do not borrow from these works in this effort, I perceived the need to mention these writings for those readers wishing to pursue the national conventions from different theoretical perspectives.

Indeed, the breadth of research on these nationally-oriented happenings in conjunction with their significance within the American approach to government indicate a field of action of enormous potential for the student of political communication. I will now turn to a review of the theoretical framework which guides this effort to capture the dynamic processes that are in action in the 1984 version of the nomination-through-convention function.
Theoretical Framework

This project employs the theoretical framework of Kenneth Burke in its evaluation of the 1984 national nominating conventions. Perhaps an appropriate starting point for a review of Burke's philosophical worldview would be his "definition of man" which he has expressed in this manner:

Man is a symbol-using animal, inventor of the negative, separated from his natural condition by instruments of his own making, goaded by the spirit of hierarchy, and rotten with perfection.40

Burke as argued in favor of a world characterized by division. The author's conceptualization of division is the foundation of his theoretical worldview. Due to the human capacity for "symbolicity," Burke separated our physical environment into two classes: humans (with the "symbol-using, symbol-making, and symbol-misusing" capacities) and, perhaps more precisely, non-humans (entities that do not display an ability to create and manipulate symbols).41 Burke articulated this outlook through his discussion of the "action-motion" dichotomy.42 The ability to employ symbols as a means of directing attention, intentionally, separates the human from the other life forms which share our physical environment. Borrowing from Freud, although in fundamental disagreement with that writer, Burke argued that intentions may originate on either a conscious or unconscious level and, eventually, manifest themselves in specific actions.43 Burke summed his "action-motion" argument through the following:
1. There can be no action without motion. (That is, even the "symbolic action" of pure thought requires corresponding motions of the brain.)

2. There can be motion without action. (For instance, the motions of the tides, of sunlight, of growth and decay.)

3. Action is not reducible to terms of motion. (For instance, the "essence" or "meaning" of a sentence is not reducible to its sheer physical existence as sounds in the air or marks on the page, though material motions of some sort are necessary for the production, transmission, and reception of the sentence.) One might state their terministic situation thus: A tide that laughed and talked would not be wholly reducible to terms of just a tide.

One example Burke has used to relate this distinction between "action" and "motion" involved a bird that was trapped in a classroom due to the positioning of the windows in that room. The bird could not recognize the need to adjust its behavior (that is, fly toward the open portion of the window instead of the closed portion) and, as a result, escape that unfortunate situation. To Burke, the bird was operating in the realm of motion and in the absence of symbolicity was restricted in its ability to negotiate its environment.

Burke argued that the human would be able to "escape" such a situation due to his or her ability to symbolically manipulate the physical nature of that predicament. Moreover, if such an event were to occur in the presence of other humans, those witnessing the event could symbolically relate information (an "action") which would assist the individual
in the negotiation of the problem. The "action-motion" distinction represents the basis of the Burkean worldview.

Burke extended the use of division to inter-human activity: "... whereby my toothache is mine and no one else's. When I die I die alone. Even when I die with a thousand people, I die as an individual. On that level there is as complete, as clear an empirical a distinction as you could ever want between one individual and another."46

The Burkean argument is clear. Humans operate in a world of action. Yet, these actions are reflective of individual preferences which, in turn, lead to a consideration of a "natural state" of division. Burke has denoted the individuality of symbolicity as being representative of "terministic screens." To illustrate his point Burke offered the analogy of two photographs of the same tree: "Here something so 'factual' as a photograph revealed notable distinctions in texture, and even form, depending upon which color filter was used for the documentary description of the event being recorded."47 In sum, an individual's construction of "reality" is a reflection of that individual's personal frame of reference or "terministic screen."

The Burkean construction of "reality" is predicated on the notion that a "natural state" of division exists on at least two levels: the divisions between human forms and non-human forms which manifest themselves in the "action-motion" dichotomy and the divisions which are present among
humans due to our individuality which manifest themselves in the various "terministic screens" which guide our unique constructions of "reality." This condition, the natural state of division, leads us to consider the role of rhetoric in the conduct of human relations.

Burke addressed the "need" for rhetoric in the conduct of human relations through the following passage:

Ideology cannot be deduced from economic considerations alone. It also derives from man's nature as a "symbol-using animal." And since the "original economic plant" is the human body, with the divisive centrality of its particular nervous system, the theologian's concerns with Eden and the "fall" come close to the heart of the rhetorical problem. For, behind the theology, there is the perception of generic divisiveness which, being common to all men, is a universal fact about them, prior to any divisiveness caused by social class. Here is the basis of rhetoric. Out of this emerge the motives for linguistic persuasion. Then, secondarily, we get the motives peculiar to particular economic situations.46

More specifically, Burke defined his concept of rhetoric as "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents . . . it is trying to move people."49 The author continued by suggesting:

[Rhetoric is] rooted in an essential function of language itself, a function that is wholly realistic, and is continually born anew; the use of language as a symbolic means of inducing cooperation in beings that by nature respond to symbols.50

Thus, Burke advanced a theory of rhetoric predicated on the classical interpretation of that activity. The author
extended that viewpoint by noting: "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his." Again, more specifically, Burke presented the core of his argument:

As for the relation between "identification" and "persuasion" we might well keep in mind that a speaker persuades an audience by the use of stylistic identifications; his act of persuasion may be for the purpose of causing the audience to identify itself with the speaker's interests; and the speaker draws on identification of interests to establish rapport between himself and his audience.

As Marie Hochmuth Nichols discussed in her highly regarded review of Burke's ideas, Burke's concentration on overcoming this natural state of divisiveness through identification represents the distinction between the "old" rhetoric and the "new" rhetoric. Nichols remarked: "Whereas the key term for the 'old rhetoric was persuasion and its stress on deliberate design, the key term for the 'new' rhetoric is identification and this may include partially 'unconscious' factors in its appeal."

Clearly, the worldview Burke explicated is predicated on the notion of individual differences which manifest themselves in the various forms of divisiveness evidenced in human behavior. The world of "action" reflects a variety of diverse "intentions" due to the individualistic nature of the actors present on the various stages of life. Burke has
argued that, by nature, "individuals are at odds with one another, or become identified with groups more or less at odds with one another;" therefore, "identification is affirmed with earnestness precisely because there is division." Indeed, "identification is compensatory to division" to the extent that "if men were not apart from one another, there would be no need for the rhetorician to proclaim their unity" or "consubstantiality." While Burke's writings have been interpreted in terms of a "new rhetoric," he displayed a strong attachment to the philosophical foundations of the "old rhetoric" in a straightforward fashion. One area where one may chart the similarity in these viewpoints is in Burke's discussion of the situation-specific nature of the identification process. In his work *The Philosophy of Literary Form* Burke addressed the relevance of the situation to the subsequent discourse by stating: "Critical and imaginative works are answers to questions posed by the situation in which they arose. They are not merely answers, they are strategic answers, stylized answers." In addition, "These strategies size up the situation, name their structure and outstanding ingredients, and name them in a way that contains an attitude toward them." Yet, one may wonder, of what relevance is this to the Aristotelian tradition? Burke responded:

I don't say Aristotle has given us the last word on these matters. But I submit that his actual
treatment of topics is fundamentally correct. You could add new topics, and develop them accordingly. But what you got 2,000 years ago was the kind of approach that can be built on in principle.

Burke was particularly productive in the development of a specifically-suited "calculus" for the assessment of his theoretical worldview in action: Burkean Dramatism. Burke defined his framework in this fashion:

Dramatism is a method of terministic analysis (and a corresponding critique of terminology) designed to show that the most direct route to the study of human relations and human motives is via a methodic inquiry into the cycle or cluster of terms and their functions implicit in the key term, "act."

He continued:

For there to be an act, there must be an agent. Similarly, there must be a scene in which the agent acts. To act in a scene, the agent must employ some means, or agency. And there cannot be an act, in the full sense of the term, unless there is a purpose.

The Burkean methodology is based on the notion that the rhetorical critic may gain insight into the "motives" of actors in specific situations via the calculus advanced above. More precisely, Burke stated in A Grammar of Motives:

In a rounded statement about motives, you must have some word that names the act (names what took place, in thought or deed), and another that names the scene (the background of the act, the situation in which it occurred); also, you must indicate what person or kind of person (agent) performed the act, what means or instruments he used (agency), and the purpose.
Burke argued that "men may violently disagree" about the types of determinations rendered through such an assessment; nevertheless, "any complete statement about motives will offer some kind of answers to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose)." Burke used a simple example: "the hero (agent) with the help of a friend (co-agent) outwits the villain (counter-agent) by using a file (agency) that enables him to break his bonds (act) in order to escape (purpose) from the room where he has been confined (scene)." Through this form of evaluation the critic may be in a position to attribute motive for the particular action which occurred in that particular situation (in the example above Burke suggested a "love of freedom" motive).

Burke referred to these five elements as the "dramatic pentad" with the specific objective of delineating how these terms "operate in the imputing of motives." Moreover, from the use of these terms specific "ratios" emerge which further facilitate the "imputing of motives" in the process of critical evaluation. Thus, Burke advanced these "ratios" as "principles of determination" and, one assumes in the spirit of precision, denoted ten possible combinations (scene-act, scene-agent, scene-agency, scene-purpose, act-purpose, act-agent, act-agency, agent-purpose, agent-agency, and agency-purpose). As Nichols pointed out:
Burke draws his key terms for the study of motivation from the analysis of drama. Being developed from the analysis of drama, his pentad "treats language and thought primarily as modes of action." His method for handling motivation is designed to contrast with the methodology of the physical sciences which considers the subject of motivation in mechanistic terms of "flat cause-and-effect or stimulus-and-response." 67

Hence, Burke approached the rhetorical act through the viewpoint of the "drama critic" and, as a result, developed a language (which he referred to as a "calculus") through which such activities could be construed. Thus, the acts performed by agents within particular scenes via a specifically designed agency (reflecting strategy) are intended to achieve a goal (purpose) and, in turn, reflect an attitude toward that, again specific, situation (hence, facilitating the "imputing of a motive"). Since this action reflects an attitude, Burke denoted such activity as a "symbolic act" which he defined as "the dancing of an attitude." 68 Through such a methodological framework the critic may construe the hierarchial order of human relationships as well as interpret the "dramatic qualities" of these happenings in terms of such theatrical constructs as "sacrifice, victimage, and scapegoatism." 69 As Golden, Berquist, and Coleman noted, these terms gain in significance "when we realize that, in Burke's view, 'life is drama'--a fact which stems from symbolic action and features the elements of 'order,' 'guilt,' 'conflict,' and 'victimage.' 70
Students of human communicative behavior have noted the inclusive nature of Burke's theoretical frame of reference. Beginning with his "definition of man," moving to his view of the role of rhetoric in light of that definition, and, ultimately, advancing to a consideration of a methodological treatment of that theoretical worldview, Kenneth Burke presented a powerful tool for rhetorical criticism. Dan Nimmo and James Combs discussed the use of this "tool" as it applies to investigations into the dramatic world of political action. The authors suggested:

As a theory of political action, dramatism appears to assume an existential universe of process, a universe in which the political existence requires action in order to overcome the real obstacles in political situations. It is public action for public audiences. Thus, when we "talk politics" we are immediately in the realm of symbolic action and dramatistic logic . . . . As dramatic activity, then, political action is amenable to analysis respecting the kinds of dramas possible.

Nimmo and Combs offered these remarks in a discussion of a "neo-Burkean" theory of politics in which they noted the theoretical similarities between Burke's writings and the works of Arthur F. Bentley. The writers noted that both men have articulated a world of "action." Bentley focused on the "actions" of groups within the American political process which was, eventually, construed (or perhaps more accurately, misconstrued) by writers of the mechanistic frame of reference as the foundation of that approach to the study of political behavior. As a result, Nimmo and Combs advanced the following argument:
We are simply saying that political scientists have had a Burkean-like program before them via Bentley throughout most of the century. They have not, by and large, chosen to follow it. Instead they extracted one aspect of Bentley's construction, reified it, then set out to study discrete groups and the interactive pressures one against the other, both governmental and non-governmental.

I introduce Nimmo and Combs' sentiments on the basis of this project's goal of advancing a "Burkean-like program" within a study of political action in a specific context. As Bentley argued some seventy-seven years ago, American politics consist of a system of dynamic entities (i.e., political groups) all of whom are in competition over the vast resources controlled by government. The processes through which Americans select candidates for the country's highest elective offices require these diverse entities to engage in a system of compromise.

In other words, American pluralism requires the diverse interests which comprise the system to form coalitions under the rubrics of the country's two major political parties. In Burkean terms, the respective groups must overcome a natural state of division through a dramatistic process of identification in the hopes of promoting consubstantiality in the general election. Therefore, the respective parties employ rhetorical strategies which address the specific situation before them in an attempt to promote identification with the party and, eventually, consubstantiality of purpose.
In this critique of the strategies employed in the 1984 nominating conventions I have chosen Burke's notion of the representative anecdote as my method of analysis. As Barry Brummett argued, "the anecdote is a macroscopic tool in the array of Burkean methods, in contrast to the pentadic, cluster argon, or other more word-specific approaches."\(^7^3\)

Flowing from Burke's root metaphor of "drama," an anecdote constitutes "a lens, filter, or template through which the critic studies and reconstructs" the activities under consideration in a way that "follows a dramatic plot."\(^7^4\)

Brummett continued:

The critic in search of an anecdote must therefore exercise his or her powers of abstraction to detect a form or pattern which is a plot, a story line, immanent within the content of the discourse and able to represent the discourse . . . . Because one is looking for an abstract dramatic form, one is looking for the same **story structure** to be told in different guises.

In light of the observation that certain situations prompt a recurrence of specific types of anecdotes, this work will subscribe to an anecdote described as "mirroring" in its evaluation of the discourse selected from the subject-matter that was the 1984 nominating conventions (such an anecdote, it would appear, embraces convention discourse in general and could therefore be used in an analysis of other assemblies as well). This representative anecdote may be summed as follows: Mirroring is the articulation of the state of divisiveness present within the time frame in question in a way
which provides for an ordering of experiences for the diverse groups operating within the system. Mirroring anecdotes construct the political scene for the audience in a way which affords the various groups an occasion to observe where they fit within a party's construction of political reality.

Through this anecdote the critic may evaluate the story line through which each party presented itself, the needs of party constituents, and the party's goals for the future. Consequently, the mirroring anecdote allows rhetors to offer constructions in which diverse groups may "see themselves" within the political spectrum and, in turn, note how their needs are addressed through that "reflection" of reality. Again, following Brummett, "stories do not merely pose problems, they suggest ways and means to resolve the problems insofar as they follow discursively a pattern that people might follow in reality." Therefore, such a construction allows each party to claim that its worldview is a realistic reflection of the political situation with realistic solutions and, simultaneously, argue that the opposition's perspective is but a deflection of that same scene.

In sum, the mirroring anecdote encompasses the identification processes through which consubstantiality may be obtained for the general election. In my view, the application of this anecdote to the six orations selected from the subject-matter will facilitate the evaluation of the respective convention themes and, in turn, explicate the rhetorical strategies in operation within that context.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

In an effort to promote precision in language use, this work offers the following definition of terms:

1. **Calculus:** This work will use the term calculus to designate the elements of the dramatistic methodology. Thus, the Burkean calculus involves the imputing of motives through the application of such Burkean terms act, agent, agency, purpose, scene, identification, and so forth.

2. **Consubstantiality:** This Burkean term will be used to designate the "acting together" of individuals and/or groups. Thus, once individuals and/or groups identify for a specific purpose they may choose to unite toward a common goal.

3. **Identification:** This Burkean term will be used to designate the means through which individuals and/or groups overcome the natural state of divisiveness present in human relations.

4. **Narrative:** This work will use the term narrative to designate the synthesis of information which depicts the activities that were the 1984 conventions. Thus, in Burkean terms, the narratives constitute the "subject-matter" from which the representative anecdote was selected.

5. **Pluralism:** Following Robert Dahl, "pluralism assumes . . . that the existence of multiple centers of power, none of which is wholly sovereign, will help to tame power, to secure the consent of all, and to settle conflicts peacefully;" thus, this work argues that American Democracy is predicated on such a concept.

6. **Process:** This study will refer to the term process to designate a theoretical viewpoint which stresses the inter-relatedness of activities in a specific field of action. Moreover, this project will assume a developmental-progressive view of process which
stresses the notion of "growth" within a given process without regard to value judgements as to the "positive" or "negative" qualities of such growth.

7. Representative Anecdote: In the Burkean calculus, a representative anecdote is a "selection of reality" or a "summation" of a larger drama which constitutes a reflective reduction of the whole for the purposes of critical evaluation.

8. Symbolic Act: In the Burkean calculus, a symbolic act refers to an activity that encompasses a given situation and therefore reflects the actor's attitude toward that action. Hence, such action is viewed as "the dancing of an attitude" through which the critic may impute motive.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

This evaluation of the 1984 national nominating conventions is predicated on the premise that a natural state of divisiveness is present within the field of action known as American politics. In order to overcome this natural condition a strategic activity has been designed which seeks to promote unity among these diverse factions under the rubrics of the Democratic and Republican Parties. Such an activity is fundamental to the maintenance of the doctrine of separation of powers and, therefore, facilitates the continuance of the American approach to government.

In its effort to review critically the rhetorical processes in operation within this field of action this work employs the theoretical framework of Kenneth Burke. Hence, as has been stated, I borrow his notion of the representative
anecdote as a means of selectively reducing the complex system of activities present during the nominating conventions as well as evaluate the content of those acts. Yet, this project also subscribes to a "developmental-progressive" conceptualization of process; therefore, an in-depth review of the growth and development of these uniquely American institutions appears necessary. Simply, in order to respond to the research question advanced by this work I must establish a context for the consideration of the subject-matter presented in Part II.

Consistent with the assumptive world which guides this research venture, Chapter Two will present an overview of the evolution which produced the national nominating convention. This review will also discuss the various functions performed by these national assemblies as well as the ways in which these institutions have changed as the result of the introduction of the national television broadcasts of these events.

Part II of the project presents the subject-matter from which the representative anecdote is drawn. This section opens with an introduction to these narratives and proceeds with the two chapters oriented to a recreation of the activities that were the San Francisco and Dallas Conventions. Part II closes with a brief summary of the themes presented through these two dynamic happenings.
Part III of the project presents the critical evaluation of the selection of reality presented in Part II. The full texts of the representative anecdote appear in the appendices. This portion of the work employs the calculus advanced by Burke in its attempt to evaluate the strategies through which the respective parties sought to mobilize their resources (i.e., the various groups within the party) for the general election. Part III concludes with an assessment of the critical techniques applied throughout this work. I will now turn to a review of the history and development of these American institutions known as the national nominating conventions.
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CHAPTER TWO

Historical Analysis:
The Evolution of the National Nominating Convention

The significance of our system lies not in the alignment of voters pro and con in purely intellectual terms but rather in the maintenance of institutions which keep political power contingent and provide alternative sets of rulers. It is well to repeat that in practice our major political parties are primarily concerned not with framing issues and drawing up distinctive programs but in trying to discover some way of bringing together into a reasonably harmonious relationship as large a proportion of the voters as possible.

The emergence and growth of the two-party system of government represent a significant innovation within the American approach to governance as originally conceived by the nation's Founding Fathers. As James Madison contemplated the dangers of "factions" within the emerging republic, he eventually satisfied himself that the republic would prevail since no one faction could muster the resources necessary to overcome the system of "checks and balances" he had so artfully devised. However, as the young nation grew, an unanticipated party system evolved within the electorate which, as V. O. Key observed, "perform(s) an essential function in
the management of succession to the course of public policy.\textsuperscript{2}

Subsequently, one area that appears to display potential for scholarly inquiry is the use of the national nominating convention as a vehicle for political organization within the two-party system. Such a claim is predicated on the notion that the executive branch of the federal government gained independence through the use of nominating conventions and, in turn, the dismissal of such devices as nomination by congressional caucus or state legislatures. Moreover, the doctrine of separation of powers was maintained as the two party system used the conventions as a means of consolidating electoral strength and, as a result, reducing the chances of the House of Representatives deciding the fate of the executive branch. In sum, the American electoral process assumed its present form once the nominating convention was accepted as a vehicle for the selection of presidential and vice presidential candidates.

This chapter will offer a review of the evolution which produced the system of party government present in the United States and how that system grew to embrace the nominating convention as a vehicle for the attainment of specific political objectives. In addition, this review will examine the functions nominating conventions perform as well as the ways in which those tasks have evolved along with the political environment in which they operate.
As Paul Boller commented in his book on the history of presidential campaigns:

The first presidential election in American history was thoroughly undemocratic. There were no primaries, nominating conventions, rival candidates, campaign speeches, or debates on public issues; and the American people didn't even get to vote for their Chief Executive... the election of George Washington as first President of the United States was a perfect expression of popular will... it was never to be like this again.

Certainly, as the Founding Fathers contemplated the office of the Chief Executive within the new republic and its relationship to the other branches of government, they appeared to reflect a specific set of assumptions regarding the creation of the American system of politics. One area where one may chart the worldview of the young nation's political elites may be found in their original conceptualization of how the country would select and replace its Chief Magistrate. As the literature suggests, the Framers of the Constitution engaged in a form of trial and error process in their efforts to determine the best way to promote a peaceful transference of executive power. The first system employed in this effort reflected the values of the republic's leadership since these decision makers argued that "a basic and natural aristocracy of men whose virtue and wisdom made them natural candidates for the presidency" existed in the country
and all they needed to decide was the best way to facilitate their ascension from within the citizenry.⁵

As a result, the method used to elect the nation's first president combined the nominating and electoral processes by relying on a system of "presidential electors."⁶ Based on Article II of the Constitution, each state would select these "electors" (either through popular vote or appointment or whatever means the state desired) and these men would make this most important decision. Consequently, as David, Goldman, and Bain have noted:

The Convention finally settled upon the method of an ad hoc electoral college. Each state would convene separately its most capable individuals to serve briefly as presidential electors, and these electors in their wisdom would choose "the best" American for the office of President. The runner-up would be Vice President.⁷

The Convention's decision to accept this approach clearly reflected its view that a "natural aristocracy" did, in fact, exist; however, the rejection of several other "plans" also appears to be demonstrative of that assembly's values. One alternative system, called the "Virginia plan," argued that the Congress should select the best man for the presidency.⁸ Yet, such a system would clearly violate the doctrine of a separation of powers among the three branches of the federal government (a notion to which the Founding Fathers were clearly dedicated and served as the basis for the use of a "Chief Executive" in the first place).
Another alternative, proposed by a delegate from Massachusetts, argued in favor of having the governors select the president. Again, the Constitutional Convention rejected that viewpoint on the basis of its potential to alter the chemistry between the state and federal governments and the possibility that a few governors of the larger states might gain a disproportionate amount of influence.

Interestingly, a fourth proposal emerged during the Convention which was rejected as inappropriate and, again, appears to be reflective of the values of the Founding Fathers: direct election by the people. As David, Goldman, and Bain have remarked:

Nor could the President be chosen by direct election of the "people," since even the limited electorate of the day would not be able to employ the "proper" standards for soundly judging which one of the "natural aristocracy" was "the best".

Hence, the Convention settled on the electoral college as a means of guaranteeing the peaceful ascension of the "cream" of the aristocracy's "crop" to the highest office in the land. While these initial assumptions concerning the "nature of things" would change as the republic evolved, they do offer an interesting series of insights as to the guiding philosophies of the young country's political elite. To be sure, the presence of such assumptions among the American elite of the revolutionary period clearly reflected the unique character of the American Revolution in that the
politics of the "motherland" - surely based on notions of aristocracy - managed to manifest themselves within the emerging American system and, in turn, separate the American Experience from the eventual social revolutions in France or Russia.\textsuperscript{12}

Nevertheless, the Constitutional Convention's version of presidential politics was, to say the least, short lived. In 1792 a controversy emerged over the vice presidential selection as "the anti-monarchy Republicans" wanted George Clinton to replace John Adams.\textsuperscript{13} While the "presidential electors" supported John Adams, pressure mounted on the system as the 1796 campaign began to take shape.

Byrne and Marx summed up the 1796 political environment:

By 1796 it was evident that with 138 electors (the increase in electors followed the growth of the young Congress) it would be possible to have many different candidates, each of whom might receive only a few votes. Furthermore, if enough electors voted for the same vice-presidential candidate, they could give him the presidency if none of the presidential candidates received a sufficient number of first-place votes.\textsuperscript{14}

In addition, the 1796 election offered other new dynamics as a crude form of "party politics" began to emerge within the American system of government. The four principal figures in the young American government were George Washington, Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson, Secretary of the Treasury Alexander Hamilton, and Representative James Madison. Throughout his tenure as the nation's first
president, George Washington had expressed his concern over the possible emergence of political parties; moreover, Washington cited the "spirit of party" and the disagreements between Hamilton and Jefferson as the principal reasons for his refusal to seek a third term.\(^\text{15}\)

Indeed, the "spirit of party" had grown immensely during the second term of the country's first administration as the use of the print media aided the opposing factions in their attempts to convey their arguments. The Hamiltonians presented their case through the *Gazette of the United States*, edited by John Fenno, while the Jeffersonians countered with the *National Gazette* of "Republican poet" Philip Freneau.\(^\text{16}\) This "spirit of party" would grow to become the single most distinctive feature of the American approach to democracy and, as a result, offer a possible solution to the growing complexities of electing presidents.

The differences of opinion which led to the formation of the "Federalist Party" and the "Republican Party" represent the personalities of the two protagonists responsible for the emergence of these two entities. As Boller has written, "Hamilton and Jefferson had little in common but their red hair."\(^\text{17}\) Hamilton, an economic "nationalist" dedicated to the interests of the country's merchants, bankers, and manufacturers, contrasted sharply with Jefferson, a man of agrarian society who favored states' rights and who was predisposed toward a "laissez-faire" form of federal
government. Hamilton argued in favor of funding the national debt and establishing a national bank while Jefferson viewed such measures as an attempt to consolidate the republic and possibly even establish a form of "monarchy" which would eventually engulf the liberties of the states and its citizens.

Correspondingly, these two opposing philosophies clashed on certain issues of foreign policy. The Jeffersonian Republicans expressed a clear preference for France while the Hamiltonian Federalists argued for the maintenance of strong ties with Great Britain. Again, these specific positions appear to be related to the fundamental differences which emerged between certain regions of the country, with the New England states seeking initiatives which would facilitate the growth of their industrial-oriented economy while the Southern states sought support for their agriculturally-based economic system.

Thus, the time was right for the emergence of a new feature of American democracy: the political party. The Founding Fathers failed to address the possible evolution of national political parties. Whereas Madison had expressed his concern over the growth of "factions" in his famous essay The Federalist #10, he did not anticipate the emergence of a national party system which could actually embrace multiple factions, consolidate their resources, and pursue specific political objectives. In fact, as noted by William Nisbet Chambers, the founders of the American political parties did
not realize at the outset that they were actually involved in the creation of a party system of government. Chambers continued by stating:

The most obvious difficulty lay in the fact that the "nation" at the outset was actually a loose assemblage of thirteen states. Each had its own history, sense of identity, and political climate; and neighboring states were often engaged in intense rivalries. In short, the nation was the scene of an indigenous, deeply rooted, conflicting pluralism. To bring the order of national parties out of such diversity was obviously no moment's task. The process by which they did so was inevitably erratic and halting. It was also inevitably accompanied by much groping, by fumbling invention as well as brilliant innovation, and by doubts and reversals.

There were no precedents for the establishment of party politics in a growing republic. In England, or any of the European countries, politics consisted of a system of personal maneuverings and connections or of family bonds. Hence, the founders of the American system of consolidating diverse factions as a means of attaining specific initiatives operated "in the dark" which, eventually, led to the demise of the two-party system for a brief period of time.

However, Chambers also noted another reason for the development of the political party as a means of building ties within a diverse republic: the special nature of the American Revolution. As mentioned previously, the American Experience differed significantly from the revolutions which occurred in countries such as France or Russia. The French
and Russian national revolutions were representative of a form of "social revolution" in which "sharp social cleavages, ideological animosities in an intense and sweeping anti-colonialism, and the hatreds towards old masters" are seen as the prominent features. This was in no way the case in the American Revolution since the populace did not seek to reject their "English patrimony totally, but rather built on some parts of it (such as English law and English liberal philosophy), while they sloughed off others (such as monarchy, aristocracy, and the idea of the royal prerogative)." The final result of such a revolution was an openness to opposition which manifested itself in the Constitution in the form of the First Amendment and other specific guarantees of freedom. For example, even though Madison expressed his concern over the dangers of "factions" within the new republic, he carefully articulated a device which he hoped would constrain their activities while allowing them to flourish within the system. After all, it was Madison who wrote the famous line, "Liberty is to faction what air is to fire, an aliment without which it instantly expires." Consequently, the author carefully set about the task of constructing a system of checks and balances which would counteract the dangers of an "out-of-control faction."

Had the American Revolution not produced a spirit of openness insofar as the expression of opposing viewpoints it is doubtful that either a free press or a political party
structure would have evolved. While the divisions over specific policy decisions may have grown to the point where party lines would dominate decision making, it was the process of selecting the Chief Magistrate that allowed the party system to grow to the point where a true national organization emerged.

The presidential campaign of 1796, in many respects, represents the first contested election for the nation's highest office. The growing party structures continued their efforts to consolidate influence by introducing the "caucus" as a vehicle for the nomination of candidates. Yet, even with the introduction of the caucus as a means of consolidating resources through the nomination process, the electoral system still displayed several prominent weaknesses. For example, when the campaign of 1796 ended, the two presidential nominees "won" as the Federalist candidate attained the presidency while the Republican nominee for president finished second and, thus, became vice president. The Adams-Jefferson Administration represented a confused electoral system to say the least and, eventually, served as an incentive for change.

The election of 1800 would also demonstrate the need to reconsider "the system" as another problem appeared. Since the election of 1796 the Republicans had grown in their organizational structure to the point of introducing such innovative campaign tactics as the use of a "card index file"
which would assist party workers in their efforts to "get out the vote" on election day. In fact, the Republican organization was so strong that it was able to persuade every one of the party's electors to vote for the "party ticket" which produced a rather fascinating series of events. Simply, the unity achieved by the Republicans produced a tie for the top spot on their "ticket," which in turn required the House of Representatives to intervene in the election.

With Jefferson and Burr tied with seventy-three votes each, an intense lobbying effort appeared as the House had to convene and respond to the situation. The Federalist party had lost the election regardless of the House's ultimate decision; nevertheless, it was the head of that party, Alexander Hamilton, who made the difference in the House vote. To Hamilton the choice involved a selection between two evils and the "lesser evil," Jefferson, gained his support and, in turn, the presidency.26

To be sure, the process of electing the nation's Chief Executive was in need of repair. Whereas the Founding Fathers anticipated many problems with prescience, they fell short on the system they devised for transferring executive power (such a shortcoming, one may argue, appears to be the direct result of their assumptions regarding a natural aristocracy). Jefferson, for rather obvious reasons, realized that the process was in need of some adjustments and managed to persuade the legislative branch to pass the
Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution just in time for the 1804 campaign. That law required the electors to make distinctions between votes for the presidency and the second spot on the ticket and, in turn, avoid the type of incident which grew from the Republican effort four years earlier.

The 1804 campaign continued the practice of using the Congressional Caucus as a vehicle for the nomination of presidential tickets. But, it appears that the Federalists never truly embraced the caucus in the sense their counterparts did as they held a series of caucuses in their nomination process (as opposed to one large assembly). In fact, as one reviews the literature, one may note some inconsistencies regarding the use of the caucus as some writers argue that the Federalists never employed the caucus in a "representative" manner. Regardless, the Republicans enjoyed a landslide of immense proportions (162-14 in favor of Jefferson).

In 1808 the "Virginia Dynasty" continued with the Republican nomination of "little Jemmy" (James Madison), again via Congressional Caucus, whereas the Federalists renamed their 1804 ticket. Furthermore, a most important event occurred in this campaign which was to have further influence on the emergence of the nominating convention as a vehicle for solidifying a diverse party. The Federalists, lacking in representation in the Congress, decided to dismiss the use of a caucus in favor of a "secret, unrepresentative and primitive convention" which was held in New York. While the
Republicans continued their domination of national politics, the use of even a "primitive" convention may be viewed as a positive development within the electoral system.

The use of the caucus in the nomination process suffered further in the campaign of 1812 as a split within party ranks resulted in the nomination of a second Republican candidate: DeWitt Clinton. The Federalists once again met in a "convention" of sorts and decided, remarkably, to join forces with the Republicans who supported Clinton over Madison. The incumbent won comfortably; nevertheless, several important events grew from the campaign. First, the use of a form of "convention" was beginning to gain the attention of political decision makers. Second, the caucus came under attack due to its unrepresentative, elitist nature as well as its role in diluting the separation of powers since members of one branch of the federal government were responsible for the nomination of candidates for another branch of the system. And, finally, the Republicans took the first step toward the formation of a national party structure by introducing a "committee of correspondence" into the system consisting of one member from each state and, as a consequence, introduced some degree of continuity between elections.

The elections of 1816 and 1820 represent the "Era of Good Feelings" in American history in which the nation experienced a period of one party rule. While the nomination of James Monroe over William Crawford in 1816 was the most
sharply contested up to that point in time, the Federalist party had virtually died (it held no caucus or convention and it did not even nominate a candidate for the second spot on "the ticket"). Moreover, after the caucus, the Monroe administration faced no competition in its efforts to attain a second term (Monroe won 231 of a possible 232 electoral votes).³³

However, the presidential campaign of 1824 would be significantly different as the "Era of Good Feelings" came to a close. The Republicans, in the last Congressional nominating Caucus, decided in favor of Crawford. In as much as the Federalist party no longer existed, nominations were offered by state legislatures which produced a new dynamic for the electorate: multiple candidates. At one point there were seventeen men in the running for the presidency; but, eventually the field narrowed to four: Crawford, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, and John Quincy Adams.

The nomination process experienced its most dramatic shift since the advent of the electoral college in that the caucus system came under wide-spread attack. As Boller noted, "Only one third of the Republican members of Congress attended the meeting and Crawford's opponents at once attacked it as undemocratic, dictatorial, unconstitutional, and unrepresentative of the party as a whole."³⁴ Assuredly, "King Caucus" suffered a damaging blow as Crawford's opponents were relentless in their attacks on that system of nomination.
Jackson won both the popular vote and the electoral college; still, he failed to win enough electoral votes to be declared the next Chief Executive. Accordingly, the election, once again, was thrown into the House of Representatives. Since Clay was out of the race by that point (the "finalists" were Jackson, Crawford, and Adams), there was speculation in the nation's capital as to how the powerful Speaker of the House might attempt to influence the outcome of the vote. Rumors suggested that a deal was in the works which would give the election to Adams and, in return, the office of Secretary of State to Clay. With Adams' victory and the ultimate appointment of Clay to that most treasured position in the Cabinet, a new rallying cry emerged for the losers. Shortly after the House's decision Jackson resigned from the Senate and began to prepare for the next campaign. Jackson left his government position by proclaiming, "The people have been cheated . . . the corruptions and intrigues at Washington . . . have defeated the will of the people." Indeed, the campaign of 1828 began in 1825 in a most straight-forward fashion.

The problems which occurred during the election of 1824 facilitated the re-emergence of two-party politics within the American system. The "Voice of the People," Andrew Jackson, reinforced that rallying cry and, in turn, a spirit of competitive politics which would last until this day. The campaign of 1824 dismissed the caucus as a vehicle for making
nomination decisions. As a result, state legislatures began engaging in the practice of nominating "favorite sons" or other noteworthy individuals for the nation's highest offices. This system, as witnessed in the 1824 fiasco, would cause many more problems than it might solve. If the states were to place names into nomination as they pleased, then the possibility that many candidates would still be in the running by election day created the danger that no single candidate could gain the majority needed to win in the electoral college. If such a practice were to continue, the House would virtually assume the responsibility of selecting the president from among the "finalists." To be sure, the doctrine of separation of powers would suffer as the result of such a system.

As Jackson defeated Adams in 1828, created the Democratic Party, and reinstituted the spirit of two-party politics, the stage was set for the introduction of a new system for nominating candidates. The election of 1832 centered upon the "Bank issue," which greatly facilitated the imposition of "party lines" for the electorate. While these lines were being drawn around that issue, Jackson began engaging in some innovative forms of "image work" as he began to associate his candidacy with "the people" and the opposition with "the aristocracy" in some rather creative ways. As David, Goldman and Bain have argued:

Jackson's election in 1828 brought with it a revolution in party politics that remains a favorite
topic of comment for historians and politicians. It ended an era in the development both of the Presidency as an office and of relations between the Congress and the Executive. Jackson came to power as the result of a highly organized popular movement in which he owed nothing to those members of Congress who had refrained from becoming his announced supporters. Thereafter the Presidency could be and was to be occupied at times by incumbents who were notably independent of the Congress, and who entered office with at least some organized support from the political party by which they had been nominated.

The "will of the people" began to manifest itself in many areas of the electoral process as the young nation continued to grow and the notion of representative democracy gained new meaning. One way to reach out to the will of the populace was to provide some input for the people with regard to the nomination of presidential and vice presidential candidates. The "Anti-Masonic" party introduced one such vehicle through which the people could be heard as it initiated the use of national nominating conventions.

The first national party convention was held in Baltimore in 1831 by this new "party." More importantly, as James Davis has pointed out, that gathering displayed certain characteristics which are still present in modern nominating conventions:

1. Delegations were chosen in a manner determined by each state,

2. Each state was entitled to as many votes as the state's representation in Congress,

3. A special majority - the Anti-Masons had decreed three-fourths of the delegates - was required for nomination,
4. An Anti-Mason national committee was appointed to carry on national party business between elections, and

5. The first party platform (called "an address to the people") was approved by the delegates.

In December of that year the National Republicans also met in Baltimore with 156 delegates from seventeen states and promptly decided two things. First, that "Prince Hal" (Henry Clay) should lead the party in the general election and, second, that Andrew Jackson should not be allowed to continue his domination of the federal government. By the same token, the Anti-Masons and the National Republicans had one other item in common besides an often vehement distrust of the Jackson administration—a small electoral base. Simply, as the literature suggests, these two "national parties" sought to create the illusion of "national power" by holding a "national" convention.

The Jackson forces, in the spirit of popular appeal, also discovered the need to hold a national convention in Baltimore in 1832. The goal of the assembly involved an attempt by Jackson to drop John C. Calhoun of South Carolina from the "ticket" without producing too much controversy. His solution: have the nominating convention "draft" Martin Van Buren as Calhoun's replacement.

Consequently, the presidential campaign of 1832 introduced a new system of nominating candidates for the executive branch of the government which was incorporated into
the electoral process at an amazing rate. Davis is joined by other writers in his argument that such an innovation was the product of a "positive evolution" on the basis of the following factors:

1. It was representative in character,
2. It divorced presidential nominations from congressional control,
3. It provided for a broad-based formulation of a party program,
4. It concentrated the party's strength behind a single presidential ticket, and
5. It reconciled personal rivalries and group or sectional interests.

Yet, it is important to note that the convention did not just "pop up" as a remedy for the nation's electoral ills since several states had been employing that device as a tool for gaining electoral coherence for some time. James Chase discussed how the convention "concept derived from the English constitutional struggles of the seventeenth century" to the point where it was accepted as a legitimate tool for attaining the "will of the people" as in the case of the use of the Constitutional Convention of 1787.

Chase also offered four reasons why the convention system evolved in the United States and the rationale for its emergence in the Atlantic states:

1. The division of the state into progressively smaller units of government . . . since the mid-Atlantic states contained more units of government some device was needed to promote
continuity within those units. This was not the case in the Southern or Western states since they employed larger units of government.

2. A dense population required the use of delegated rather than mass meetings. Since everyone couldn't be present, a system of selecting representatives had to be created (especially in the Atlantic cities such as Baltimore, New York, and Philadelphia).

3. The large number of elective offices present in the more heavily populated parts of the country required some means of organizing the choices in a way that would aid the "average citizen" in his electoral decision making.

4. The growth of a competitive two-party system since rivalry is often the greatest incentive for a political organization.

Simply, Chase has articulated a rationale for the emergence of the nominating convention that goes beyond overcoming the obvious barriers of a poor system of transportation, weak channels of communication, or an apathetic polity. His argument focused on the evolution of the political system and its needs as the result of that progressive growth.

Perhaps V. O. Key's overview of the emergence of the nominating convention will serve as a summary for this discussion of the birth of these institutions:

Thus there developed a mechanism through which party leaders, dispersed over a nation of continental proportions, could negotiate sufficient agreement to maintain parties capable of governing through the presidential system. The creation of the convention as a route to the Presidency independent of Congress was congenial to the doctrine of separation of powers. Yet the establishment of the supremacy of the convention in the choice of presidential candidates had other
consequences. The convention, diverse in its composition and unpatterned in its ways, remains free to choose presidential candidates from a range of alternatives. Had the congressional caucus prevailed, the chances are that the old war-horses of the party organization in Congress would have had the edge in the race for the Presidency. A Taft would have won over Eisenhower, a Garner over a Roosevelt, a Johnson over a Kennedy. Those factors conducive to advancement in hierarchies would have governed in the successive screenings on the way to the Presidency. An institution so transient as a national convention can be unconventional in its choices, a circumstance that is sometimes frightening; yet it permits the occasional choice of leaders who probably could not have made their way up a tighter party hierarchy.

Key's remarks appear to sum up the situation in a most insightful manner as he noted the significance of the nominating convention to the maintenance of the doctrine of separation of powers to which the Founding Fathers were so dedicated. Key also addressed the ways in which such a procedure may "open the doors" to potential candidates who are not grounded in the politics of Capitol Hill and, as a direct result, contribute to the notion of representative democracy in a very real sense.

In my view, as one reflects on the growth of the American system of democracy, one must acknowledge the significance of the evolution of the office of the Chief Executive within that approach to government. While the two-party system began to emerge during the nation's first administration, primarily as a function of the two strong personalities present at that critical time, it was the need
to seek some means of consolidating the electoral support for the presidential nominees that provided the incentive for the development of two major parties. Otherwise, a multiple party system might have emerged which would be more responsive to the needs of specific constituent groups but which would lack effectiveness in "national" politics. Fortunately, the two party system evolved and provided a means of avoiding the House of Representatives as the Final Arbiter in presidential politics and, consequently, preserved the doctrine of separation of powers. Paul Ferguson offered an interesting overview of this critical feature of the American system when he remarked:

The political life of the nation has revolved around our great national parties. Their doctrines and policies have shaped national principles and courses of action. Their history has been largely the history of the nation. For they are purely vehicles for the execution of the governmental policies advocated by their constituent members, commonly described as associations or organizations of persons knit together by the common purpose of executing certain theories or policies of government through the election to high office of persons of the same belief.

Yet, the system required the development of some vehicle through which a diverse set of organizations and interests could gather, exchange perspectives, and agree on a specific course of action with regard to the election of the Chief Magistrate. The national nominating convention eventually provided a solution for the system; however, it took forty-two years, or eleven elections, before the first nominating
convention was held. Once established, it required only three elections to establish the convention as a permanent feature of American presidential politics. Therefore, one may argue that it was this evolution in the area of presidential politics which eventually defined American Democracy and that the nominating convention may be considered to be a "prime mover" within that development. As David Broder has commented:

Of all our political institutions, none is more vital to the possibility of responsible party government than the presidential nominating convention. The convention is the one time every four years when a national political party really comes to life as a physical assemblage of its leaders and its rank-and-file delegates. The rest of the time, our national parties are more ghost-like than visible.

With that in mind, let us now turn to a discussion of the various functions these institutions perform within the national political system.

MAJOR FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY NOMINATING CONVENTIONS

As I mentioned previously, the convention became established as a permanent feature of the electoral process in just three campaigns; moreover, David, Goldman, and Bain have argued that the essential functions of the convention were established by the campaign of 1860. These writers have suggested that the convention performs four major functions:
1. The nominating function,
2. The platform-drafting function,
3. The campaign-rally function, and
4. The governing-body function. 48

However, even though these basic functions were established as early as the campaign of 1860, the convention, as a force in the electoral process, has continued to evolve as the result of alterations within the political environment. Thomas Marshall has attempted to chart this evolution by constructing a scheme which depicts three phases through which the nomination process has grown. 49

Marshall's first phase, the Congressional Caucus System, is representative of the era in which the Members of Congress dominated the nomination process (as already discussed). The second phase, the Brokered Convention System, lasted from 1832 until 1968 and is representative of a system through which the rank-and-file members of a given party were allowed to offer input into the nomination process. Marshall's last phase, or the current phase, is denoted as the System of Popular Appeal which he argued emerged as the result of "the rise of amateur activists, the mass media, the anti-Vietnam movement, (and) the 1970 Democratic reforms." 50 During each of the three phases described by Marshall the "essential functions" of the nominating convention experienced some form of adjustment; yet, their basic purpose remained: the promotion of party unity for the purposes of electoral gain. This
work will now turn to a brief discussion of each of these essential functions and, in turn, note how each has changed during the years.

THE NOMINATING FUNCTION

E. E. Schattschneider noted in 1942 that "a party that cannot make authoritative, binding nominations has ceased to be a party altogether . . . after the destruction of the congressional caucus a new nominating procedure was necessary, therefore, for the survival of party politics." Schattschneider's argument is clear as he has noted the correlation between the demise of the caucus and the temporary death of the two-party system during the "Era of Good Feelings." With the re-emergence of two-party politics during the election of 1824 and the Jacksonian appeal to "the people" came the need to get the people involved in the nomination process. Thus, the convention evolved and carries on because, as Schattschneider observed, "they do a necessary task . . . and because no feasible substitute for them has been discovered."  

The goal of the nomination process is simple: party unity. Indeed, the other three essential functions assist in the attainment of that objective as they are often used as tools of negotiation for those ends. While one element of the party may dominate the nomination itself, traditionally,
some concessions are offered in the drafting of the platform, in acknowledging the "favorites" of the competing factions through ceremony, or by offering prominent positions on the national committee to members of "the opposition." On a few occasions (1860, 1912, 1924, 1964, 1968, and 1972) the respective parties have been unable to reach a consensus during their national assembly and, as a result, lost the general election. Hence, the importance of attaining unity through the convention process stands out as the single-most important function served by these conclaves. According to Byrne and Marx:

Political parties do not generally win presidential elections by taking votes away from the opposition. Presidential elections are normally won by the party that is most effective in mobilizing its own voters and appealing to the broad mass of independents and new voters. The number of voters who move back and forth between the parties in successive elections has traditionally been relatively small.

If, for some reason, the convention is unable to agree on a certain candidate or, in the modern convention, the primary season failed to produce a clear front-runner, the convention offers the only means of resolving the nomination question and still retaining some hope of achieving party unity. Davis referred to this function of the nomination process as the "brokerage function" and he argued that the convention will never become outmoded as long as such a function remains. While the "brokerage function" has not
been exercised since the advent of the television coverage of the national conventions, it still remains as a vital characteristic of the convention process if for no other reason than serving as the "last hope" of a dark horse candidate.

The nominating process within the national convention has changed a great deal since the early conventions. The day of the "favorite son" nomination has passed in favor of an electoral process that employs the primary election as a means of narrowing the field of potential nominees. During the era of the favorite son the convention would sometimes be held up for days as the assembly attempted to cope with regional competition or while "deals" were negotiated for candidates and their causes. The advent of national television coverage, as Marshall has argued, has produced the need for more concise and harmonious gatherings that dismiss the use of "favorite son" nominations, multiple nomination speeches, and long, protracted roll-call votes. Indeed, the national nominating convention is the product of a dynamic electoral system that constantly experiences change—even in the most fundamental function performed by that assembly.

THE PLATFORM-DRAFTING FUNCTION

Will Rogers used to argue that the Platform should not be taken too seriously since its "just for the orator to get up and point to and all . . . . So don't mess with the
Still, conventions have been known to fight over the use of a single word within a plank of the platform. Many critics have long held that the platform represents a lot of work for very little gain; however, once one stops and reflects on the goal of a national convention, party unity, one may be in a position to acknowledge the efficacy of the platform-drafting function.

Pomper and Lederman conducted an extensive review of the platforms of the two parties from 1944 through 1968 and discovered several tendencies which seem to counteract the myth that these works are meaningless documents. The authors categorized each sentence in each platform as "either simple rhetoric and fact, an evaluation of the parties' records, or as a pledge about the party's future policies." The results indicated that, on the whole, about one half of the platform statements discussed the party's plans for the future or, in other words, what the voter can expect if the party in question attains its objective. Furthermore, slightly more than a third of the statements were oriented around evaluations of the two parties' records on specific issues (of course, these statements were highly partisan). And lastly, the authors discovered that less than a quarter of the statements turned out to be "rhetoric" (i.e. empty language).

The Pomper and Lederman study also argued that the platforms of their sample period did not contain large amounts of
vague or evasive language, but contained "specifically worded statements of party intentions." In fact, the writers even deduced that these specifically worded statements were oriented around certain topics depending, of course, upon the party in question. According to this study, the Republicans spent most of their "platform energy" on the subjects of national defense and government size while the Democrats addressed the concerns of labor and the topic of welfare.

Finally, the authors offered clear evidence against the myth that these documents are not binding in nature as they totalled all of the "promises" offered from 1944 through 1964. The result indicated that by 1966 seventy-two percent of the specific promises offered in specific platform statements had been addressed through policy initiatives (Paris argued that the total may be higher by 1972).

Hence, as the result of their research, the authors offered the following conclusion:

The platform is important, but not as an inspired gospel to which politicians resort for policy guidance. It is important because it summarizes, crystallizes, and presents to the voters the character of the party coalition. Platform pledges are not simply good ideas, or even original ones. In their programs, Democrats and Republicans are not typically breaking new paths; they are promising to proceed along one or another path that has already become involved in political controversy. The stands taken in the platform clarify the parties' positions on these controversies and reveal the nature of their support and appeals.

Therefore, as one accepts the premise that the goal of the national nominating convention is the promotion of party
unity for the purposes of electoral gain, one may begin to acknowledge the efficacy of the platform-drafting function. According to Pendleton Herring, "Platform making is a process of psychological value . . . it provides a release for opinions and scope for the interplay of personalities . . . platform making is one step more in the process of working out some kind of synthesis."  

THE CAMPAIGN-RALLY FUNCTION

When the Anti-Masons met for the first national nominating convention in 1831 they decided that the gathering should be "open to the public" in order to promote the representative nature of that vehicle for negotiating the nomination of candidates. As the system of employing nominating conventions grew, the importance of maintaining a degree of openness grew as well. These huge gatherings provide an extraordinary opportunity for fellowship among partisans and, as a result, the campaign-rally function of these events is not to be minimized.

James Chase described this function by stating: "Apart from the benefits of unity, organization, and propaganda the bringing together of like-minded men from scattered communities, many meeting one another for the first time, kindled enthusiasm and fortified party morale." At times, the festive spirit of these national assemblies has caused some
concern among those critically evaluating the event (interesting, many of these critics, as we will note in a few pages, who argue against these rallies are not Americans which may have some bearing on their perceptions regarding convention activities); however, regardless of criticisms levied against this feature of a convention, the rally function appears to be crucial to the process.

During the early years of the convention the campaign-rally function contributed to the formation of unity within the party due to its ability to acknowledge those candidates who were not fortunate enough to receive the party's nomination. The long and often protracted demonstrations for or against some candidate or issue facilitated the free flow of expression central to the participatory nature of the conclave. Again, Herring seems to have captured this aspect clearly by stating:

A huge mass meeting cannot be judged by its incapacity to perform tasks appropriate to a small committee. Unless we are to substitute for the convention a small executive council, we must accept the characteristics resulting from size . . . . it is an indigenous institution and can be best evaluated with respect to our own particular needs.

Moreover, in the age of television, as we shall note shortly, the campaign-rally function has grown in importance due to television's ability to reach mass audiences and hopefully involve them vicariously. Nevertheless, the campaign-rally function has been a stable feature of
"conventioning" since the very first assembly and, because of its controversial nature, will receive a bit more attention as this work progresses.

THE GOVERNING-BODY FUNCTION

It is interesting to note that the governing-body function is the "oldest" of the four functions described in this review of the evolution of the conventions. As I noted earlier, the Republicans (as they were then known) initiated the practice of formulating a "committee of correspondence" in 1812 as a means of coordinating the party's efforts between elections. Hence, one would imagine that such a practice would have continued with the introduction of the nominating convention; however, this does not seem to be the case.

David, Goldman, and Bain have selected the conventions of 1852 as the starting date for the use of this important function as these writers argued that both parties (the Democrats and the Whigs) created their coordinating bodies during the same year. At first, the primary responsibility for these committees involved the issuance of the official call for the convention. Yet, that role has been expanded to include the selection of the convention city, apportioning the delegates on the basis of the rules adopted by the previous convention, and the preparation of the temporary role
of delegates. In addition, the National Committee is responsible for approving the selection of a national convention director, the recommendation of a slate of temporary and permanent officers for the national convention, and--perhaps most importantly--the national committee is responsible for conducting the party's business between elections.67

Davis noted that the establishment of a "permanent year-round national headquarters" for the two major parties (this occurred in the 1930s) produced a slight shift in responsibility in the planning of the national conventions away from the national committee (an ad hoc group) to the full-time staff.68 Davis continued:

As the size and cost of national conventions has steadily ballooned, especially since the advent of nationwide television, convention planning has become big business. No longer do the national committees have the expertise in handling media arrangements, printing contracts, processing thousands of hotel reservations, and handling the endless number of other details for these massive gatherings . . . . But if the committee members have given up the convention "house-keeping" duties, they have not abdicated decision-making on site-selection, approval of delegate apportionment rules, and the selection of temporary convention officials.69

This function is as important to the success of the national party as any other since, as a political organization, there must be some continuity between meetings and, moreover, there is a need for some form of "umbrella" organization for the fifty state organizations. While the two-party system is crucial to the maintenance of the American
system of electoral politics, the task of coordinating such a vast network of diverse organizations requires a tremendous amount of time and energy. The national nominating conventions provide for this coordination through the establishment of the national committee and the maintenance of a permanent full-time staff.

LATENT FUNCTIONS

John Davis suggested that the national conventions also serve several "latent functions" which are essential to the maintenance of the two-party system. The first of these functions involves the use of the nominating convention as a vehicle for building a consensus for a nonconsensus candidate as in the case of Jimmy Carter in 1976. Davis referred to this function as the "legitimating function." Another "latent function" performed by these national assemblies is described as the "general consensus building function" through which diverse organizations within the party rally around the nominees through compromise. To be sure, this notion of facilitating agreement among the many varied factions present within a major political party is central to the convention process in general. The other "latent functions" described by Davis appear to be more of a reiteration of the points we have already established (e.g., Davis' "celebration and ritualistic expression" function and his
"compromise and accommodation" function); however, in my view, one may benefit from consideration of these "latent functions" since they offer further insights into these complex assemblies known as the national nominating conventions.

Thoughout the years of "conventioning" in American politics several writers have attacked these gatherings for one reason or another. As I mentioned previously, writers such as Agar and Ostrogorski have expressed sincere displeasure with the "atmosphere" present within the convention. In fact, Ostrogorski went as far as to suggest that "God takes care of drunkards, of little children, and of the United States" after witnessing one of these national gatherings. Apparently, the air of celebration was disturbing to Ostrogorski, which led Herring to comment that he simply did not understand the American spirit of politics (and, in turn, inspired my comment regarding a non-American's reaction to a purely American spectacle).

Richard C. Bain has noted four main criticisms levied against the national nominating conventions:

1. Convention membership is not truly representative of the party and/or the national electorate,
2. Actual decisions are made by only a few of the many delegates who attend the conventions,
3. Conventions cannot -- or at least do not -- pick the best man, and
4. Conventions characteristically are undignified and prone to indulge in meaningless displays.
Bain has argued that these criticisms, while well-intentioned, do not stand well in the face of the facts. Consequently, let us take a few moments to address each of these criticisms individually. First, the nature of American politics is such that one must strain to catch a glimpse of "national politics" and, typically, the only time that is possible is during the national conventions. Simply, the American republic is a diverse set of independent political organizations which are rooted in state and local units. As the time to select representatives for the national convention grows near, it stands to reason that the prominent state and local leaders will, if they so desire, be in a favorable position with regard to their selection as delegates. It would be difficult to deny these individuals that privilege; by the same token, their selection should in no way hamper the representative nature of the assembly (were these people not selected as leaders by their constituencies?).

With regard to the second criticism, as Bain along with Herring have argued, any time a gathering consists of more than a handful of people some form of leadership structure must emerge if any kind of action is to result from the assembly. Certainly, since the very first national convention, these conclaves have been much too large to be conducted as a town meeting; therefore, some form of decision-making hierarchy must emerge in order to conduct business.
In my view, the third criticism is a bit difficult to respond to in as much as one must wonder what "the best man" would be like. Bain suggested that "leadership adept at reconciling conflicting goals and points of view" typically is nominated by conventions. Yet, that particular response is not very satisfying either. Perhaps a historical review is the best response to this third criticism since one must recognize the evolution of the nomination process in order to realize its importance to the maintenance of the system. In other words, "the best man" is not the central issue, but "who selects the best man." If one wishes to preserve the American system and the doctrine of separation of powers, then the convention, through its representative format, offers the most hope. If elections were continuously decided by the House of Representatives, the system would experience a fundamental shift. Hence, while some may attack the convention on the basis of this third criticism cited by Bain, a brief moment of reflection will reveal the value of the convention to the maintenance of American Democracy and, as a result, resolve such a shallow curiosity.

The last criticism levied against the conventions may be the most prominent. However, as Bain has pointed out,

An American political party has a special need to find ways of making its membership feel "belonging," because party affiliation has so far scarcely ever been a dues-paying, card-holding basis but depends almost entirely on the will of the individual member to become and remain a partisan.
Bain's point is a strong one indeed; however, the spirit of the convention is, once again, captured concisely by the words of Herring:

Our conventions are a romantic and flamboyant attempt to get a high degree of popular participation in the high drama of democracy. It is not an institution to be dismissed contemptuously because of its noise and apparent confusion. It is characteristic of our free political system; the Nazis have pageantry of a different sort. Those who prefer order will find it in Nuremberg.

The criticisms levied against the use of national nominating conventions are thoughtful and, in many respects, have served as the basis for several modifications within the convention process. Hopefully, this chapter has established the dynamic nature of these mass assemblies within a dynamic system which will, in turn, allow this work to continue by pointing to the next phase in the development of these vehicles for the nomination of presidential tickets. Indeed, the convention process has changed. The rules for the selection of delegates have been modified in an attempt to make the gathering more "representative;" many of the decisions which must be made by the convention are now addressed prior to the convening of the convention (e.g., the platform committee now meets the week before the convention); and, the number and length of demonstrations have been adjusted in order to accommodate the television networks. Thus, as stated in chapter one, this work assumes a developmental-progressive viewpoint which allows for an assimilation
of these various changes in the convention process without compromising the understanding of the essential function performed by these conclaves: the promotion of party unity for the general election.

Two writers, James Davis and Alexander Bickel, have argued that a fundamental change has occurred in the convention process as that body has evolved from a "deliberative body" to a "ratification assembly." This notion hinges on the argument that the delegates are no longer "representatives of the people" who attend the conventions for the purpose of making decisions for their constituents, but that the primary system allows the people to speak for themselves and, as a result, the convention is merely a restatement of those sentiments. Such an argument clearly reflects an evolutionary worldview on the part of the writers and serves as a starting point for the next section of this overview.

THE NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTION IN THE AGE OF TELEVISION

The introduction of the broadcast media into the American society has changed virtually every facet of American life. As radio, and then television, became integrated into the American society, the social fabric evolved in its awareness of cultural diversity, economic distribution, and political mobilization. The American electoral process reflected this
evolution as a new "stage" emerged that would produce a new set of "actors" prepared with very different "scripts" for consumption by the polity.

One area where this evolution may be charted is in the fundamental adjustments experienced by the national nominating conventions. These rowdy, indigenous assemblies dramatically altered their format after the 1924 campaign to the point where they would never return to their previous state. In order to understand the conventions of 1984 one must return to the conventions of 1924, briefly, and then turn to the conventions of 1952 in the hope of creating a context from which to work.

In 1924 the national conventions were broadcast over national radio for the first time. This innovation would offer the American people the unique opportunity to "participate" in the nominating process in an unprecedented fashion. Furthermore, it would offer the nation's political elite the opportunity to reach the largest audience possible and, subsequently, expand the use of the convention as a forum for the promotion of party objectives.

The 1924 Republican National Convention ran smoothly as the GOP nominated the Coolidge-Dawes ticket without difficulty (prompting humorist Will Rogers to comment that the ticket "could have been nominated by postcard"). The Democrats offered a somewhat different version of democracy-in-action as that assembly proceeded to present the listening audience
with the longest national nominating convention in history (the only one to spread into a third week). The Democrats managed to take all of 103 ballots to nominate J. W. Davis, with radio covering it all the way. The Democratic National Convention of 1924, to say the least, stands alone among the many national assemblies since 1832 and, consequently, offered incentive for change within that party's approach to the nomination process.

The broadcast of the 1924 Democratic National Convention displayed some unusual features by modern standards of broadcast journalism. The Democrats stationed a "censor" on the podium in case a "fight" erupted. That individual was instructed to "pull the plug" on the broadcast in that instance. In addition, the announcers were instructed to "ignore" any "scuffles" among the delegates. There were quite a few "scuffles" and the announcers ignored most of them, but a few did get reported—much to the chagrin of the Democrats.

By the 1928 national conventions the parties had matured in their knowledge of the use of radio and offered the nation a much more "controlled" affair. The next major shift in convention procedure occurred in 1932, again with the Democrats, as Roosevelt broke tradition by flying to Chicago to accept the party's nomination with a nationally broadcast acceptance speech. As the technology expanded, the political use of these innovations appeared as a natural consequence. J. Leonard Reinsch offered the following thought on this subject:
The railroad did much to 'nationalize' the political nominating convention. The telegraph changed the tempo even more . . . . the use of another instrument of communications - the telephone - had significant and sometimes dramatic effects . . . . by making the convention proceedings available to every American, broadcasting makes its finest contribution to insure the continuance of the American way of life.

While Reinsch's assessment is sweeping in nature, it does capture the evolutionary qualities of the convention process. Yet, these progressive changes have not occurred in isolation, as William Carleton has argued by stating, "basically, the transformation (in nominating conventions) is a response to the more integrated, mass society in which we live."\textsuperscript{81}

The radio broadcasts of the conventions produced several fundamental adjustments in the convention process just as that medium served as a means of "integrating" society as Carleton suggested. However, the transformations induced through the use of radio would pale in the light of the changes rendered through the use of television, a topic to which we will now turn.

Without question, Charles A. H. Thomson's work on the television broadcasts of the 1952 conventions is a definitive work in that area.\textsuperscript{82} Thomson offered a series of insights regarding the introduction of television into the conventions which do not seem to be available in other reviews; therefore, I will borrow extensively from that work in this discussion of the 1952 conventions.
Thomson noted that the planning for the 1952 convention broadcasts began as early as May, 1951, with television having an immediate input into the process. The television networks wanted the conventions to be held in the same city, preferably in the central time zone, in a facility which would accommodate the technical needs of that medium. The solution: Both national assemblies were held in Chicago, which allowed the networks to "set up" their technical facilities for both gatherings simultaneously.

The financial arrangements for these first national broadcasts produced a period of lively debate between the national parties and the networks because of the precedents established in 1948. In 1948 the conventions were broadcast to a limited audience and, unbelievably, the national committees paid for the installation of the networks' equipment since the networks were not seeking commercial sponsorship for the broadcast (it was viewed as a public service). At first, the networks pushed for similar arrangements for 1952; however, since all four networks had plans to seek commercial sponsorship for the 1952 affairs, the national parties did not feel that they should pay for the installation of equipment. The parties "won" the debate, but the discussion over commercial sponsorship was not yet over.

The parties wanted to have some input into the selection of sponsors since these organizations were honestly insecure about the nature of such a commercial venture. After much
debate, both groups agreed on the following conditions under which sponsorship would be allowed:

1. The type of sponsor is subject to the approval of the party;

2. Commercials may be offered only during recesses or during periods of long pauses;

3. Commercial messages must meet the highest standards of dignity, good taste, and length;

4. No commercial announcements may originate from the floor of the convention hall; and,

5. The networks had to run a disclaimer at the beginning and end of the broadcast in order to eliminate the possibility of confusing the audience regarding sponsorship.

Since the networks agreed to these conditions regarding sponsorship they decided to assert themselves with regard to their editorial prerogatives during the actual broadcasts. Therefore, the networks made their own decisions as to when they would carry a speech from the podium and the like.

The pattern of coverage planned by the networks was simple, as all four networks would have access to a central broadcast controlled by a single director (Robert Doyle) from a central location. Each network agreed on the selection of Doyle as the director of the pool shots, but each network also retained the freedom to use the pool shots when it wanted, therefore insuring editorial flexibility.

Once the networks and the parties reached agreement on these basic issues of sponsorship, camera locations, and editorial freedom, the stage was set for an innovative use of
a new medium for the transmission of political messages. The conventions have not been the same since; both sides (the networks and the national parties) have been refining the use of these broadcasts with each convention. In fact, it appears as if the Democrats of 1952 learned a great deal from the GOP's experience of the same year. As Thomson explained:

The Republicans did little to adapt their proceedings to television or to coach the various delegates in television dress and manners. This may have resulted from inertia, from inexperience, or from a judgement that such exhortations would not do much good anyway once the pressure was on. The Democrats, however, announced great plans for turning television to full account - plans that did not, however, call for any changes in party rules or basic procedures. Even before the Republican convention they asked their delegates to watch Republican behavior and to be guided accordingly. . . . The Democratic convention management took immediate steps to remedy the chief omission of the Republicans in physical arrangements: a good camera position to cover the speaker's rostrum head-on.

In addition, Chairman Rayburn instructed Democratic delegates to keep their balloons out of the way of the cameras and the Democrats instructed personnel to watch the television monitors closely in case anything seemed to be "going wrong." In fact, the Democrats even went as far as to issue a leaflet warning the delegates that they could be on-camera at any time - so, beware!

The networks had also learned from the experience with the GOP as they refined the practice of using walkie-talkies to send reports from the convention floor (the Republicans
did not care for this practice and would often "close the floor" to reporters with such devices). The Democrats, apparently, did not object to the use of that technology and, as a result, the networks used that format more and the pool shots less during the convention.

As a result of the 1952 experience, both sides, the parties and the networks, learned a good deal about the capacity of television to project a national convention. In my view, it is fascinating to reflect upon these first broadcasts and note the logistical discussions between the two participants in this joint venture. A young medium was feeling its way through a maze of new experiences while an old institution evolved in a new direction. The end result was the next phase in American participatory democracy.

The 1956 national nominating conventions would also enjoy the benefits of national exposure via the major television networks; however, several new controversies emerged. First, the two national committees declared their freedom from television domination by announcing that the conventions would be held in different cities, thus, slightly upsetting the television networks. Secondly, the networks began to assert themselves with regard to their editorial decision making by refusing to broadcast the newest innovation employed by the conventions: films. It appears as though CBS decided against broadcasting a film narrated by John F. Kennedy called "The Pursuit of Happiness" that the
Democrats planned to use as part of their introduction of their nominee. The delegates and the party chairman, Paul Butler, reacted strongly in that as the chairman rose to denounce the network the delegates proceeded to shake the central camera stand. Clearly, the "love-hate" relationship between the national parties and the national networks reached a new plane.

Charles Fant captured the nature of this "symbiotic" relationship through these remarks:

The networks and the parties share a common desire to attract as many television viewers as possible. The cooperation between them in attempting to achieve this end has over the years developed into a strong reciprocal relationship from which the parties receive free, national exposure and the networks are given a rare opportunity to present live, emotional programming and to promote their news departments.

Without a doubt, as a means of getting their message to the general public, the national parties have turned their attention toward the broadcasts of their national assemblies through the networks and away from the print media. As Don Womack, former superintendent of the Senate Press Gallery, commented to me in an interview concerning the coverage of the conventions by the print media: "In 1952 we (the Gallery staff) were top dog since we performed a vital function for the national committees for free, but with the use of television came a decline in our role in the process."
Womack was joined by the current Superintendent of the Gallery, Robert Petersen, in his assessment of the present situation. The television networks, the two men argued, bring their own money to the conventions and spend it as needed. On the other hand, the print press coverage costs the national committees money for the construction of the press stand, the provision of work facilities, communications costs, and the housing/transportation of the Press Gallery staffs (the Federal Election Commission and the Senate Ethics Committee have independently ruled that the Gallery serves a legitimate function in the accreditation of press personnel for the two national committees). Thus, it isn't difficult to understand why the print press is treated as a type of "second class citizen" in relation to their colleagues in the broadcasting media since the broadcasters spend their own money and reach a great many more people.

Television's impact on the conventions goes beyond a shift in dynamics between the print press and the national parties to the point of affecting the entire structure of the assembly. In 1952 the three major networks (the fourth network was not assessed by Thomson) provided an average of seventy-one hours of coverage for the Republican convention and seventy-four hours for the Democrats. The respective conventions lasted for approximately forty hours (the Republican National Convention) and forty-six hours (the Democratic National Convention); hence, the networks offered a
considerable amount of coverage of events which occurred outside the convention hall (committee meetings, etc.). This was never to happen again. In fact, the opposite would emerge as the networks began to be bored with the quadrennial events.

The use of gavel-to-gavel coverage was to become a serious issue as early as the 1968 conventions. Elmer Lower wrote in 1968 that ABC would refrain from the "traditional" gavel-to-gavel coverage and offer an alternative for viewers in the form of "highlights." Lower stated: "The American voter has a choice in November. So will the television viewer in August. What is good for democracy at the ballot box can also be good for the lighted box in the parlor." Penn Kimball followed a similar line of reasoning in his 1976 article advocating a reduction of convention coverage as he argued:

The argument made for more selective coverage of political conventions on television is the same as that made for newspapers which cannot print the full text of every speech. News is always a small part of the whole and deciding what to leave out can be the most significant part of the judgment.

Indeed, over a short period of time the terms of the debate had changed from the concerns over sponsors and camera positions to the editorial decision making of the networks. Paletz and Elson presented an interesting analysis on the network coverage of the 1972 Democratic National Convention.
by systematically reviewing NBC's coverage of that assembly and contrasting those findings with the perceptions of Democratic delegates from North Carolina. The authors discovered that the delegates from the Tar Heel state did not recall the conventions as being as "exciting" as the depictions of those activities by NBC. In defense of NBC, NBC president Reuven Frank declared, "We will cut away from the podium as we see fit. We are not there to carry the convention. We are there to report the convention." In support of Frank, the authors cited NBC anchor David Brinkley:

The convention essentially is not on the rostrum. The delegates on the floor are the convention, and it is impossible to report a convention without reporting on them. It may well be that some of us talk too much, but it is also true that at a convention, there are long periods - a half hour, or longer - when absolutely no business is being done and when, in fact, the rostrum is empty and quiet. And we do have to put something on the air. And so we do the only thing we can do - we interview delegates and others.

William McAndrew expressed sentiments similar to those of the NBC personnel as he described convention coverage as follows:

A political convention has reminded at least one observer of an early 19th century novel. It has a dozen sub-plots developing simultaneously and hundreds of characters to keep straight. Here is where the anchor men in the convention hall help us all. The anchorman's job is to talk only when he can add something, and not be a sports announcer reciting statistics or drowning the audience in meaningless facts.
McAndrew offered those comments in 1968, during the era of gavel-to-gavel coverage when the networks had a great deal of time available for their storytelling and, thus, the 19th century novel metaphor. But it appears as if those days have passed to the point where the network broadcasts are beginning to resemble a "sportscast" of sorts. The New York Times argued in July of 1984 that the use of former politicians as "commentators" during their broadcasts created a new atmosphere:

In a pattern that is similar in many ways to the tendency of television networks to draft former athletes for the reporting of football and baseball games, broadcasters, newspapers and magazines are increasingly employing politicians to report political news, blurring the lines between journalism and professional politics.

Simply, the networks have changed their attitudes toward their coverage of national nominating conventions. As Dudley Clendinen wrote: "Ever symbiotic, the relationship between the parties and the networks is now graphically changing. More and more, the parties view their conventions as vast advertisements of their wares. Less and less, the networks see them as news." Therefore, the networks are now using "color commentators" in much the same way as they employ former athletes in an effort to liven the telecasts and add a distinctive flavor to the program (and, in turn, present their "show" - not the party's).

Thom Shales, media critic for The Washington Post, pursued this theme prior to the Democratic Convention of 1984
by interviewing several prominent individuals from present and past conventions. Shales described the 1984 coverage as "hit-and-run" coverage and continued by noting the sentiments of Reuven Frank:

There really have been three important, major developments since the halcyon days of conventions. . . . one, the novelty wore off . . . two, both parties changed the way the candidate is selected. . . . three, the great days of conventions as people remember them coincided with the two great social issues of the past three decades - civil rights and Vietnam - and heavily debated those issues. There is now no such issue . . .

Thus, once again, the system experienced change. What was once a major television spectacle through which the networks would display their newsgathering skills and technology is now considered to be "boring" and lacking in news content. In 1984 the three major networks decided to cut back dramatically in their coverage of the two conventions from San Francisco and Dallas. The plan to offer only two hours of prime-time coverage each night placed the national parties in a position where they had to streamline the assembly even further in order to reach the national viewing audience with their messages.

However, it is interesting to note that the Republican party, historically an innovator in the use of the broadcast media, introduced a new element to the system: the RNC Network. On August 20, 1984, the first day of the Republican National Convention in Dallas, I attended a press conference
held by Ron Walker, the convention manager for the Republicans, in which Walker discussed the party's own national television network and its broadcast of the Dallas conclave. Walker reported that the party would be broadcasting its own version of the convention that concentrated on the events taking place on the podium (they would not secure commentators and the like). He went on to point out that the RNC Network would be carried by between 1,200 - 1,300 television stations across the United States and over 13,000 radio stations. Moreover, Walker noted that between 2,500 and 4,000 cable systems would also carry either all or parts of the RNC Network's broadcasts. Walker described the action as simply being an effort to "get the message out" without the filters of the network coverage.

One other interesting innovation appeared in Dallas during the 1984 assembly: the use of video introductions. As I commented earlier, since the advent of television coverage the parties have attempted to shorten the number and length of certain types of speeches. One such speech is the "introduction of the next speaker" oration that often consumes a large amount of valuable time. While the San Francisco Democrats used this technique on occasion, the Republicans refined the practice by using it extensively throughout the four-day affair. In addition, the GOP displayed the presence of mind to provide these clips with a standard musical score which allowed the participant inside the hall to
note that a speaker was about to appear on the podium. As a rule, the national television networks did not broadcast these "video-intros," but the RNC Network and C-Span did.

Once again, in my view, such innovations provide further evidence for the selection of a developmental-progressive theoretical framework as one studies these dynamic happenings. Indeed, the system has experienced change and such change appears to be progressive in character. As a concluding overview of this portion of this work, I would like to offer the specific areas where the use of television has had an impact on the procedures of the national conventions.

The following has emerged as the principal adjustments rendered in the convention process as outlined by Waltzer:

1. Cities bidding for a convention should be "telegenic" and boast a hall that can meet the space and wiring requirements of television. Television coverage has led the parties to give increased professional attention to the visual appearance and attractiveness of the convention hall and proceedings.

2. The credentials and platform committees meet as de facto bodies the week before the convention, to eliminate the "dull Tuesday" of waiting for them to meet and report, and to take the spotlight off of any party disharmony that might develop during their meetings.

3. To speed up conventions, the requirements for a roll call vote have been stiffened, and, if a poll of a state delegation is requested and in order, the convention chairman may send a representative to conduct the poll and continue the roll call of the states without waiting for the results.
4. Party rules limiting the number of seconding speeches and forbidding nondelegates to address conventions frequently are suspended to permit party candidates and incumbents to be seen nationally on television, and permit presidents, former presidents, former presidential candidates, and others to speak before the convention and nation. However, rules regarding favorite-son nominations and enforcing time limits on seconding speeches are maintained.

5. Television coverage has affected the schedule and program of conventions. Major convention events -- keynote and nominating speeches, balloting, acceptance speeches -- are held during the prime televiewing hours.

6. Motion picture films have been prepared by the parties and shown to their assembled delegates, and, the parties hope, by the television networks to their viewing audience.

Waltzer went on to comment on the shift in the personnel hired by the parties to help with convention arrangements (they now hire former network personnel for assistance with the TV arrangements), the change in the balance of power between the print and broadcast media (as I mentioned previously), the use of conventions by "interest groups" as a forum for the expression of their viewpoints, and the general "packaging" of these assemblies for national consumption. In summary, the author offered the following assessment:

Television coverage has been praised for reforming conventions and politics. Television has been given and has taken credit for initiating improvements in convention procedure, purging politics of the phony and the charlatan, slaying the wild orator and one-speech politician, ending the reign of cabals in smoke-filled-rooms, creating a better-informed electorate, transforming the national convention into a "national town meeting," and serving the development of a national politics.
Indeed, Waltzer seems to have captured several of the positive developments rendered through the introduction of the television broadcasts of these national assemblies.

In conclusion, this portion of the research project has attempted to establish the history and development of the national nominating convention, its impact on the American political system, and its place in our modern political environment. In my view, one would experience difficulty in his or her attempt to interpret the conventions of 1984 without knowledge of the evolution of this political device. Hopefully, this chapter has assisted in providing a context for the consideration of the 1984 versions of these uniquely American institutions.
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SUMMARY OF PART I:
THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

In *Language as Symbolic Action* Burke allocated considerable time to his discussion of "terministic screens" and that notion's relevance to the study of human communication. In so doing, the author offered the analogy of how a textbook on a given subject serves to direct attention in a predetermined manner. Burke stated: "A textbook on physics, for instance, turns the attention in a different direction from a textbook on law or psychology." Part I of this work follows a similar line of reasoning in that I have intentionally attempted to direct the reader's attention to the evolutionary qualities of the topic under review. In my view, the assumptive world guiding this project requires us to view the conventions of 1984 through a critical lens which is considerate of the history and development of these political institutions.

Subsequently, Part I has offered an evolutionary-based interpretation of the activities it purports to study. Fundamentally, I suggest that one will find an evaluation of the conventions of 1984 difficult unless one has a context from which to qualify such information. Thus, Chapter Two spends considerable time in that regard.
The national nominating conventions, like the party system in general, are completely extra-constitutional in nature. The Founding Fathers simply did not anticipate the emergence of national political parties. Therefore, forty-two years, or eleven elections, passed before the national conventions. These assemblies were established at an amazing rate in that their basic functions were in place after just three campaigns. However, the means through which these functions were performed (i.e., speeches, the use of media, rituals, etc.) evolved in conjunction with the communications technologies available to the two parties. Hence, a dynamic conceptualization of such activities appears to be warranted.

Yet, this research project is concerned with an evaluation of the 1984 versions of this institution through which presidential and vice presidential nominations are rendered. Moreover, that evaluation is predicated on a theoretical framework that reflects a developmental-progressive view of process which, in turn, calls for an awareness of the history and development of the subject-matter. Consequently, following Burke, if the anecdote is to be a reflection of the subject-matter it purports to represent, then the selection of reality in question needs to be grounded in that subject-matter. Part I of this project has attempted to do just that--develop a context from which a selection of reality may be advanced and, as a result, constitute a representative anecdote of the 1984 conventions that is reflective, not
deflective, of that larger, evolutionary-based, drama that is the nomination-through-convention process.
NOTES

The key to process studies is in the focus on the processes themselves and in careful interpretation as to what processes are under way in a given historical period. A temporal framing then focuses analysis on what we might call the aesthetics of experience in that time-frame; that is, what symbolic dramas are being conducted in politics at that time. The symbolic "rules" which obtain in the process in question can be subjected to aesthetic interpretation as to their meanings for the people involved in the relevant transactions. In other words, to understand a political process requires the study of the communications which define the situation for those involved.

The 1984 national nominating conventions provide a rich context for an examination of the "politics of 1984." The symbolic dramas associated with these two assemblies appear to offer meaningful insights into the dynamics of this "historical period." The nomination of Geraldine Ferraro, the emergence of Jesse Jackson, the incumbent image of Ronald Reagan, and the platforms of the two parties reflect the nature of the political transactions of this "time-frame" in American history.

In order to evaluate the communicative processes in action during these two events this work will now turn to
a representative anecdote of those activities. The following narratives constitute the subject-matter from which the representative anecdote emerged. While the six orations in question are viewed as a selection of that larger drama, these narratives extend beyond that discourse in an effort to provide a context for a consideration of those "ultimate acts." Therefore, it is my contention that one may chart the growth and development of the respective convention themes through the narratives and, in turn, gain depth of understanding with regard to the significance of the "summation" offered.

This project, as noted earlier, offers the following as its research question:

How did the Democrats and Republicans use their 1984 national nominating conventions in the process of mobilizing their diverse constituencies for the 1984 general election?

In responding to this question, this work will evaluate the 1984 versions of the nomination-through-convention process via the critical methodology of Kenneth Burke. First, I offer a "selection of reality" from San Francisco and Dallas through the representative anecdote and its corresponding subject-matter. Second, I will evaluate the form and substance of that "summation" through the "mirroring" anecdote discussed in Chapter One.

However, before presenting these chapters for consideration, a few remarks addressing the critical act of
constructing these narratives of the subject-matter to be studied appear to be in order. In his 1968 piece on "The Anatomy of Critical Discourse" Lawrence Rosenfield discussed the "critical act" through the presentation of an analogy which I view as useful.² Rosenfield described "the critic" as follows:

Whenever the word "critic" comes up in conversation, a variety of images is liable to come to mind. Some think of the book reviewer or the drama critic for a newspaper. Others, who equate "critic" with "carper," are reminded of a sour, negative individual who cannot be pleased. . . . Clearly, common usage has made the term so vague as to be practically meaningless.

The writer continued:

In order to clarify what is meant here, it may be helpful to draw a rough comparison between events discussed by critics and those events we commonly call "athletic." We shall discover that in the main the critical posture resembles the "spectator" half of an agent-spectator dichotomy.

Rosenfield proceeded by offering four qualities the critic shares with the "spectator" of an athletic event. First, the "spectator" enjoys the subject matter he or she observes. Rosenfield argued that "if they are genuine fans, (they) do more than simply purchase a ticket of admission so that they may sit in proximity to the athletic activity."¹ In other words, Rosenfield suggested that the "spectator" enjoys the activity to be observed to the point where he or she will allocate time for "reflection and communication" about the event with others.
Second, Rosenfield maintained that the "spectator" (if he or she is a "true enthusiast"--and not a "part-time fan") displays an appreciation for "the execution of the event" that goes beyond "winning and losing." Simply, the "spectator" is not so much concerned with "outcome" (the score), but how "the game" was played.

Third, Rosenfield noted that the "spectator" displays a deep appreciation for the intricacies of "the game." This "heightened appreciation" for the rules and strategies which constitute "the game" in question manifests itself in a "consciousness of artistic principles" which "contributes to appreciation."

Finally, the three previous attributes join to form a fourth characteristic of the "spectator:" the attainment of "expert status." This fourth feature suggested that the "spectator" who develops a well-rounded knowledge of "the game" may enter into the realm of "expert" to the point where others who appreciate "the game" seek his or her assessments of particular situations.

To sum Rosenfield's argument, the author suggested that the critic shares four characteristics with the athletic "spectator" in that he or she (1) enjoys "the game;" (2) demonstrates an appreciation for "the game" that extends beyond "winning and losing;" (3) displays an increased level of knowledge regarding the intricacies of "the game;" and (4) shares such knowledge with others and, thus, ascends to "expert" status.
The following narratives represent a synthesis of data which I critically assembled in an effort to provide a "selection" of a larger reality for the purposes of evaluation. In so doing, I also functioned as a "spectator." Without question, I "enjoy the game" and, therefore, attempt to reconstruct these two events in a way that demonstrates that temperament. In addition, I attempt to go beyond "winning and losing" to the point of probing into the "intricacies of the game" for the reader. In the process, I cite the thoughts of other "spectators" who, in some cases, have attained "expert" status over the years (i.e., journalists). In conclusion, the following narratives reflect a "spectator's" interpretation of the activities that were the 1984 San Francisco and Dallas conventions. Indeed, the "spectator" of political activity would be hard-pressed to discover a "bigger game" to "enjoy."
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CHAPTER THREE:

THE 1984 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

Lights! Cameras! Unity!¹

The thirty-ninth Democratic National Convention met in San Francisco, California from July 16-19, 1984. The 1984 conclave marked the third time the Democrats had gathered in a California city with the last California convention occurring in 1960 in Los Angeles.² The 1984 convention was held in the Moscone Center and it represented the second time the Democrats had visited San Francisco (the first occurred in 1920).

The Moscone Center, an underground facility, appeared to offer the Democrats all the modern technology necessary for the conduct of a national convention. The four big screen televisions, computer terminals, computer-operated message system, and microwave facilities provided the communications capabilities required for this type of nationally-oriented media event. However, the press facilities offered to the print media were quite small and very inadequate as noted by the Press Gallery staff (and reiterated each day by reporters). The press platform was not built where everyone could
view the speaker's podium, the office space provided to news organizations was much smaller than originally promised, and the telephone service did not measure up to agreed-upon standards. These arrangements contrasted sharply with the television facilities which were paid for by the networks and represented the "state-of-the-art" equipment.

The security arrangements for the Democratic Convention were, as one would imagine, extremely well coordinated. The City of San Francisco did not interfere with the peaceful demonstrations of the many interest groups present in San Francisco, but a powerful police "presence" was maintained at all times. Doubtless, the city was well-prepared for the convention's security needs.

The Democrats convened their national convention after a long, often bitter, primary season which prompted speculation over Walter F. Mondale's ability to generate unity within a divided Democratic Party. Alan Ehrenhalt of the Congressional Quarterly offered the following assessment:

For most of us in America, a convention means a coming together. For the Democratic Party, in recent years at least, it has tended to mean the opposite -- a coming apart. Every four years, Democrats gather to select a presidential nominee without knowing whether they will leave with enough common purpose to give him a chance to win in the fall.

Yet, the 1984 assembly offered a new spirit of enthusiasm for the eventual nominee and his party as Mondale created a place for his nomination in history by selecting Geraldine
A. Ferraro as his running mate. However, that historic act was upstaged as Mondale attempted to assert his leadership by removing the chair of the party prior to a convention held in that chair's home state.

Moreover, the convention process in general seemed to be under attack as the national television networks dramatically reduced their coverage and called the events "dinosaurs." Other members of the news media countered that argument by offering articles noting the significance of the convention process. For example, Flora Lewis of The New York Times supported this latter position through these remarks:

But it is (through) the conventions that the American body politic shows its shape, stretches its muscles, forms its personality. They show who is in the cast and who are just spectators, who seek to represent democracy and who are content to be represented.

Therefore, the 1984 San Francisco convention began to emerge as a "testing site" for both the leadership of Walter Mondale and the role of the convention in the electoral process.

In a Washington Post commentary published the Sunday before the convention opened Joseph Kraft discussed the composition of the Democratic Party which was about to meet in San Francisco. Kraft argued that "the ramshackle collection of minorities known as the Democratic Party usually compromises its differences enough to command a national majority;" however Kraft maintained that "this year, the bidding for competitive advantage overcame the common interest in
electing a president. In a similar note, Steven Roberts of The New York Times reported that the Times' poll of the delegates revealed a startling conclusion: only fifty percent of the delegates believed their nominee could win in the fall (only thirty-five percent of Jesse Jackson's delegates and fifteen percent of Gary Hart's delegates felt Mondale could win). To be sure, Mondale faced a major challenge as he attempted to generate unity through the national convention and, in turn, overcome the injuries inflicted through the primaries and his decision to remove Charles Manatt as the party chair.

The diversity of the Democratic Party was further exemplified through its demographic composition. Nearly half of the delegates were women, close to one in four represented a minority group, and around one in seven was an elected or party official. The AFL-CIO maintained that they constituted twenty-five percent of the delegates/alternates present (which is interesting considering that only three percent of the delegates/alternates described themselves as "blue-collar" workers), thus, representing the largest single interest group attending the convention. The Mondale campaign would have to deal with a diverse group of political operatives in its drive for unity. As William Safire noted in his discussion of the Mondale strategy:

If, however, the theme in the Cuomo keynoter, the film, and the acceptance addresses pick up the initial notes struck in the Mondale introduction of
Mrs. Ferraro . . . then, perhaps, Mr. Mondale can do what Jerry Ford did in the campaign of 1976: close a 17-point gap and make a hot race of it.10

Mondale had set a powerful theme for the national convention the weekend prior to its opening through his selection of Representative Ferraro as a running mate. Adam Clymer argued that the appeal to the "Ellis Island Image" could provide Mondale with a vehicle for the consolidation of party resources.11 In discussing the Democrats' "quadrennial effort to define themselves," Clymer noted:

The newest, most sudden move in that course of re-definition of the oldest political party in the world was the choice of Representative Geraldine A. Ferraro to run for Vice President, a move that renews the party's image as the Ellis Island of American politics, the entry port for new participants,12 from the Irish to the blacks and now to women.

The writer went on to describe the Ferraro selection as "something old and something new" since she presented Democrats with a "candidate expected to appeal to old values and to ethnic groups who have drifted away from the Democrats" as well as a nominee whose "sex says the party is open to the original in politics in a way that no set of innovative position papers or the most imaginative use of computers . . . can say."13

David S. Broder examined the Ferraro selection from a slightly different perspective by noting how the choice of a woman reflected upon the image of Mondale. Broder remarked:
For years, Mondale has been plagued by his reputation for being cautious, conventional and colorless. By choosing Rep. Geraldine Ferraro as his running mate and announcing the decision on the eve of the convention, Mondale has come on stage as a much bolder and more commanding figure than he ever before seemed.

However, the Mondale image would suffer immensely within a two-day period as the nominee attempted to assert his newfound power by replacing the chair of the Democratic Party, Charles Manatt, with a former Carter administration aide, Bert Lance. The national attention generated through the Manatt-Lance affair would almost displace the excitement produced by the Ferraro announcement. Haynes Johnson suggested the following in his analysis of the women's reactions to these pre-convention happenings:

Mondale, their new leader, had surprised and delighted them last week by acting as Fritz the Bold with his selection of a woman for this ticket. Then over the weekend he disappointed them - and that grievously understates the depth of their feelings - by playing Walter the Timid with his on again, off again handling of the party chairmanship.

The national media reacted quickly regarding the Mondale team's inability to capitalize on the Ferraro announcement as evidenced in these remarks by Jules Witcover:

It is an old axiom in politics that you never step on your own story. That is, if you have a favorable development going, you don't do something that will generate news and take the play away from the good thing you have working for you.
Indeed, Mondale had effectively "stepped on" his "own story" through his attempt to replace Californian Charles Manatt prior to a California convention. Jack Nelson of the Los Angeles Times advanced the argument that the Mondale forces had been locked away "in their bastion at Lake Tahoe" and "had cut themselves off from both the feelings of ordinary delegates and the accumulated wisdom of the Democratic Party's old pols" which resulted in the Manatt-Lance confusion. 17

Yet, some journalists were not so kind to the Mondale organization as evidenced in the writing of conservative commentators Evans and Novak:

The rising arrogance in the Mondale camp, which infuriated Big Labor and party regulars, surfaced Saturday ... the way Democratic National Chairman Charles T. Manatt was disposed of reinforced the taint of Carterism, suggesting massive incompetence. 18

Jack Germond offered Frank Mankiewicz's view that "it's a step backward. It's a reminder of all the things the party does not want to be reminded of." 19 While Mary McGrory recommended that the "albatross" replace the "donkey" as the Democratic Party's symbol, she continued by quoting South Carolina Senator Ernest Hollings as stating that Mondale "must be a secret mole for Ronald Reagan." 20

The national media were not alone in their surprise over the removal of Manatt in favor of Lance and the sudden
reversal which reinstated Manatt. The delegates also expressed their dismay over this unnecessary activity. The *National Journal Convention Daily* (a free publication which was available to all delegates as they entered Moscone) reflected this sentiment with a front page story that greeted convention participants on Monday. Alexander and Arvidson commented, "There are troublesome indications that Walter F. Mondale has become so insulated from political reality that he runs the most dangerous risk of all for national politicians: inability to monopolize on the positive." In addition, Lou Cannon and Helen Dewar described the frustrations of the party's rank-and-file over the "Manatt-Lance confusion" and how it had effectively "killed" the Ferraro story. Simply, as Tom Wicker noted in his commentary:

> The leadership Mr. Mondale tried to assert was rebuffed; the signal he wanted to send was blurred. Then, compounding his own mistakes, he reinstated Mr. Manatt and seemed to confirm the charge he had tried to refute - that he was a weak leader who couldn't stand up to pressure.

Without question, the excitement created by the announcement concerning Ferraro ebbed with the massive confusion generated by the Manatt-Lance fiasco. Those of us who entered the Moscone Center for the opening session of the convention felt as if the entire assembly was experiencing a sense of excitement; yet there were nagging doubts concerning Mondale. The convention hall appeared to be a sea of red "Hart" signs complemented with a large number of green
"Jackson" posters. Delegates appeared to leap for joy at the mention of Ferraro's name while shaking their head as they read the National Journal Convention Daily (NJCD) which outlined the latest development concerning the "Lance Affair." Similarly, one could not help but note the emotion present in the ovation offered Manatt as the chair opened the convention. Mondale had, it would appear, acted unwisely in his effort to assert his leadership and he would need the help of some of his most powerful supporters if he were to recover.

One of these powerful supporters was being counted on to help recapture the lost momentum through his nationally televised keynote address. New York Governor Mario Cuomo's keynote address gained new importance due to the developments of the previous weekend. Martin Schram cited the sentiments of the Mondale staff:

Walter F. Mondale's advisors, who designed a two-track, image-building strategy for him and wound up derailing it, are looking to a Monday noon Mondale-Ferraro rally and New York Gov. Mario M. Cuomo's evening keynote address to salvage their Democratic National Convention Kickoff.

While the keynote speaker is to set "the tone of the convention by reviewing the current political agenda and urging party unity and action," the task confronting Mario Cuomo demanded more than that if Mondale were to regain control over his convention. In addition, the governor would be addressing the nation just a few minutes after former President Jimmy Carter which could impose some additional
constraints on that particular oration. In his preview of the Cuomo address, The New York Times' correspondent Howell Raines cited the sentiments of the Cuomo staff:

Mr. Cuomo's speech is designed to set the tone and lay down the thematic attack lines to be used against President Reagan in the fall. Timothy P. Russert, a Cuomo aide, said the address would be built around the "government-as-family" metaphor that the Governor used in his inaugural speech. The speech is also an exercise in "Cuomo jujitsu," he said. That is, the speech, like the Japanese martial art, aims to break down the opponent's main strength, his genial personality, as a mask disguising policies that punish the average family.26

Cuomo emerged before the nation as a new actor on the stage of national politics through his keynote address. The former lawyer pointed to "reasonableness" as the guiding light of his political philosophy.27 Marcia Kramer of the Chicago Tribune described Cuomo as follows:

For Cuomo, 52, the man with the large nose and sad and saggy eyes that cartoonists love to draw, the rise to center stage began with his upset victory over popular New York City Mayor Edward Koch in the 1982 Democratic gubernatorial primary. He then narrowly defeated millionaire Republican Lewis Lehrman in the general election.28

Cuomo, a first-term governor, received his Law degree from St. John's School of Law in 1956 and entered private practice while also remaining at St. John's as an instructor in the Law School.29 He was appointed Secretary of State by Governor Hugh Carey in 1975 and in 1978 was elected Lieutenant Governor of New York. Michael Barone summed the
selection of Cuomo as the keynoter by stating: "not for years has a keynoter set the tone and defined the themes of a convention as much as this one has, even before giving the speech." While the selection of Cuomo as the keynote speaker for the convention may represent "the perfect choice" for his party, the task at hand for the governor from New York extended beyond its traditional boundaries as it emerged as the turning point of a troubled Democratic National Convention.

Cuomo appeared poised and prepared to face the nation as he approached the podium on the first evening of the national convention. He quickly quieted the crowd and its chants of "Mario, Mario" as he began to assume a "lawyer's personae" in preparation for his thirty-nine minute performance (see Appendix A for the complete text of the Cuomo keynote address). Cuomo opened his address by stating:

Please allow me to skip the stories and the poetry and the temptation to deal in nice but vague rhetoric. Let me instead use this valuable opportunity to deal immediately with the questions that should determine this election and that we all know are vital to the American people.

Governor Cuomo proceeded by presenting the theme of the evening's oration as he attacked a recent speech by President Reagan in which the incumbent had described the country as a "shining city on a hill." Cuomo pronounced:

And the President is right, in many ways we are a shining city on hill, but the hard truth is that not everyone is sharing in this city's splendor and glory.
A shining city is perhaps all the president sees from the portico of the White House and the veranda of his ranch, where everyone seems to be doing well.

But there's another city, there's another part of the city, there's another part of the city, the part where some people can't pay their mortgages and most young people can't afford one, where students can't afford the education they need and middle-class parents watch the dreams they hold for their children, evaporate . . . . There is despair, Mr. President, in the faces you don't see, in the places you don't visit in your shining city.

In fact, Mr. President, this is a nation, Mr. President you ought to know that this nation is more a "Tale of Two Cities" than a "Shining City on a Hill." 32

Cuomo advanced his argument by describing the guiding philosophy of the Reagan administration as being representative of a form of "Social Darwinism" in which the strong survive, often at the expense of the less fortunate. He then observed:

It's an old story. It's as old as our history. The difference between Democrats and Republicans has always been measured in courage and confidence. The Republicans believe that the wagon train will not make it to the frontier unless some of the old, some of the young, some of the weak are left behind by the side of the trail. The strong, the strong they tell us will inherit the land!

We Democrats believe in something else, we Democrats believe that we can make it all the way with the whole family intact. 33 And we have more than once.

After reflecting on the administration of Franklin Roosevelt, Cuomo continued his lawyer-like argument:

We must win this case on the merits. We must get the American public to look past the
glitter, beyond the showmanship . . . to the reality, the hard substance of things. And we'll do it not so much with speeches that sound good as with speeches that are good and sound.34

Cuomo then proceeded to invite the party and the nation to unite against the Reagan administration and promote "the truth" by stating:

And because we Democrats must unite, we Democrats must unite so that the entire nation can unite. Surely the Republicans won't bring this convention together. Their policies divide the nation . . . into the lucky and the left-out, the royalty and the rabble.35

The first-term governor next advanced his family metaphor as he described the party as "our family" by demonstrating the diversity of the Democratic Party. Cuomo announced that the Democrats "speak for the minorities who have not yet entered the main stream" and the "ethnics who want to add their culture to the magnificent mosaic that is America;" moreover, Cuomo argued, "We speak for reasonable people who are fighting to preserve our very existence from a macho intransigence that refuses to make intelligent attempts to discuss the possibility of nuclear holocaust with our enemy."36

The plea for unity continued as Cuomo asserted:

If you need any more inspiration to put some small part of your own differences aside to create this consensus then all you need to do is reflect on what the Republican policy of divide and cajole has done to this land since 1980.37
Governor Cuomo expounded on the "fear theme" which would eventually dominate this convention as he addressed the hungry, the homeless, the plight of the farmers, the deficit, and the Reagan foreign policy. Cuomo invited the convention to pursue the negative by pointing to the killing of nuns in El Salvador by stating: "We give money to Latin American governments that murder nuns, and then we lie about it." 38

Assuredly, Cuomo asserted the fear theme as he pointed to the future under a second Reagan term and the potential that administration could have to alter the composition of the Supreme Court. The governor countered that vision with the Democratic worldview as he stated:

We Democrats still have a dream. We still believe in this nation's future. And this is our answer to the question -- our credo: We believe in only the government we need, but we insist on all the government we need. We believe in a government that is characterized by fairness and reasonableness, a reasonableness that goes beyond labels, that doesn't distort or promise to do what it knows it can't do . . . . We would rather have laws written by the patron of this great city, the man called the "World's Most Sincere Democrat" -- St. Francis of Assissi -- than laws written by Darwin. 39

Cuomo closed his thirty-nine minute oration through the use of a personal example: his father. Cuomo traced his father's "struggle to live with dignity" and described that effort as "the real story of the shining city." 40 Again, Cuomo offered his vision of the future by saying:

And ladies and gentlemen, and on January 20, 1985, it will happen again. Only on a much grander
scale. We will have a new president of the United States, a Democrat born not to the blood of kings but to the blood of pioneers and immigrants. And we will have America's first woman vice president, the child of immigrants, and we will open with one magnificent stroke, a whole new frontier for the United States . . . for the love of God. Please make this nation remember how futures are built.

The crowd's reaction to the Cuomo keynote seemed to be the elixir the Mondale forces needed. The delegates entered a state of excitement that appeared to relieve the anxieties of the previous weekend. Cuomo had exercised great care in his construction of the party's past, his assessment of its present, and his predictions for the future under a second Reagan administration. In addition, he offered a vision of the future under Democratic leadership predicated on "reasonableness" and "fairness" which, in turn, would dismiss the "divisions" created through the elitist philosophy of the Republican Party.

The national media reacted to the Cuomo keynote in a variety of fashions. Richard Cohen, writing for the NJCD, stated:

The speech was vintage Cuomo, with 13 references to "family" and 10 to "children." The son of poor immigrant Italian parents, he laid out his vision for "the family of America," as he did during his 1982 campaign for governor of New York.

Hedrick Smith reacted to Cuomo's oration as follows:

In effect, Mr. Cuomo was telling Democratic partisans that the road to victory lay in distinguishing
between a popular preacher and his controversial program, in separating an attractive messenger from a debatable message.

Mike Royko of the Chicago Tribune reacted:

It read like poetry. And for the first time in many years, somebody clearly defined for the Democrats what being a Democrat means. They needed that. For years they have been wondering exactly what they represent. Some babble on so long when they try to explain themselves that eventually you don't even care.

Other commentators offered strong support for the keynote address. David Brinkley stated, "As far as skill and delivery, effective delivery, I think it's the best I've ever heard." Expressing a similar view, a Chicago Tribune editorial responded by exclaiming, "Henry Fonda couldn't have delivered it better." Howell Raines noted how the Cuomo address approached the "Mondale problems" of the previous weekend:

In his keynote address, Mr. Cuomo alluded to the strains of the week. "We should not be embarrassed or dismayed if the process of unifying is difficult, even at times wrenching," he said. Noting that these differences cause "debates, even arguments," he added: "That's what our primaries were about. But now our primaries are over, and it is time to lock arms and move into this campaign together."

Yet, not all of the reactions were favorable as evidenced in Anthony Lewis' column in The New York Times:

Critics said Governor Cuomo looked too much to a past America, really the Depression America that
Franklin Roosevelt faced as a candidate in 1932. Mr. Cuomo talked of a country divided between royalty and rabble, of an America with homeless people sleeping in the streets, and people hungry in the richest society in history . . . . the Cuomo images had no meaning to a family watching him on television in a suburban ranch house. Moreover, in the critics' view, the speech offered no sense of possibility, no vision of an alternative future.

James Reston offered some support for Lewis' observations as he noted the similarity between the Cuomo oration and another famous political speaker by stating:

Like Disraeli, he used the image of "two nations," one rich, one poor, and mocked President Reagan's vision of America as "a shining city on a hill" . . . The paradox of his speech was that he was calling for both unity and a campaign stressing class divisions.

However, Reston did point out that the Democrats now have a campaign theme whereas they only had a "campaign team" prior to Cuomo's speech. Reston concluded, "so what is developing now is a campaign based on class conflict, with each party blaming the other for dividing the nation." 49

The Democratic National Convention which displayed a rather inauspicious opening had now taken several steps toward regaining the excitement generated through the Ferraro selection as the vice presidential nominee. Hopefully, for the Mondale campaign, the electricity generated through the Cuomo keynote could be maintained throughout the next three days; moreover, California Assembly Speaker Willie Brown's huge party at Pier 45 (the "Oh What a Night" party which
invited all delegates and alternates) was also being counted on to promote an air of relief through unity.

After the keynote address on the first evening of the convention the three remaining candidates vying for the Democratic nomination held a meeting to discuss their plans for the general election. On Tuesday morning the San Francisco Chronicle proclaimed in huge type, "THE DEMO SUMMIT; CONTENDERS SEEK COMMON GROUND," which offered the following as its lead: "Walter Mondale huddled privately last night with rivals Gary Hart and Jesse Jackson, and promised to unite against President Reagan - after their lingering battles are settled." The article continued by quoting Mondale:

This was not a meeting to negotiate ... this was not a meeting to seek to resolve differences. Rather, it was a long-overdue meeting to discuss together what must be done to carry out our values and win this election.

Regardless of the proposed intent of the "summit," the headline and accompanying photograph (showing the three men clasping hands) appearing in the Chronicle presented the convention with an image of unity which could serve as a starting point for the generation of that theme. In addition, as an interesting aside, the Democrats were so dedicated to the generation of the unity theme that Governor Cuomo left San Francisco after delivering his keynote address. Hence, the enthusiasm sparked by his oration could
be more effectively directed toward the party's goals as opposed to the speaker who prompted that reaction.

The second session of the 1984 Democratic National Convention was called to order at 1:52 P.D.T. on Tuesday by the party chair, Charles Manatt. As I entered the Moscone Center for a second time, I noted a shift in the attitude of the delegates as they appeared to be much more excited about the convention than on the previous day. One may only speculate if such a shift was produced by the Cuomo address, Willie Brown's party, the anticipation over the platform "discussion," or the rumors of unity among the three finalists (or more realistically, a combination of sorts). Nevertheless, the atmosphere was much more festive and, as a result, the party appeared to be in a much better position with regard to the resolution of several remaining conflicts.

While the Chronicle offered the convention an "upbeat" news story with its headline, the other major San Francisco daily presented a sharply contrasting viewpoint. The San Francisco Examiner declared on Tuesday, "HART, JACKSON VOW PLATFORM WAR: 'THIS IS NOT A CORONATION,' JESSE SHOUTS," which stated the following as its lead: "Gary Hart and Jesse Jackson vowed today to fight an all-out battle over the Democratic Party platform - even as negotiators for Walter Mondale were seeking a last-minute compromise."52

Indeed, the second session of the convention would prove to be a crucial turning-point in the unfolding drama designed
to promote unity within a divided party. The two San Francisco dailies clearly depicted the two sides of the conflict. One observed the "summit" as its lead story while the other referred to a "war" over the platform.

The party platform represented a significant hurdle for the Mondale forces, and, therefore, the nominee's staff presented speakers who both advocated their point of view and identified with the contesting forces. For example, Atlanta Mayor Andrew Young addressed the convention and endorsed the Mondale language for the platform. However, Young was booed, largely by the Jackson supporters, as he developed his sentiments. Not a few observers were surprised by this hostile reaction to a former civil rights leader. Such a negative response indicated clearly the strength of the support Jackson had mustered for this "war" over the platform's language.

In discussing the Democratic Party's platform prior to the opening of the convention George Will remarked:

> Democrats, those free spirits, dispensed, when writing their platform with that inhibition called editing. No reader will have an aching sense that the platform ends too soon . . . . The trouble begins when the platform wanders off into matters of fact . . . .

Will argued that the platform was full of mistakes with regard to the interpretation of statistical information concerning the Reagan administration and its policies. He specifically noted the platform's comments regarding the "misery index," highway deaths, workers' safety, and crime.
Each of these categories, Will maintained, had improved under the Republican administration whereas the platform suggested something rather different. Will continued:

In politics, style and substance are often interestingly related: rhetoric reveals temperament, which drives policy. This leaden, mechanical platform comes from people who do not seem to be having fun in politics. It reads like a joyless product of anxiety - anxiety lest some cause or faction, however marginal, be denied a nod, however perfunctory.

Even though one must recognize the degree to which Will's conservative orientation influenced his thoughts on this matter, his ideas with respect to the general nature of the Democrats' platform were consistent with those expressed by more liberal sources. The New York Times, for example, printed the following excerpts from the platform:

Reducing Budget Deficits: "The Democratic Party is pledged to reducing these intolerable deficits."

Equal Rights for Women: "The Democratic Party recognizes reproductive freedom as a fundamental human right."

Foreign Policy: "A Democratic President will reserve the automatic militarization of foreign policy."

Clearly, one is hard pressed to note any specific suggestions of ways and means in these excerpts; still, as Will noted, they do suggest "temperament" in a most straightforward manner. Timothy Clark of the NJCD observed that the document was "23 per cent longer than the 1980
A fundamental choice awaits America - a choice between two futures. It is a choice between solving our problems, and pretending they don't exist; between the spirit of community, and the corrosion of selfishness; between social decency and social Darwinism; between expanding opportunity and contracting horizons; between diplomacy and conflict; between arms control and an arms race; between leadership and alibis.

America stands at a crossroads.

The platform report continued by noting that "the President who appointed James Watt will appoint the Supreme Court" and that the "President who proposed deep cuts in Social Security will be charged with rescuing Medicare." In addition, the Platform stated, the "President who fought the Equal Rights Amendment will decide whether women get fair pay for their work;" and "The president who opposed every nuclear arms control agreement since the bomb went off will be entrusted with the fate of the earth."

In focusing on the "choice between two futures" the document introduced three specific areas of concern for Democrats by first presenting "the future under Reagan" followed by their worldview. As Will and later Clark clearly observed, the Democrats appear to speak to the concerns of virtually every interest group under that broad umbrella known as the Democratic Party. The end result of all the
attention generated by the platform "war" was highly predictable as noted by Clark:

In the end, each camp got something it wanted. Hart's plank is now in the platform. Mondale avoided a floor fight on affirmative action. And Jackson got floor votes on his planks.

In fact, the Jackson campaign was able to proclaim victory because of its success in attracting more support than the 417 delegates committed to his nomination. While one must resist the temptation to dismiss the platform struggle as "much ado about nothing," one should acknowledge the efficacy of these debates in generating the unity theme and in resolving, at least partially, the "leadership" question which emerged in the wake of the "Lance Affair." Also of importance is the fact that Jackson's campaign viewed these debates as one of the two opportunities it would have to flex its new-found political leverage. The second opportunity would occur just a few hours later as Jackson addressed the nation through the convention via a prime-time, televised speech.

Jesse Louis Jackson was born in Greenville, South Carolina in 1941. The ordained Baptist minister announced his candidacy for the nation's highest office on November 3, 1983 and had sustained his drive for that office through a unique, though often exploitive, campaign strategy. As he prepared to address the nation through the convention, Jackson personified the historical significance of this San Francisco
conclave. He was the first black to address a national convention from such a prominent position of strength. In fact, his introduction to the audience clearly reflected the symbolic nature of Jackson's campaign, deemed the "Rainbow Coalition," as a series of speakers representing different minority groups addressed the convention with their view of the Jackson candidacy.

Jackson delivered an emotionally-charged speech which, at times, would deviate from the advanced copy of the text. Those of us who stood on the press stand expressed fascination over Jackson's speaking style. The orator would often deviate from the text for five or more minutes by speaking extemporaneously. Despite these changes in language and emphasis, the speech clearly achieved two goals: first, it aroused the passions of both the primary and secondary audiences; and, second, it offered Mondale an opportunity to continue his quest for party unity.

Richard Meyer of the Los Angeles Times described the speech as follows:

Jesse Jackson drove the Democratic National Convention to its feet Tuesday and brought hundreds of delegates to tears with a stirring expression of hope that his presidential campaign was not in vain and a poignant apology for any discomfort, pain or fear he might have caused . . . . Jackson, ending months of concern among Democrats, also declared unequivocally: "I will be proud to support the nominee of this convention."

Richard Corrigan of the NJCD reinforced Meyer's conclusion by stating:
Jesse Jackson may run a distant third in the balloting tonight, but he is flying high as the political savior of the down-and-out and leader of an expanding chunk of the Democratic Party. . . . the tone and substance were mainly on party unity and on the need to unhorse Reagan, which was precisely what the Mondale camp had hoped to hear.

The national media's reactions continued. The Chicago Tribune, for instance, reported, "Both Jesse Jackson and the Democratic National Convention got what they wanted from his electrifying prime-time speech Tuesday - satisfaction." The New York Times described the religious connotation of the discourse:

Its priest was Mr. Jackson. Its forum was the Democratic National Convention. And its mentor was Walter F. Mondale, who had two Governors, a United States Senator, six Congressmen and a union president bumped from the schedule in order to give the civil rights leader some of the time and platform Mr. Mondale had promised.

Jackson had clearly reinforced the momentum established the evening before by Cuomo. Not only did he articulate his view of American politics, but he supported the theme of unity within a divided party. That his efforts were rewarded there could be little doubt. The convention closed its second session with a series of songs which, in turn, prompted the delegates to stand and dance. Meanwhile the press left the hall to record its thoughts for tomorrow's readers.

The third session of the convention presented the participants with a marathon episode of "unity generation."
Included in the session was Senator Hart's address followed by the roll call vote for the presidential nomination. Upon entering the Moscone Center, I could sense a state of "excited calm." The delegates with whom I talked seemed to be "up" for the anticipated vote and the Hart speech; at the same time they showed visible signs of fatigue.

The senior Senator from Colorado, Gary Hart, was born in Ottawa, Kansas in 1936. In establishing himself as the runner-up to Mondale in the primary season Hart offered a campaign based on a "new ideas" thesis. Such an approach, Hart had come to believe, was a striking contrast to the "tired, worn-out solutions" set forth by Mondale. His address to the nation through the convention, as in the case of Jackson's performance of the previous evening, would dictate the degree to which unity could be achieved in the 1984 convention. The timing of his oration also added to the historic nature of this convention since Hart would be speaking prior to the roll call vote. Not since William Jennings Bryan in 1896 had a runner-up enjoyed the benefits of such timing.

In supporting the unity theme in this prime-time address, Hart described the Republicans by stating, "Ronald Reagan and his gang of greedy polluters can no longer sing 'America the Beautiful' while they scar her face, poison her air and corrupt her waters." Hart appeared "stone-faced," as the San Francisco Chronicle described him, throughout a
forty-minute speech in which he was interrupted more than fifty times. Howell Raines reported that the Hart speech "seemed designed to end the most sharply contested, protracted nomination struggle by the Democrats in 50 years on a conciliatory note." Hart, it would appear, gave credence to this claim when he asserted: "Ronald Reagan has provided all of the unity we need." Hart continued:

It [the Reagan Administration] creates in each of us as Americans, not simply Democrats, a moral imperative for as long as we live, history and coming generations will ask: Did you do everything you could to defeat Ronald Reagan?

Clearly, Hart had provided Mondale with the unity plea he so urgently needed even though he did not concede the party's nomination prior to the roll call vote. Earlier in the day, The New York Times reported a deal had been made between the Mondale and Hart forces which presumably would result in Hart's being offered a prestigious position on a party commission to examine party rules (the fifth time since 1968 the party had formed such a commission). Consequently, even though Hart did not concede the nomination to Mondale, he chose not to interfere with the generation of the unity theme; indeed, he actually facilitated the development of that vision by focusing the nation's attention on the Republicans.

The Hart oration had obviously drained the audience emotionally, but the evening still had hours to go before the
end of the convention's third session. The nomination speeches and the roll call vote remained as the principal business. A tired Democratic National Convention sat through the nominations of McGovern, Jackson, Hart, and finally Mondale. By 9:17 P.D.T. the voting began and at 10:17 P.D.T. the New Jersey delegation put Mondale "over the top." In fact, around 10:30 P.D.T. (well after 1:00 a.m. on the east coast) Jackson appeared before the convention to call for unity within the party. Shortly afterward, Hart appeared to reinforce Jackson's proclamation. Before the evening ended the convention had voted to nominate Mondale by acclamation. A short time later the nominee appeared before the convention audience to thank them for their support. To be sure, the convention had experienced a dramatic turnabout since the "Lance-Manatt" experience just two days earlier.

The final session of the 1984 Democratic National Convention would offer a stark contrast to the previous sessions if for no other reason than the fact that it would be relatively short and tailored for the national television audience. The day would open with the convention focussing its attention, briefly, on several important senate races across the country (via a series of speeches) and then on the business of nominating Geraldine A. Ferraro.

After the nomination speeches the convention turned to the roll call of the states in order to nominate the first woman ever to hold a position on a major-party ticket.
However, the convention decided to nominate Ferraro by acclamation which, if nothing else, dramatically speeded up the process for the party (soothing its concern regarding prime time coverage on the east coast). With the "official business" completed, a very excited convention awaited the acceptance of the historic nomination. Timothy Clark described the nomination of Ferraro as follows:

She is an instant creation, a kind of Pallas Athena emerging in full battle regalia from the brow of the Democrats' equivalent of Zeus - House Speaker Thomas P. O'Neill Jr. of Massachusetts - with an assist from such lesser gods as Democratic National Committee chairman Charles T. Manatt.

The Clark article, appearing in the NJCD on the Sunday before the convention opened, continued by reviewing the political career of the eventual vice presidential nominee by stating:

Shrewdly focusing her energies on internal party affairs instead of legislative intricacies, she has forged ties with O'Neill and other party leaders, and they have given her a series of increasingly visible posts . . . . at once attractive and able to spout sports analogies with the best of the boys in House Democratic strategy sessions, she is characterized by male colleagues as more capable, thorough and well-organized than other women House Members.

Interestingly, Clark concluded his piece by noting that while other women in the House (he cited Elizabeth Holtzman and Bella Abszug as examples) were "confrontational" in their dealings with the party structure, Ferraro did not engage in
such tactics preferring to move toward the "inside of the party."

In addition, former California governor and presidential candidate Edmund G. Brown, Jr. offered his view of the Ferraro nomination for the Chronicle by writing:

With one bold choice, Walter Mondale has transformed his presidential campaign. The selection of Geraldine Ferraro comes at just that time in our history when new forces are poised to realign our politics. Since Roosevelt, the Democratic Party has been the party of inclusion, but not since John Kennedy has the party so dramatically shown its openness to the future. The choice of a woman for vice president changes utterly the odds on a Mondale victory.

To be sure, Ferraro recognized the potential for seizing on the Kennedy image for the Democratic Party as evidenced in her remarks to a rally in downtown San Francisco on the first day of the convention. Ferraro declared to the crowd: "What this ticket is all about and what we celebrate today is not what America can do for women, but what women can do for America."

Moreover, according to "convention rumor" during the first session of the assembly, the Mondale selection of Ferraro had seriously countered a strategy conceived by the Hart campaign which was oriented around a withholding of votes on the first ballot of the presidential nomination. Simply, Hart had hoped to convince the women, blacks, and hispanics to abstain on the first ballot and, thus, deny Mondale a
first ballot nomination. Yet, with the selection of Ferraro the Mondale camp deprived the Hart forces of the core of that strategy: the women. As a last chance effort, Hart announced to the convention that he would select Ferraro as his running mate should he gain the party's nomination.

Geraldine A. Ferraro was born on August 26, 1935 in Newburgh, New York. The first woman Representative from Queens, New York was elected to the 96th Congress in 1978 and won re-election in the 1980 and 1982 campaigns. Once again, appealing to the Ellis Island fantasy which so dominates the Democratic Party, Ferraro sent herself through law school while working in the day as a public school teacher in New York. The daughter of immigrants maintained a private law practice for thirteen years before serving as an Assistant District Attorney in Queens County for four years. During her second term in the House, Congresswoman Ferraro retained her position on the Democratic Steering and Policy Committee and, in turn, facilitated her emergence as an "insider" in the Democratic Party.

Throughout the San Francisco convention I was able to secure floor passes which allowed me to move about the convention floor, at will, while the members of the media were restricted to thirty-minute visits. With that freedom in mind, I ventured down on the floor and witnessed the Ferraro acceptance speech from a distance of about twenty feet. Prior to her appearance several "workers" were busy running
around the floor disseminating plastic American flags and, generally, working the crowd into a frenzy. Indeed, the 1984 Democratic National Convention was "ready" to hear Representative Ferraro.

Ferraro approached the podium that Thursday night with the grace and charm which would emerge as her trademark throughout the general election (see Appendix B for the complete text of the Ferraro acceptance speech). She appeared to be calm, but sincerely touched by the convention's response to her presence. Ferraro opened her address by stating:

Ladies and Gentlemen of the convention, my name is Geraldine Ferraro, I stand before you to proclaim tonight: America is the land where dreams can come true for all of us.

In her effort to capture her feelings for her audience Ferraro cited the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "Occasionally in life there are moments which cannot be completely explained by words. Their meaning can only be articulated by the inaudible language of the heart." Ferraro proceeded by offering her assessment of the task before her: "Tonight, the daughter of a woman whose highest goal was a future for her children talks to our nation's oldest party about a future for us all." Next, the historic nominee offered the thesis of her remarks as she stated:

The promise of our country is that the rules are fair. If you work hard and play by the rules, you can earn your share of America's blessings.
Ferraro continued by presenting an example of her thesis through a review of her own career. The three-term Representative noted her transition from student to lawyer to Member of Congress and how her values in conjunction with a respect for "the rules" facilitated that ascension. Ferraro then offered her view that Mondale shared her sentiments by comparing and contrasting their personal histories. Once the nominee had established her thesis she noted how the Republicans did not advocate the same set of "rules" by declaring:

Americans want to live by the same set of rules. But under this administration, the rules are rigged against too many of our people. It isn't right that every year, the share of taxes paid by individual citizens is going up, while the share paid by large corporations is getting smaller and smaller. The rules say: everyone in our society should contribute their fair share.

Representative Ferraro continued by attacking the president's view of the economy and the deficit by citing a second rule: "The rules say: we must not leave our kids a mountain of debt." Following that prescription, she denounced the practice of unequal pay for women by stating: "If you play by the rules, you deserve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work." In offering her fourth "rule," which dealt with the impact of the deficit on women and children, she proclaimed: "The rules of a decent society say, when you distribute sacrifice in time of austerity, you don't put women and children first."
Ferraro concluded the "rules segment" of her oration by discussing the problems associated with the Social Security system by suggesting: "Social Security is a contract between the last generation and the next, and the rules say: you don't break contracts." The vice presidential nominee summed her position on "the rules" by arguing that the Reagan administration does not observe those rules and that the Democrats are ready to initiate a change. She continued:

For change is in the air . . . just as surely as when John Kennedy beckoned America to a new frontier . . . when Sally Ride rocketed into space . . . and Reverend Jesse Jackson ran for the high office of president of the United States. By choosing a woman to run for our nation's second highest office, you send a powerful signal to all Americans. There are no doors we cannot unlock. We will place no limits on achievement. If we can do this, we can do anything. Tonight, we reclaim our dream. We're going to make the rules of American life work fairly for all Americans again.

Ferraro proceeded by addressing the party's concern for family values, but she also pointed to a distinction between the Democrats' view of family and the opposition's as she remarked: "We are going to restore those values -- love, caring, partnership -- by including, and not excluding, those whose beliefs differ from our own." The speaker then acknowledged the theme which appeared to run across every speech offered at this convention:

To those working Americans who fear that banks, utilities, and large special interests have a lock on the White House today, we say: Join us, let's
elect a people's president; and let's have govern-
ment by and for the people again.
To an administration that would savage student
loans and education at the dawn of a new
 technological age, we say: you fit the classic
definition of a cynic: you know the price of
everything, but the value of nothing.

Ferraro closed the speech with one final appeal designed
to demonstrate the differences between the two parties:

My fellow Americans: We can debate policies and
programs. But in the end what separates the two
parties in this election campaign is whether we use
the gift of life -- for others or only ourselves.
... To all the children of America, I say: the
generation before ours kept faith with us, and like
them, we will pass on to you a stronger, more just
America.

The twenty-seven minute oration concluded with an erup-
tion of applause and a sincere display of emotion by many of
the delegates on the convention floor. John Fogarty de-
scribed the Ferraro address as "a blunt speech that portrayed
a bright, fair and prosperous American future built on the
values of the past." Fogarty also noted that Ferraro was
interrupted twenty-nine times with a fifth standing ovation
occurring at the end of the performance. Unfortunately for
Ferraro, the celebration had to be shortened in order to
insure that Mondale would speak before a prime-time viewing
audience; therefore, after a few minutes of demonstrations
the lights were dimmed and the convention viewed a film
oriented around the life of presidential nominee: Walter F.
Mondale.
While I realized that Thursday would be an emotionally-charged evening, I had no idea how easily the delegates would be able to overcome their fatigue and rally around their cause. In fact, when Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts appeared on the podium to introduce the party's presidential nominee people, in some instances, ran to their seats. Kennedy did not waste any time as he immediately quieted the crowd and proceeded to hail the selection of Ms. Ferraro. The senior senator continued by advancing his image of the opposition as he stated:

In the great struggle of social justice in our century, the Democratic Party has been the tribune of the people, the enemy of the interests. And I do not see how our opponents can even dare to mention this question in 1984. For the greatest collection of special interests in all American history has now assembled inside the cold citadel of privilege known as the Republican Party... All we have to do is tell the truth on them, show the voters a clear view of that exclusive Republican citadel -- and the walls will come tumbling down.

The Democrats, though not fully prepared to welcome Mondale, became increasingly more enthusiastic as Kennedy developed his speech. Yet the suspicion remained that Mondale lacked the eloquence and the television appeal to compete rhetorically with Cuomo, Jackson, Hart, Ferraro, and Kennedy--all of whom had produced a galvanic effect on the delegates. Regardless, the stage was set for the Democratic nominee for president to address the nation and offer his vision of America's future.
Mondale was born on January 5, 1928 in Ceylon, Minnesota. The son of a Methodist minister and a school teacher, both of Norwegian descent, Mondale represents an ideological framework that can be "traced directly to the roots of American liberalism in the 1930s and 1940s . . . . He grew up in an atmosphere charged with enthusiasm for the New Deal and populism." In 1960 Mondale was appointed Attorney General of Minnesota and elected to that post by the people later that year. He was also appointed to his Senate seat in 1964 and later gained the approval of his constituency in the 1966 and 1972 elections. Jimmy Carter selected Mondale as his running mate at the 1976 convention and again during the 1980 assembly; however, the connection to the Carter administration was viewed by many to be as large a political handicap as it was an experiential virtue.

Mondale entered the 1984 presidential campaign as the clear front-runner; but, that prized position was upset once the primary season was underway. He had a very difficult primary campaign although he had already secured most of the prominent endorsements available to a Democratic candidate. Certainly, the types of events which transpired during the opening of this convention (the "Lance Affair," for example) seemed to typify the Mondale effort. Nevertheless, "Fritz" Mondale had received his party's nomination and unity was at hand despite the troubles of the previous weekend.
Mondale appeared calm and confident as he approached the podium to address the nation through the convention (see Appendix C for the complete text of the Mondale Acceptance Speech). The former vice president opened his oration as follows:

My fellow Democrats:
My fellow Americans:
I accept your nomination.
Behind us now is the most wide-open race in political history.
It was noisy -- but our voices were heard. It was long -- but our stamina was tested. It was hot -- but the heat was passion, and not anger. It was a roller-coaster -- but it made me a better candidate, and it will make me a stronger president of the United States.
I do not envy the drowsy harmony of the Republican Party. They squelch debate; we welcome it. They deny differences; we bridge them. They are uniform; we are united. They are a portrait of privilege; and we are a mirror of America.

Mondale continued with his first order of business, party unity, by stating:

When we speak of family, the voice is Mario Cuomo's.
When we speak of change, the words are Gary Hart's.
When we speak, when we speak of hope, the fire is Jesse Jackson's.
When we speak of caring, the spirit is Ted Kennedy's.
When we speak of patriotism, the strength is John Glenn's.
And when we speak of the future, the message is Geraldine Ferraro.
And now we leave San Francisco -- together.

Once the nominee had established his point with regard to unity, he proceeded to paint a self-portrait of his career
by saying: "I'm Walter Mondale. You may have heard of me -- but you may not really know me." Mondale reviewed his background and his dedication to basic American values in much the same manner as his running mate did a few hours before. However, as he continued his oration the nominee stood squarely on the same path the speakers before him had so clearly paved, the past. He reviewed the 1980 campaign by pointing out what he saw as the problems facing the nation as the result of the Reagan victory. In part, he said:

Lincoln once said that ours is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. But what we have today is government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich, and we're going to make a change in November.

Look at the record, first, there was Mr. Reagan's tax program. And what happened was this, he gave each of his rich friends enough tax relief to buy a Rolls Royce -- and then he asked your family to pay for the hub caps.

Mondale continued:

Then they socked it, then they socked it to workers. They encouraged executives to vote themselves huge bonuses -- while using King Kong tactics to make workers take Hong Kong wages.

Mr. Reagan, Mr. Reagan believes that the genius of America is in the boardrooms and exclusive country clubs. I believe that greatness can be found in the men and women who built our nation; do its work; and defend our freedom.

Mondale then outlined one of the few specific statements of ways and means presented during the entire convention as he addressed the problem of the rising deficit: "Let's tell the truth . . . . Mr. Reagan will raise taxes, and so will I."
He won't tell you. I just did."102 Furthermore, the nominee argued: "When he raises taxes, it won't be done fairly. He will sock it to average-income families again, and he'll leave his rich friends alone."103

Mondale progressed by challenging the president to a debate on the deficit and the economy in general. Then the former vice president offered a challenge to the American people as he remarked:

It is time, it is time for America to have a season of excellence. Parents must turn off the television; students must do their homework; teachers must teach; and America compete. We'll be number one if we follow these rules. Let's get with it in America again.104

Whereas the Mondale thesis did not stress the "fear" appeal so clearly present in other prominent orations, his argument did offer a sense of "threat" to those who do not share his philosophy. Specifically, he mentioned those companies which use cheaper labor from abroad by stating, "And our country won't help your business -- unless your business helps our country."105 The speech moved onward by addressing the threat of nuclear war (again, backing off the fear appeals present in the Cuomo, Jackson, Hart, and Ferraro speeches), arms control, and U.S. - U.S.S.R. relations. The Democratic Party's nominee concluded his thirty-four minute acceptance address with his vision of the future under a Mondale-Ferraro administration by proclaiming:
Before the start of the next decade, I want to go to my second Inaugural, and raise my right hand, and swear to "preserve, protect, and defend" a Constitution that includes the Equal Rights Amendment.

My friends America is a future that each generation must enlarge; a door each generation must open; a promise that each generation must keep.

For the rest of my life, I want to talk to young people about their future. And whatever their race, whatever their religion, whatever their sex, I want to hear some of them say what I say -- with joy and reverence -- tonight: "I want to be president of the United States."

The Mondale oration concluded in a dramatic fashion as the convention hall erupted into an enthusiastic demonstration of unity. The nominee and his family were joined on the podium by his running mate and her family, virtually all of the candidates from the primary campaigns, and other noted party regulars. As one looked out across the hall, one could not help but feel that the Democrats had achieved the unity they had worked so hard to attain. The demonstration continued for some time and ended with a display of unity as the entire assembly joined together to close their national convention by "singing and swaying" to the tune "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

The media reacted to the Mondale speech in a variety of ways since different correspondents seemed to focus on different parts of the address. For example, Steve Wiegand concentrated on the tax increase proclamation by writing: "With remarkable frankness for an acceptance speech, Mondale bluntly predicted that no matter who wins the November
election, federal taxes will go up - a statement he has made on the campaign trail." \(^{107}\)

David Johnston presented readers with what he viewed as the "basic premise" of the Mondale oration when he stated that the speech was predicated on Peter Hart's 1983 poll that suggested that the 1984 election would go to the candidate who best articulates the future for the nation. \(^{108}\) Johnston also reviewed the construction of the Mondale address by citing the comments of Mondale's chief speechwriter, Martin Kaplan. Kaplan stated that the speech took six weeks to write; moreover, Kaplan acknowledged that he had read every speech Mondale had delivered over the last ten years. In this connection, The New York Times reported that Kaplan had read every acceptance speech of both parties for the last eighty years. \(^{109}\)

In addition, Howell Raines described the speech as follows:

Following the traditional prescription for acceptance speeches, he reached out to voters outside the Democratic base. He also sought to rally party regulars by savaging President Reagan as an advocate of "government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich." \(^{110}\)

Raines continued:

In a convention at which the main item of business has been the healing of wounds inflicted in the primary, Mr. Mondale also responded to the peace overtures this week from his defeated rivals, Mr. Jackson and Senator Gary Hart of Colorado. \(^{111}\)
Raines' observation regarding the "healing of wounds" seems to represent the overriding theme of the San Francisco convention as well as the essence of the Mondale performance. In my view, the most prominent thesis advanced throughout this convention centered around the family metaphor and the need to "pull the family together" in order to combat an unjust enemy. This argument was advanced at the expense of specific statements of ways and means. Thus orators allocated most of their time to the task of unifying the party against what they perceived to be the "royalty" that personified the Republicans.

William Safire supported this observation in the following comment:

A new political axiom was revealed at the 1984 Democratic Convention: the whole is less than the sum of its parts . . . . The party of F.D.R. put together a coalition of big-city machines, organized labor, northern intellectuals and a solid south. In a Depression, that worked. Now the party of Mondale is trying to fuse a following of old liberals, new women, blacks, labor and Southern politicians . . . . It won't work in prosperity . . . . Here is where the whole becomes less than the sum of its parts; publicized proximity causes the strange bedfellows to subtract support from each other . . . . this "family" is a fiction; the coalition does not coalesce.

Timothy Clark reviewed the rationale behind the party's use of the "family" metaphor:

Many Democrats believe that Reagan has capitalized on the theme unfairly, and that his policies have hurt, not helped American families . . . . But the Democrats still must overcome not only Reagan's
carefully built identification with the idea of family values, but also their own identification with issues that are disliked by some to whom the family theme appeals—abortion on demand and homosexuals' rights for example.

Whether the "coalition" did "coalesce" or not, the Democrats clearly decided to muster their forces around the family theme and did so, in my view, through a series of masterful oratorical performances. In fact, the prominent speeches of this convention were so impressive that the party nominee placed himself in a difficult position dramatically. As Jack Germond and Jules Witcover noted:

It could be Walter F. Mondale's peculiar fate that he be remembered as a bridesmaid at his own wedding. On successive nights this week, others have played on the emotional heartstrings of the delegates to the Democratic National Convention. First there was keynoter Mario M. Cuomo, then a conciliatory Jesse Jackson turning the podium into a pulpit, then for his own supporters anyway—Gary Hart's view of the future. . . . On top of all that, the selection of Geraldine A. Ferraro . . . most presidential nominees, but not all, dominate their own conventions, and those who don't often have trouble in the general election that follows. 114

Expressing an opposing view, Hedrick Smith of The New York Times noted that the "public pledges of support" from the Jackson and Hart camps "helped heal the wounds of a long, hard-fought primary campaign. And, in turn, benefit Mondale." 115 Or, perhaps more realistically, some sort of synthesis of these two viewpoints may reveal a political party in a period of transition, as depicted by Tom Wicker:
What happened to Mrs. Ferraro and Mr. Jackson here may also be the most dramatic evidence yet that the modern Democratic party has become a new instrument in American politics. Its role seems more and more to be that of providing emergent and developing interests with a place in political life, and access not to power itself but to that new national nervous system through which attention must be gained before power can be won.  

Wicker continued by suggesting that the Democratic Party had evolved into a "party of participation" as opposed to a "party of government" in which "power will be more avidly sought by and more widely distributed among those who in the long past could only suffer its consequences." If Wicker's analysis stands the tests of time, then the convention of 1984 may emerge as a significant historical event in the evolution of the Democratic Party.  

That historical perspective notwithstanding, the San Francisco assembly did offer some fundamental examples of convention rhetoric as Democratic orators, convention media, and the party platform consistently referenced "fear" as a rallying cry against the Republicans. Joseph Kraft suggested that such appeals will not work in a modern context by stating:

Probably the Democrats would do better in the country at large if they could once again sound the alarms warning of economic disaster and national disgrace. But the option is not really there . . . . Sounding the note of urgency carries little conviction. In the absence of any felt national emergency, individuals concentrate on a better living.
However, this did not seem to deter the Democratic orators from their goal of promoting a "circling of the wagons" against the enemy through fear. Indeed, if the present situation did not create any sense of urgency, the Democrats would reflect upon the past when the party "saved the day" from the opposition. The Washington Post captured this trend in an editorial entitled "The Democrats and Their Ghosts" in which the writers asserted:

Both the Carter and Cuomo speeches were designed to go back and retrieve what part of the Democratic past there is on which Democrats can agree and of which they believe they can be proud . . . . The Democrats' challenge - and their problem - lies in finding a way to deal with the here and now with a relevance comparable to that of Franklin Roosevelt's enterprise had for his own times and a moral purpose as strong as that which animated the human rights movement.

The point offered above seemed to extend beyond the principal addresses of the first session to the extent of representing a fundamental premise of the "unity" theme. The 1984 convention wanted to forget 1980 in favor of a more pleasant memory - whether it be 1932 or 1960 - in the hopes of rallying support for the fall election. The central theme required the party to forget the recent past (the primaries and the Carter administration), ignore the present, and look to a future reminiscent of the distant past. Some Democrats recognized this rhetorical strategy and denounced it as unwise as evidenced in the remarks of South Carolina Senator Ernest Hollings:
The good news is that we Democrats can win in November. We can defeat Ronald Reagan. We can put an end to his mismanagement of the resources of this great nation - its people, its treasure, its government. The bad news is that on the present course, we won't . . . . It wasn't a purloined briefing book or an old actor's virtuoso performance that did us in. Democrats met the enemy in 1980 - and it was us.

Walter Mondale may have achieved his goal of attaining unity within a divided Democratic Party through his 1984 convention, but it came as the result of a rhetorical strategy which may have ignored the election of 1980. Perhaps Richard Viguerie, a conservative fund-raiser, captured this thesis best when he commented:

I've read a lot about the Democrats achieving party unity in San Francisco. Well, they did achieve unity, but it came at a high price. The Democrats just priced themselves right out of the market, right out of the mainstream of the American people.

The degree to which Viguerie's analysis could be sustained would depend upon how the "market" would be defined during the general election and that process was not yet complete. Before the nation could fully judge the Democrats and their worldview they would need to examine the other half of this political equation as presented by the Republicans through their national convention in Dallas, Texas.
The 1984 presidential campaign had been a long, often vicious, struggle for the Democratic Party. Walter Mondale, the early front-runner, had experienced a series of unexpected challenges during the primary elections which, in turn, set the scene for a potentially contested convention. From a Burkean perspective, the state of divisiveness before the Democratic Party was formidable and would therefore require a rhetorical strategy that appealed to a broad base of the Democratic coalition. Gary Hart arrived in San Francisco with a nationally-established campaign and a substantial block of delegates. Jesse Jackson came to the Moscone Center with a media-wise campaign that knew how to arouse the passions of an organized block of delegates. Indeed, the Democrats were in need of a powerful means of identification if consubstantiality were to be obtained through this national convention.

On July 13, 1984--three days before the opening of the San Francisco assembly--Mondale revealed his unifying strategy. The former vice president offered a symbolic act of historic proportions through his selection of Geraldine A. Ferraro of New York as his vice presidential running-mate. The unifying power of this act was immense in that it appealed to what Clymer described as the "Ellis Island Fantasy" of the Democratic Party. In addition, it allowed
Mondale to emerge as "Fritz the Bold" by presenting a new, forceful, version of his candidacy. Clearly, the selection of Ferraro displayed the rhetorical force to overcome virtually any threat posed by the Hart or Jackson campaigns.

Yet, there seems to be a tendency in the Democratic Party to use the national convention as a forum for controversy--a point addressed by Ehrenhalt's comments earlier in this chapter. The 1984 Democratic convention was not to be an exception as the Mondale campaign decided to exercise its new-found power by replacing the Chair of the Democratic Party, Californian Charles Manatt, prior to the opening of a California convention. Moreover, the Mondale forces replaced Manatt with Bert Lance of Georgia, a former Carter administration official.

The national media pounced on this story with force as journalists described the announcement as evidence of the "rising arrogance of the Mondale camp;" as "a step backward...a reminder of all the things the party" wants to forget; and quoted Ernest Hollings as stating that Mondale must be "a secret mole for Ronald Reagan." The reaction to the firing of Manatt was so strong that the former vice president rescinded the order, reinstated Manatt, and appointed Lance to another position in the campaign. These actions had serious consequences as one considers the symbolic nature of such activity from a Burkean perspective.
Mondale had offered a powerful symbol of unity through his selection of Ferraro on the Friday before the convention; however, the careless handling of another symbolic move—the placement of a Southerner in a position of power in the party—failed due to the situation in which the act was rendered. When one remembers Burke's insistence on strategic responses to specific situations, the fact that Lance was a symbol of the Carter administration (and a negative one at that) along with the setting of the convention, Manatt's home state, presented the Mondale forces with a dilemma of such magnitude that it could upset the momentum generated by the Ferraro selection.

Hence, the rhetorical task confronting the Democrats was a two-fold one in that the party would now have to move attention away from the Lance-Manatt confusion and toward some unifying theme. While the Ferraro selection initially displayed that unifying capacity, the Mondale campaign's handling of the party chairmanship disrupted the effectiveness of that strategic act. The Democrats would now have to turn to the leadership of the party to re-establish the enthusiasm once generated by Ferraro's selection.

In the effort to obtain unity within a traditionally divided party, the Democrats turned to a rhetorical strategy oriented toward the identification of the enemy. Democrats began telling a story that identified Ronald Reagan as the enemy of the diverse groups of the Democratic coalition. In
Burkean terms, these stories facilitated group identification through the portrayal of a situation in which these interests were being victimized by the unfair, elitist decision making of the Reagan administration. To be sure, the Democrats would have advanced such a story in any event; however, the Manatt fiasco created an urgent need for some unifying theme which could recapture lost momentum.

The strategy first emerged on Monday evening as the party's keynote speaker, Mario Cuomo, offered his "Tale of Two Cities" address. This oration clearly defined the situation for the audience as it identified the Reagan administration as one based on a philosophy of "Social Darwinism." Cuomo's story revealed a Democratic coalition in a state of victimage, in Burkean terms, in that the Republicans were threatening the prosperity of the various groups in that coalition.

Cuomo's portrayal was reinforced by O'Neill's depiction of the "unfair" policies of the Reagan administration; Jackson's view that "our time has come;" and Hart's assessment of the "greedy" nature of Reagan's philosophy. Perhaps Hart summed the strategy best when he argued: "Ronald Reagan has provided all the unity we need." These speeches all relied on the use of "fear" as they told their stories to the audience. The "fear" of four more years of victimage emerged as the story line through which all the discourse appeared to be organized--a point I will discuss in my analysis of the mirroring anecdote later in this work.
In my view, this rhetorical strategy in conjunction with the symbolic nature of the Ferraro selection, was effective for the Democrats in their efforts to unify the party. The Jackson and Hart orations expressed their support for Mondale while not compromising the positions of their respective interests. The steady flow of stories emanating from the rostrum seemed to present the audience with messages through which groups could identify. All stories clearly referenced the threat posed by the villain Reagan to the needs of the coalition and, in so doing, focused attention on the "fear" of four more years.

By Thursday evening, it appeared as though the Lance-Manatt confusion had disappeared and unity was at hand. The Ferraro acceptance speech reinforced the story line of a need for "fairness" as she rallied the party in the name of group solidarity. The Kennedy introduction of Mondale added to the enthusiasm generated by the Cuomo, O'Neill, Jackson, Hart, and Ferraro speeches. As the convention came to a close, the Democrats assembled on the podium in a display of unity which seemed to transcend the problems of the previous weekend. A Democratic National Convention that opened on a historic note, floundered in indecision, and regained strength on the basis of the story telling abilities of prominent party members ended on a positive note.

Since I will discuss the use of the mirroring anecdote later, I will reserve comment on that aspect of the
convention until then; however, a brief assessment of the convention's theme seems appropriate at this point. While the theme of "fear and fairness" stands out as the primary thrust of the discourse rendered in San Francisco, it appears as though the Democrats set the tone for a campaign based on what Reston described as "class conflict" through their national convention. The Democrats advanced a story based on an "us vs. them" scenario in which the "family" that is the Democratic coalition needed to unite through identification against a common enemy: the Reagan administration. Therefore, the "family" had to compromise its differences or else suffer through four more years of victimage at the hands of the villainous Republicans. Such a story line is rich in its dramatic qualities as it clearly identified "friends and foes" for the audience as well as offering a foundation upon which identification with the party could be established. Clearly, from a Burkean perspective, the first step in overcoming divisiveness is identification; the Democrats seemed to obtain that goal over the four-day period of their national convention.
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CHAPTER FOUR:

THE 1984 REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

The thirty-third Republican National Convention met in Dallas, Texas from August 20-23, 1984. The 1984 Dallas assembly marked the first time the Republicans had held a convention in the Lone Star State. The Dallas Convention Center, the site of the gathering, is the third largest facility of its kind in the United States and, therefore, provided more than enough space for the Republicans.

Indeed, the Dallas complex provided a sharp contrast to the San Francisco experience in that the print media appeared to be pleased with their accommodations. The press platform was arranged in a manner that allowed all the members of the print press to observe the speaker's podium from their assigned seats. The working space provided off the convention floor for the respective news organizations was bountiful and the dining arrangements provided by the City of Dallas were generous. Unlike the San Francisco facility, the Dallas Convention Center did not display the four huge television monitors placed at strategic positions within the hall, but instead offered one large screen directly behind the speaker's podium and one giant screen placed behind the
camera stand in front of the podium with a series of smaller monitors dispersed throughout the auditorium.

In addition, the Dallas assembly was organized somewhat differently from the Democrats' gathering since the Republicans planned to meet in six sessions of around two hours each (as opposed to the marathons of San Francisco). The schedule called for two morning sessions (on Monday and Tuesday) and four prime-time evening sessions. In my view, as the week progressed the convention participants appeared to be much more relaxed and rested than were their counterparts in San Francisco which could be attributed, in part, to the schedule of convention activities.

One other interesting note involves the weather in Dallas at the time of the convention since the temperature in Texas stayed around 100 degrees. While the security around the convention complex was extremely tight, the Dallas police had little to manage since "the protesters" left town almost as quickly as they arrived. The City of Dallas had placed these groups (their "tent city" headquarters) next to a livery in the area; thus, with temperatures in the 100s, the conditions were too much for the demonstrators to withstand. While these groups had hoped to use the convention as a forum to express their grievances, the weather and the city government proved too much to overcome.

As the Republicans gathered in the sweltering home of "America's Team," the Dallas Cowboys, they appeared to be
riding a political trend which was about to place them in a rather unique position. The Gallup Poll released during the convention announced that the GOP was not only perceived by Americans as the party most likely "to keep the nation prosperous," but the Republicans were challenging the Democrats "as the party most likely to keep the nation at peace." Specifically, as George Gallup, Jr. reported:

The latest Gallup Poll shows that 49 percent of the public - the highest figure since these measurements were begun in 1951 - saying the Republican Party will do a better job of keeping the U.S. prosperous, while 36 percent name the Democratic Party and 15 percent say they see little difference between the parties or do not offer an opinion.

Yet, as Jack Nelson discussed in the Los Angeles Times, the Republicans had even more to celebrate than their rise in the polls as the Democrats were still suffering from the national media attention generated by their vice presidential candidate Geraldine A. Ferraro. Ferraro had announced in San Francisco that she would provide a complete financial statement for both herself and her husband which would go beyond the requirements imposed by federal law. This unnecessary promise to disclose all of her family's financial dealings generated attention when her husband refused to cooperate by including his financial records. On the first day of the GOP convention, Rep. Ferraro held a news conference in New York designed to address the public concerns generated by this controversy. Indeed, the Republican Party
appeared to be in a position to enjoy the "best of both worlds" as they were not only "riding high" in the polls, but also observing the Democrats as they "self-destruct" through the Ferraro debacle (all the while Republicans refused to comment on the matter for the record).

Unlike their counterparts in the Democratic Party, the GOP would assemble at their national convention with "unity" virtually assured. As Alan Ehrenhalt commented for the Congressional Quarterly:

It has been 20 years since the Republican Party did any serious convention brawling, or left the hall with any real shortage of unity . . . . What is interesting about this tradition of GOP convention unity, though, is that it has a relatively short history. All through the era of Franklin Roosevelt, into the 1950s and up until Barry Goldwater's tumultuous 1964 nomination, Republicans were easily quarrelsome as Democrats. A few things have happened since to calm them down. Among them, of course, is success.

Still, the Republicans were not content with their recent electoral success or their rise in the public opinion polls; what they most earnestly wished, now, was to present the nation with a national convention that reflected their new-found character. Ronald Brownstein discussed this effort in the National Journal Convention Daily (NJCD) by suggesting: "It used to be that the most important people at conventions were political bosses. Today, they're probably media consultants . . . . We're talking images here." In fact, Brownstein cited the GOP's convention manager, Ron Walker, as stating:
If we've organized it (the convention) from a professional standpoint, to those people who are looking at us . . . perhaps the message will come through that we can run a train on time, and if we can do it here, we can run the country.

Walker elucidated that point in an article for *First Monday* (a GOP-oriented publication):

One of the things we are hoping to be able to accomplish at this convention is to show we are a party of the future, a party open to new ideas. We want to bring in those various elements of modern technology that will enhance the dissemination of information and the ability to communicate. That is why we are bringing in what I call the state of the art technology such as electronic mail.

Thus, the Dallas convention represented an attempt by the Republicans to demonstrate for the nation that the party can run the convention on time through the use of the "new technologies" which, as Walker argued, implies their ability to run the country. However, the 1984 convention extended beyond that feature as evidenced by Timothy Clark's report for the *NJCD* regarding the assembly's theme:

Allegiance to family, religion and morality and traditional "lifestyles" are themes to be stressed in Dallas, as if the GOP somehow wants to emphasize the view that it is holier than the Democrats.

In addition, as noted in *U.S. News and World Report*, the GOP's theme went one step further by proclaiming: "We as a nation are prouder, stronger, better under the leadership of Ronald Reagan." This theme would come to dominate a most optimistic national convention as the convention managers
would carefully orchestrate the events inside the convention hall around the personality of the incumbent president and, in turn, dismiss the Democrats as the party of the past.

Before discussing the principal theme of this convention as outlined above, I perceive the need to point out some of the demographic characteristics of this 1984 GOP gathering. The convention consisted of 2,390 delegates and 2,034 alternates with an almost perfect 50-50 split with regard to gender (50.2 percent male and 48.9 percent female). However, this gathering consisted of a population that was over 86 percent white (the blacks constituted 4.4 percent with other minorities respectively representing less than one percent of the delegates/alternates). Additionally, the GOP was represented by a group that was 60 percent Protestant, only 20 percent Catholic, and had no other religion able to claim more than 2.3 percent of the delegates/alternates. To say the least, the demographic composition of the Republican National Convention was fundamentally different from the San Francisco Democrats on the basis of race and religion.

The Republicans differed from the Democrats in one other vital area as the GOP prepared to convene their national convention: the adoration they displayed toward their candidate. As stated in the review of the Democratic convention, the Democrats initially were unsure as to whether Mondale had a chance to defeat a popular incumbent. While the GOP argued over the language of its platform or the role of the
"New Right," there was one point on which all the Republican partisans agreed and that was that Ronald Wilson Reagan should continue as President of the United States.

The Dallas assembly would project a concern over "traditional American values" throughout the four-day gathering; however, the overriding theme of this convention centered on the image of the president. Steven Weisman described that image for The New York Times as follows:

Jimmy Carter, Richard Nixon and Lyndon B. Johnson yearned for the Presidency. Surely one secret of Mr. Reagan's success is that he conveys the impression that he would prefer to be back at the ranch. His manner suggests that if it takes being President to carry out his deeply held ideas - by golly, he'll just have to be President.

Newsweek followed a similar line of reasoning in its description of the incumbent president:

As a man, he is neither especially acute nor especially driven; as president, he is neither especially knowledgeable nor especially well prepared for the most powerful job in the world. But he succeeds effortlessly, in a way that leaves both friends and adversaries groping for explanation. Although it may be too much to say that Ronald Reagan has reinvented the presidency during his first 45 months in office, he has unquestionably revitalized it.

Yet, the Reagan image projects beyond the Oval Office as noted by Time's Hugh Sidey:

He is a refrain from Stars and Stripes Forever. He is a whiff of a kinder age out of the attic. He is reassurance, a pat on the back, a little belief in every person's dream. He is a do-it-yourselfer in
an era of easy cop-outs, a simple loyalist among
the sophists, a gauzy visionary stumbling through
computer print-outs. He is comfort that things are
not as bad as the experts say they are. Ronald
Reagan is a mood that has seeped through the land
like the beguiling scent of honey-suckle on a soft
Georgia night. Millions have been soothed and
seduced.

While one may hesitate to suggest that the delegates to
the Republican National Convention were captivated by the
"scent of honey-suckle on a soft Georgia night," they were
involved in a well-orchestrated "seduction" that would cul­
minate on Thursday evening and, hopefully for the GOP, con­
tinue through November. Without question, the theme to this
Dallas convention centered on Ronald Reagan with the Demo­
cratic Party, as emanating from San Francisco, serving as the
spring board for the projection of that theme.

As I entered the Dallas Convention Center for the open­
ing session, I was impressed by the size of the complex. The
press facilities were clearly superior to the those of San
Francisco convention and the Republicans delivered every
speech to each reporter's work area (which was in clear view
of the podium) as well as maintaining an up-to-date bulletin
board listing press conference times. In addition, I could
not help but notice what I perceived as a difference in the
demeanor of the GOP delegates. In San Francisco the dele­
gates were clearly advocates of specific points of view and
they were dedicated to the expression of those ideals; how­
ever, in Dallas the delegates seemed to share one common
feeling that would transcend any individual concern. Ronald Reagan was the glue that held this convention together and that realization set an atmosphere for the entire event.

The Republican Party Chairman, Frank J. Fahrenkopf, Jr., clearly related this point in his address before the convention during the opening session. Fahrenkopf stated:

Not so long ago, Dwight Eisenhower set a goal for us: It is, he said, "Lifting from the backs and from the hearts of men, their burdens and their fears, so they may find before them a golden age of freedom and peace."

We have come here to make that vision a reality and we will leave here to re-elect Ronald Reagan the next President of the United States.

To light our way, we will adopt a platform which embodies all that we want for this blessed nation of ours. And along the way, we will extend our hand to the legions of Independent voters -- and to Democrats who, right now, must be terribly concerned about what happened to their Party in San Francisco. 

Fahrenkopf continued by citing the words of John Kennedy ("ask not what your country can do for you") and contrasting them with his view of the San Francisco gathering by declaring, "never before have so many people in one room demanded their country do so much for them." Within an hour after the Republican convention opened, the chair of the party had already outlined the argument to be advanced for the next four days: individual strength and patriotism are more important than group identification and solidarity.
The morning session seemed to end almost as quickly as it began as the GOP closed its first session right on time. The afternoon would feature a series of press conferences held by the party in a special area reserved for that purpose. Throughout the convention the Republicans would provide a steady stream of speakers for the press to interview, extending all the way to the vice president, in order to facilitate the transmission of their worldview.

The "prime-time" second session of the GOP's convention featured a series of speakers of national prominence. With the possible exception of the keynoter, Katherine Ortega, the evening's orators were all nationally-known figures. Jeane Kirkpatrick, Howard Baker, and Margaret Heckler would all address the convention during its first evening session and present messages oriented around the same theme. After an impressive "video introduction," the Ambassador to the United Nations and a life-long Democrat, Jeane Kirkpatrick, introduced the evening's theme:

This is the first Republican convention I have ever attended. I am grateful that you should invite me a life-long Democrat -- on the other hand, I realize you are inviting many life-long Democrats to join our common cause.

Kirkpatrick next advanced the principal argument of the evening's discourse as she explained why she was attending a GOP convention. The Ambassador argued that the leadership of the Democratic Party had drifted away from the
basic principles which traditionally guided that party's decision making; hence, she introduced a new symbol for national consumption: The San Francisco Democrats. Kirkpatrick asserted that "the San Francisco Democrat" displayed certain features which distinguished that type of partisan from the traditional Democrat of FDR's party. Clearly, Kirkpatrick set the scene for the Ortega keynote through her use of the symbol "San Francisco Democrat" in a way that allowed the subsequent speakers to invite the unhappy Democrats of the old FDR coalition to join the Reagan Team.

The Majority Leader of the United States Senate, Howard Baker, continued that line of reasoning, yet Baker did so by "fanning the flames" of partisanship as he remarked:

Does anybody here think Ronald Reagan should be re-elected President?
I've come to the right place.
The Democrats have come to a different conclusion. They say America is waiting for Walter Mondale.
They say America is trembling, despairing, terrorized, greedy, and divided between the lucky and the left out. For a while, I though they were talking about themselves. But that's America they're talking about.

The senior senator from Tennessee continued:

America's choice this year is not just between Ronald Reagan and Walter Mondale. It's between a team that has proven it can succeed and a team that has proven it can't.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services, Margaret M. Heckler, joined in the chorus of "singing the praises" of the president while attacking the character of Mondale:
There are none so blind as will not see; there are
none so deaf as will not hear; and there are none
so wrong as Walter Mondale . . . . who will not
learn. Well, President Reagan understands that
ture compassion and true fairness lie in making
this nation a better place to live for all Ameri­
cans, and in keeping his promises.

The Republicans were offering the convention and the
nation a steady stream of speakers all of whom were offering
messages oriented around the same theme and, more important­
ly, they did it very quickly. The use of the video intro­
ductions added to the variety show format and the overall
pace of the program in a most straight-forward way. This
approach, in my view, offered a stark contrast to the more
traditional format employed by the Democrats in San Fran­
cisco. In addition, it appeared as though the GOP had di­
vided its keynote address into a series of messages with the
actual keynoter reiterating a previously established point.

The selection of Katherine Davalos Ortega as the key­
oter of this national convention surprised commentators
since the United States Treasurer was not well-known across
the country. Howell Raines reported that "campaign offici­
cials" had selected her because of "her sex" and her identi­
fication with "Hispanic voters." In contrast, the party
chair declared that Ortega (the first woman ever to address
the GOP convention as a keynoter) was selected on the basis
of her "life and accomplishments" which he described as the
"embodiment of Republican values and philosophies."
Ortega was born on July 16, 1934 in Tularosa, New Mexico. She represents the tenth woman to hold the office of U.S. Treasurer (a practice initiated by Truman in 1949) and was appointed to that position in 1982. The Treasurer was the first member of her family to attend college, majoring in business, and had enjoyed a prosperous career in the banking industry prior to entering government.

As Ortega approached the speaker's podium that Monday evening, one gained the impression that the keynoter was somewhat intimidated by the task before her. Her rather rigid delivery created a feeling of nervousness; however, the content of her remarks projected a fundamentally different image (for the complete text of Ortega's keynote address see Appendix D). After the perfunctory "my fellow Americans" remarks, the speaker advanced the theme initiated by Kirkpatrick, Baker, and Heckler by stating:

But what I have to say tonight, I say from the heart -- and with deep conviction that our country's future lies not in the empty rhetoric we heard in San Francisco last month, but in the courage and vision of a President who in four short years has restored America's faith in itself. I believe in President Reagan and in what he stands for.
I believe in our President not because I am a woman.
Not because I am of Hispanic heritage.
But above all because I am an American. I am an American who loves her country and all it stands for.
America stands for freedom --
for opportunity --
for the right of every individual, to fulfill his or her potential, as members of the family of God, not creatures of an almighty government.
The keynote speaker proceeded by reviewing the "weak leadership" of the Carter administration in light of the "record of economic recovery" of Ronald Reagan. Addressing Mondale's distaste for a "re-run" of the 1980 campaign, Ortega proclaimed:

Walter Mondale says it is "unfair." He says he cannot see any point in re-running the campaign of 1980.
But don't think for a minute that Mr. Mondale wants to look to the future. What he really wants to do is forget 1980 --
And re-run the campaign of 1932. 28

Ortega addressed the tax issue by asserting:

Mr. Mondale wants higher taxes.
And when Mr. Mondale came out for higher taxes to pay for the promises he made to get his party's nomination, millions of Americans who remember his record as Senator and Vice President just shook their heads and said -- "There he goes again."

The keynoter then attacked the theme advanced by her counterpart in San Francisco, Mario Cuomo, by arguing:

They talked about "family" -- but when they say "family," what they really mean is big government.
They talk about "values." But when they say "values," what they really mean is big government regulation. And when they talk about "fairness" -- well, nobody's ever said it better than President Reagan: "The only thing 'fair' about the economic programs the Democrats gave us during the Carter-Mondale years is that they made everybody miserable." 30

Ortega continued by offering the thesis around which the entire evening's oratory revolved:
Let Mr. Mondale look about him. He might see one Democratic party -- but in fact there are two Democratic Parties in America this year. There is the party that met in San Francisco last month -- the party of special interests -- the party of doom-sayers -- the party of demagogues who look to America's future with fear, not hope. Then there are those Democrats of the mainstream -- Democrats who, in the tradition of Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, recognize the danger that communism poses to the hemisphere and the world. Democrats who, whatever other differences we may have, share our Republican vision of America as the land of freedom and individual opportunity, not big government paternalism.

To those millions of Democrats abandoned by their national leadership in San Francisco -- Democrats who were shut out of their traditional party home -- We Republicans here in Dallas say -- We welcome you to our home. Nuestra casa es su casa. Our home is your home.

Ortega closed her twenty-one minute oration with a second response to Cuomo by declaring:

Now in 1984, we Republicans still see our nation through Lincoln's eyes. We see America not as a nation divided -- by religion or race or creed or sex or ethnic group -- but as one people. We all take pride in our individual heritage -- that which makes us unique. But the pride we pass on to future generations is the proud heritage of being Americans.

As the crowd erupted into a floor demonstration, it seemed apparent that the Republicans had employed several voices to express a single message during this second session of their national convention. Dirk Kirschten discussed this strategy in the NJCD:
The evening's principal speakers, U.S. Representative to the United Nations Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, Senate Majority leader Howard H. Baker Jr. and U.S. Treasurer Katherine D. Ortega, the convention keynoter, vied to paint the most vivid negative image of the Carter Administration. Occasionally it sounded as if the speeches had been crafted by a single writer.

James Risser of The Des Moines Register reinforced Kirshchen's assessment by commenting, "The anti-Mondale rhetoric was as hot as the 100-degree-plus temperature that seared Dallas as the GOP began a four-day celebration." However, it is interesting to note the different emphases presented in the national media's reactions to the second session's discourse. David Broder concentrated on the references to Walter Mondale, as did Jack Nelson; however, Ann Devoy (USA Today) cited the "our home is your home" remark as the theme of the evening's orations. Ken Merida described the GOP's first prime-time session as "a Rainbow Coalition of its own" as the party offered the nation a cross section of speakers ranging from blacks to hispanics to women and so forth. Regardless, the Republicans had set the tone for their national convention during its first two sessions which was predicated on the notion that the "San Francisco Democrats" were not representative of the mainstream of America and those Democrats who were "unhappy" with that fact could find "a home" in Ronald Reagan's Party.

As the second session and the first day of the convention came to a close, most of the delegates/alternates
present in the hall were preparing to enjoy the "Texas social life" that had been carefully arranged for them. From my perspective, the social life in Dallas was fundamentally different from the San Francisco experience in that these gatherings were not open to members of the press. The "By Invitation Only" restriction was present at virtually all of the GOP socials whereas the Democrats maintained an "open door" policy throughout their four-day celebration (only press credentials were needed in San Francisco). These "restrictions" along with the demographic composition of the GOP reflect, again, a fundamental distinction between these two political organizations in a most straightforward fashion.

As I entered the Dallas Convention Center for the third session of the convention on Tuesday morning, I passed Dan Rather of CBS News on my way to the press podium. I was fascinated by his popularity among the delegates; Rather was totally surrounded by "fans" seeking his autograph. Indeed this particular event seemed to typify the assembly in that the participants were relaxed and enjoying themselves as evidenced in the attention generated by the television personality. In my view, this contrasts sharply with the delegates/alternates in San Francisco who were virtually worn out by Tuesday evening (this was particularly amazing in the Texas heat).
The third session was uneventful in virtually every respect. The GOP offered its delegates/alternates a series of video clips concerning several key senate races across the nation, a series of speeches on varied issues, and an overview of the platform by that committee's chair, Trent Lott of Mississippi. The afternoon proved to be much more exciting from my perspective as I attended a series of press conferences. Donald Regan held a session at 2:00 p.m. on the president's economic program and George Bush held a conference at 3:30 p.m. on foreign affairs. Both conferences were well coordinated and conducted punctually. In my view, the GOP performed admirably in this respect as it presented the national news media with a neatly wrapped package of news by featuring high-level government officials speaking on specific topics; hence, the media could gain the reactions of prominent officials, but the party could control the topic of the discussion.

The principal order of business for the GOP's Tuesday sessions involved the adoption of the party's platform. While this had been an exciting procedure in San Francisco, the Dallas version of the same activity was a much more subtle happening. The national news media, especially the national television networks, offered several stories concerning the "New Right's" domination of the platform process. But, for the experienced journalists in Dallas, that news angle was weak (for the delegates, it was non-existent) as evidenced by the comments of Jack Germond and Jules Witcover:
An aide to the Reagan campaign, commenting on the Republican Platform Committee's deliberations here in advance of the party's convention, likened the White House's task to "holding a sparrow in your hand. You can't squeeze it too hard," he said, "or you'll kill it. And you can't hold it too loosely or it will fly away." This strategy has taken into consideration two essential truths. One is that a political party has one set of responsibilities and an Administration another. And the other is that a platform is, after all, very inside baseball.

Carl Leubsdorf of The Dallas Morning News commented on the only "controversy" associated with the GOP platform:

With a small band of party moderates unable to get the support of the six delegates needed to bring minority reports on abortion and the Equal Rights Amendment to the floor, there was neither dissenting debate nor a roll-call vote.

Leubsdorf continued by quoting Trent Lott: "Today we have a platform that the American people will love." While the American people may "love" the Republican version of America's future, several national commentators were impressed by the distinctions drawn between the two major parties through their respective platforms. The Christian Science Monitor reported that "Republicans have drawn deep fault lines between themselves and the Democrats in the 1984 election race" and that "the distinctions between the two policy statements are as sharp as they have been in many elections." However, the editorial board of The New York Times offered a more exact analysis of the two policy statements as it noted the optimistic nature of the GOP's version as opposed to the negative tone of the Democrat's document. The Times stated:
How ironic . . . that the party of Roosevelt, the man who said that all we have to fear is fear itself, "itself has become the party of fear."

One may note evidence for The Times' reaction as one reviews the preamble of the GOP platform. The following excerpt is from that section of the document:

This year, the American people will choose between two diametrically opposed visions of what America should be.
The Republican Party looks at our people and sees a new dawn of the American spirit.
The Democratic Party looks at our nation and sees the twilight of the American soul.
Republicans affirm that now, as throughout history, the spiritual and intellectual genius of the American people will create a better nation and maintain a just peace. To Republicans, creativity and growth are imperatives for a new era of opportunity for all.

The Republicans continued by offering the "basic premise" upon which their philosophy rests:

From freedom comes opportunity; from opportunity comes growth; from growth comes progress . . . . Rhetorical pilfering of Republican ideals cannot disguise one of history's major ironies: the party whose 1932 standard-bearer told the American people, as president, that all we have to fear is fear itself has become the party of fear.

Today we declare ourselves the Party of Hope - not for some but for all.
It has been said that mercy must have a human heart and pity a human face. We agree. Democrats measure social programs in terms of government activity alone. But the divine command to help our neighbor is directed to each individual and not to a bureaucratic machine. Not every problem cries out for a federal solution.

As one reflects upon the preamble of the Democratic version of America's future as presented in the previous
chapter, one may clearly note the point rendered by *The Times* editorial board. The two appeals are fundamentally different and, as George Will remarked earlier, "rhetoric reveals temperament and temperament drives policy." "The party of hope" contrasts sharply with the "party of fear" which, if nothing else, reveals the significance of the platform-drafting function of a national with regard to the generation of the conclaves' teams.

The Republican Party would adopt its platform during the fourth session of its convention on Tuesday evening; however, this second prime-time episode would offer several other features as well. Rep. Jack Kemp, former President Gerald Ford, Sen. Robert Dole, and Secretary of Transportation Elizabeth Dole would address the convention during the fourth session as the GOP attempted to replay Monday's effort by presenting a series of speakers oriented around a single message. As Carl Leubsdorf commented:

Three leaders of the Republican Party's moderate wing sought to counter one of the principal 1984 Democratic themes Tuesday night, assuring GOP delegates that President Reagan practices fairness, instead of just promising it. . . . Former President Gerald Ford and the husband-and-wife team of Kansas Sen. Robert Dole and Transportation Secretary Elizabeth Dole all made the same point at the convention's second nationally televised nighttime session, using words that were quite similar.

These three prime-time addresses represented a reaction to the Democrats' charge that the Reagan administration was "unfair" as evidenced in Ford's remarks:
Far from assuring Americans, as Franklin D. Roosevelt did, that all we have to fear is fear itself, Mondale has embraced fear as enthusiastically as he embraces his pre-convention rivals. All he has to offer is fear itself.

He divides America into three classes. The rich, he says, are better off today, but "working Americans are worse off, and the middle class is standing on a trap door." Is there a difference between the middle class and working Americans? It just isn't so that working Americans are worse off today than under Carter-Mondale. You know it, I know it, Walter Mondale knows it.

He's just peddling fear. And, by the way, who's going to pay those higher taxes he promises? Who pays taxes? Those middle class working Americans whose spendable take-home income has increased by eight per cent during the Reagan years.

So, let's have a referendum on the future. Americans aren't about to buy Vice President Mondale's "new realism." There's only one kind of realism. You don't get it by crossing Jimmy Carter's innocence with George McGovern's pie in the sky.

As the evening progressed, the crowd appeared to be gaining some enthusiasm over the theme emanating from the speaker's podium. It appeared to me that Ford had awakened the crowd for Dole who continued the attack upon the Democrats' argument by stating:

Hope is the spirit of America. And hope is what we lacked just four short years ago. The poor lacked hope of anything better. Black people lacked hope of economic and social justice already delayed. The working man and woman lacked hope that their wages would outpace the cruel inflation. The senior citizen lacked hope that Social Security would keep its promises to them. The Hispanic, like other ethnic Americans, lacked hope that their adherence to family values would admit them to the family of decision makers. The disabled lacked hope that they would have equal opportunity. The family farmer lacked hope that all his labor would be rewarded with a decent standard of living.
The Kansas Senator summed his remarks on the "fairness" issue and introduced his wife who continued the GOP's response to that charge:

President Reagan's policies are designed to open doors of opportunity to all our citizens, to make a difference in people's lives -- a real difference. We are sharpening the tools for millions of Americans too often neglected -- to bring them into the mainstream of society: socially, economically, politically. The President doesn't just talk about fairness. He achieves it. He doesn't just praise hard work, he provides it. He doesn't just salute the family, he is securing its future.

The fourth session of the Republican National Convention closed in much the same manner as Monday's edition. The GOP had presented the nation a series of speakers addressing a single theme. On Monday the Republicans attacked the "Democrats of San Francisco" as being unrepresentative of that party's heritage and, in turn, invited those in the mainstream of the Democratic Party to "join the cause." On Tuesday the GOP addressed the "fairness" charge which had inspired the comments of several of the prominent speakers in San Francisco. The GOP clearly displayed a "game plan" for their national convention and, as of Tuesday evening, it appeared to move like clockwork.

The fifth session convened around 7:30 p.m. C.D.T. with Charlton Heston leading the Pledge of Allegiance and Wayne Newton singing the National Anthem. Wednesday's session would offer some fascinating displays as the well-rested convention delegates would nominate their presidential nominee,
celebrate that nomination, hear from the nominee's wife, a former nominee, and most interestingly, witness an address from a black minister who would appear to "out Jesse - Jesse." The Reverend E.V. Hill walked on to the speaker's podium in a relatively unassuming manner, but once he began speaking there was no place to hide. His rhythmic delivery was obviously similar to Jesse Jackson's; however, the message was fundamentally different. Hill declared, "We need four more years" and "I can stand four more years" as he worked a predominately white crowd into a frenzy. This would be an emotional night for the Republicans in this convention hall and the Heston/Newton/Hill opening provided a solid start in that regard.

While the GOP used video tapes throughout the convention, they would offer some very emotional productions on Wednesday and Thursday nights. One of these emotionally-charged films was shown prior to an address by Nancy Reagan. The film, introduced by former Dallas Cowboy quarterback Roger Staubach, depicted the First Lady and her close relationship with the president. The film closed with Reagan responding, "I don't know what I would do without her" which seemed to touch the emotions of the audience in an authentic way.

Nancy Reagan appeared before the convention and the national television audience to deliver a short speech. As always, the First Lady did not speak from a prepared text;
thus, her remarks were brief. In closing, Mrs. Reagan urged the delegates to "Make it one more for the Gipper" and then, in an amazing display of modern communications technology, proceeded to wave to her husband whose image appeared on the huge television screen behind her. Once the president returned the gesture, the crowd erupted in an emotional display which would continue throughout his nomination later in the session.

The convention next heard from its 1964 presidential nominee, Sen. Barry Goldwater of Arizona. Goldwater opened his remarks as he had twenty years earlier by reminding the Republicans that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice." James Dickenson of The Washington Post described the Goldwater speech as follows:

A 75-year-old man once ridiculed as a right-wing extremist stood at the speaker's podium at the Republican National Convention here tonight, a living symbol of how much American politics has changed 20 years after he gave one of the most famous convention speeches in the nation's history. . . . His speech tonight was on a topic long dear to his heart: liberty and national defense.

Once the former presidential nominee completed his address to the convention the Republicans were prepared to nominate their 1984 standard-bearer for his second term. The task of placing Reagan's name into nomination was assigned to a long-time friend of the incumbent president, Sen. Paul Laxalt of Nevada. Laxalt opened his address by reflecting on the challenge before him:
Four years ago I stood before the Grand Old Party's convention and put into nomination the name of our candidate for the nation's highest office. Looking back, we can say "Thank God, he won that election!"

When I stood before you then, America was a shaken nation -- humbled at home -- humiliated abroad. After an unprecedented string of domestic and foreign policy failures, President Carter and his hand-picked Vice President -- Walter Mondale -- had this nation on its knees.

As Laxalt was placing Reagan's name in nomination, I moved onto the convention floor in order to "capture" the up-coming demonstration which had been billed as a very well-coordinated expression of Republican resolve. At 9:45 p.m. C.D.T. the demonstration began as a series of marching bands paraded across the floor, balloons fell from the ceiling, and the big screen televisions flashed signs proclaiming "Better - Stronger - Reagan." After several minutes Rep. Robert Michel of Illinois pleaded with the audience to "bottle some of that energy and send it back to the fifty states." He then called the convention back to order. Around 10:30 the convention placed George Bush's name into nomination and a much smaller demonstration followed. These "demonstrations" caused the fifth session to extend beyond its normal time limit; nevertheless, the displays were much better coordinated than were the "demonstrations" I had witnessed in San Francisco.

The Tuesday evening session of the national convention had shattered convention precedent by voting to place Reagan and Bush on the same nomination "ballot" on Wednesday.
Hence, the convention was able to nominate the entire "ticket" at once and, in turn, speed up the process. However, it is equally interesting to note the convention's insistence on using the "roll call of the states" in the nomination process. The Republicans seemed to be very proud of the technological innovations introduced at their convention; yet, they insisted on using an unnecessary ritual for the nomination vote (all that was really required was to have each state chair enter the state's vote on the computer terminal present in each delegation). Regardless, convention ritual prevailed, the GOP nominated its incumbent ticket, and the Reverend Jerry Fallwell closed the fifth session around 11:43 p.m. against the background of a jazzy version of "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

The sixth and final session of the 1984 Republican National Convention promised to be an exciting affair. For three days the GOP had dedicated a great deal of energy into working this gathering into a state of euphoria which would culminate in the appearance of the anointed ones: George Bush and Ronald Reagan.

I arrived for the final session somewhat earlier than usual since I was hoping to secure a seat in clear view of the speaker's podium. I achieved that goal and therefore had an opportunity to observe the program from a distance of around thirty feet (indeed, as close as one could get without joining the Secret Service). Interestingly, for the first
time in both conventions the networks changed their personnel on the speaker's podium as ABC had Sam Donaldson on hand (as opposed to Sander Vanocur) and CBS placed its anchor, Dan Rather, on the podium. This evening was to be a special one indeed and the shift in network personnel reflected that observation rather clearly.

As one comes to expect from the Republican Party, the final session began promptly at 8:00 p.m. C.D.T. The GOP introduced its vice presidential nominee in the same fashion it would introduce the president: via a film. The film was rather brief and by 8:19 George Bush stood before the nation to accept his nomination.

George Herbert Walker Bush was born on June 12, 1924 in Milton, Massachusetts. A veteran of the Second World War, Bush completed his undergraduate degree after the war by graduating Phi Beta Kappa from Yale University. Bush was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1966 from the Seventh District of Texas and won re-election, unopposed, two years later. In December 1970, President Richard Nixon appointed Bush United States Ambassador to the United Nations. Bush held that position until 1972 when he assumed the Chairmanship of his party's national committee (again, appointed by Nixon). The Congressional Quarterly reported that Bush was considered as a possible vice presidential selection by Gerald Ford in 1974 when the former Representative from Michigan assumed the presidency from Nixon; however, Bush was
named "Chief of the U.S. Liaison Office in the People's Republic of China" instead. Bush was then appointed Director of the Central Intelligence Agency by Ford. Not a few Republicans and Independents agree that Bush represents one of the most qualified executives in recent American history which is reflected in his nickname on Capitol Hill: "Mr. Resume."

Bush addressed the nation through the convention in a confident, deliberate manner (see Appendix E for the complete text of the Bush acceptance speech). He opened by accepting his nomination, relating the need for a second Reagan term, and then proceeded to do what "conventional wisdom" says a vice presidential nominee is supposed to do: attack the opposition. Bush began his assault by declaring:

For over half a century, the liberal Democrats have pursued a philosophy of tax and spend; tax and spend. And, sure enough, out of that Moscone Center in San Francisco, that Temple of Doom came Mr. Mondale's first promise -- a solemn promise to raise everyone's taxes.

Well, Mr. Mondale calls this promise to raise taxes a lot of courage, an act of courage. But it wasn't courage -- it was just habit, because he is a gold medal winner when it comes to increasing the tax burden of the American people.

The vice president continued with a specific statement of ways and means by proclaiming:

Give us the line item veto and watch what this president can do.

I heard that speaker in San Francisco last month exhorting his fellow Democrats with the cry, "Our time has come; our time has come."
The American people have a message for the tax raisers, the free spenders, the excess regulators -- the government-knows-best handwringers, those who would promise every special interest group everything -- and that message is: "Your time has passed; your time has passed."

Bush next outlined the Reagan record by contrasting it to the Carter-Mondale administration. One example of this approach was his reaction to the Democrats' charge that Reagan will alter the composition of the Supreme Court. Bush responded:

We heard that liberal convention in San Francisco attack the president regarding the Supreme Court. But the record shows that President Reagan's sole appointment to the Court, Sandra Day O'Connor, is an outstanding Justice -- and that's a fact.

Vice President Bush proceeded with his "and that's a fact" review of the Reagan record by addressing the "fairness" issue raised in San Francisco:

And one more fact, and let this be heard loud and clear: Ronald Reagan has protected and will continue to protect the rights of all Americans. Discrimination based on race, religion, sex or age will never be tolerated by this president nor this vice president. And furthermore, we condemn the vicious anti-semitism of Louis Farrakhan and the ugly bigotry of the Ku Klux Klan. Of course problems remain, of course problems remain, and yes, there's still much to be done to provide opportunity for those Americans who truly need help. But the answer doesn't lie in going back to the "malaise" days of Carter and Mondale. . . .

Instead, the answer lies in a dynamic private sector that provides jobs, jobs with dignity. The answer lies in limited government and unlimited confidence in the American people.
Bush continued with a review of the Reagan foreign policy and concluded by stating:

And one last point on foreign affairs. I am proud to serve with a president who is working for peace and I am proud to serve with a president who doesn't go around apologizing for the United States of America . . . . No longer do we read and hear stories about the job of president being too big for any one person. Gone are the days of blaming the American people for what was really a failure not of the people, but of our national leadership . . . . This is the message we will take from this Convention -- a message of optimism -- a message of hope . . . . May we continue to keep the light of freedom burning. And may we continue to move forward in the next four years -- on the high road to peace, prosperity and opportunity -- united behind a great President, Ronald Reagan.

The vice president concluded his remarks and was joined on the podium by several prominent Republicans (Laxalt, Baker, and Michel among others); however, the demonstration which ensued was brief since the evening's agenda called for the Bush oration, the Reagan film, and the president's speech to occur within a two-hour block of prime-time national television. As one would suspect, the national media reacted to the Bush speech in a variety of ways as evidenced by the reaction of John Fogarty of the San Francisco Chronicle:

A combative George Bush, warning Democrats "your time has passed," last night accepted the Republican nomination for a second term as vice president . . . . The 60-year-old . . . drew the lines for what promises to be a tough campaign against the Democrats.
Robert Hillman of *The Dallas Morning News* concentrated on the tax issue by commenting: "Taking on Mondale head-on, Bush said that the Democratic standard-bearer had promised to raise taxes not out of 'courage' but out of 'habit.'" Bill Peterson of *The Washington Post* responded:

Playing the role traditionally reserved for vice-presidential nominees, Bush offered a point-by-point defense against charges made by Democrats at what he called their national "temple of doom" convention last month. Bush's speech made it sound as if he and Reagan intend to run against the 1980 Carter-Mondale ticket rather than the 1984 Mondale-Ferraro ticket.

The Peterson analysis insightfully noted that the Bush oration never once mentioned the name Geraldine Ferraro. Howell Raines appeared to follow the Peterson reasoning as he wrote: "Mr. Bush built his speech around the idea that Mr. Reagan offered 'strong, principled, firm leadership' in place of a return to the 'Carter-Mondale era of vacillation.'" Hence, the Republicans shared a common feature with the Democrats in that both conventions spent considerable time reflecting on history. The difference may be found in what part of American history was referenced as the Democrats referred to the "distant past" whereas the GOP concentrated on the "recent past" in an effort to point out the "changes" produced in the last four years.

The convention hall quickly dimmed the lights after the Bush speech as the GOP prepared to offer what many considered to be the single most controversial event of this
1984 assembly: the Reagan campaign film. The New York Times described the convention film as follows:

Republicans have spent untold dollars and three years of collecting footage preparing an 18-minute film to introduce President Reagan Thursday night. . . . It brings home his political message, with his own narration and documented by footage that used the techniques of the evening news programs to report only good news . . . . The film, shot almost entirely in the warm colors of browns and reds that Madison Avenue long ago found reassuring to viewers, is made by The Tuesday Team, a commercial team led by Phyl Dusenberry, a New York advertising executive.

The film appeared to captivate the audience although I could not view it myself from my position on the press stand (I have since seen it). The convention had the audio portion of the film playing at a fairly high volume which contributed to the drama of the climax of the film as an announcer introduced Reagan while the band played "Hail to the Chief." One may correctly observe that the ensuing demonstration was intense.

Ronald Wilson Reagan was born on February 6, 1911 in Tampico, Illinois. The graduate of Eureka College is a former sportscaster who left home to pursue a career as a movie actor in California. Reagan entered public service in 1966 with his election as Governor of California by nearly a million-vote margin. He was re-elected to a second term in 1970 and, in 1974, began a career as a political commentator. Reagan's national political career received a boost in 1964 when he made a nationally broadcast speech on behalf of the
failing campaign of Barry Goldwater. In 1968 he received 186 convention votes for president at the Republican National Convention. Reagan ran for the Republican nomination formally in 1976 and lost that race to the incumbent Gerald Ford. The former governor was nominated by his party in Detroit in 1980 and was sworn in as the 40th president of the United States on January 20, 1981.

President Reagan stood before a national television audience and an excited convention as he prepared to accept his party's nomination (see Appendix F for the complete text of the Reagan acceptance speech). He opened by thanking the State of Texas and the City of Dallas for their hospitality by promising to try to deliver a victory that "is the size of the heart of Texas." The president continued:

America is presented with the clearest political choice of half a century. The distinction between our two parties and the different philosophy of our political opponents are at the heart of this campaign and America's future . . . . We didn't discover our values in a poll taken a week before the convention. And we didn't set a weathervane on top of the Golden Gate bridge before we started talking about the American family. The choices this year are not just between two different personalities, or between two political parties. They are between two different ways of governing -- their government of pessimism, fear, and limits . . . or ours of hope, confidence, and growth. Their government sees people only as members of groups . . . ours serves all the people of America as individuals. Theirs lives in the past, seeking to apply the old and failed policies to an era that has passed them by . . . ours learns from the past and strives to change by boldly charting a new course for the future.
Reagan progressed by taking his audience for a "little stroll down memory lane" in an effort to remind the nation of the Carter-Mondale administration. The president argued:

Farmers have to fight insects, weather, and the marketplace -- they shouldn't have to fight their own government. The high interest rates of 1980 were not talked about in San Francisco. But how about taxes. They were talked about in San Francisco. Will Rogers once said he never met a man he didn't like. If I could paraphrase Will, our friends in the other party have never met a tax they didn't like... or hike.

The president reviewed his position on taxes and his desire to change the system. Yet, he was determined to revive the Carter era for his audience and concluded by proclaiming: "Those whom government intended to help discovered a cycle of dependency that could not be broken. Government became a drug -- providing temporary relief, but addiction as well."\(^{68}\)

Reagan proceeded by asserting his political philosophy:

It was time we ended this reliance on the government process and renewed our faith in the human process. In 1980, the people decided with us that the economic crisis was not caused by the fact that they lived too well. Government lived too well. It was time for tax increases to be an act of last resort. Not of first resort.\(^{69}\)

As the crowd began chanting "four more years," the GOP's nominee continued:

But worst of all, Americans were losing the confidence and optimism about the future that has made us unique in the world. Parents were beginning to doubt that their children would have the better
life that has been the dream of every American generation.
We can all be proud that pessimism is ended. America is coming back and is more confident than ever about the future.

President Reagan advanced by reviewing his record as the nation's Chief Executive all the while reminding the audience of the Carter-Mondale years. He discussed the NATO alliance, Central America, the Grenada episode, and the general state of world politics. The incumbent next turned his attention to domestic affairs and, specifically, to the deficit:

We have heard a lot about deficits this year from those on the other side of the aisle. Well, they should be experts on budget deficits. They've spent most of their political careers creating deficits. For 42 of the last 50 years, they have controlled both Houses of the Congress. And for almost all of those 50 years, deficit spending has been their deliberate policy. Now, however, they call for an end to deficits -- they call them ours, yet at the same time the leadership of their party resists our every effort to bring federal spending under control.

Reagan continued by attacking Walter Mondale:

Was anyone surprised by his pledge to raise your taxes next year if given the chance? In the senate, he voted time and again for new taxes, including a 10-percent income tax surcharge and higher taxes on certain consumer items. He also voted against cutting the excise tax on automobiles.... If our opponents were as vigorous in supporting our voluntary prayer amendment as they are in raising taxes, maybe we could get the Lord back in the schoolroom and drugs and violence out.

Returning to the Democratic nominee's tax plan, the president remarked: “We could say they spend money like drunken
sailors but that would be unfair to drunken sailors. All right (crowd laughter) . . . I agree . . . all right . . . I was going to say it would be unfair because the sailors are spending their own money." The incumbent next moved into a review of his version of the Democrats' philosophy by addressing specific areas of concern (i.e., "raise unemployment") and prompting his audience to respond with their view of whether such conditions were desirable (of course, they chanted "no"). Reagan reiterated his political philosophy:

As we ask for their help [the American people], we should also answer the central questions of public service: why are we here? What do we believe in? Well for one thing, we are here to see that government continues to serve the people and not the other way around. Yes, government should do all that is necessary, but only that which is necessary . . . We believe in the uniqueness of each individual. We believe in the sacredness of human life. For some time now we have fallen into a pattern of describing our choice as left or right. It has become standard rhetoric in discussions of political philosophy. But is that an accurate description of the choice before us?

The 40th president continued:

Isn't our choice really not one of left or right, but up or down: down through statism, the welfare state, more and more government largesse, accompanied always by more government authority, less individual liberty and ultimately totalitarianism, always advanced in the name of our own good. The alternative is the dream conceived by our founding fathers, up, to the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with an orderly society. We don't celebrate Dependence Day on the fourth of July. We celebrate Independence Day. The right of each individual to be recognized as unique, possessed of dignity and the sacred right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. At the same
time, with our independence goes a generosity of spirit more evident here than in almost any other part of the world. Recognizing the equality of all men and women, we are able and willing to lift the weak, cradle those who hurt, and nurture the bonds that tie us together as a nation, one nation under God.

As was the tendency in San Francisco when Ferraro and Mondale reviewed their "political histories" for the audience, the president proceeded with an analysis of his political evolution. Yet, this reflection was strategic in that Reagan entered political life as a Democrat; therefore, his message presented an additional point:

I began political life as a Democrat, casting my first vote in 1932 for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. . . . As the years went by and those promises were forgotten, did I leave the Democratic Party or did the leadership of that party leave not just me but millions of patriotic Democrats who believed in the principles and philosophy of that platform [the platform in question called for a reduction in government spending] . . . . As Democratic leaders have taken their party further and further away from its first principles, it's no surprise that so many responsible Democrats feel that our platform is closer to their views, and we welcome them to our side.}

Again, Reagan returned to a review of his 1980 campaign promises and the subsequent record of his administration. While one hesitates to suggest that Reagan has a "pattern" he prefers to follow in his public discourse, the president does display a propensity toward introducing the "average American" in the text of his speeches. In this instance, Reagan traced the path of the Olympic Torch as it was carried across
the country during the summer. The president offered a transition from the discussion of the "Olympic Torch" to the torch atop the Statue of Liberty. The Republican incumbent concluded his oration on that theme by stating:

The glistening hope of that lamp is still ours. Every promise, every opportunity is still golden in this land. And through that golden door our children can walk into tomorrow with the knowledge that no one can be denied the promise that is America. Her heart is full; her door is still golden, her future bright. She has arms big enough to comfort and strong enough to support. For the strength in her arms is the strength of her people. She will carry on in the eighties unafraid, unashamed, and unsurpassed.

In this springtime of hope, some lights seem eternal, America's is.

Thank you, God bless you, and God bless America.

As one might imagine, the 1984 Republican National Convention erupted upon the completion of the president's remarks. The subsequent demonstration continued as the GOP assembled a number of prominent party figures on the podium with the incumbent ticket and Ray Charles sang "America the Beautiful." The president's oration was longer and contained more specific statements of ways and means than did his counterparts in San Francisco. Moreover, it was delivered with a charm and eloquence of a skilled, veteran performer. Perhaps Dan Hulbert of the Dallas Times Herald captured the Reagan performance best when he commented:

He knows he's acting, we know he's acting and we know he knows we know. Yet, unlike other theatrical pols, he trades away little credibility in the process . . . . Only Reagan, with his astonishingly
ordinary, reasonable tone, manages to convey both honesty and theatricality, realness and fakeness, at the same time. His voice is hushed, as though he were speaking privately, exclusively, into each of our ears. And yet, the charisma, like Kennedy's, washes indiscriminately over vast convention halls and voting blocs, larger-than-life, unreachable.

The oration, which lasted 55 minutes, was interrupted 77 times by the partisan crowd (primarily due to the president's review of the path of the Olympic Torch which prompted each delegation to cheer as Reagan mentioned their state). The Dallas Morning News described the speech as follows:

Repeatedly interrupted by waves of applause and chants of "four more years," Reagan told the crowd in the Dallas Convention Center and a nationwide television audience that the choice in November is between the Democratic Party's "government of pessimism, fear and limits," and the Republican one "of hope, confidence and growth.

The Washington Post provided an interesting contrast in its assessment:

Top aides said the speech was shaped by the president's preferences especially his desire to get in his licks at the Democrats for their denunciation of his performance and his principles during their convention in San Francisco last month.

The Post also commented that the speech was "disappointing" in that Reagan did not outline his plans for "the future" preferring, instead, to guarantee "himself a night full of cheers for his memory book." G. Robert Hillman asserted that the speech stressed "form over substance" as the
president "did what he does best - set the tone, establish the themes, be consistent." In that vein, Lou Cannon reported:

Reagan's speech tonight was designed to rekindle some of the optimism that pervaded the 1980 Republican National Convention in Detroit and has been a trademark of his presidency. It also was intended to mollify moderate Republicans, independents and city dwellers who may have felt slighted by what critics have called the narrow conservative focus of the GOP platform.

Paul West offered a colorful description of the president's address as he examined the patriotic tone of the oration:

On Thursday night, President Reagan came out swinging against his Democratic challenger, who had waved Old Glory with fervor in San Francisco last month . . . . It was no contest. Ronald Reagan is still the heavyweight champion of the New Patriotism . . . . Behind the patriotic colorings of his acceptance address, Reagan exposed the strategic framework of his fall campaign.

In addition, The New York Times' Hedrick Smith reviewed the Dallas speech in light of Mondale's acceptance address in San Francisco and concluded:

In what many other politicians expect to become one of the most sharply polarized Presidential campaigns in years, the battle lines are already starkly drawn. With their acceptance speeches, the two rivals are dramatically at odds on taxes, responsibility for federal deficits, the fairness of each other's domestic policies, the use of American power abroad and on dealing with the Russians, above all in the arms race and in arms negotiations . . . . In the Presidential competition, language has matched imagery: Mr. Reagan, with his accomplished Hollywood presence and charisma, preaching
a national era of confidence and ebullience, and Mr. Mondale, with his more down-to-earth Minnesota penchant for understated directness, promising a new realism about the nation's problems.

As we noted in the review of the Democratic National Convention in the preceding chapter, the degree to which the Democrats had "priced themselves out of the market" would depend upon how that market was defined. Indeed, as the GOP closed its 1984 national convention, that market was clearly defined for the electorate. In the process of defining that market both parties demonstrated the essential character of their political organizations. Joseph Kraft commented on this topic after the Republican assembly:

The interesting feature of the convention is a discreet search for identity. For the Republicans have yet to decide whether they are merely a party of opposition, strong for a season, or a majority party with the balanced approach to national problems that can prevail for a long pull.

Yet, as the GOP "searched" for its identity they received a little help from the San Francisco Democrats, a point which Morton Kondracke explained by quoting an "un-named White House official:"

All of our tactical bumbling can't undo his strategic mistake . . . instead of playing to our weakness, which is on the war-peace issue, Mondale tried to attack our strengths, which are that we have cut taxes and have produced an economic recovery and that we have a President who is believable. Mondale is obviously trying to raise the deficit issue, but deficits are an abstraction to people, while tax cuts and growth are realities.
In my view, the Republicans oriented their national convention around a similar line of reasoning as they attempted to argue that the Mondale-Ferraro ticket did not, in any way, represent the "mainstream" of the Democratic Party. Therefore, the GOP, beginning with Ambassador Kirkpatrick's speech, invited "unhappy" Democrats to "take a walk" (as the president described it) and join the Republican cause. This strategic activity prompted Haynes Johnson to comment:

What's going on here? Which are the Republicans and which are the Democrats? And how are you supposed to tell anymore, given the self-portrait they want us to take away from their respective conventions . . . . It's a shrewd appeal the Republicans of 1984 are making: get the old Democrats by appealing to their long-dead heroes, and get the young ones who wouldn't know what "Happy Days Are Here Again" meant even if you told them the title and then hummed a few bars.

Dirk Kirschten reviewed that argument for the National Journal Convention Daily:

With thoughts of a victory of landslide magnitude permeating the high command of President Reagan's re-election committee, the rhetoric of the convention has been blatantly directed toward proselytizing Democrats rather than rallying Republicans . . . . The most noticeable aspect of the GOP strategy, however, has been the siren song courting alienated Democrats to find a new home in the Republican Party. Seldom, if ever, have the names of so many Democratic politicians been summoned up for praise and admiration at a convention of the opposition party.

In addition, as one would imagine, several national commentators offered analyses of the two conventions upon the
completion of the GOP affair in Texas. The Chicago Tribune suggested that the two assemblies were "similar" since both events attempted to "present themselves as the vessels of harmony and prosperity" and a reflection of "the real America." Yet, the Tribune also noted a fundamental distinction between the two conventions as the editorial board argued that the GOP "orchestrated" their assembly while the "Democrats negotiated their way through theirs."

Moreover, James Reston discussed the two themes emanating from San Francisco and Dallas by commenting:

In San Francisco, the Democratic Party emphasized two main issues: fear and fairness. Here in Dallas, the Republicans are countering with Ronald Reagan, progress and patriotism ... In short, it is easier to put the eye of a television camera on the tangible evidence of new construction and on the President in the White House than to dramatize poverty or fear, which are often invisible.

Flora Lewis offered a somewhat different assessment of the two national conventions by arguing that the images projected from San Francisco and Dallas were actually deceiving. The writer suggested that while the Democrats seemed "at odds" with one another they had actually discovered "a sense of direction for their party" which would prove beneficial in the long run. In contrast, the GOP, according to Lewis, appeared as follows:

The Republican surface here is a spread of honey, and as sticky. The theme is unity, unity, unity, not only of all Republicans in support of Ronald
Reagan, but of all Americans in support of some nebulous vision of a happy world in his image.

Lewis continued by arguing that, in reality, a fierce fight was developing over the 1988 election within the Republican Party to the point where their new-found unity would be short-lived.

Regardless, the Republicans had offered the nation a national convention predicated on optimism which, as virtually all the commentators seem to agree, represented a sharp contrast to the San Francisco experience. Tom Wicker described the GOP as "America's Party" upon the conclusion of the Republican assembly. In fact, USA Today quoted South Carolina Senator Strom Thurmond as declaring: "I've been to 12 conventions - six Democrat and six Republicans - and this is the most enthusiasm I've seen."

The task confronting the two parties upon the conclusion of their national conventions was rather clear and, perhaps, best summed by the remarks of Robert Michel as he pleaded with the GOP audience to "bottle some of that energy" and take it back to the states. The 1984 national nominating conventions had defined the market for the American people and, in the process, revealed a political institution in transition as the parties employed the new technologies in their effort to "draw the lines" between the two philosophies for the electorate. The nominating conventions had indeed evolved and the 1984 Republican National Convention may reflect the form of things to come.
A historical review of the Republican Party reveals that the GOP can experience as severe a state of divisiveness as the Democrats on occasion. However, the 1984 presidential campaign was not one of those occasions. The Republicans assembled in Dallas riding high in the public opinion polls behind an extremely popular incumbent president. In addition, the symbolic candidacy of Geraldine Ferraro was experiencing difficulties in the national media because of controversies over her personal finances. In sum, it appeared as though the GOP might have an opportunity to seize upon a state of uncertainty in the Democratic Party to the point of attracting traditional Democrats to the Republican cause.

This perceived condition manifested itself in a Republican strategy predicated on expanding the electoral base of that party by identifying the Mondale-Ferraro ticket as unrepresentative of the mainstream of the Democratic Party and the nation as a whole. The GOP presented a story for national consumption which depicted the hero, Ronald Reagan, in a confrontation with a well-established villain: "big government." This strategy employed the Burkean notion of "scapegoating" as "big government" served as a scapegoat for the ills confronting that administration. In addition, the Republicans identified the Mondale-Ferraro candidacy as advocates of "big government" and, subsequently told stories
portraying that ticket as a threat to the individual prosperity enjoyed under the Reagan administration.

This strategy was made possible by the popularity of the Reagan image. As evidenced in the polling information released prior to the Dallas assembly, the GOP was enjoying a new sense of popularity with Americans on several issues. The goal of the Dallas conclave would be to capitalize on that state of affairs not only in the presidential election, but in state and local races as well.

The rhetorical task before the Republican Party involved the identification of the entire party with the image of its incumbent president. The GOP assembled with "unity" in hand, therefore, the state of divisiveness before the Republicans was not so prominent as in the case of their counterparts in San Francisco. The rhetorical strategy of the GOP appeared to be based on an identification with the "hero" at work against a villainous "big government" in pursuit of a state of individual prosperity. This state of individual prosperity contrasted sharply with the Democrats' concentration on group solidarity. A point which the GOP addressed often as it argued that the needs of all Americans superseded the desires of the individual groups with which one may affiliate. Thus, the story portrayed the patriotic aspects of individual prosperity as a higher value than group identification.
The Dallas assembly refined the practice of convention story telling in as it seemed to present specific themes during each session of the four-day gathering. The Monday evening session issued a formal invitation for Democrats to cross party lines in support of four more years of individual prosperity. The Tuesday evening sessions attacked the Democrats' argument that the Reagan administration was "unfair" through a series of speeches which stressed the needs of "all our citizens" as opposed to those of certain groups. The Wednesday evening session presented a Republican version of "Camelot" as the convention heard from First Lady Nancy Reagan as well as celebrating the second nomination of the "hero" Reagan. Finally, the last evening of the convention offered the party ticket and their arguments against the evils of "big government." These two orations reinforced the sentiments established by the earlier sessions as they argued the virtues of individual prosperity, identified with patriotism, and appealed to the interests of all Americans in an effort to enlist the support of traditional Democrats.

The San Francisco Democrats offered a unique series of stylistic identifications through their discourse as Cuomo, Jackson, Hart, Kennedy, and Ferraro represented the vested interests of identifiable groups within that political coalition. This was not the case in Dallas in that the GOP sought identification with constituents on another level through the image of its incumbent president. The appeals for unity
through group interests were by-passed in favor of a theme based on the patriotic nature of individual initiative. Indeed, the rhetorical strategies employed by the two parties differed sharply in this regard.

Another interesting contrast in strategy involved the GOP's references to specific pieces of legislation which were presented in terms of their ability to assist the "hero" in his battle against "big government." The Democrats, with the exception of the Mondale tax proposal, did not reference specific pieces of legislation in favor of a strategy based on the threats the Reagan administration posed to group solidarity. In Dallas, references to the line-item veto, a balanced budget amendment, and tax simplification were common and often cast in terms of their ability to assist the president's fight for individual prosperity. While Reagan was criticized for a "lack of substance" in his acceptance speech, a review of the texts of all the acceptance speeches reveals that the incumbent was more issue-oriented than any of the other three speakers; moreover, these references to specific policy initiatives were presented through a dramatic form conducive to the task at hand.

In sum, the GOP convention in Dallas was far less eventful than its counterpart in San Francisco in that it did not feature a historic nomination, a fiasco over the party chairmanship, the resolution of a hard-fought primary campaign, or the issuance of a controversial policy statement. Instead,
it offered a well-oiled political machine for national consumption in the hope of establishing a point: if they can run a convention on time, they can do the same for the country. Again, I shall reserve comment on the GOP's use of the mirroring anecdote until the next section of this work; however, two points do stand out at this juncture. First, these two conventions reflected a sharp contrast in the themes through which they hoped to obtain identification and, eventually, consubstantiality for the general election. Second, the methods of story telling employed by the two parties were fundamentally distinct. Indeed, these two conclaves clearly "defined the market" for the American people and, as we shall soon discuss, provided "equipment for living" in the process.
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SUMMARY OF PART II:

THE 1984 NATIONAL NOMINATION CONVENTIONS

The means through which the Democratic and Republican Parties mobilized their constituencies for the 1984 general election were as distinct as their respective political philosophies. The San Francisco and Dallas assemblies employed fundamentally different rhetorical strategies in their conventions which manifested themselves through the conclaves' style and substance.

The Democratic Party rallied its forces through a convention based on a "fear and fairness" theme. Democratic orators constantly referenced the "unfair" qualities of the Republican administration; moreover, they presented disconcerting visions of the future in their depictions of a continuation of the Reagan administration. The Democrats also attempted to rally partisans through the use of a "family" metaphor. Thus, the San Francisco convention sought to mobilize the "family" against the "evil" of the opposition through appeals to specific groups within the party.

The Republican Party offered a fundamentally different approach. Republican orators consistently referenced "patriotism and prosperity" in their discourse as they reinforced the sentiment "Four More Years." In addition, the GOP
invited members of the opposition to "join the cause" through activities specifically oriented to that task. In sum, the Republican convention sought to rally all "Americans," as individuals, behind the incumbent president and, in turn, expand that party's electoral base for the general election.

The next portion of this project presents a critical evaluation of the rhetorical strategies reflected in the activities of the Democrats and Republicans in their efforts to mobilize their constituencies via the conventions. The activities described in the preceding narratives will be evaluated and, in turn, claims are advanced. Such claims employ the calculus developed in Kenneth Burke's dramatism.

Due to the diversity which exists in a pluralistic system the political parties must seek some vehicle which will facilitate the consolidation of interests necessary for the attainment of national political objectives such as the election of the party's presidential ticket. Hence, this portion of the project has attempted to review the activities which occurred during the 1984 nominating conventions--the principal vehicle through which such a consolidation is performed. The goal of this section of the work involved the presentation of the subject-matter from which the representative anecdote was drawn. It is now time to evaluate the rhetorical strategies in operation within the anecdote and, as a result, gain insight as to the symbolic nature of this particular "season" of the political "year" that was the 1984 presidential election.
PART III:
CRITICAL ANALYSES AND CONCLUSIONS

INTRODUCTION

Kenneth Burke's dramatism rests on the metaphor "life is drama." Consequently, he argued that "literature" or other forms of "stories" provide "equipment for living" since the story lines present in these depictions are representative of the dramatic qualities of "everyday life." Burke stated:

Social structures give rise to "type" situations, subtle subdivisions of the relationships involved in competitive and cooperative acts. Many proverbs seek to chart, in more or less homey and picturesque ways, these "type" situations. I submit that such naming is done, not for the sheer glory of the thing, but because of its bearing upon human welfare . . . . the names for typical, recurrent social situations are not developed out of "disinterested curiosity," but because the names imply a command (what to expect, what to look for).

Burke continued his discussion of "proverbs" and other forms of "story telling" as follows:

The point of view might be phrased in this way: Proverbs are strategies for dealing with situations. In so far as situations are typical and recurrent in a given social structure, people develop names for them and strategies for handling them. Another name for strategies might be attitudes.
Hence, Burke appears to have suggested that the various forms of dramatic portrayal present in a society (i.e., its print media, broadcast media, or theater) offer strategies for coping with the recurrent situations of everyday life. Burke continued his line of reasoning by noting that such stories must be "realistic" in that they must "size things up properly" since "one cannot accurately know how things will be" unless one "knows how things are." Burke concluded that such "art forms" as "tragedy or comedy or satire" could be "treated as equipments for living, that size up situations in various ways and in keeping with correspondingly various attitudes." Consequently, people may learn of strategies to obtain "identification" and, eventually, "consubstantiality" through stories which depict "realistic" responses to particular situations.

This viewpoint led to the generation of a "calculus" through which critics may construe the dramas of daily living, and/or their corresponding depictions in "literature," in a variety of ways. For example, Burke offered a "microscopic" tool of analysis through his pentad which enables critics to review the specific acts rendered by agents through agencies within certain scenes for strategic purposes. In addition, the Burkean framework presents "macroscopic" tools through which critics may evaluate activities in terms of their thematic orientation. The Burkean construct of the representative anecdote is one such
"macroscopic" approach and serves as the method of analysis employed in this research venture.

Representative anecdotes are methodological tools which enable the critic to selectively reduce a field of action in a reflective manner. Moreover, once this reflective selection has been rendered, this approach facilitates the identification of a basic story line which encompasses the dramatic qualities of the selection under review. However, critics must exercise care in the process of reduction in that the research goal is to reflect, not deflect, the larger drama and therefore avoid misrepresenting (a deflection) the subject-matter from which the selection was drawn.

This work offers a selection of the larger drama that was the 1984 national nominating conventions. The six orations which constitute this selection of reality appear to represent "ultimate acts" among the many activities rendered in that field of action. In this age of "limited exposure" (i.e., the reduction in network coverage of the conventions) these six speeches appear to have assumed new importance in that they represented the optimal opportunity for the parties to communicate with the nation, through the networks, in an unedited fashion.

As one considers the use of the conventions as a means of "defining the market" under the rubrics of the two parties, one may acknowledge the inter-related nature of the discourse. The story lines advanced by the respective
parties not only depict their view of the situation, but also reference the opposition's outlook of the same. These stories gain their dramatic appeal from references to the "heroes" who either "save the day" by replacing the "villains" in power or "save the day" by remaining in office and overcoming the threat posed by potential "villains." Hence, the market is defined, dramatically, in terms of "good" and "bad" which, in turn, indicates the inter-related nature of the discourse since each party references the other in the process of telling its story.

The mirroring anecdote projects a story line based on the notion that individuals and/or groups "see themselves" in the respective dramas offered by the two parties. As these individuals or groups view themselves within that construction of reality, they note the portrayal of their needs as well as the projected resolution of those problems. It is through these strategic portrayals that individuals or groups identify with a particular party's worldview and, as a result, move toward consubstantiality for the task at hand. Indeed, such a story line provides "equipment for living" since these depictions "size things up" and relate "how things will be" for the audience. From the Burkean perspective, mirroring facilitates the identification process in a manner conducive to American pluralism in that the diverse groups which comprise the system are able to see a "reflection" of their worldview in the "stories" advanced by
the parties. Consequently, these groups decide which "image" reflected by the "mirror" offers the most potential, they identify with that reflection, and strive to overcome the state of divisiveness present through an affiliation with one of the two stories.

To sum at this point, let us reflect on the research question advanced at the outset of this project:

How did the Democrats and Republicans use their 1984 national nominating conventions in the process of mobilizing their diverse constituency groups for the 1984 general election?

This work responds to this fundamental question by suggesting that the two parties mobilized their constituency groups through six inter-related symbolic acts. These orations revealed the attitudes of the two parties and therefore provided equipment for living for viewers as they interpreted the story. Moreover, these acts presented constructions of the situation before the social structure with a strategic response to that perceived condition. However, the rhetorical strategies evidenced in these six symbolic acts were fundamentally distinct. The reflections offered in the stories rendered revealed two discrete dramas from which constituents could choose. This project now seeks to elaborate on the distinctions between these two stories through the mirroring anecdote as the following chapter presents a critique oriented to those ends. In addition, I argue that the means through which the story is told have evolved in
that one party appears to have adapted its "mirror" for the constraints imposed by television while the other retained a more traditional means of story telling. Clearly, the means through which the anecdote is projected are of importance in that the way a story is told has a bearing on how a story line is perceived.

Thus, two claims are advanced in this effort to evaluate the story lines through which the two parties sought to achieve identification with their constituencies. The first claim addresses the dramatic themes through which each party presented itself, the needs of its constituents, and the resolution of those perceived needs. Such a claim argues how the respective stories, based on the mirroring anecdote, provided equipment for living for the audience in the process of obtaining consubstantiality for the general election.

The second claim reviews the means through which the larger drama of the conventions were projected. As noted earlier, the convention format (i.e., the means through which the story is told) has evolved in conjunction with the communications technologies available to the two organizations. Therefore, an assessment of those means appears to complement the critique of the story line rendered through those means and, in turn, offers a more complete response to the research question.

Yet, prior to moving into the presentation of these claims I perceive the need to qualify my argument. In his A
Grammar of Motives Burke discussed the use of his calculus in the following manner:

As we shall see later, it is by reason of the pliancy among our terms that philosophic systems can pull one way and another. The margins of overlap provide opportunities whereby a thinker can go without a leap from any one of the terms to any of its fellows . . . . Hence, no great dialectical enterprise is necessary if you would merge the terms, reducing them to as few as one; and then, treating this as the "essential" term, the "causal ancestor" of the lot, you can proceed in the reverse direction across the margins of overlap, "deducing" the other terms from it as its logical descendants.

In my view, Burke offered these sentiments as a means of avoiding a "cookbook" interpretation of his framework. The Burkean worldview posits a critical methodology predicated on flexibility with regard to the critic's evaluation of the activity under review. Burke's ideas do not appear to be reducible to a single interpretation from which all critics must work. With that in mind, this project offers but one interpretation of the Burkean framework and maintains a goal of seeking consistency regarding the application of that interpretation.
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CHAPTER FIVE
AN EVALUATION OF THE REPRESENTATIVE ANECDOTE: THE CONTENT AND FORM OF MIRRORING

One possible starting point for a discussion of the mirroring anecdote's content and form in the 1984 national nominating conventions could be an overview of the two themes emanating from San Francisco and Dallas. James Reston of The New York Times suggested that the Democrats offered a theme oriented to "fear and fairness" while the Republicans projected a theme of "progress and patriotism." This contrast in themes facilitated the development of two distinct dramas from which the electorate could choose in the general election.

The Democrats sought to appeal to the need to restore "fairness" in governmental decision making by identifying and offering a possible remedy for the avoidance of a trend of social divisions. In so doing, the San Francisco conclave addressed the specific needs of the various groups which comprise that political party as it constructed a reality which revealed an unfair state of divisiveness. Moreover, the means through which the Democrats offered that
construction of reality sharply contrasted with the Republican approach to "story telling."

The Republicans countered by appealing to the need to avoid the individual sacrifices that result from "big government." The GOP theme stressed the individual prosperity which resulted from the Reagan Administration's attack on the villain "big government" as well as how these changes represented a return to "basic American values." Hence, the Republican theme stressed the need to promote individual freedoms, as opposed to group solidarity, and labeled the Democratic ticket as unrepresentative of that party which led to an invitation to "unhappy Democrats" to join the Reagan cause.

Such clear distinctions in the respective conventions' content appear to provide a basis for the following claim:

The 1984 national conventions featured two distinct rhetorical strategies with regard to the use of the mirroring anecdote. The Democrats offered a story line which stressed the needs of the diverse groups which constitute that party; therefore, as Democrats looked into the mirror, they saw their respective groups reflected. The Republicans offered a story line oriented to the needs of individuals; therefore, as Republicans looked into the mirror, they saw a reflection which stressed individual prosperity.

The mirroring anecdote allows the respective parties to articulate a story for the audience through which viewers may see themselves within that construction of reality. This claim maintains that the reflections cast by the two groups
differed on the basis of how the viewer identified with that image. The Democrats told a story based on group identification whereas the GOP revealed a story oriented on patriotism through identification as individual Americans. The distinction is rather clear--as one saw his or her reflection on the mirror, did he or she appear as a member of a group or as an individual American?

The Democrats used a "fear" theme to describe the Republicans as a threat to the social order. Governor Cuomo set the tone for this strategy through his "Tale of Two Cities" keynote address in which he described the president as dividing the country into the "lucky and the left-out" and the "royalty and the rabble." Following that story line, Senator Kennedy described the Republican Party as "the cold citadel of privilege" and the party's nominee for president argued that "Mr. Reagan believes that the genius of America is in the boardrooms and exclusive country clubs." In addition, the historic vice presidential nominee, Geraldine Ferraro, noted how the Republicans sought to "rig the rules" of American society against the various groups outside the exclusive circle of influence that is the GOP. Hence, it appears as though the San Francisco Democrats focused on the differences between the two parties by suggesting that the Republicans were oriented toward the rich and affluent who maintain their wealth at the expense of the less fortunate.
The Republicans engaged in a fundamentally different strategy as they appeared to promote the similarity of interests among all Americans. This strategy manifested itself in a storyline that identified the Mondale-Ferraro ticket as one that did not reflect "traditional" Democratic values in that the ticket was "out of touch" with the mainstream of the party and, in turn, the American people. Treasury Secretary Ortega, the keynoter, was assisted by Ambassador Kirkpatrick, Secretary Dole, and Senator Baker (among others) in a rhetorical strategy which argued that the audience should transcend "party lines" and do what is best for all Americans—not just the individual groups with which citizens may affiliate. In that vein, the keynoter asserted that she did not support the president "because I am a woman" or "because I am of Hispanic heritage" but "because I am an American." Essentially, the Dallas Republicans focused on a storyline which emphasized the similarities among Americans through the use of the patriotism theme.

In my view, one may gain a richer insight into these rhetorical strategies by reflecting on three questions groups entertain as they construct symbolic representations of themselves.¹ The questions "who are we," "what do we want," and "how do we resolve those needs" are not only central to the formation of a group worldview or ideology, but they also reveal the elements of the stories advanced through the mirroring anecdote. As the audience gazes into the mirrors
offered by the two parties, they are afforded an opportunity to "see themselves" and their needs along with the resolution of those perceived needs in that reflection. Therefore, the critic may gather insights into the rhetorical strategies through which the respective parties sought identification with constituents in an analysis of these basic questions. With this in mind, let us now review each of these concerns individually in an effort to assemble a gestalt of the mirroring anecdote in action.

POINT ONE: In the identification of "who are we" the Democrats described themselves as a collection of diverse groups while the Republicans argued that they represented the concerns of all Americans.

The Democratic Party of 1984 described itself as a "mirror of America" and contrasted that "mirror" with the "portrait of privilege" that is the Republican Party (according to Walter Mondale). The San Francisco assembly described itself as a collection of groups attempting to restore fairness to American government. In his keynote Cuomo defined his party as the party of "minorities who have not yet entered the main stream" and "ethnics who want to add their culture to the magnificent mosaic that is America." Ferraro identified herself as the "daughter of an immigrant from Italy" in the opening of her acceptance speech. Clearly, the Democrats considered themselves to be a coalition of groups who, at times, were at odds with each other.
The Republican Party of 1984 presented a fundamentally different theme in its analysis of its identity. The Dallas convention argued for individual freedoms with patriotism as the common denominator. Republican orators did not reference their affiliation with groups in the manner of their counterparts in San Francisco. Ortega's insistence that she as an "American" above all else; Elizabeth Dole's contention that the concerns of "Americans" should supercede the desires of individual groups; and George Bush's appeal for "individual dignity" stand out as strong examples. Unmistakably, the traditional philosophies of these two political entities were clearly depicted through the story lines advanced in their national conventions.

Equally traditional was the two parties' insistence on inflammatory language as a tool for describing the other party and its construction of reality. Gary Hart's depiction of "Ronald Reagan and his greedy gang of polluters;" Jesse Jackson's assertion that he would "rather have FDR in a wheel-chair" than "Reagan on a horse;" and Cuomo's distortion that "we give money to Latin American governments that murder nuns, and then we lie about it" are but a few examples of inflammatory discourse. As a complement, the GOP's nominees Bush and Reagan declared that "the American people have a message for the tax raisers, the free spenders . . . and that message is: your time has passed" and "I would say they spend money like drunken sailors . . . but that wouldn't be
fair to drunken sailors . . . the sailors spend their own money," respectively serve as examples. The Republican ticket, as it was reported in the media, could not resist the temptation to strike back against the inflammatory language of the San Francisco convention which, in my view, demonstrated the inter-related nature of the discourse. Moreover, the dramatic qualities of "story telling" require orators to describe the "heroes" and the "villains" of their respective scenarios in their efforts to draw distinctions for the audience. Thus, it would stand to reason that the mirroring anecdote would provide for the identification of "good" and "bad" in the process of constructing a reality for national consumption.

In drawing distinctions between the two parties, orators consistently referenced fundamental values as a means of advancing their points. Cuomo's contention that "it's an old story . . . the difference between Democrats and Republicans has always been measured in courage and confidence" is one example. Ferraro's comments that "Americans across this country believe in the same basic dream" and Mondale's view that "America is a future that each generation must enlarge" are instances where the mirroring anecdote allowed the audience to project the positive qualities of their worldviews onto the discourse offered by the party.

The Republicans followed this strategy as well as Ortega argued "that our country's future" may be found in "the
courage and vision of a president who in four short years has restored America's faith in itself." In addition, Bush's argument that "more Americans are giving to help others" and Reagan's assessment that "the choices are not just between two different personalities, or between two political parties" but between "two different visions of the future... their government of pessimism, fear, and limits... or ours of hope, confidence, and growth" demonstrate how the speakers referenced fundamental values in their depictions of themselves and the opposition.

To sum at this point, the two parties identified themselves for the American people in no uncertain terms; moreover, these dramatic portrayals followed "traditional" lines. The Democratic Party identified itself as a collection of diverse groups while the GOP presented itself as a party oriented toward the promotion of individual prosperity. Such constructions followed the mirroring story line through their ability to allow the viewer an occasion to see him or herself as either a member of a group or as an individual American. Consequently, identification may occur on one level or another as the viewer considered this construction of "who are we" as a starting point in the process of obtaining consubstantiality with one of the two parties.

POINT TWO: In the identification of "what we need" the Democrats referenced the need to "restore fairness" in society whereas the Republicans advanced the need for four more years of individual prosperity.
One of the more predominant needs in a democratic society is the perception of "fairness" with regard to the distribution of that society's resources. The Democrats referenced this perceived need in appeals to the audience by suggesting that the Republican administration did not concern itself with "fairness" in societal decision making. More specifically, Cuomo argued that the Reagan Administration practiced "Social Darwinism" as a guiding political philosophy. In addition, Ferraro contended that the GOP "rigged the rules" against "too many of our people." Consequently, Democratic orators created a scenario predicated on what Burke might describe as a "victimage" story line. Such a drama, based on the mirroring anecdote, would present a reflection where the individual groups of the party were "victimized" by unfair, elitist decision making. Following the "Social Darwinism" thesis, the story line revealed an administration that rewarded the "strong" at the expense of the "weak" in a way which restricted the growth of emerging political movements (many of whom--such as the black, gay, hispanic, and women's groups--are active in the Democratic Party). Therefore, the challenge before the Democratic Party involved the restoration of "fairness" in executive policy making and, as a result, averting the continuation of victimage.

The Republicans countered the "fairness" charge through Ortega's keynote address in which she asserted that "the only
thing fair about the economic programs the Democrats gave us during the Carter-Mondale years is that they made everybody miserable." The GOP discussed the need for four more years of the Reagan Administration by citing their interpretation of that administration's record. The principal theme of this story involved the argument that "big government" stifles individual initiative; Mondale-Ferraro represent "big government;" therefore, be "patriotic" and support individual freedoms. This scenario clearly represented the Burkean concept of "scapegoating" in that "big government" was portrayed as the source of the evil which hindered the growth of individual Americans. By using "big government" as a scapegoat the GOP was able to tell a story, through the mirroring anecdote, in which individuals and/or groups could see themselves offering unnecessary sacrifices to the evil entity that is a huge federal government. Surely, the Republicans asserted, such sacrifice is "unpatriotic" and restrictive of individual growth; thus, the audience must do all that is necessary to combat "big government" and maintain the prosperity which accompanies the demise of that "scapegoat."

Consistent across all the appeals to "fairness" rendered by Democratic orators was the plea for party unity. According to these speakers, the only possible way to restore "fairness" was through collective action. Mondale echoed this theme in the opening of his acceptance speech by declaring: "I do not envy the drowsy harmony of the Republican
Party. They squelch debate; we welcome it. They deny differences; we bridge them. They are uniform; we are united.

Cuomo pleaded with the audience to "surrender some small parts of our individual interests;" Hart observed that "Ronald Reagan has provided all the unity we need;" and Jackson proclaimed that "our time has come." Similarly, the Democrats expressed needs that extended beyond unity as evidenced in Cuomo's presentation of the party's credo:

We believe in only the government we need but we insist on all the government we need. We believe in a government that is characterized by fairness and reasonableness, a reasonableness that goes beyond labels, that doesn't distort or promise to do things we know it can't do.

In addition, Ferraro presented a story based on a "rules" theme in which she argued that "fairness" may be achieved through an acknowledgement of the "rules" which make the American Dream possible. Of course, as mentioned earlier, such a story line identified a clear villain as she designated the Republicans as people who do not observe the "same set of rules" and, as a result, are propagators of the forms of "victimage" characterized by "Social Darwinism."

While the Democrats sought party unity as a goal of their convention, the Republicans gathered in Dallas with unity in hand. Subsequently, appeals to unity were dismissed in favor of more straight-forward appeals to GOP-oriented statements of ways and means. After all, the Republicans had a very clear idea of what was needed in order to continue the
prosperity they argued existed and did not hesitate to proclaim that position: "Four More Years." The GOP story line offered a widely-acknowledged "hero" in Ronald Reagan and sought to portray Reagan in action combating the evil that is "big government." Hence, the Dallas conclave spent considerable time discussing policies which would assist the hero in his efforts to overcome this scapegoat upon which the story was based.

Since the evils of "big government" were considered to be a threat to the prosperity of all Americans, the Republicans designed a rhetorical strategy which reached out to the opposition party as well as partisan Republicans. Ortega's plea that "our home is your home;" Kirkpatrick's comment that "you are inviting many life-long Democrats to join our cause;" Bush's argument that "more Americans today believe we have strong, principled, firm leadership in the White House;" and a presidential stroll down "memory lane" all added to a Republican invitation to join the GOP. Perhaps the most persuasive of these arguments emanated from the incumbent president as evidenced in the following excerpt:

I began political life as a Democrat, casting my first vote in 1932 for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. That year, the Democrats called for a 25 percent reduction in the cost of government by abolishing useless commissions and offices and consolidating departments and bureaus, and giving more authority to state governments.

As the years went by and those promises were forgotten, did I leave the Democratic Party or did the
leadership of that party leave not just me but millions of patriotic Democrats who believed in the principles and philosophy of that platform?

Indeed, the Reagan stroll "down memory lane" captured the basic story line through which the GOP advanced its construction of reality. According to Reagan, the guiding philosophy of the Democratic Party had evolved in a direction away from the mainstream of American political thought and, in turn, created a monster. This monster, "big government," was a threat to all Americans; therefore, the president set the tone for an identification with his administration as a vehicle through which all Americans could unite, fight the evil of "big government," and avoid the unnecessary sacrifices demanded by a large federal government.

This story line contrasted sharply with the drama advanced by the San Francisco Democrats. The Democrats sought to promote consubstantiality by identifying themselves as a "family" dedicated to the restoration of "fairness" in governmental policy making. This story portrayed an administration practicing a philosophy of "Social Darwinism" that victimized those political entities who did not currently maintain the strength to sustain themselves in a time of peril. These two scenarios represent distinct uses of the mirroring anecdote, moreover, the differences in these two story lines appear clearer as one considers the resolutions identified in these dramatic portrayals.
POINT THREE: With regard to the resolution of needs identified by the parties, the Democrats argued that the audience must separate the "salesman" from the "product" and avoid the victimage of a second Reagan term. The Republicans countered with a strategy addressing specific statements of ways and means which would assist the hero Reagan in his battle against "big government" and, in turn, benefit all Americans.

Recalling Burke's contention that "stories" provide "equipment for living" by identifying the characteristics of situations and prescribing remedies for those often problematic scenarios, I now turn to the "strategic" resolutions rendered by the two parties through their respective uses of the mirroring anecdote. Clearly, the two parties had identified themselves and their perceptions of the needs of constituents through the story lines advanced to this point; however, these scenarios would fall short of providing "equipment for living" unless they identified strategic responses to the situations advanced in those stories.

According to the Democrats' keynoter, the first step in avoiding the victimage inherent in "Social Darwinism" involved looking "past the glitter" to the point of separating a popular salesman from an unpopular product. In essence, the Democrats concentrated on persuading the audience to separate the "man" from the "program." Next, the party offered a series of stylistic identifications oriented to specific groups within the Democratic coalition such as
Cuomo's remark that "we are proud of our labor movement;" all orators endorsed the Equal Rights Amendment; and other statements which attempted to follow-up on the "fairness" theme by arguing that the current situation was victimizing the individual groups within the party.

Perhaps the most significant statement of resolution came from the party's nominee for president as he announced that he would raise taxes upon his election. While it appears as though everyone endorsed issues such as the E.R.A.; ending what they perceived to be an "arms race;" and an end to what was described as "American adventurism" through the military; it seems as if no speaker rendered as clear a statement of ideology as the Mondale tax proposal. However, it should be noted that the Mondale proposal was consistent with the story line advanced throughout the convention in that Mondale argued that Reagan was considering a "secret plan" which would also produce a tax increase, but one that was "unfair" and continue the practice of victimizing the less fortunate members of society.

The GOP assembly reflected a fundamentally different rhetorical strategy in this regard. With unity in hand, the Republicans expressed their desires regarding specific pieces of legislation which they argued would benefit all Americans. The school prayer issue, a Republican-sponsored crime bill, the Reagan conceptualization of "enterprise zones," the line-item veto, tax simplification, and an overall reduction
of the role of government emerged as the principal policy statements rendered. Again, these legislative initiatives were cast as ways through which the hero Reagan could combat the injustices that resulted from "big government" and, as a result, avoid unnecessary sacrifices on the part of individual Americans.

The line-item veto was one example of this strategy as Bush and Reagan offered straight-forward appeals in favor of that initiative as a remedy for the problems in streamlining the federal government. Bush proclaimed: "Give us the line item veto and watch what this president can do." Reagan declared: "There is no better way than the line-item veto--now used by governors in 43 states--to cut out waste in government." The president buttressed that argument by suggesting that the Democrats had created a government which fostered dependency; specifically, Reagan stated: "Those whom government intended to help discovered a cycle of dependency that could not be broken. Government became a drug--providing temporary relief, but addiction as well." Clearly, Reagan had offered a Republican interpretation of the victim-mage scenario that stressed how the source of the country's socio-economic problems, a large federal government, must be restrained in order to prevent unnecessary sacrifices by individual Americans. Moreover, such a scenario allowed the Republicans to identify the Mondale-Ferraro ticket as the advocates of "big government" and, thus, it was cast as the villain in the story.
The two parties offered clear resolutions of their constructions of the situation; yet, these depictions revealed a sharp difference in tone. The Democrats continued to dwell on the "fear" theme as a means of rallying constituents whereas the Republicans stressed the positive aspects of four more years of Reagan "prosperity."

The three principal areas where the Democrats employed the fear strategy were in the discussions of the deficit, the "arms race," and social legislation. Cuomo set the pace in the use of the fear theme as he asserted the Reagan philosophy of "Social Darwinism," posed the question "how high will they pile the missiles," and described the deficit as the "largest in the history of the universe." Throughout this oration the New York governor argued that the Reagan philosophy would divide the nation and leave the weak behind; lead the nation into nuclear war; and promote an economic system that would ruin the future for "our children."

Cuomo's use of the victimage scenario was joined by Jackson's pleas regarding the "left out;" Hart's assertion that the election "is a referendum on our future--perhaps even whether our children will have a future;" and Ferraro's declaration that "it is time Ronald Reagan stopped scaring our senior citizens." Mondale elevated this dramatic portrayal when he suggested that the nation did not vote for "an arms race . . . to destroy family farming . . . to trash civil rights laws . . . to poison the environment . . . to
assault the poor, the sick, and the disabled." In fact, the Democrats' use of this strategy was so pervasive that former President Gerald Ford suggested that all Walter Mondale had to offer was "fear itself."

The Republicans offered a fundamentally different resolution to their story as they appeared to argue that "prosperity is at hand" and the best way to continue that trend is to re-elect the president. However, the GOP featured an interesting twist in their resolution in that the party consistently portrayed the Mondale-Ferraro ticket as "extremist" and unrepresentative of the mainstream of the Democratic Party. Consequently, the Republicans issued an invitation to Democrats to join the president by crossing party lines in support of the prosperity produced by that administration. This was the theme of the first evening's discourse as Kirkpatrick and Ortega set about the challenge of inviting the "unhappy Democrats" to join the Republican cause. Ortega's plea that "our house is your house" and the mere presence of a life-long Democrat (Kirkpatrick) demonstrated that point. The most effective appeal of all, it would appear, was the president's reflection on his own transition from the Democratic Party to the GOP on Thursday evening.

The respective party platforms provided additional evidence regarding the distinctions in the tone of the stories told by the two conventions. As noted in the narratives of Part II of this work, the preambles of both platforms
addressed the "fear" appeals the Democrats employed in their attempts to rally the party for the general election. Perhaps Will Rogers was correct when he suggested that we "don't mess with the platform;" however, with regard to the use of these two distinct rhetorical strategies, the excerpts offered earlier clearly indicate two fundamentally different approaches.

The resolutions to the problems identified by the two stories advanced in the conventions of 1984 suggest that these conclaves did indeed "define the market" for the general election. The Democrats provided a scenario which described how a basic need of constituents would be restored through the election of the Mondale-Ferraro ticket and simultaneously offered a dark view of the future under a second Reagan term. The Republicans presented a very different resolution as they reached out to all Americans to "join the team" and defeat the villain "big government;" moreover, the GOP argued that the Mondale-Ferraro ticket was "out-of-step" with mainstream America and a threat to individual prosperity.

SUMMARY OF CLAIM ONE

The mirroring anecdote offers a story line that initiates the process of identification. Such a story line provides a foundation which can serve as a basis for con-substantiality in that it allows an audience to "see
themselves," a conceptualization of their needs, and a resolution of those perceived needs. Consequently, mirroring supplies "equipment for living" as it describes a situation, offers a realistic strategy for coping with that situation, and presents a resolution to the situation based on that assessment of reality. The strength of the mirroring anecdote is in its flexibility as a rhetor may structure the story to suit the occasion without altering the basic story line.

The flexibility of the mirroring anecdote was clearly evident in the stories offered during the 1984 national nominating conventions. The Democratic Party presented the nation with a convention based on a "fear and fairness" theme that attempted to rally constituents against an administration that was victimizing the groups of that coalition. The "us vs. them" mentality which emerged from San Francisco was a deliberate attempt to "circle the wagons" (through identification) against a common "enemy" and, in turn, promote con-substantiality within a potentially divided party. This strategy was based on an appeal to the need for fairness in political decision making by demonstrating, through mirroring, that the Reagan Administration was "unfair," exclusive, and self-centered in its dealings with the various groups in the Democratic coalition. Hence, the only way to restore "fairness" and avert the dangers of a second Reagan term was unification of the Democratic Party.
This claim also argued that the Republicans saw an opportunity to engage in expansionistic rhetoric through its national convention. The Dallas conclave identified the Mondale-Ferraro ticket as unrepresentative of "mainstream America" and subsequently argued that the Reagan Administration promoted the good of all Americans—not just partisan Republicans. This strategy resulted in countless appeals to "unhappy Democrats" to join the Republican cause in its fight against "big government" and its pursuit of individual prosperity for all the citizenry.

Clearly, an evaluation of the mirroring anecdote in action in these two contexts reveals two distinct applications of that story line. One party mirrored an image of the diverse groups which comprise that organization and told a story of victimage as it described the threat posed by four more years of Republican rule. This story promoted identification with the various groups within the Democratic Party in the hopes of generating consubstantiality against a common enemy. The Republican Party mirrored an image oriented toward individual prosperity for all Americans. This story promoted identification through a patriotism theme in which the needs of all the citizenry would be served.

Directly related to the stories rendered through the mirroring anecdote is the way the story was told by the two parties. One party practiced "story telling" through traditional means while the other offered a more streamlined
version of the process. In my view, the sharp contrast in styles appears to merit further explanation—a point to which this evaluation will now turn.

CLAIM TWO: The 1984 national conventions displayed two distinct styles of story telling. The Democratic convention represented a traditional or "group-mediated" approach to story telling whereas the Republican assembly presented a technologically-oriented "mass-mediated" style.

The 1984 national conventions offered a sharp contrast in styles as the Democrats presented a "traditional," marathon-type assembly while the GOP introduced a new, more streamlined, version. To be sure, the Democrats were innovative in their quadrennial gathering; but, the degree to which that party adjusted its convention for the "new style" of media coverage (the retreat from gavel-to-gavel coverage by the major networks) was not so distinctive as in the case of their counterparts in Dallas.

The shift away from the gavel-to-gavel coverage by the major television networks introduced a new system of constraints for the two parties to consider as they attempted to present their stories to the nation. This change in approach added to the significance of the six pieces of discourse selected for analysis earlier; however, a developmental conceptualization of the convention process leads one to ponder the importance of this change in style. Hence, this claim will examine the differences in the two styles in terms of
their significance to the practice of telling stories as a means of providing equipment for living. Perhaps a starting point for such a discussion could be a brief overview of the evolution of the story telling process.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE SYSTEM

In Chapter Two I briefly mentioned Thomas Marshall's framework regarding the three phases through which the nomination process has evolved. These phases appear to be representative of trends in which the power relationships within the parties experienced some form of adjustment. The first phase or trend, the Congressional Caucus System, placed the power to nominate candidates for the nation's highest offices in the hands of congressional leaders. The electorate had input into the system, but the process of selecting the field of candidates excluded popular participation. The second trend, the Brokered Convention System, redistributed that power, in the spirit of Jacksonian Democracy, to the extent where "the people" were allowed to participate in the selection of the respective parties' presidential tickets. This second trend continued until the introduction of the television broadcasts of the national conventions and the rise of certain forms of social activism across the country. On the whole, the introduction of the television coverage, the rise in the use of the state primary elections, increased
levels of social activism, and changes in party rules regarding delegate selection produced Marshall's third phase, the System of Popular Appeal.

This third phase ended the control over the nomination process once exercised by the party "bosses" or "regulars" in that it allowed groups oriented around specific concerns to participate directly in the convention's business. In my view, this redistribution of political power introduced a new phase in participatory democracy inasmuch as the respective party hierarchies would have to recognize the sentiments of many diverse factions without the degree of control those hierarchies once enjoyed.

In reflecting upon the first two phases of Marshall's framework one may notice the emphasis the parties placed on the delegates as the prime means of disseminating their political messages to the nation. Representatives from the various states would gather at the convention, exchange sentiments, and, under the leadership of the party "bosses," return home to spread the word.

With the advent of the national broadcasts of the conventions the respective parties realized the potential to communicate directly with the entire nation without the strong reliance on the delegates and/or the "bosses." Although the parties in no way ignore the delegates, they now shape their messages, or tell their stories, through strategies oriented toward a national audience. Hence, one may
note a gradual shift in style from a "delegate-centered" national convention toward a "media-centered" assembly.

I maintain that this shift in emphasis may be explained through Nimmo and Combs' notion of "group-mediated realities" and "mass-mediated realities." These authors argued that a distinction exists between those political transactions which occur in face-to-face interacting groups (the group-mediated reality) and those that are conducted through the mass media. Nimmo and Combs suggested that the construction of stories through dramatic means is a fundamental part of political mobilization (i.e., stories provide "equipment for living"); furthermore, the student of political communication benefits from the realization that there are two distinct ways through which such stories may be built and disseminated.

This claim posits the notion that the first two phases advanced by Marshall appear to be representative of what will be described as a "group-mediated convention" whereas the current phase may be portrayed in terms of a "mass-mediated" form of convention. This does not suggest that these two styles are mutually exclusive since there is often considerable overlap between the two types. However, I do maintain that the San Francisco convention displayed the types of features associated with the "old-style" group-mediated approach while the Dallas assembly reflected the types of adjustments in style associated with the mass-mediated convention. This argument rests on the idea that the "shape" of
the mirror has an impact on how the reflection cast by that mirror is perceived. Perhaps a more in-depth review of the "shape" of these two forms of mirroring will shed additional light on this claim.

**THE GROUP-MEDIATED CONVENTION**

In the days of the group-mediated convention the convention managers employed rhetorical strategies that attempted to reach out to the divergent groups in the audience in individual ways. The use of the "favorite-son nomination" and the subsequent demonstrations which followed that gesture facilitated the synthesis of interests required for electoral success. In addition, the long, protracted "Dull Tuesdays" in which the respective parties would attempt to write their platforms provided an excellent opportunity for the individual delegations and/or groups to express their views on a given topic of concern. Also, the use of multiple nomination speeches and seconding speeches allowed the various interests to express their views regarding a certain candidate or issue. In sum, the group-mediated convention employed specific rhetorical strategies designed to promote a sense of involvement—and therefore facilitate identification—with the story lines advanced through that particular assembly. The goal of such an endeavor involved a synthesis of interests which could, in turn, lead to consubstantiality for the
general election. Remember, the parties were dependent upon the delegates to relate the party's story to most of the party membership; thus, the story telling process emerged as a two-step activity. This suggests that identification with the party's story must first occur inside the convention hall prior to its dissemination to a national audience.

Certainly, several of the basic characteristics of the "old-style" convention have passed as the national conventions conduct the platform and credentials business the week before the assembly convenes. In addition, the "favorite son" nominations, multiple nomination speeches, multiple seconding speeches, and lengthy demonstrations are all "outlawed" by convention rules. A new trend has emerged. A trend I describe as the "mass-mediated convention" through which the respective parties attempt to promote consubstantiality for the general election on a broader scale. Consequently, I will now argue that the Republican convention in Dallas displayed several of the basic characteristics of this new-style of story telling by contrasting that approach with the format employed by the San Francisco Democrats.

THE MASS-MEDIATED CONVENTION

Unlike the San Francisco Democrats, the Dallas Republicans dismissed the tradition of organizing long, protracted sessions for their delegates and the national audience. The
GOP conducted its business in six two-hour sessions as opposed to the four six-to-eight hour sessions required by the Democrats. This claim contends that such a shift in schedule produces two important effects: first, the delegates are not worn out by having to sit through such a long day and, second, the party is able to conduct its business in the morning sessions and reserve the evening sessions for prime-time activities. This shift in emphasis enhances the telegenic nature of the convention since delegates appear "fresh" on camera (and often less disputatious); in-fighting over matters such as the platform can occur out of the view of the prime-time cameras; and the party can orchestrate the messages emanating from the podium with greater precision. This contrasts sharply with the Democrats' approach in that the San Francisco assembly was never running on time throughout their never-ending sessions. In fact, with so much to do in one session, the convention was easily "side-tracked" by a demonstration that continued too long or an orator who went beyond his or her allotted time limit or, as in the case of Bert Lance's insistence that former President Jimmy Carter speak in prime-time, a sudden change in the schedule. These are the remnants of the traditional, group-mediated convention in which time was not considered to be a factor and stories did not have to adapt to television.

The GOP also added to the mass-mediated nature of its national convention through the use of "video introductions."
As discussed earlier, these brief films opened with the same musical score and a graphic of the party's symbol, the elephant. The film then depicted the featured individual functioning in his or her work environment or other scenes which could be used to tell a story about that person (i.e., showing the person with Reagan or in front of a famous landmark). The use of these "video introductions" drastically speeded up the pace of the convention as well as adding to the telegenic qualities of the story. The Democrats did use this technique on occasion; however, in Dallas, it was the rule. In a group-mediated format it is important to have the members of various groups stand before the audience to proclaim the virtues of the up-coming speaker for constituents, regardless of the amount of time consumed. The traditional convention used these occasions as a means of promoting identification with the speaker about to address the assembly. In the era of the mass-mediated convention, time is a precious commodity; therefore, the video introduction provides the basis for identification through the use of the story telling techniques of television.

The Republican convention managers also displayed concern for what the major television networks were broadcasting to viewers when they did not cover the events occurring on the rostrum. Subsequently, the GOP arranged for certain party members to be available for network interviews at specific times. The Doles, the Fords, the Reagan and Bush
families, and other prominent Republicans were offered for interviews at specific times. This strategy clearly revealed a Republican effort to manage the flow of information through the network gatekeepers by controlling access to party celebrities.

In addition, the Republicans attempted to manage the information flow through the media between sessions through the use of press conferences. The vice president, members of the cabinet, party officials, and other prominent participants would speak to the media each day in a well-coordinated format. For example, I observed George Bush during a press conference on foreign affairs in which the vice president refused to speak to other matters. Clearly, the press was frustrated by the control exercised over the content of the exchanges, but they did have an opportunity to gather the reactions of a prominent party official even though the GOP controlled the topic of the discussion.

The San Francisco convention also attempted to present prominent party members for the networks to interview as well as offer a steady stream of press conferences. However, these activities were not as well-coordinated as in the Dallas example in that they did not occur in a central location, concentrate on a central theme, or consistently involve the "prestige players." In a group-mediated convention these activities are not as strictly controlled whereas the mass-mediated assembly seeks to optimize exposure for the television cameras and the mass media in general.
The 1984 Dallas convention clearly revealed a shift in the style of story telling traditionally associated with national conventions. The Republicans extended this shift toward a mass-mediated assembly further through another, totally unique, means: the RNC Network. As briefly mentioned in Chapter Two, the GOP offered the country gavel-to-gavel coverage of its national convention through its own television network. This practice went beyond a closed-circuit telecast to hotel rooms or the use of taped "convention highlights" to the point of presenting the nation the events occurring on the GOP rostrum as they happened. The RNC Network coverage was similar to that offered by the C-Span Network or the gavel-to-gavel coverage available through some Public Broadcasting outlets in that it did not employ announcers, reports from the convention floor, video taped reports, or any of the other techniques of broadcast journalism. Nevertheless, the presence of such a story telling device constitutes an important innovation in the convention process as it may pave the way for the next phase in the story telling capacity of this uniquely American political institution.

SUMMARY OF CLAIM TWO

This claim has argued that a new form of convention has evolved which is oriented around the mass media's ability to
reach a national audience. Through its emphasis on a more telegenic means of story telling, its use of the mass media as a vehicle for the transmission of its messages, along with the introduction of its own network, the Republican Party offered a national assembly that was representative of what I have described as a mass-mediated convention. The political goal of a group-mediated as well as a mass-mediated convention remains intact: the consolidation of constituency groups for the general election. However, the development of communications technologies such as the microwave capabilities, the reduction in network coverage of the assemblies, and the refinement of television production techniques by the two parties have produced a new phase in the convention process.

The national nominating convention has always sought ways of improving its ability to reach out to the private realities of Americans. In the "group-mediated convention" this process involved strategies oriented toward those groups present inside the convention hall in the hopes of promoting identification with the party in that context and, subsequently, relying on the delegates and/or "bosses" to disseminate the party's messages.

The advent of the national broadcasts of the conventions introduced a larger audience for the two parties as well as providing an opportunity to reduce a two-step process to one. As a result the parties now tell their stories to a national
audience and, in turn, practice mirroring on a much grander scale. To be sure, the delegates still play an important role in the conduct of party politics; however, they no longer are the principal purveyors of "equipment for living" for party members. From the Burkean perspective, as the situation changes, the strategies through which the story is told changes as well.

In conclusion, this chapter has advanced two claims which address the content and form of the mirroring anecdote as that story line applied to the conduct of the 1984 nominating conventions. These claims have stressed two major points: one, the stories generated through the mirroring anecdote displayed fundamentally different strategies; and two, the means through which the story was told were also distinct. Yet, while these two assemblies offered contrasting assessments of the situation through different styles of story telling, they shared one basic trait: they provided equipment for living through a dramatic portrayal of the choices before the American people and defined the market in the 1984 presidential campaign.
NOTES

1These thoughts on the "ideology-formation process" are from notes taken while attending Professor William R. Brown's class--Communication 617--during the spring quarter 1985 at The Ohio State University.

American pluralism and Burkean methodology share a fundamental assumption regarding human nature: a natural state of divisiveness exists among individuals and/or groups. The Founding Fathers acknowledged this basic assumption as they constructed a system of government predicated on competition among groups; moreover, they devised that system in such a way as to place "checks and balances" on the activities of these groups in order to insure the maintenance of a system of competitive opposition. Burkean methodology also acknowledged this assumption as it argued that such a condition provides a basis for rhetoric in that, without divisiveness, there would be no need for the rhetorician to "proclaim unity." Indeed, the fact that these two frameworks, American pluralism and Burkean criticism, share this basic assumption appears to provide a sense of "epistemological satisfaction" as one employs the latter in an evaluation of the former in a specific field of action.

As the American Republic matured, problems emerged regarding the transfer of executive power. The House of
Representatives was often required to serve as the Final Arbiter over presidential elections since candidates for that high office were unable to secure the necessary number of electoral votes to win in the electoral college. This situation was in clear violation of the doctrine of separation of powers in that one branch of the federal system was deciding the fate of another. This condition was a natural extension of the pluralistic foundation of the American system since the diverse groups which comprise that system would select a candidate and, in the absence of some means of consolidation, work to elect that individual. However, the system experienced difficulty as an increase in the number of candidates made it impossible for electoral majorities to be obtained. This state of affairs in conjunction with an emerging desire for popular input in the nomination of candidates created a need for some means through which a consolidation of interests could be achieved. In time, a solution evolved which would consolidate the diverse interests inherent in a pluralistic system under the auspices of the two major political parties. This solution was the national nominating convention—the subject of this research venture.

This final chapter will now bring closure to this evaluation of the 1984 national nominating conventions through an overview of the study that addresses four specific topics:

1. A review of the thrust of the research and the subsequent findings,
2. An evaluation of the methodology employed in the research effort,

3. A discussion of the implications of the findings for the field of political communication, and

4. A discussion of recommendations and suggestions for further study.

The goal of this overview involves an examination of not only the findings rendered through this project, but the means through which these results were obtained.

I. REVIEW OF THE STUDY

A developmental progressive conceptualization of process requires the researcher to seek information regarding the emergence and growth of the subject matter under consideration. Chapter Two of this work spent considerable time in that regard; therefore, I shall be brief in my remarks on that subject here. However, a review of the history of the national nominating convention reveals the fundamental importance of that institution to the American political system. By "defining the market" in presidential elections for the electorate, these assemblies preserve two vital elements of the American system: the doctrine of separation of powers and the viability of the two-party system.

Still, as one considers the pluralistic nature of American politics, the question remains, how do the two
parties rally such diverse entities as the interest groups present in this system? How do these two organizations appeal to the multiple realities present in a pluralistic republic? These questions are the domain of rhetoric. As Burke argued, the natural state of divisiveness among people creates the need for rhetoric. The American system of government is clearly representative of the state of divisiveness referenced in Burke's point. Therefore, it appears to be a reasonable claim to suggest that a Burkean interpretation of these rhetorical activities may yield insights into these concerns.

The research question advanced in this study of the national conventions asked how the two parties used these devices as a means of mobilizing their constituencies for the general election. A dramatistic response to that question reveals that the parties presented a series of symbolic acts which told stories to the audience. These stories provided "equipment for living" through their dramatic portrayals of realistic situations. Moreover, such stories "define the market" for the electorate in presidential elections in that they offer strategic assessments of the political situation before the nation. In so doing, the conventions facilitate the maintenance of the two-party system and the essential character of the American system.

I maintain that the stories advanced by the parties in this context may be described in terms of a representative
anecdote I refer to as "mirroring." Following Burke's notion of the representative anecdote as a means of critical inquiry, the mirroring anecdote suggests that the discourse emanating from national conventions may be cast in terms of a story line which allows individuals and/or groups an occasion to "see themselves" and their worldviews. Therefore, "friends" and "foes" or "good" and "bad" are identified through stories which speak to the needs of constituents and offer a resolution to those perceived conditions. Such stories appeal to fundamental values through dramatic means as they define the market as it appears at that point in time. Indeed, they are a rhetorical means of overcoming division through the process of identification with one of the two party's constructions of reality.

The content and form of mirroring as that story line appeared in the 1984 conventions are the topics of interest in this research effort. As we have seen, the San Francisco Democrats mirrored a party of diverse groups experiencing a state of victimage as the result of the unfair administrative policies of a Republican chief executive. The principal need reflected in this story line was the restoration of "fairness" in governmental policy making; moreover, the only way to reinstate such a state of affairs was through a united "family" (as the party described itself). Otherwise, the groups comprising the Democratic coalition would experience a continuation of the philosophy of "Social Darwinism"
practiced by the Republican administration. While the Democrats offered a resolution to their scenario that featured responses to the needs of the diverse groups in the party, they also contrasted that vision with a depiction of four more years of GOP rule through the use of a "fear" theme. Clearly, the Democrats practiced mirroring through a theme based on "fear and fairness" in their national assembly.

Correspondingly, we noted that the Dallas Republicans mirrored a party of individual Americans enjoying the prosperity rendered by the Reagan Administration. The GOP story line featured the hero, Ronald Reagan, in combat against an easily identifiable scapegoat: "big government." The Republican story argued that "big government" requires unnecessary sacrifices on the part of the individual American and is, therefore, a threat to individual prosperity. Hence, the party addressed the need for individual prosperity by presenting a resolution with two features: one, the GOP maintained that its hero needed "help" in his battle against the villain in the form of certain legislative initiatives and, second, they asserted that the Mondale-Ferraro ticket was extremist and unrepresentative of the mainstream of the Democratic Party. This second point led to invitations to "unhappy Democrats" to join the Republican fight for individual prosperity. After all, the GOP scenario revealed, it was the "patriotic" thing to do.
These two uses of the mirroring anecdote provided an opportunity for the audience to identify with one of the two stories advanced by these national conventions. As viewers gazed into the mirror, they either saw themselves as a member of a group or as an individual American. Following that identification, the audience could observe the articulation of their needs as individuals or group members as well as a resolution of those conditions. Hence, the stories offered by the two parties facilitated the process of identification central to an effort to overcome this natural state of divisiveness—a condition necessary for the type of collective action required by the American system of presidential politics.

I have also argued that the two stories presented through these national assemblies differed in an additional regard: the way they were told. In my view, as one reads the writings of Nimmo and Combs and their discussions of "group-mediated" and "mass-mediated" realities, one may note the similarity between their discussion of "story telling" and the Burkean view of the same. Therefore, I contend that the use of such constructs in a Burkean interpretation of these conventions is not only appropriate, but adds depth of understanding to the argument.

As noted earlier, the means through which the parties tell their stories to constituents have evolved in conjunction with the communications technologies available to those
efforts. Prior to the emergence of the broadcasting industry the parties relied on the delegates present inside the assembly hall to identify with the conventions' messages and convey them to the American public. These were the days of the "group-mediated convention" in which the parties exercised great care in providing time for the divergent elements within the party to express their views. The group-mediated convention featured specifically-designed vehicles through which identification could occur such as the "favorite son nomination," multiple nomination speeches, and the often long, drawn-out process of writing the party's platform.

The national television broadcasts of the conventions introduced several new elements for the parties to consider in their efforts to communicate with constituents. In my view, the 1984 Republican National Convention in Dallas emerged as a prototype of a new approach which I described as the "mass-mediated convention." This new style of conventioning stresses story telling techniques which conform to the dramatic imperatives of television. Therefore, the GOP offered shorter sessions, new means of introducing speakers, controlled the appearances of party personnel before the media, and produced its own broadcasts of the proceedings. This shift in convention format contrasted sharply with the more "traditional" style of conventioning evidenced in San Francisco.
In summary, the 1984 national conventions offered contrasting uses of the mirroring anecdote in both content and form. This shift in form, in my view, provides evidence for the selection of a developmental progressive conceptualization of the convention process. Additionally, the two stories emanating from San Francisco and Dallas clearly provided "equipment for living" as they strategically assessed the situation for the audience in a dramatic fashion. These two uses of mirroring allowed the audience to determine the "heroes" and "villains" of the respective scenarios and, consequently, initiate the processes of identification necessary for collective action. It is through these dramatic portrayals that the two parties rally their diverse constituents, "define the market," and maintain the viability of the two party system.

II. EVALUATION OF THE METHODOLOGY

The Burkean approach to the study of human communicative behavior rests on the metaphor "life is drama." As noted in Chapter One, Burke has argued that there is a natural state of divisiveness present in human relations on at least two levels: the distinctions between human and non-human forms and the distinctions which arise among people due to their individuality. This conceptualization serves as a starting point for a construing of life as "drama" in that in the absence of divisiveness, there is no drama.
This state of divisiveness therefore produces a need for rhetoric as a means of overcoming this natural condition. Through rhetoric individuals and/or groups construct realities which identify "friends" and "enemies" and, in turn, provide a foundation for identification to emerge. As people identify with one another, the potential for consubstantiality appears; therefore, collective action becomes possible as consubstantial entities pursue objectives which serve their constructions of their situations.

As a result of this theoretical perspective, Burke offered a methodological framework through which one may study these processes of identification in specific fields of action. This methodological framework offers research tools which may be applied on at least two levels. For example, the Burkean calculus provides a "microscopic" means of analysis through the pentad. This approach concentrates on the five elements of the pentad as they apply to a specific situation in an effort to impute motive and gain insight into rhetorical activity.

However, the Burkean methodology also provides for "macroscopic" assessments of rhetorical behavior through notions such as the representative anecdote—the approach employed in this research venture. The anecdote allows the researcher to selectively reduce a series of activities in a reflective manner in an effort to critique certain acts which are viewed as "prototypes" or "summations" of the
larger field of action. Once the critic has reflectively reduced the larger drama in question he or she may then attempt to identify a basic story line through which the selection may be organized. This approach allows the critic to review large bodies of discourse and clearly contrasts such word-specific approaches as Burke's word clusters while evaluating the dramatic qualities of human relations.

In my view, Burkean methodology displays limitless potential as a means of studying the dynamic qualities of human behavior. The methodological tools available within this framework allow the critic a significant amount of flexibility with regard to the technique to be employed in his or her research effort. The Burkean critic may select the level of analysis desired and then choose from a variety of tools through which that analysis may be conducted.

However, as one reads through the literature associated with Burkean methodology one quickly notes the breadth of interpretations available. The Burkean calculus is apparently broad enough to allow scholars the opportunity to interpret Burke's writings to their own ends. For example, as I reviewed Brummett's writings on the representative anecdote I quickly noted how he argued against "reduction" as an element of this approach to criticism. Upon reflection, I realized that Brummett had disregarded Burke's comments regarding the critical act of reflectively selecting a "summation" of a larger drama in a way which avoided a
deflection of the same. Brummett argued that reduction was to be avoided whereas I interpreted Burke as advocating reduction, but with proper scope. Clearly, such discrepancies may serve as a basis for theoretical inconsistencies which manifest themselves in the application of these critical techniques.

The goal of this research effort did not involve the application of Burkean thought to "uncharted waters" or an enhancement of that frame of reference through some reconceptualization of Burke's original thesis, but simply sought to apply that writer's notions to a specific field of action which seemed amenable to that form of analysis. Hence, I submit that this study's contribution to the field of political communication is epistemic in nature in that I employed Burke's framework in an effort to generate knowledge concerning the rhetorical activities associated with the national conventions. I did not revise Burke's thesis or extend his work to an unexplored area. I applied his work in an effort to argue how the two parties used their conventions to mobilize their constituencies for the general elections.

III. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FIELD

Throughout this work I have referenced the writings of Nimmo and Combs as I discussed the use of Burkean principles
in a review of political behavior. I perceive the need to refer to the writings of these authors one last time in my assessment of the implications of this research for the field of political communication. In their paper on a "neo-Burkean" theory of politics the authors suggested the following:

A neo-Burkean theory of politics is thereby a theory of political communication. If politics is dramatic communication, then it will be necessary to offer answers not only to the question of in what sense politics is dramatic, but also in what sense is the drama political? Such a theory must come to grips with the politics inherent in the drama of all human relations, exemplified not only in political theater as located in remote, abstract "governments," but also in "the politics of everyday life." For if daily and routine acts of communication of any of us contain logical, aesthetic, rhetorical, ethical, and even metaphysical aspects and phrases, they also include the political.

These sentiments clearly reveal the authors' contention that the dramatic activities of everyday life provide "equipment for living" from a political point of view. Hence, a dramatic interpretation of interpersonal relations, popular media, or group behaviors may yield "political" content as well as "aesthetic" or "metaphysical" information. Of course, this view also maintains that an assessment of political activity may yield content which is dramatic in nature.

This research project has argued that the activities occurring in the field of action known as the national nominating conventions are dramatic in nature. This position
rests on the notion that the two parties use these occasions as a forum for telling stories that provide equipment for living for the audience. In so doing, they define the market for the electorate under the umbrella organizations of the two parties and, as a result, facilitate the continuance of American Democracy.

Consequently, these national assemblies provide a rich context for an examination of political communication "in action." Students of the field may approach such a dynamic setting through a variety of research techniques in their efforts to capture the activities present in that context. As a result, I contend that the national nominating conventions offer our field an unusual opportunity to observe the various processes of national politics in action on a grand scale.

In addition, I maintain that the use of dramatistic research techniques offers vast potential for students of political communication. Politicians weave stories for their audiences that clearly provide equipment for living for those individuals. These stories identify the characters on stage in that particular political arena, their traits, and project images of the past, present, and future in the process. These stories are the domain of rhetoric; moreover, they reveal the dramatic qualities of political life. Therefore, the contention that dramatistic methods yield valuable insights into the nature of these stories appears not to only be a sustainable claim, but offers vast implications for this field of inquiry.
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

Throughout this research venture I have consistently referenced this effort's commitment to a developmental progressive conceptualization of process. This frame of reference requires the researcher not only to consider the emergence and growth of the subject-matter under consideration, but also to ponder the implications of future growth.

In 1984 it was not uncommon to hear commentators suggest that the national conventions are "dinosaurs." These individuals often argued that the primary elections across the nation were slowly replacing these national assemblies and their capacity to "define the market" for the electorate.

In my view, such commentary failed to consider "what conventions do" from a theoretical perspective. No "primary election"—even a national primary election—can function in the capacity of a national convention. I argue this point on the basis of the convention's ability to "tell stories" through which identification—and eventually consubstantiality—may occur. Over the four days of a national convention representatives of virtually every interest in our pluralistic system receive an opportunity to tell the story of their condition. As these entities weave these tales, they systematically align themselves with one of the two major parties in varying degrees. American presidential politics
requires a unique form of collective action due to the demands of the electoral college; thus, the emergence of such consubstantial behavior would be difficult to imagine in the absence of these basic acts of identification. If conventions are entering their own version of the "ice age," then the system as a whole had better "bundle up."

Still, I return to my initial comments regarding the assumptive world from which I have operated in this study of national conventions. That assumptive world leads me to a consideration of the 1988 conventions. Will the mass-mediated convention continue to prosper or was the emergence of that approach a function of incumbency? How will the Democrats and Republicans of 1988 "define the market" through their respective stories for the American people? How will the 1988 national nominating conventions provide equipment for living for Americans?

These are the questions we must pursue in the conventions of 1988. The conventions offer a unique glimpse of national politics in action. Indeed, freedom breeds diversity and diversity creates competition over resources. The activities present in a national convention reveal the ways through which diverse groups gather, share sentiments, and mobilize their forces for a specific goal--the general election. These behaviors are rhetorical in nature and reflective of the essential character of the American political system. Hopefully, this work contributes to the
communication scholar's understanding of these processes and, in turn, sheds light on the dynamic qualities of American Democracy.
NOTES
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DELIVERED BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION
JULY 16, 1984
The following is a compilation of the advanced text of the speech provided by the Democratic National Convention, the C-Span Network coverage, and the text of the speech as presented in The New York Times.

On behalf of the Great Empire State and the whole family of New York, let me thank you for the great privilege of being able to address this convention.

Please allow me to skip the stories and the poetry and the temptation to deal in nice but vague rhetoric.

Let me instead use this valuable opportunity to deal immediately with the questions that should determine this election and that we all know are vital to the American people.

Ten days ago, President Reagan admitted that although some people in this country seemed to be doing well nowadays, others were unhappy, even worried, about themselves, their families and their futures.

The President said that he didn't understand that fear. He said "Why, this country is a shining city on a hill."

And the President is right, in many ways we are a shining city on a hill, but the hard truth is that not everyone is sharing in this city's splendor and glory.

A shining city is perhaps all the President sees from the portico of the White House and the veranda of his ranch, where everyone seems to be doing well.
But there's another city, there's another part of the shining city, the part where some people can't pay their mortgages and most young people can't afford one, where students can't afford the education they need and middle-class parents watch the dreams they hold for their children evaporate.

In this part of the city there are more poor than ever, more families in trouble, more and more people who need help but can't find it.

Even worse: there are elderly people who tremble in the basements of the houses there.

And there are people who sleep in the city's streets, in the gutter, where the glitter doesn't show.

There are ghettos where thousands of young people, without a job or an education, give their lives away to drug dealers every day.

There is despair, Mr. President, in the faces that you don't see, in the places that you don't visit in your shining city.

In fact, Mr. President, this is a nation, Mr. President you ought to know that this nation is more a "Tale of Two Cities" than it is just a "shining city on a hill."

Maybe, maybe Mr. President if you visited some more places.

Maybe if you went to Appalachia where some people still live in sheds, maybe if you went to Lackawanna where
thousands of unemployed steel workers wonder why we subsidized foreign steel. Maybe, maybe Mr. President if you stopped in at a shelter in Chicago and spoke to the homeless there: maybe Mr. President, if you asked a woman who had been denied the help she needed to feed her children because you said you needed the money for a tax break for a millionaire or for a missile we couldn't afford to use.

Maybe, maybe Mr. President.

But I'm afraid not.

Because, the truth is ladies and gentlemen that this is how we were warned it would be.

President Reagan told us from the very beginning that he believed in a kind of social Darwinism. Survival of the fittest. "Government can't do everything," we were told "So it should settle for taking care of the strong and hope that economic ambition and charity will do the rest. Make the rich richer and what falls from the table will be enough for the middle class and those who were trying desperately to work their way into the middle class."

You know the Republicans called it trickle-down when Hoover tried it. Now they call it supply side. But, it's the same shining city for those relative few who are lucky enough to live in its good neighborhoods.

But for the people who are excluded -- for the people who are locked out -- all they can do is stare from a distance at that city's glittering towers.
It's an old story. It's as old as our history.

The difference between Democrats and Republicans has always been measured in courage and confidence.

The Republicans, the Republicans believe that the wagon train will not make it to the frontier unless some of the old, some of the young, some of the weak are left behind by the side of the trail.

The strong, the strong they tell us will inherit the land!

We Democrats believe in something else, we Democrats believe that we can make it all the way with the whole family intact.

And we have more than once.

Ever since Franklin Roosevelt lifted himself from his wheelchair to lift this nation from its knees. Wagon train after wagon train. To new frontiers of education, housing, peace. The whole family aboard. Constantly reaching out to extend and enlarge that family. Lifting them up into the wagon on the way. Blacks and hispanics, and people of every ethnic group, and native Americans -- all those struggling to build their families and claim some small share of America.

For nearly fifty years we carried them all to new levels of comfort, and security, and dignity, even affluence.

And remember this, some of us in this room today are here only because this nation had that kind of confidence.

And it would be wrong to forget that.
So, here we are at this convention to remind ourselves where we come from and to claim the future for ourselves and for our children.

Today our great Democratic party, which has saved this nation from depression, from fascism, from racism, from corruption, is called upon to do it again. . . . this time to save the nation from confusion and division, from the threat of eventual fiscal disaster and most of all from the fear of a nuclear holocaust.

But that's not going to be easy, Mo Udall is exactly right, it won't be easy and in order to succeed, we must answer our opponent's polished and appealing rhetoric with a more telling reasonableness and rationality.

We must win this case on the merits.

We must get the American public to look past the glitter, beyond the showmanship . . . to the reality, the hard substance of things. And we'll do it not so much with speeches that sound good, as with speeches that are good and sound.

Not so much with speeches that will bring people to their feet, as with speeches that will bring people to their senses.

We must make, we must make the American people hear our "Tale of Two Cities."

We must convince them that we don't have to settle for two cities, that we can have one city, indivisible, shining for all of its people.
Now we will have no chance to do that if what comes out of this convention -- is a babel of arguing voices.

If that's what's heard throughout the campaign, dissonant sounds from all sides, we will have no chance to tell our message.

To succeed we will have to surrender some small parts of our individual interests, to build a platform that we can all stand on, at once, and comfortably, -- proudly singing out. We need a platform we can all agree to so that we can sing out the truth for the nation to hear, in chorus, its logic so clear and commanding that no slick Madison Avenue commercial, no amount of geniality, no martial music will be able to muzzle the sound of the truth.

And we Democrats must unite, we Democrats must unite so that the entire nation can unite. Because surely the Republicans won't bring this convention together. Their policies divide the nation ... into the lucky and the left-out, into the royalty and the rabble.

The Republicans are willing to treat that division as victory. They would cut this nation in half, into those temporarily better off and those worse off than before, and they would call that division recovery.

Now, we should not, we should not be embarrassed or dismayed or chagrined if the process of unifying is difficult, even wrenching at times.

Remember that unlike any other party, we embrace men and women of every color, every creed, every orientation, every
economic class. In our family are gathered everyone from the abject poor of Essex County in New York, to the enlightened affluent of the gold coasts at both ends of the nation. And in between is the heart of our constituency, the middle class . . . the people not rich enough to be worry free but not poor enough to be on welfare. The middle class, those people who work for a living because they have to, not because some psychiatrist told them it was a convenient way to fill the interval between birth and eternity. White collar and blue collar. Young professionals. Men and women in small business desperate for the capital and contracts that they need to prove their worth.

We speak for the minorities who have not yet entered the main stream.

We speak for ethnics who want to add their culture to the magnificent mosaic that is America.

We speak, we speak for women who are indignant that this nation refuses to etch into its governmental commandments the simple rule "Thou Shalt Not Sin Against Equality," a rule so simple. I was going to say, and I perhaps dare not, but I will, it's a commandment so simple it can be spelled in three letters . . . E.R.A.!

We speak, we speak for young people demanding an education and a future.

We speak for senior citizens, we speak for senior citizens who are terrorized by the idea that their only
security . . . their social security . . . is being threatened.

We speak for millions of reasoning people fighting to preserve our environment from greed and from stupidity. And we speak for reasonable people who are fighting to preserve our very existence from a macho intransigence that refuses to make intelligent attempts to discuss the possibility of nuclear holocaust with our enemy. They refuse, they refuse because they believe we can pile missiles so high that they will pierce the clouds and the sight of them will frighten our enemies into submission.

Now we're proud of this diversity as Democrats, we're grateful we don't have to manufacture it the way the Republicans will next month in Dallas, by propping up mannequin delegates on the convention floor.

But we, while we're proud of this diversity, we pay a price for it.

The different people that we represent have many points of view. And sometimes they compete and even debate, and even argue. That's what our primaries were all about.

But now the primaries are over and it is time when we pick our candidates and our platform here to lock arms and move into this campaign together.

If you need any more inspiration to put some small part of your own differences aside to create this consensus then all you need to do is to reflect on what the Republican policy of divide and cajole has done to this land since 1980.
Now the President has asked the American people to judge him on whether or not he's fulfilled the promises he made four years ago.

I believe as Democrats we ought to accept that challenge and just for a moment let us consider what he has said and what he's done.

Inflation, inflation is down since 1980. But not because of the supply-side miracle promised to us by the President. Inflation was reduced the old fashioned way, with a recession, the worst since 1932. Now how did we, we could have brought inflation down that way, how did he do it? Fifty-five thousand bankruptcies. Two years of massive unemployment. Two hundred thousand farmers and ranchers forced off the land. More homeless, more homeless than at any time since the great depression in 1932. More hungry in this world of enormous affluence, the United States of America, more hungry, more poor -- most of them women -- and he paid one other thing -- a nearly 200 billion dollar deficit threatening our future.

Now we must make the American people understand this deficit because they don't. The President's deficit is a direct and dramatic repudiation of his promise to, in 1980, balance the budget by 1983.

How large is it? The deficit is the largest in the history of the universe; it, President Carter's last budget had a deficit less than one-third of this deficit.
It is a deficit that, according to the President's own fiscal advisor, may grow to as high as 300 billion dollars a year, for "as far as the eye can see."

And ladies and gentlemen, it is a debt so large that as almost one-half of the money we collect from the personal income tax each year goes just to pay the interest.

It is a mortgage on our children's future that can be paid only in pain and that could bring this nation to its knees.

Now don't take my word for it . . . I'm a Democrat.

Ask the Republican investment bankers on Wall Street what they think the chances of this recovery being permanent are. If you see they're not too embarrassed to tell you the truth, they'll say they're appalled and frightened by the President's deficit. Ask them what they think of our economy, now that it's been driven by the distorted value of the dollar back to its colonial condition -- now we're exporting agricultural products and importing manufactured ones.

Ask those Republican investment bankers what they expect the rate of interest to be a year from now. And ask them, if they dare tell you the truth, you'll learn from them what they predict for the inflation rate a year from now because of the deficit.

Now, how important is this question of the deficit.

Think about it: practically! What chance would the Republican candidate have had in 1980 if he had told the
American people that he intended to pay for his so-called economic recovery with bankruptcies, unemployment and more homeless, more hungry and the largest government debt known to humankind? If he had told the voters in 1980 that truth, would American voters have signed the loan certificate for him on election day? Of course not! That was an election won under false pretenses, it was won with smoke and mirrors ... and illusions. And that's the kind of recovery we have now as well.

And what about foreign policy?
They said that they would make us and the whole world safer.
They say they have.
By creating the largest defense budget in history, one that even they now admit is excessive. By escalating to a frenzy the nuclear arms race. By incendiary rhetoric. By refusing to discuss peace with our enemies. By the loss of 279 young Americans in Lebanon in pursuit of a plan and a policy that no one can find or describe.
We give money to Latin American governments that murder nuns, and then we lie about it.
We have been less than zealous in support of our only real friend, it seems to me, in the Middle East, the one democracy there, our flesh and blood ally, the state of Israel.
Our, our policy, our foreign policy drifts with no real direction, other than an hysterical commitment to an arms race that leads nowhere . . . if we're lucky. And if we're not . . . it could lead us into bankruptcy or war.

Of course we must have a strong defense!

Of course Democrats are for a strong defense, of course Democrats believe that there are times when we must stand and fight. And we have. Thousands of us have paid for freedom with our lives. But always -- when this country has been at our best -- our purposes were clear.

Now they're not. Now our allies are as confused as our enemies.

Now we have no real commitment to our friends or to our ideals . . . not to human rights, not to the refusenicks, not to Sakharov, not to Bishop Tutu and the others struggling for freedom in South Africa.

We, we have in the last few years, spent more than we can afford. We have pounded our chests and made bold speeches. But we lost 279 young Americans in Lebanon and we live behind sand bags in Washington.

How can anyone say that we are safer, stronger, or better?

That, that is the Republican record.

That its disastrous quality is not more fully understood by the American people I can only attribute to the President's amiability and the failure by some to separate the salesman from the product.
And now, now, now it's up to us, now it's up to you and to me to make the case to America.

And to remind Americans that if they are not happy with all that the President has done so far, they should consider how much worse it will be if he is left to his radical proclivities for another four years unrestrained, unrestrained.

Now if, if July, if July brings back Ann Gorsuch Burford ... what can we expect of December?
Where would, where would another four years take us?
Where would four years more take us?
How much larger will the deficit be?

How much deeper the cuts in programs for the struggling middle class and the poor to limit that deficit? How high will the interest rates be? How much more acid rain killing our forests and fouling our lakes?

And ladies and gentlemen please think of this, the nation must think of this. What kind of Supreme Court will we have? We must ask ourselves, what kind of court and country will be fashioned by the man who believes in having government mandate people's religion and morality?

The man who believes that trees pollute the environment, the man that believes that, that the laws against discrimination against people go too far. The man who threatens Social Security and Medicaid and help for the disabled.

How high will we pile the missles?

How much deeper will be the gulf between us and our enemies?
And ladies and gentlemen, will four years more make meaner the spirit of the American people?

This election will measure the record of the past four years. But more than that, it will answer the question of what kind of people we want to be.

We Democrats still have a dream. We still believe in this nation's future.

And this is our answer to the question -- this is our credo:

We believe in only the government we need but we insist on all the government we need.

We believe in a government that is characterized by fairness and reasonableness, a reasonableness that goes beyond labels, that doesn't distort or promise to do things we know it can't do.

We believe in a government strong enough to use the words "love" and "compassion" and smart enough to convert our noblest aspirations into practical realities.

We believe in encouraging the talented, but we believe that while survival of the fittest may be a good working description of the process of evolution, a government of humans should elevate itself to a higher order. We, our government, our government should be able to rise to the level where it can fill the gaps left by chance or a wisdom we don't understand.
We would rather have laws written by the patron of this great city, the man called the "World's Most Sincere Democrat" -- St. Francis of Assissi -- than laws written by Darwin.

We believe, we believe as Democrats, that a society as blessed as ours, the most affluent democracy in the world's history, one that can spend trillions on instruments of destruction, ought to be able to help the middle class in its struggle, ought to be able to find work for all who can do it, room at the table, shelter for the homeless, care for the elderly and infirm, and hope for the destitute.

And we proclaim as loudly as we can the utter insanity of nuclear proliferation and the need for a nuclear freeze, if only to affirm the simple truth that peace is better than war because life is better than death.

We believe in firm, we believe in firm but fair law and order, we believe proudly in the union movement, we believe, we believe, we believe in privacy for people, we believe in openness by government, we believe in civil rights, and we believe in human rights.

We believe in a, we believe in a single fundamental idea that describes better than most text books and any speech that I could write what a proper government should be. The idea of family. Mutuality. The sharing of benefits and burdens for the good of all. Feeling one another's pain. Sharing one another's blessings. Reasonably, honestly,
fairly -- without respect to race, or sex, or geography or political affiliation.

We believe we must be the family of America, recognizing that at the heart of the matter we are bound one to another, that the problems of a retired school teacher in Duluth are our problems. That the future of the child, that the future of the child in Buffalo is our future. That the struggle of a disabled man in Boston to survive, to live decently is our struggle. The hunger of a woman in Little Rock, our hunger. The failure anywhere to provide what reasonably we might, to avoid pain, is our failure.

Now for 50 years, for 50 years we Democrats created a better future for our children, using traditional Democratic principles as a fixed beacon, giving us direction and purpose, but constantly innovating, adapting to new realities: Roosevelt's alphabet programs; Truman's NATO and the G-I Bill of Rights; Kennedy's intelligent tax incentives and the Alliance for Progress; Johnson's civil rights; Carter's human rights and the nearly miraculous Camp David Peace Accord.

Democrats did it . . . and Democrats can do it again.

We can build a future that deals with our deficit.

Remember this, that fifty years of progress under our principles never cost us what the last four years of stagnation have. We can deal with that deficit intelligently, by shared sacrifice, with all parts of the nation's family contributing, building partnerships with the private
sector, providing a sound defense without depriving ourselves of what we need to feed our children and care for our people.

We can have a future that provides for all the young of the present, by marrying common sense and compassion.

We know we can, because we did it for nearly 50 years before 1980.

And, we can do it again. If we do not forget, if we do not forget that this entire nation has profited by these progressive principles. That they helped lift up generations to the middle class and higher: That they gave us a chance to work, to go to college, to raise a family, to own a house, to be secure in our old age and, before that, to reach heights that our own parents would not have dared dream of.

That struggle to live with dignity is the real story of the shining city. It's a story, ladies and gentlemen, that I didn't read in a book, or learn in a classroom. I saw it, and lived it. Like many of you.

I watched a small man with thick calluses on both his hands work fifteen and sixteen hours a day. I saw him once literally bleed from the bottoms of his feet, a man who came here uneducated, alone, unable to speak the language, who taught me all I needed to know about faith and hard work by the simple eloquence of his example. I learned about our kind of democracy from my father. And I learned about our obligation to each other from him and my mother. They asked only for a chance to work and to make the world better for their
children and they, they asked to be protected in those moments when they would not be able to protect themselves. This nation and this nation's government did that for them.

And that they were able to build a family and live in dignity and see one of their children go from behind their little grocery store in South Jamaica on the other side of the tracks in south Jamaica where he was born, to occupy the highest seat in the greatest state of the greatest nation in the only world we know, is an ineffably beautiful tribute to the democratic process.

And ladies and gentlemen, and on January 20, 1985, it will happen again. Only on a much, much grander scale. We will have a new president of the United States, a Democrat born not to the blood of kings but to the blood of pioneers and immigrants.

And we will have America's first woman vice president, the child of immigrants, and she, she, she will open with one magnificent stroke, a whole new frontier for the United States.

Now it will happen -- it, will happen if we make it happen. If you and I make it happen.

And I ask you now -- ladies and gentlemen, brothers and sisters -- for the good of all of us -- for the love of this great nation, for the family of America -- for the love of God. Please, make this nation remember how futures are built.

Thank you and God bless you.
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Ladies and Gentlemen of the convention, my name is Geraldine Ferraro, I stand before you to proclaim tonight: America is the land where dreams can come true for all of us.

As I stand before the American people and think of the honor this great convention has bestowed upon me, I recall the words of Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., who made America stronger by making America more free.

He said: "Occasionally in life there are moments which cannot be completely explained by words. Their meaning can only be articulated by the inaudible language of the heart."

Tonight is such a moment for me. My heart is filled with pride.

My fellow citizens, I proudly accept your nomination for vice president of the United States.

And, you're wonderful, and, and, and I am proud to run with a man who will be one of the great presidents of this century, Walter F. Mondale.

Tonight, the daughter of a woman whose highest goal was a future for her children talks to our nation's oldest party about a future for us all.

Tonight, the daughter of working Americans tells all Americans that the future is within our reach -- if we're willing to reach for it.
Tonight, the daughter of an immigrant from Italy has been chosen, has been chosen to run for president in the new land my father came to love.

Our faith that we can shape a better future is what the American dream is all about. The promise of our country is that the rules are fair. If you work hard and play by the rules, you can earn your share of America's blessings.

Those are the beliefs I learned from my parents. And those are the values I taught my students as a teacher in the public schools of New York City.

At night, I went to law school. I became an Assistant District Attorney, and I put my share of criminals behind bars. I believe: if you obey the law, you should be protected. But if you break the law, you must pay for your crime.

When I first ran for Congress, all the political experts said a Democrat could not win my home district of Queens. But I put my faith in the people and the values that we shared. Together, we proved the political experts wrong.

In this campaign, Fritz Mondale and I have put our faith in the people. And we are going to prove the experts wrong again.

We are going to win, because Americans across this country believe in the same basic dream.

Last week, I visited Elmore, Minnesota, the small town where, yea Elmore, the small town where Fritz Mondale was
raised. And soon Fritz and Joan will visit our family in Queens.

Nine hundred people live in Elmore. In Queens, there are 2,000 people on one block. You would think we'd be different, but we're not.

Children walk to school in Elmore past grain elevators; in Queens, they pass by subway stops. But, no matter where they live, their future depends on education -- and their parents are willing to do their part to make those schools as good as they can be.

In Elmore, there are family farms; in Queens, small businesses. But the men and women who run them all take pride in supporting their families through hard work and initiative.

On the Fourth of July in Elmore, they hand flags out on Main Street; in Queens, they fly them over Grand Avenue. But all of us love our country, and stand ready to defend the freedom that it represents.

Americans want to live by the same set of rules. But under this administration, the rules are rigged against too many of our people.

It isn't right that every year, the share of taxes paid by individual citizens is going up, while the share paid by large corporations is getting smaller and smaller. The rules say: everyone in our society should contribute their fair share.
It isn't right that this year Ronald Reagan will hand the American people a bill for interest on the national debt larger than the entire cost of the federal government under John F. Kennedy.

Our parents left us a growing economy. The rules say: we must not leave our kids a mountain of debt.

It isn't right that a woman should get paid 59 cents on the dollar for the same work as a man. If you play by the rules, you deserve a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

It isn't right that -- if trends continue -- by the year 2000 nearly all of the poor people in America will be women and children. The rules, the rules of a decent society say, when you distribute sacrifice in times of austerity, you don't put women and children first.

It isn't right that young people today fear they won't get the Social Security they paid for, and that older Americans fear they will lose what they have already earned. Social Security is a contract between the last generation and then next, and the rules say: you don't break contracts. We are going to keep faith with older Americans.

We hammered out a fair compromise in the Congress to save Social Security. Every group sacrificed to keep the system sound. It is time Ronald Reagan stopped scaring our senior citizens.

It isn't right that young couples question whether to bring children into a world of 50,000 nuclear warheads.
That isn't the vision for which Americans have struggled for more than two centuries. And our future doesn't have to be that way.

Change is in the air . . . just as surely as when John Kennedy beckoned America to a new frontier . . . when Sally Ride rocketed into space . . . and Reverend Jesse Jackson, ran for the office of President of the United States.

By choosing a woman to run for our nation's second highest office, you send a powerful signal to all Americans. There are no doors we cannot unlock. We will place no limits on achievement.

If we can do this, we can do anything.

Tonight, we reclaim our dream. We're going to make the rules of American life work fairly for all Americans again.

To an administration that would have us debate all over again whether the Voting Rights Act should be renewed and whether segregated schools should be tax exempt, we say, Mr. President: Those debates are over. On the issue of civil, voting rights, and affirmative action for minorities, we must not go backwards. We must -- and we will -- move forward to open the doors of opportunity.

To those who understand that our country cannot prosper unless we draw on the talents of all Americans, we say: We will pass the Equal Rights Amendment. The issue is not what America can do for women, but what women can do for America.
To the Americans who will lead our country into the 21st century, we say: we will not have a Supreme Court that turns the clock back to the 19th century.

To those, to those concerned about the strength of family values, as I am, I say: we are going to restore those values -- love, caring, partnership -- by including, and not excluding, those whose beliefs differ from our own. Because our own faith is strong, we will fight to preserve the freedom of faith for others.

To those working Americans who fear that banks, utilities, and large special interests have a lock on the White House we say: Join us; let's elect a people's president; and let's have a government by and for the people again.

To an Administration that would savage student loans and education at the dawn of a new technological age, we say: you fit the classic definition of a cynic: you know the price of everything, but the value of nothing.

To our students and their parents, we say: we will insist on the highest standards of excellence because the jobs of the future require skilled minds.

To young Americans who may be called to our country's service, we say: we know your generation will proudly answer our country's call, as each generation before you.

This past year, we remembered the bravery and sacrifice of Americans at Normandy. And we finally paid tribute . . . as we should have done years ago . . . to that unknown
soldier who represents all the brave young Americans who died in Vietnam.

Let no one doubt, we will defend America's security and the cause of freedom around the world. But we want a president who tells us what America is fighting for . . . not just what we are fighting against. We want a President who will defend human rights -- not just where it is convenient -- but wherever freedom is at risk -- from Chile to Afghanistan, from Poland to South Africa.

To those who have watched this Administration's confusion in the Middle East as it has tilted first toward one and then another of Israel's long-time enemies and wonder will America stand by her friends and sister Democracy -- we say, America knows who her friends are in the Middle East and around the world -- America will stand with Israel always.

Finally, finally, we want a president who will keep America strong, but use that strength to keep America, and the world, at peace. A nuclear freeze is not a slogan: it is a tool for survival in the nuclear age. If we leave our children nothing else, let us leave them this earth as we found it -- whole and green and full of life.

I know in my heart Walter Mondale will be president.

A wise man once said, "Every one of us is given the gift of life, and what a strange gift it is. If it is preserved jealously and selfishly, it impoverishes and saddens. But if it is spent for others, it enriches and beautifies."
My fellow Americans: We can debate policies and programs. But in the end what separates the two parties in this election campaign is whether we use the gift of life -- for others or only ourselves.

Tonight, my husband, John, and our three children are in this hall with me. To my daughters, Donn and Laura, and my son, John Jr., I say: my mother did not break faith with me... and I will not break faith with you. To all the children of America, I say: the generation before ours kept faith with us, and like them, we will pass on to you a stronger, more just America.

Thank you.
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My fellow Democrats:
My fellow Americans:
I accept your nomination.

Behind us now is the most wide-open race in political history.

It was noisy -- but our voices were heard. It was long -- but our stamina was tested. It was hot -- but the heat was passion, and not anger. It was a rollercoaster -- but it made me a better candidate, and it will make me a stronger president of the United States.

I do not envy the drowsy harmony of the Republican Party. They squelch debate; we welcome it. They deny differences; we bridge them. They are uniform; we are united. They are a portrait of privilege; and we are a mirror of America.

Just, just look at us here tonight black and white, Asian and Hispanic, native and immigrant, young and old, urban and rural, male and female -- from yuppie to lunchpail, from sea to shining sea we are all here tonight in this convention thinking for America.

And when we, and when we in this hall speak for America -- it is America that is speaking.
When we speak of family, the voice is Mario Cuomo's.
When we speak of change, the words are Gary Hart's.
When we speak, when we speak of hope, the fire is Jesse Jackson's.
When we speak of caring, the spirit is Ted Kennedy's.
When we speak of patriotism, the strength is John Glenn's.
And when we speak of the future, the message is Geraldine Ferraro.

And now we leave San Francisco -- together.
And over the next one hundred days, in every word we say, and every life we touch, we will be fighting for the future of America.

Joan and I are parents of three wonderful children who will live much of their lives in the twenty-first century.
This election is a referendum on their future -- and on ours.

So tonight I want to speak to the young people of America -- and to their parents and to their grandparents.
I'm Walter Mondale. You may have heard of me -- but you may not really know me.

I grew up in the farm towns of southern Minnesota. My dad was a preacher, and my mom was a music teacher. We never, we never had a dime. But we were rich in the values that are important, and I've carried those values with me ever since.
Tny taught me to work hard; to stand on my own; to play by the rules; to tell the truth; to obey the law; to care for others; to love our country; and to cherish our faith.

My story isn't unique.

In the last few weeks, I've deepened my admiration for someone who shares those same values. Her immigrant father loved our country. Her widowed mother sacrificed her family. And her own career is an American classic: doing your own work. Earning your way. Paying your dues. Rising on merit.

My presidency will be about those values. And my, my vice president will be Geraldine Ferraro.

Tonight, we open a new door to the future. Mr. Reagan calls it "tokenism." We call it America.

Ever since I graduated from Elmore High, I've been a Democrat.

I was the Attorney General of my state; then a United States Senator. And then an honest, caring man -- Jimmy Carter -- picked me as his running mate, and in 1976 I was elected vice president.

Then in 1980, Ronald Reagan beat the pants off us.

So tonight, I want to say something to those of you across the county who voted for Ronald Reagan -- Republicans, Independents, and yes, some Democrats:

I heard you. And our party heard you.

After we lost, we didn't tell the American people that they were wrong. Instead, we began asking you what our mistakes had been.
And for four years, I listened to all of the people of our country. I traveled everywhere, it seemed like I had visited every acre of America.

It wasn't easy. I remember late one night, as I headed from a speech in one city to a hotel a thousand miles away, a friend of mine came up to me and said, "Fritz, I just saw you on TV. Are those bags under you eyes natural?" And I said, "No, I got them the old fashioned way. I earned them."

To the thousands of Americans who welcomed me into your homes and into businesses, your churches and your synagogues: I thank you.

You confirmed my belief in our country's values. And you helped me learn and grow.

So tonight we come to you with a new realism: ready for the future, and recapturing the best in our tradition.

We know that America must have a strong defense, and a sober view of the Soviets.

We know that government must be as well-managed as it is well-meaning.

We know that a healthy, growing private economy is the key to our future.

We know that Harry Truman spoke the truth when he said: "A president . . . has to be able to say yes and no, but mostly no."

Look at our platform. There are no defense cuts that weaken our security; no business taxes that weaken our economy; no laundry lists that raid our Treasury.
We are a wiser, stronger, and we are focused on the future. If Mr. Reagan wants to re-run the 1980 campaign: fine. Let them fight over the past. We're fighting for the American future -- and that's why we're going to win this campaign.

One last word, one last word to those of you who voted for Mr. Reagan.

I know what you were saying. But I also know what you were not saying.

You did not vote for a $200 billion deficit.
You did not vote for an arms race.
You did not vote to turn the heavens into a battleground.
You did not vote to savage Social Security and Medicare.
You did not vote to destroy family farming.
You did not vote to trash the civil rights laws.
You did not vote to poison the environment.
You did not vote to assault the poor, the sick, and the disabled.

And you did not vote to pay fifty bucks for a fifty-cent lightbulb.

Four years ago, four years ago, many of you voted for Mr. Reagan because he promised that you'd be better off. And today, the rich are better off. But working Americans are worse off, and the middle class is standing on a trap door.
Lincoln once said that ours is to be a government of the people, by the people, and for the people. But what we have today is a government of the rich, by the rich, and for the rich, and we're going to make a change in November.

Look at the record, first, there was Mr. Reagan's tax program. And what happened was this, he gave each of his rich friends enough tax relief to buy a Rolls Royce -- and then he asked your family to pay for the hub caps.

Then they looked the other way at the rip-offs: soaring utility bills, phone bills, medical bills.

Then they crimped our future. They let us be routed in international competition, and now the help-wanted ads are full of listings for executives, and for dishwashers -- but not much in between.

Then they socked it, then they socked it to the workers. They encouraged executives to vote themselves huge bonuses -- while using King Kong tactics to make workers take Hong Kong wages.

Mr. Reagan, Mr. Reagan believes that the genius of America is in the boardrooms and exclusive country clubs. I believe that greatness can be found in the men and women who built our nation; do its work; and defend our freedom.

If this administration has a plan for a better future, they're keeping a secret.

Here's the truth about the future: we are living on borrowed money and borrowed time. These deficits hike
interest rates, clobber exports, stund investment, kill jobs, undermine growth, cheat our kids, and shrink our future.

Whoever is inaugurated in January, the American people will have to pay Mr. Reagan's bills. The budget will be squeezed. Taxes will go up. And anyone who says they won't is not telling the truth to the American people.

I mean, I mean business. By the end of my first term, I will reduce the Reagan budget deficit by two-thirds.

Let's tell the truth. That must be done, it must be done. Mr. Reagan will raise taxes, and so will I. He won't tell you. I just did.

There's another difference, there's another difference, there's another difference, there's another difference. When he raises taxes, it won't be done fairly. He will sock it to average-income families again, and he'll leave his rich friends alone. And I won't stand for it, and neither will you, and neither will the American people.

To the corporations and the freeloaders who play the loopholes and pay no taxes, my message is: your free ride is over.

To the Congress, my message is: we must cut spending and pay as we go. If you don't hold the line, I will; that's what the veto is for.

Now that's my plan to cut the deficit. Mr. Reagan is keeping his plan secret until after the election. That's not leadership; that's salesmanship.
And I think the American people know the difference.

I challenge, tonight I challenge, Mr. Reagan to put his plan on the table next to mine -- and then let's debate it on national television before the people of this country. Americans, Americans, Americans want the truth about their future -- they're entitled to it, and they want the truth now, not after the election.

When the economy, American economy leads the world, the jobs are here, the prosperity is here, and the future is here for our children. But that's not happening today. This is the worst trade year in American history. Three million of our best jobs have gone overseas.

Mr. Reagan has done nothing about it they have no plan to get our competitive edge back; but we do.

We will cut the deficits, reduce interest rates, make our exports affordable, and make America number one again in the world economy.

We will launch a renaissance in education, in science, and learning. A mind is a terrible thing to waste. And this must be the best-educated generation in American history and I will lead our nation forward to the best system that this nation has ever seen. We must do it, we must do it.

It is time, it is time for America to have a season of excellence. Parents must turn off that television; students must do their homework; teachers must teach; and America compete. We'll be number one if we follow these rules. Let's get with it in America again.
To big companies that send our best jobs overseas, my message is: we need those jobs here at home. And our country won't help your business -- unless your business helps our country.

To countries that close their markets to us, my message is: we will not be pushed around any more. We will have a president who stands up for American workers and American businesses and American farmers in international trade.

When I grew up, and people asked us to imagine the future, we were full of dreams. But a few months ago, when I visited a grade school class in Texas and asked the children to imagine the future, they talked to me about nuclear war.

Lately, as we've neared the election, this administration has begun to talk about a safer world. But there's a big difference: as president, I will work for peace from my first day in office -- and not from my first day of campaigning for re-election.

As president, as president, I will reassert American values. I'll press for human rights in Central America, and for the removal of all foreign forces from the region. And in my first hundred days, I will stop the illegal war in Nicaragua.

We know, we know the deep differences with the Soviets. And America condemns their repression of dissidents and Jews; their suppression of Solidarity; their invasion of Afghanistan; their meddling around the world.
But the truth is that between us, we have the capacity to destroy the planet. Every president since the bomb has gone off has understood that. And talked with the Soviets and negotiated arms control: why has this administration failed, why haven't they tried, why can't they understand the cry of Americans and human beings for sense and sanity in control of these God awful weapons, why why?

Why, why can't we meet in summit conferences with the Soviet Union at least once a year? Why can't we reach agreements to save this earth? The truth is, we can.

President Kennedy was right when he said: We must never negotiate out of fear. But we must never fear to negotiate. For the sake of civilization, we must negotiate a mutual, verifiable nuclear freeze before these weapons destroy us all.

The second, the second, the second term of the Mondale-Ferraro administration will begin in 1989.

By the start of the next decade, I want to ask our children their dreams, and hear not one word about nuclear nightmares.

By the start of the next decade, I want to walk into any classroom in America and talk to some of the brightest teachers, students and have them tell me "I want to be a teacher."

By the start, by the start of the next decade, I want to walk into any public health clinic in America and hear the doctor say, "We haven't seen a hungry child this year."
By the start of the next decade, I want to walk into any store in America; and I want to pick up the best product, of the best quality, and the best price; turn it over; and read, "Made in the U.S.A."

By the start, by the start of the next decade, I want to meet with the most successful business leaders anywhere in America, and see as many minorities and women in that room as there I see in this room here tonight.

By the start of the next decade, I want to point to the Supreme Court and say, "Justice is in good hands."

Before the start of the next decade, I want to go to my second Inaugural, and raise my right hand, and swear to "preserve, protect, and defend" a Constitution that includes the Equal Rights Amendment.

My friends, America is a future that each generation must enlarge; a door each generation must open; a promise that each generation must keep.

For the rest of my life, I want to talk to young people about their future.

And whatever their race, whatever their religion, whatever their sex, I want to hear some of them say what I say -- with joy and reverence -- tonight: "I want to be president of the United States."

Thank you, thank you.
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My fellow Republicans here in Dallas --

My fellow Americans

Republicans, Democrats and independents watching this convention across the country --

My fellow Americans serving our country overseas:

I am honored to be here tonight to deliver the keynote to this 1984 National Convention of the Republican Party.

I am honored because I know there are many members of our party more eloquent than I.

But what I have to say tonight, I say from the heart -- and with the deep conviction that our country's future lies not in the empty rhetoric we heard in San Francisco last month, but in the courage and vision of a President who in four short years has restored America's faith in itself.

I believe in President Reagan and in what he stands for. I believe in our President not because I am a woman. Not because I am of Hispanic heritage. But above all because I am an American. I am an American who loves her country and all it stands for.

America stands for freedom --

for opportunity --
for the right of every individual, to fulfill his or her potential, as members of the family of God, not creatures of an almighty government.

And I believe in President Reagan not just because of what he says as a great communicator -- but because of what he has done as a great leader.

So let the Democrats run their campaign on rhetoric. We Republicans will run ours on the Reagan Record of Peace, Prosperity, and Pride in America.

We are going to campaign on that record and we are going to re-elect the Reagan Bush team in November.

But more than that: we are going to elect Republicans to the United States Senate and House who will give President Reagan the support he needs to finish the job he began in 1981.

The job of restoring the American people's confidence in our free institutions -- confidence eroded during the Carter Mondale years.

The job of regaining world respect in the search for peace -- respect lost when President Carter was in the White House -- Walter Mondale was his Vice President -- and 52 American Citizens were held hostage by a mob, for 444 days.

We have come a long way in four years -- from the shame of Tehran to the brave rescue of American students in Grenada.
We have come from the weak leadership of the Carter Mondale administration to the strength of the Reagan Bush administration.

We have come a long way -- and we are not going back to the Carter Mondale years, when a weak leadership left the door open for communist aggression -- from Afghanistan to our own hemisphere.

We are going forward -- forward, behind the decisive leadership of a president who has rebuilt America's defenses -- strengthened the western alliance -- and created conditions for a true, lasting peace based on reality, not wishful thinking.

President Reagan is the true candidate for peace in this year of decision -- a President who can and will achieve peace without caving in to Soviet threats.

Let there be no mistake.

The direction of America's foreign policy in the next four years is going to remain in the strong, capable hands of President Reagan and Vice President Bush -- not the indecisive, inexperienced hands of Walter Mondale and his running mate.

Finally, President Reagan will need help to finish the job of rebuilding our nation's economy.

Look at the Reagan record of economic recovery.

Our economy is growing.

More Americans are working than ever before in history.
Median family income is up -- in every segment of our population.

Inflation is under control

Think of how far we have come since the Carter Mondale years of double-digit inflation, 21 percent interest rates -- and economic misery.

Those were the hard facts of Carter Mondale economics -- the facts they didn't talk about at the Democratic convention last month.

Inflation -- high interest rates -- Americans on fixed incomes not able to make ends meet -- is that what Mr. Mondale meant in San Francisco when he talked about "fairness?"

Well, as the American people learned during those Carter Mondale years, liberal rhetoric does not put people back to work -- and it doesn't pay the bills.

Or is it "unfair" to recall those disastrous Carter Mondale years.

Walter Mondale says it is "unfair." He says he cannot see any point in re-running the campaign of 1980.

But don't think for a moment that Mr. Mondale wants to look to the future. What he really wants to do is forget 1980 --

And re-run the campaign of 1932.

Listen to the Democratic candidate for President and you hear the sound not of the future -- but of the distant past.
And that is not just a partisan Republican opinion, either. One of Mr. Mondale's fellow Democrats calls his economic program for America "A collection of old and tired ideas, held together by paralyzing commitments to special interests and constituency groups."

Now, I don't ordinarily agree with Gary Hart. But in this case, as Treasurer of the United States, I can say he was right on the money.

Do we need any better example of what Gary Hart said, than the old, tired idea Mr. Mondale trotted out as the major theme of his acceptance speech?

Mr. Mondale wants higher taxes.

And when Mr. Mondale came out for higher taxes to pay for the promises he made to get his party's nomination, millions of Americans who remember his record as Senator and Vice President just shook their heads and said --

"There he goes again."

Because Mr. Mondale's record -- from the day he first entered public life -- has been based on the idea of high taxes, big spending, and more government regulation.

And promises, promises, promises.

It is the same old story -- no matter how Mr. Mondale and other speakers at the Democratic convention tried to dress it up.

They talked about "family" -- but when they say "family," what they really mean is big government.
They talk about "values." But when they say "values," what they really mean is big government regulation.

And when they talk about "fairness" -- well, nobody's ever said it better than President Reagan: "The only thing "fair" about the economic programs the Democrats gave us during the Carter Mondale years is that they made everybody miserable."

And that's not just partisan Republican opinion. It is an opinion shared by millions of mainstream Democrats who voted for President Reagan in 1980, and are going to vote for him again in 1984.

Mainstream Democrats who this year supported Presidential candidates like John Glenn, Reubin Askew, and Ernest Hollings -- but who find they have been shut out of their traditional party home by the narrow interest groups in charge of last month's Democratic Convention.

Let Mr. Mondale look about him. He might see one Democratic party -- but in fact there are two Democratic parties in America this year.

There is the party that met in San Francisco last month -- the party of special interests -- the party of doom sayers -- the party of demagogues who look to America's future with fear, not hope.

Then there are those Democrats of the mainstream --

Democrats who, in the tradition of Harry Truman and John F. Kennedy, recognize the danger that communism poses to the hemisphere and the world.
Democrats who, whatever other differences we may have, share our Republican vision of America as the land of freedom and individual opportunity, not big government paternalism.

To those millions of Democrats abandoned by their national leadership in San Francisco -- Democrats who were shut out of their traditional party home --

We Republicans here in Dallas say --

We welcome you to our home.

Nuestra casa es su casa.

Our home is your home.

Join us now. Join us in November, so that the values we all believe in will prevail in 1984 with the re-election of President Reagan and Vice President Bush.

My fellow Americans --

On the minted dollar of the United States is the face of liberty --

The profile of the woman of the great statue whose centennial we celebrate in 1986.

The mid-term year of the second Reagan Administration.

Millions of our forebears came to this country through the portal where the Statue of Liberty stands. Millions came through other portals -- Latin America, Asia, and Africa.

Most of these succeeding generations of new Americans came to escape tyranny and to live their lives in freedom.

Others came not of their free will, but their descendants would in time find freedom and equality in a land that
never ceases to change -- to grow in spirit -- to offer new vistas of hope and opportunity for each new generation.

There is the face of Liberty on that coin -- and there are other symbols of American freedom.

There are the words, "In God We Trust" -- and the words "E Pluribus Unum."

"E Pluribus Unum" -- out of many, one. Out of the many states, out of the many states that joined to gain our freedom there was born one nation, indivisible.

This party -- our Republican party -- was born, in the spirit of Abraham Lincoln, to keep that nation one and indivisible.

Now in 1984, we Republicans still see our nation through Lincoln's eyes.

We see America not as a nation divided -- by region or race or creed or sex or ethnic group -- but as one people.

We all take pride in our individual heritage -- that which makes us unique. But the pride we pass on to future generations is the proud heritage of being Americans.

That was the vision of our country Ronald Reagan had when he accepted our party's nomination four years ago.

We remember his closing words at that convention in Detroit --

"God Bless America."

What better way to open this convention in Dallas?
What better way to open this convention that finds us one party, united, in one nation, united -- as we move forward toward an era of peace, prosperity and opportunity, behind the leadership of President Ronald Reagan.

What better way than to say --
From the heart --
Dios Bendiga A America --
God Bless America.
Thank you.
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Madame Chairman, my fellow Republicans, and my fellow Americans.

I accept your nomination and the honor and challenge it represents.

Four years ago in Detroit, I pledged my total dedication and energies to support our president. And that has been an easy pledge to keep. Tonight, I pledge again my every effort to support President Reagan as he leads this nation into four more years of prosperity, opportunity, and peace.

In 1980, America needed Governor Reagan in the White House to restore power to the grassroots and to give the American people fresh hope and a new beginning.

In 1984, America needs President Reagan in the White House for a second term to finish the job -- to keep this country moving forward.

But we can't move forward if we have a majority in Congress that wants to go back.

With your all-out effort, we will maintain control of the Unites States Senate -- and we'll get a House of Representataives that will move forward with President Reagan and the party of the future -- not backward with Tip O'Neill and the party of the past.
For over half a century, the liberal Democrats have pursued a philosophy of tax and spend; tax and spend.

And, sure enough, out of that Moscone Center in San Francisco, that Temple of Doom, came Mr. Mondale's first promise to raise everyone's taxes.

Well, Mr. Mondale calls this promise to raise taxes a lot of coverage, an act of courage. But it wasn't courage -- it was just habit, because he is a gold medal winner when it comes to increasing the tax burden of the American people.

Well, President Reagan, with strong support in Congress, cut tax rates across-the-board for every single American -- and he'll keep those rates cut.

The message the American people got from San Francisco was, "We'll raise your taxes." But, our message from Dallas is: the American people want less spending and less regulation, not more taxes.

They want to keep America's dynamic economy strong.

They want to reduce deficits by making government more efficient, holding the line on spending, and true economic growth.

And, as for a balanced budget, our message is this: let the big spenders in Congress step aside. Give us the Balanced Budget Amendment.

Give us the line item veto and watch what this president can do.
I heard that speaker in San Francisco last month exhorting his fellow Democrats with the cry, "Our time has come; our time has come."

The American people have a message for the tax raisers, the free spenders, the excess regulators -- the government-knows-best handwringers, those who would promise every special interest group everything -- and that message is: "your time has passed."

No matter how your rhetoric, no matter how your rhetoric tries to move away from your voting records; no matter how hard you try to turn your back on Jimmy Carter; no matter how much you now talk about family values, this country will not retreat. You've had your chance. Your time has passed.

This president has turned this country's economy around. Since we came into office, productivity is up, personal savings are up, consumer spending is up, housing starts are up, take-home pay is up, inflation -- the cruelest tax of all -- is down, and more Americans are at work than at any time in the history of the United States.

More Americans are enjoying our country because our parks are cleaner and our air is purer. Under this president, more lands have been acquired for parks, more for wilderness. The quality of life is better -- and that's a fact.

And you know, more Americans are giving to help others. Private contributions in the great tradition of neighbor helping neighbor are up -- and that's a fact.
At the same time, government help for the truly needy is up. The Social Security System has been strengthened and saved by our president's leadership and a truly bi-partisan effort in Congress.

More Americans now have a chance to quality education. Test scores are up in our schools. In striving for excellence we have re-emphasized fundamentals. We believe in teaching kids to read, and to write, and to add, and to subtract. We believe in classroom discipline and in merit pay for teachers. We believe in local control of schools. We believe kids should not be prohibited from prayer -- and that's a fact.

And we're waging all-out war against narcotics in our schools, in our neighborhoods and across the land. We will not rest until American society is free from the threat of drug-pushers -- and that's a fact.

More Americans are safe -- crime is down -- and that's a fact.

President Reagan and I think it's time that we worried less about the criminals and more about the victims of crime.

As for our judicial system, it's always been my view that the Supreme Court should not be all caught up and involved in the political arena. But since the Democrats made this an issue in San Francisco, let me say that the American people want a Supreme Court that will interpret the Constitution, and not legislate.
We heard that liberal convention in San Francisco attack the President regarding the Supreme Court. But the record shows that President Reagan's sole appointment to the Court, Sandra Day O'Connor, is an outstanding Justice -- and that's a fact.

And one more fact, and let this be heard loud and clear: Ronald Reagan has protected and will continue to protect the rights of all Americans. Discrimination based on race, religion, sex or age will never be tolerated by this president nor this vice president. And furthermore, we condemn the vicious anti-semitism of Louis Farrakhan and the ugly bigotry of the Ku Klux Klan.

Of course problems remain, of course problems remain, and, yes, there's still much to be done to provide opportunity for those Americans who truly need help. But the answer doesn't lie in going back to the "malaise" days of Carter and Mondale.

The answer doesn't lie in Mr. Mondale's new spending programs -- programs that John Glenn estimated would cost up to $170 billion more in spending; or in Mondale deficits that Fritz Hollings estimated at $400 billion. It doesn't lie in the programs of a man that Gary Hart called "mush."

Instead, the answer lies in a dynamic private sector that provides jobs, jobs with dignity. The answer lies in limited government and unlimited confidence in the American people.
Just as there is a new confidence -- a new optimism -- there is new confidence in U.S. leadership around the world. Since becoming vice president, I've gone to 59 countries. Talked to the leaders of those countries and to many other foreign leaders who have come here.

Forgotten is the Carter-Mondale era of vacillation -- of weakness -- of lecturing to our friends, and then letting them down.

In this hemisphere, when 1000 American lives were threatened and when four small Caribbean countries called out for U.S. support to give democracy a chance, President Reagan acted.

And I don't care what Walter Mondale says about it or what Tip O'Neill says about it, Grenada was a proud moment in the history of the United States of America.

Because our president stood firm in defense of freedom, America has regained respect throughout the world. And because President Reagan has made America stronger, chances for world peace -- true, lasting peace -- are stonger.

Our European alliance has never been more solid.

More countries in Central and South America have turned to democracy since Ronald Reagan became president. Thirteen Latin American countries have held democratic elections since 1980.

We have strengthened our friendships with countries in the Pacific. We are doing more to foster democratic change
and to help the hungry in Africa. We are reaching out to more countries in the Middle East, and our strategic relations with Israel have never been stronger.

And one last point on foreign affairs. I am proud to serve with a president who is working for peace and, and I am proud to serve with a president who doesn't go around apologizing for the United States of America.

As vice president, I've had the opportunity to watch this president in action. I've seen a real leader make tough decisions.

No longer do we read and hear stories about the job of president being too big for any one person. Gone are the days of blaming the American people for what was really a failure not of the people, but of our national leadership.

Four years ago, we came into office to restore our economy, expand opportunity for all Americans, and secure a lasting peace.

Much has been done. Much remains to be done.

But this we know: More Americans today believe we have strong, principled, firm leadership in the White House.

This is the message we will take from this convention -- a message of optimism -- a message of hope.

Three decades ago, a great American president stood on the Capitol steps and made his second inaugural address.

"May we pursue the right without self-righteousness," said Dwight Eisenhower.
"May we know unity without conformity."

"May we grow in strength without pride in self."

"May we, in our dealings with all people of the earth, ever speak truth and serve justice."

And finally, said President Eisenhower, "May the light of freedom . . . flame brightly, until at last the darkness is no more."

Now, as in President Eisenhower's day, these words reflect the true spirit and aspirations of the American people.

May we continue to keep the light of freedom burning. And may we continue to move forward in the next four years -- on the high road to peace, prosperity and opportunity -- united behind a great president, Ronald Reagan.

Thank you all very, very much.
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Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, delegates to this convention, and fellow citizens:

In 75 days, I hope we enjoy a victory that is the size of the heart of Texas. Nancy and I extend our deep thanks to the lone star state and the "Big D" -- the city of Dallas -- for all their warmth and hospitality.

Four years ago I didn't know precisely every duty of this office, and not too long ago, I learned about some new ones from the first graders of Corpus Christi School in Chambersburg, Pennsylvania. Little Leah Kline was asked by her teacher to describe my duties. She said: "The president goes to meetings. He helps the animals. The president gets frustrated. He talks to other presidents."

How does wisdom begin at such an early age? Tonight, with a full heart and deep gratitude for your trust, I accept your nomination for the presidency of the United States.

I will campaign on behalf of the principles of our party which lift America confidently into the future.

America is presented with the clearest political choice of half a century. The distinction between our two parties and the different philosophy of our political opponents are at the heart of this campaign and America's future.
I've been campaigning long enough to know that a political party and its leadership can't change their colors in four days. We won't, and no matter how hard they tried, our opponents didn't in San Francisco.

We didn't discover our values in a poll taken a week before the convention. And we didn't set a weathervane on top of the Golden Gate Bridge before we started talking about the American family.

The choices this year are not just between two different personalities, or between two political parties. They are between two different visions of the future, two fundamentally different ways of governing -- their government of pessimism, fear, and limits ... or ours of hope, confidence, and growth.

Their government sees people only as members of groups ... ours serves all the people of America as individuals. Theirs lives in the past, seeking to apply the old and failed policies to an era that has passed them by ... ours learns from the past and strives to change by boldly charting a new course for the future.

Their lives by promises, the bigger, the better. We offer proven, workable answers.

Our opponents began this campaign hoping that America has a poor memory. Well, let's take them on a little stroll down memory lane and remind them of how a 4.8 percent inflation rate in 1976 became back-to-back years of double-digit
Inflation -- the worst since World War I -- punishing the poor and the elderly, young couples striving to start their new lives, and working people struggling to make ends meet.

Inflation was not some plague borne on the wind, it was a deliberate part of their official economic policy needed, they said, to maintain prosperity. They didn't tell us that with it would come the highest interest rates since the Civil War.

As average monthly mortgage payments more than doubled, home building nearly ground to a halt, tens of thousands of carpenters were thrown out of work. And who controlled both houses of the Congress and the Executive Branch at that time? Not us, not us.

Campaigning across America in 1980, we saw evidence everywhere of industrial decline. And in rural America, farmers' costs were driven up by inflation; they were devastated by wrongheaded grain embargo, and were forced to borrow money at exorbitant interest rates just to get by. And, many of them didn't get by. Farmers have to fight insects, weather, and the marketplace -- they shouldn't have to fight their own government.

The high interest rates of 1980 were not talked about in San Francisco.

But how about taxes. They were talked about in San Francisco. Will Rogers once said he never met a man he didn't like. If I could paraphrase Will, our friends in the
other party have never met a tax they didn't like . . . they didn't like or hike. Under their policies, tax rates have gone up three times as much for families with children as they have for everyone else over these past three decades. In just the five years before we came into office, taxes roughly doubled.

Some who spoke so loudly in San Francisco of fairness were among those who brought about the biggest, single, individual tax increase in our history in 1977, calling for a series of increases in the Social Security payroll tax and in the amount of pay subject to that tax. The bill they passed called for two additional increases between now and 1990, increases that bear down hardest on those at the lower income levels.

The Census Bureau confirms that, because of the tax laws we inherited, the number of households at or below the poverty level paying Federal Income Tax more than doubled between 1980 and 1982. Well, they received some relief in 1983 when our across-the-board tax cut was fully in place, and they'll get help when indexing goes into effect this January. Our opponents have repeatedly advocated eliminating indexing. Would that really hurt the rich? No, because the rich are already in top brackets. But those working men and women who depend on a cost-of-living adjustment to keep abreast of inflation would find themselves pushed into a higher tax bracket and wouldn't keep even with inflation because they'd
be paying a higher income tax. That's "Bracket Creep" and our opponents are for it; we're against it.

It's up to us to see that all our fellow citizens understand that confiscatory taxes, costly social experiments and economic tinkering were not just the policies of a single administration. For the 26 years prior to January of 1981, the opposition party controlled both houses of Congress. Every spending bill and every tax for more than a quarter of a century has been of their doing.

About a decade ago, they said federal spending was out of control, so they passed a budget control act, and, in the next five years, ran up deficits of $260 billion.

In 1981 we gained control of the Senate and the Executive branch. With the help of some concerned Democrats in the House we started a policy of tightening the federal budget instead of the family budget. A task force chaired by Vice President George Bush, the finest vice president this country has ever had, it eliminated unnecessary regulations that had been strangling business and industry.

And while we have our friends down memory lane, maybe they'd like to recall a gimmick they designed for their 1976 campaign. As President Ford told us the night before last, adding the unemployment and inflation rates, they got what they called a misery index -- in '76 it came to 12 1/2 percent. They declared the incumbent had no right to seek re-election with that kind of a misery index.
Four years ago in the 1980 election, they didn't mention the misery index. Possibly because it was then over 20 percent.

And do you know something? They won't mention it in this election either; it's down to 11.6, and dropping.

By nearly every measure, the position of poor Americans worsened under the leadership of our opponents. Teenage drug use, out-of-wedlock births, and crime increased dramatically, urban neighborhoods and schools deteriorated. Those whom government intended to help discovered a cycle of dependency that could not be broken. Government became a drug -- providing temporary relief, but addiction as well.

And let's get some facts on the table that our opponents don't want to hear. The biggest annual increase in poverty took place between 1978 and 1981 -- over 9 percent each year. In the first two years of our administration, well I should say, pardon me I didn't put a period in there, first two years of our administration, that annual increase fell to 5.3 percent. And 1983 was the first year since 1978 that there was no appreciable increase in poverty at all.

Pouring hundreds of billions of dollars into programs in order to make people worse off was irrational and unfair.

It was time we ended this reliance on the government process and renewed our faith in the human process.

In 1980, the people decided with us that the economic crisis was not caused by the fact that they lived too well. Government lived too well.
It was time for tax increases to be an act of last resort, not of first resort.

The people told the liberal leadership in Washington, "Try shrinking the size of government before you shrink the size of our paychecks."

Our government was also in serious trouble abroad. We had aircraft that couldn't fly and ships that couldn't leave port. Many of our military were on food stamps because of meager earnings, and re-enlistments were down. Ammunition was low, and spare parts were in short supply.

Many of our allies mistrusted us. In the four years before we took office, country after country fell under the Soviet yoke. Since January 20, 1981, not one more inch of soil has fallen to the communists.

But worst of all, Americans were losing the confidence and optimism about the future that has made us unique in the world. Parents were beginning to doubt that their children would have the better life that has been the dream of every American generation.

We can all be proud that pessimism is ended. America is coming back and is more confident than ever about the future.

Tonight, we thank the citizens of the United States -- whose faith, and unwillingness to give up on themselves or this country, saved us all.

Together, we began the task of controlling the size and activities of the government by reducing the growth of its
spending while passing a tax program to provide incentives to increase productivity for both workers and industry. Today, a working family earning $25,000 has about $2,900 more in purchasing power than if tax and inflation rates were still at 1980 levels.

Today, of all the major industrial nations of the world, America has the strongest economic growth; one of the lowest inflation rates; the fastest rate of job creation -- six-and-a-half million jobs in the last year-and-a-half; a record 600,000 business incorporations in 1983; and the largest increase in real, after-tax personal income since World War II. We're enjoying the highest level of business investment in history, and America has renewed its leadership in developing the vast new opportunities in science and high technology.

America is on the move again, and expanding towards new eras of opportunity for everyone. Now, we're accused of having a secret. Well, if we have, it is that we're going to keep the mighty engine of this nation revved up. And that means a future of sustained economic growth without inflation that's going to create for our children and grandchildren a prosperity that finally will last.

Today, today, our troops have newer and better equipment, their morale is higher. The better armed they are, the less likely it is they will have to use that equipment. But if, heaven forbid, they're ever called upon to defend this nation, nothing would be more immoral than asking them to do so with weapons inferior to those of any possible opponent.
We have also begun to repair our valuable alliances, especially our historic NATO Alliance. Extensive discussions in Asia have enabled us to start a new round of diplomatic progress there. In the Middle East, it remains difficult to bring an end to historic conflicts -- but we are not discouraged. And we shall always maintain our pledge never to sell out one of our closest friends -- the state of Israel.

Closer to home, there remains a struggle for survival for free Latin American states -- allies of ours, they valiantly struggle to prevent communist takeovers fueled massively by the Soviet Union and Cuba. Our policy is simple: we are not going to betray our friends, reward the enemies of freedom, or permit fear and retreat to become American policies -- especially in this hemisphere. None of the four wars in my lifetime came about because we were too strong. It is weakness, it is weakness that invites adventurous adversaries to make mistaken judgments.

America is the most peaceful, least war-like nation in modern history. We are not the cause of all the ills of the world. We're a patient and generous people. But for the sake of our freedom and that of others, we cannot permit our reserve to be confused with a lack of resolve.

Ten months ago, we displayed this resolve in a mission to rescue American students on the imprisoned island of Grenada. Democratic candidates have suggested that this could be likened to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the
crushing of human rights in Poland or the genocide in Cambodia. Could you imagine Harry Truman, John Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey or Scoop Jackson making such a shocking comparison?

Nineteen of our fine young men lost their lives on Grenada, and to even remotely compare their sacrifice to the murderous actions taking place in Afghanistan is unconscionable.

There are some obvious and important differences. First, we were invited in by six east Caribbean states. Does anyone seriously believe the people of Eastern Europe, or Afghanistan invited the Russians? Second, there are hundreds of thousands of Soviets occupying captive nations across the world. Today, our combat troops have come home, our students are safe, and freedom is what we left behind in Grenada.

There are some who have forgotten why we have a military, it's not to promote war. It's to be prepared for peace. There is a sign over the entrance to Fairchild Air Force Base in Washington state, that sign, that sign, that sign says it all: "Peace is our profession."

Our next administration, I heard you and that administration will be committed to completing the unfinished agenda we have placed before the Congress and the nation. It is an agenda which calls upon the national Democratic leadership to cease its obstructionist ways.

We have heard a lot about deficits this year from those on the other side of the aisle. Well, they should be experts
on budget deficits. They've spent most of their political careers creating deficits. For 42 of the last 50 years, they have controlled both houses of the Congress. And for almost all of those 50 years, deficit spending has been their deliberate policy. Now, however, they call for an end to deficits -- they call them ours, yet at the same time the leadership of their party resists our every effort to bring federal spending under control. For three years straight they have prevented us from adopting a balanced budget amendment to the constitution. We will continue to fight for that amendment mandating that government spend no more than government takes in, and we will fight as the vice president told you for the right of a president to veto items in appropriations bills without having to veto the entire bill. There is no better way than the line-item veto -- now used by governors in 43 states -- to cut out waste in government. I know, as governor of California, I successfully made such vetos over 900 times.

Now their candidate, it would appear, has only recently found deficits alarming. Nearly 10 years ago he insisted that a $52 billion deficit should be allowed to get much bigger in order to lower unemployment and said that sometimes we "need a deficit in order to stimulate the economy."

As senator, he voted to override President Ford's veto of billions of dollars in spending bills and then voted no on a proposal to cut the 1976 deficit in half.
Was anyone surprised by his pledge to raise your taxes next year if given the chance? In the Senate, he voted time and again for new taxes, including a 10 percent income tax surcharge, higher taxes on certain consumer items. He also voted against cutting the excise tax on automobiles.

And he was part and parcel of that biggest, single, individual tax increase in history -- the Social Security Payroll Tax of 1977. It trippled the maximum tax and still didn't make the system solvent.

If our opponents were as vigorous in supporting our voluntary prayer amendment as they are in raising taxes, maybe we could get the Lord back in the schoolrooms and drugs and violence out.

Something else, something else illustrates the nature of the choice Americans must make. While we've been hearing a lot of tough talk on crime from our opponents, the house Democratic leadership continues to block a critical anti-crime bill that passed the Republican senate by a 91-1 vote. Their burial of this bill means that you and your families will have to wait for even safer homes and streets.

There's no longer any good reason to hold that passage of tuition tax credit legislation. Millions of average parents pay their full share of taxes to support public schools while choosing to send their children to parochial or other independent schools. Doesn't fairness dictate that they should have some help in carrying a double burden?
When we talk of the plight of our cities, what would help more than our enterprise zones bill which provides tax incentives for private industry to help rebuild and restore decayed areas in 75 sites all across America? If they really wanted a future of boundless new opportunities for our citizens, why have they buried enterprise zones over the years in committee?

Our opponents are openly committed to increasing your tax burden. We are committed to stopping them, and we will.

They call their policy the "New Realism." But their "New Realism" is just the "Old Liberalism." They will place higher and higher taxes on small businesses, on family farms, and on every other working family so that government may once again grow at the people's expense. We could say they spend money like drunken sailors but that would be unfair to drunken sailors, all right I agree, all right I was going to say it would be unfair because the sailors are spending their own money.

Our tax policies are and will remain pro-work, pro-growth, and pro-family. We intend to simplify the entire tax system; to make taxes more fair, easier to understand and, most important, to bring the tax rates of every American further down, not up. Now, if we bring them down far enough, growth will continue strong; the underground economy will shrink; the world will beat a path to our door; and no one will be able to hold America back; and the future will be ours.
Another part of our future, the greatest challenge of all, is to reduce the risk of nuclear war by reducing the levels of nuclear arms. I have addressed parliaments, have spoken to parliaments in Europe and Asia during these last 3 1/2 years declaring that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought. And those words were greeted with spontaneous applause.

There are only two nations who by their agreement can rid the world of these doomsday weapons, the United States of America and the Soviet Union. For the sake of our children and the safety of this earth, we ask the Soviets -- who have walked out of our negotiations -- to join us in reducing and, yes, ridding the earth of this awful threat.

When we leave this hall tonight, we begin to place these clear choices before our fellow citizens. We must not let them be confused by those who still think that G.N.P. stands for Gross National Promises.

But after the debates, position papers, speeches, conventions, television commercials, primaries, caucuses, and slogans -- after all this, is there really any doubt at all about what will happen if we let them win this November?

-- Is there any doubt that they will raise our taxes?
-- That they will send inflation into orbit again?
-- That they will make government bigger than ever and deficits even worse?
-- Raise Unemployment?
-- Cut back our defense preparedness?
-- Raise interest rates?
-- Make unilateral and unwise concessions to the Soviet Union?

And all in the name of compassion.

It's what they've done to America in the past. But if we do our job right, they won't be able to do it again.

It's getting late, in 1980 we asked the people of America: are you better off than you were four years ago?

Well the people answered then by choosing us to bring about a change. We have every reason now, four years later, to ask that same question again, for we have made a change and the American people joined and helped us.

Let us ask for their help again to renew the mandate of 1980, to move us further forward on the road we presently travel, the road of common sense; of people in control of their own destiny; the road leading to prosperity and economic expansion in a world at peace.

As we ask for their help, we should also answer the central questions of public service: why are we here? What do we believe in? Well for one thing, we are here to see that government continues to serve the people and not the other way around. Yes, government should do all that is necessary, but only that which is necessary.

We don't lump people by groups or special interests. And, let me add, in the party of Lincoln, there is no room
for intolerance, and, not even a small corner for anti-semitism or bigotry of any kind. Many people are welcome in our house, but not the bigots.

We believe in the uniqueness of each individual. We believe in the sacredness of human life. For some time now we have all fallen into a pattern of describing our choice as left or right. It has become standard rhetoric in discussions of political philosophy. But is that an accurate description of the choice before us?

Go back a few years to the origin of the terms and see where left or right would take us if we continued far enough in either direction. Stalin . . . Hitler. One would take us to communist totalitarianism -- the other to the totalitarianism of Hitler.

Isn't our choice really not one of left or right, but of up or down: down through statism, the welfare state, more and more government largesse, accompanied always by more government authority, less individual liberty and ultimately totalitarianism, always advanced as for our own good. The alternative is the dream conceived by our founding fathers, up, to the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with an orderly society.

We don't celebrate Dependence Day on the Fourth of July. We celebrate Independence Day. The right of each individual to be recognized as unique, possessed of dignity and the sacred right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.
At the same time, with our independence goes a generosity of spirit more evident here than in almost any other part of the world. Recognizing the equality of all men and women, we are able and willing to lift the weak, cradle those who hurt, and nurture the bonds that tie us together as a nation, one nation under God.

Finally, we are here to shield our liberties, not just for now or for a few years, but forever.

Could I share a personal thought with you tonight? Cause tonight's kind of special for me. It is the last time, of course, that I address you under these circumstances. I hope you'll invite me back to future conventions.

Nancy and I will be forever grateful for the honor you have done us, for the opportunity to serve, and for your friendship and trust.

I began political life as a Democrat, casting my first vote in 1932 for Franklin Delano Roosevelt. That year, the Democrats called for a 25 percent reduction in the cost of government by abolishing useless commissions and offices and consolidating departments and bureaus, and giving more authority to state governments.

As the years went by and those promises were forgotten, did I leave the Democratic Party or did the leadership of that party leave not just me but millions of patriotic Democrats who believed in the principles and philosophy of that platform? One of the first to declare this was so, a former
Democratic nominee for president -- Al Smith, the Happy Warrior -- who went before our nation in 1936 to say on radio that he could no longer follow his party's leadership, and that he was "taking a walk."

As Democratic leaders have taken their party further and further away from its first principles, it's no surprise that so many responsible Democrats feel that our platform is closer to their views, and we welcome them to our side.

Four years ago we raised a banner of bold colors -- no pale pastels. We proclaimed a dream of an America that would be "a shining city on a hill."

We promised we'd reduce the growth of the federal government, and we have. We said we intended to reduce interest rates and inflation, and we have. We said we would reduce taxes to provide incentives for individuals and business to get our economy moving again, we said and we have. We said there must be jobs with a future for our people, not government make-work programs, and, in the last 19 months, 6 1/2 million new jobs in the private sector have been created. We said we would once again be respected throughout the world, and we are. We said we would restore our ability to protect our freedom on land, sea, and in the air, and we have.

We bring to the American citizens in this election year a record of accomplishment and the promise of continuation.

We came together in a "National crusade to make America great again," and to make "A new beginning."
Well, now, it's all coming together. With our beloved nation at peace, we are in the midst of a springtime of hope for America. Greatness lies ahead of us.

Holding the Olympic Games here in the United States began defining the promise of this season.

All through the spring and summer, we marveled at the journey of the Olympic torch as it made its passage, east to west. Over 9,000 miles, by some 4,000 runners, that flame crossed a portrait of our nation.

From our Gotham City, New York, to the Cradle of Liberty, Boston, across the lovely Appalachian springtime, to the City of the Big Shoulders, Chicago. Moving south towards Atlanta, over to St. Louis past its Gateway Arch, across wheat fields into the stark beauty of the southwest and then up into the still snow-capped rockies. And, after circling the greening northwest, it came down to California, across the Golden Gate and finally into Los Angeles.

And all along the way, that torch became a celebration of America. And, we all became participants in the celebration.

Each new story was typical of this land of ours. There was Ansel Stubbs, a youngster of 99, who passed the torch in Kansas to 4-year-old Katie Johnson. In Pineville, Kentucky, it came at 1:00 a.m., so hundreds of people lined the streets with candles. At Tupelo, Mississippi, at 7:00 a.m. on a Sunday morning, a robed church choir sang "God Bless America" as the torch went by.
That torch went through the Cumberland Gap, past the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial, down the Santa Fe trail and alongside Billy the Kid's grave.

In Richardson, Texas, it was carried by a 14-year-old boy in a special wheelchair. In West Virginia, the runner came across a line of deaf children and let each one pass the torch for a few feet, and at the end those youngsters' hands talked excitedly in their sign language. Crowds spontaneously began singing "America the Beautiful" or "The Battle Hymn of the Republic."

And then, in San Francisco, a Vietnamese immigrant, his little son held on his shoulders, dodged photographers and policemen to cheer a 19-year-old black man pushing an 88-year-old white woman in a wheelchair as she carried the torch.

My friends, that's America.

We cheered in Los Angeles as the flame was carried in and the giant Olympic torch burst into a billowing fire in front of the teams, the youth of 140 nations assembled on the floor of the coliseum. And in that moment, maybe you were struck as I was with the uniqueness of what was taking place before 100,000 people in the stadium, most of them citizens of our country, and over a billion worldwide watching on television. There were athletes representing 140 countries here to compete in the one country in all the world whose people carry the bloodlines of all those 140 countries and
more. Only in the United States is there such a rich mixture of races, creeds, and nationalities -- only in our melting pot.

And that brings to mind another torch, the one that greeted so many of our parents and grandparents. Just this past Fourth of July, the torch atop the Statue of Liberty was hoisted down for replacement. We can be forgiven for thinking maybe it was just worn out from lighting the way to freedom for 17 million new Americans. So now we'll put up a new one.

The poet called Miss Liberty's torch the "Lamp beside the golden door." The golden door -- that was the entrance to America and it still is. And now you really know why we are here tonight.

The glistening hope of that lamp is still ours. Every promise, every opportunity is still golden in this land. And through that golden door our children can walk into tomorrow with the knowledge that no one can be denied the promise that is America.

Her heart is full; her door is still golden, her future bright. She has arms big enough to comfort and strong enough to support. For the strength in her arms is the strength of her people. She will carry on in the eighties unafraid, unashamed, and unsurpassed.

In this springtime of hope, some lights seem eternal, America's is.

Thank you, God Bless You, and God Bless America.
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