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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze keynote speaking in Republican national conventions from 1856 to 1964. The study sought to determine the purposes and characteristics of the keynote speech and to analyze the methods and significance of the Republican keynote speaker. Specifically, the question posed by this study was: When viewed as a genre—as a type or kind of speech—what are the inherently unique features of the Republican keynote address? As it appears in this study, the keynote speech is a long, often vitriolic, usually ill-supported, carefully prepared, well publicized speech, that historically has been designed to stimulate, convince, or persuade both the delegates and the public of the desirability or undesirability of a course of action, an administration, a party, a party faction, or an individual. In recent years, the speech has been increasingly directed to radio, television, and the press rather than to the assembled delegates and guests. Additionally, the speech usually reflects the position of the party rather than merely voicing the opinions of the speaker. This keynote speech
has long been a part of convention activity.

In order to examine the highly complex relationship that exists among keynoter, party, occasion, and delegate, this study attempted to ferret out recurring ideas, themes, methods of argument, and forms of support, rather than to discuss techniques or ideas that occurred only occasionally.

The keynote speech is an integral part of the observable convention, and often is not designed to function as a kind of deliberative rhetoric. As this study points out, a national political convention usually has, in addition to its deliberative function, a campaign-rally function, a cohesive function, a compromising function, a propaganda function, and a ratifying function. In order to ascertain the relationship of the keynoter to these various functions several categories of convention criticisms were examined.

The keynote speakers

There was no single rationale for selecting a keynote speaker in Republican national conventions. Newspaper writers, scholars, and casual observers, as well as delegates and members of the Republican hierarchy agreed that the speaker should have some degree of oratorical ability. Another frequently mentioned characteristic of the person
selected as keynoter was his political prowess. Most of the keynoters seemed to fall into two rather distinct categories: (1) men who already possessed considerable power and prestige, and (2) men who were being groomed by the party for possible future leadership. Additional considerations included geography, the speaker's appearance, or intraparty power struggles.

The theme most characteristic of Republican keynoting was that "our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders." This theme was most often supported by appeals to patriotism, emotive language, assertion, specific instances, rhetorical questions, authority, lists of beneficial legislation, and appeals for morality.

A second characteristic theme charged that the "Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism." This idea was most often supported by negative ethos, and by assertion, rhetorical questions, comparison, sarcasm, ridicule and humor. The remaining eight major themes were: (3) We need unity and harmony; (4) America is wonderful; (5) Our fiscal policies are excellent; (6) The centralization of power is dangerous; we are concerned for the individual American citizen; (7) Our policies provide an
impetus for business and manufacturing; (8) Our policies aid the labor force; (9) Our policies are of benefit to agriculture; and (10) Our policies on tariff and trade are sound.

Although drastic changes have occurred in the evolution of the Republican keynote speech, the speech has not become a purposeless vestige of the convention.
The use of a national party convention as a method for nominating candidates for president and vice-president dates back in an unbroken line to the election of 1832. Richard C. Bain has remarked that "neither the virility of the system nor the general public acceptance of convention decisions as legitimate—for a period of one hundred and thirty years—can be attributed to chance."\(^1\)

It has long been argued that the bombastic oratory and emotional demonstrations that accompany nominating conventions are undignified and purposeless activities. Bain thinks that

\[ \ldots \text{there is considerable justification for the criticism, especially if conventions are thought of simply as agencies for making nominations and developing a party platform. These functions are indeed the central reason for the existence of the system as an institution—but they are also functions that must depend heavily on the enthusiastic and devoted participation of a vast number of people.}\(^2\)

One of the activities that has traditionally evoked enthusiasm and widespread attention has been the keynote speech.


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 7.
This speech, which was classified by Mark Sullivan as "a combination of oratory, grand opera and hog-calling," is the subject of this study.

KEYNOTING DEFINED

Traditionally, the speech of the temporary chairman of the convention has been labeled as the keynote speech. The only three exceptions to this procedure occurred in the Republican national conventions of 1952, 1956, and 1960. In these years, the Republican national committee created two separate positions—a temporary chairman to preside while the permanent organization was being formed and a keynote speaker whose sole responsibility was to give a speech. In their 1964 convention, the Republicans returned to the earlier practice of having the temporary chairman deliver the keynote.

Definitions of the keynote speech and the keynote speaker have ranged from serious analysis to ridicule; many writers, however, have merely ignored the existence of the institution.

Writing in the Dictionary of Civics and Government, Marjorie Tallman defines the keynote speech as "the address delivered by the temporary chairman of a National Nominating Convention which in flamboyant style reviews the political situation attempts to heal discords, and urges the
gathering on to greater efforts for victory. . . ." 3 Sperber and Trittschuh attempt to define keynoting in terms of its historical development: (a) keynoting in American politics originally referred to any act or agency which set the dominant tone for public acts; (b) "a definite statement to which a party attunes its campaign"; and (c) "that a further narrowing is found in the 20th century when the keynote address becomes a regular feature of the party convention: the speech which calls upon the party to accept the challenges for which it is so eminently suited." (These writers also include a statement attributed to Will Rogers that "a keynote speech is press notices of the Republican Party written by its own members."). 4 Another authority, Eugene J. McCarthy, states that the keynote speech is

... an address to the convention designed to arouse the delegates' enthusiasm and to promote a sense of loyalty and unity to one's party. The keynote address is usually given early in the proceedings of the convention. Sometimes it has a decisive impact on the convention and also on the campaign, either in setting the general tone for the party effort, in arousing enthusiasm for major candidates, or in actually developing a candidate. 5

Writing in the 1964 Guide to Conventions and Elections, S. M.


Mirkin defines a keynoter as "a politician who delivers the keynote address early in a convention's proceedings; this address is the party's theme song, outlining its ideals and objectives." The keynote speech, as it appears in this study, is a long, often vitriolic, usually ill-supported, carefully prepared, well publicized speech, that historically has been designed to stimulate, convince or persuade both the delegates and the public of the desirability or undesirability of a course of action, an administration, a party, a party faction, or an individual. In recent years, the speech has been increasingly directed to radio, television, and the press rather than to the assembled delegates and guests. Additionally, the speech usually reflects the position of the party rather than merely voicing the opinions of the speaker. This keynote speech has long been a part of convention activity.

WHY STUDY KEYNOTING IN REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTIONS?

The writer feels that there are six reasons why a study of Republican keynoting is necessary. First, the fact that the keynote address has existed for over a hundred years

---


7 For a detailed discussion of the functions and purposes of the keynote speech, refer to Chapter IV.
appears to indicate that it has at least minor importance in the affairs of the convention. Both David and Bain have suggested that an organization with widespread membership needs a periodic convocation where members of the laity can mingle with the professional leadership and that all such gatherings have "characteristically featured some sort of ritual or display . . . of whatever kind, such manifestations are meant to instill in an organization's membership a sense of belonging to the group."^8 Second, the keynote speech is worthy of study because of the outstanding speakers who have often served as keynoter. Included in this group of influential men are Earl Warren, Elihu Root, Douglas MacArthur, Warren G. Harding, Charles W. Fairbanks, and Harold Stassen. In his preface to *The Politics of National Party Conventions*, Paul T. David suggests a third reason for studying keynoting by observing that,

. . . the more clearly the operations of these institutions are seen and understood, the more readily it will be possible to devise efforts designed to improve their effectiveness in the general service of government—and the easier it will be to stave off changes that might be adverse to the general welfare. This, fundamentally, is the most weighty practical reason for pursuing the study of the details and interrelationships of that central political operation, the choice of presidential candidates.9

A fourth reason for studying keynoting is the widespread


attention and publicity that the speech receives. A study conducted at the University of Miami showed that "there was more viewing of the MacArthur speech (59.3 per cent) than of any other convention or post convention political event in the 1952 campaign." This rating compares with 52.1 for Hoover's speech, 48.8 for Eisenhower's acceptance speech, and 38.3 for Stevenson's acceptance speech. In addition to radio and television coverage, newspapers and magazines begin to speculate on the national committee's choice for this spot. As the day of the convention approaches, the keynoter is headline news. Magazines print biographies of the speakers; newspapers follow the progress of the preparation of the speech. On the day after the speech, most of the major newspapers across the country carry copies of the address. Columnists and editorialists are provoked into writing long essays on what the keynoter did or did not say.

Fifth, the study of Republican keynoting offers an opportunity to examine the evolution of this kind of speaking. In spite of the bulk of commentary on keynote speaking, only E. Neal Claussen's study of Democratic keynoting offers a complete and thorough treatment of the institution. Claussen analyzed the history of keynoting in Democratic national conventions from 1832 to 1960. When paralleled with


12 Ibid.
Claussen's study of the Democratic keynoter, this study will provide a complete picture of keynote speaking in American national political conventions. Paul T. David has stated that "the job has to start somewhere, and any contribution to a better understanding of the nominating process in its relationship to the party system would seem sufficiently important to justify substantial efforts." A composite picture of keynoting in America can contribute to this understanding. Finally, the writer is in agreement with Gerald Pomper's observation that with the exception of the studies conducted by the Brookings Institution, scant research has been published on conventions *per se*. Pomper points out that "it is surprising that so little serious attention has been devoted to the method of selecting the national candidates . . . many matters . . . still require investigation."  

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

This study analyzes the speaking of the keynoter in Republican national conventions from 1856 to 1964. Although the keynote speeches given prior to 1900 seem to be of little significance, the writer feels that the inclusion of these early years will aid in understanding the development of the modern keynoter.

---


The problem posed by this study is to determine the purposes and characteristics of the keynote speech and to analyze the methods and significance of the Republican keynote speaker. When viewed as a genre—as a type or kind of speech—what are the inherently unique features of the Republican keynote address?

In order to understand fully the social and political setting in which the twenty-seven keynote speeches were delivered, Chapter II analyzes the nature of conventions and convention audiences.

Chapter III discusses the keynote speakers and attempts to answer the following questions:

Qualifications

Who were the keynoters and what qualities or qualifications did they possess?

What common characteristics or qualities can be observed among all twenty-seven keynoters?

What rationale does the national committee use when they select a keynoter?

Method of selection

What is the role of the arrangements committee and the national chairman in the selection of the keynoter?

What are the attitudes of the delegates regarding the selection of the keynoter?

Chapter IV presents general information about the speeches and attempts to answer the following questions:

Convention organization

What is the place of the speech in the convention organization?
Function and purpose of the speech

What are the views of newspaper writers, casual observers, delegates, members of the Republican leadership and the keynoters themselves about the purpose of the speech?

Do the specific purposes of the keynote speeches vary?

Chapter V analyzes the speeches and attempts to provide answers to the following questions:

Logical appeals

What common themes and arguments occur repeatedly?

How did the speakers support their ideas?

Pathetic appeals

What motive appeals are most often used?

Do the speeches reveal the use of popular symbols and heroes?

Is the style highly emotive?

Ethical appeals

Do the ethical proofs establish the credibility of the speaker or of his party?

Organizational techniques

Do the speeches reveal common organizational techniques in partitioning or development?

The concluding chapter seeks to answer the following questions:

What are the inherently unique features of the Republican keynote address?

What is the significance of Republican keynoting?

What major changes have occurred during the evolution of this speech?
METHOD OF DEVELOPMENT

This study examines the highly complex relationship that exists among keynoter, party, occasion, and delegate. Rather than using a traditional rhetorical pattern of analysis based on the five canons of invention, organization, style, memory, and delivery, the study focuses attention on keynoting as a type or kind of speaking. Consequently, the effort has been to ferret out recurring ideas, themes, methods of argument, and forms of support, rather than discussing techniques or ideas that occurred only occasionally.

Since this study concerns a class or type of speaking rather than the effectiveness of a speaker in any single given situation, a collective approach to the twenty-seven speakers and speeches seems desirable. It is only when we may view all of the arguments used in all of the keynote speeches that we can determine which arguments can be classified as "typical" or "representative." The same rationale applies to the selection of the speakers, their use of proofs, and their methods of organization. It would be of comparatively little value, for example, to know that Julius Burrows cited many statistics in his 1908 keynote speech or that George Hoar used numerous analogies in his keynote address of 1880. Such information is meaningful only when viewed in relation to the techniques employed by the other twenty-five keynote speakers. Isolated information about a specific speaker, a specific occasion, or a specific speech can shed
little light on keynoting as a type of speaking. A "collective" approach, then, is an attempt to discover repetitive patterns in the selection of keynoters as well as within the speeches themselves.

Such a collective approach is designed to eliminate problems that have confronted other researchers in this general subject area. By approaching the study of keynoting as a type of speaking rather than as twenty-seventeen separate speeches, the writer hopes to locate "evidences of recurring pattern and long-term change wherever they can be found. These are likely to be phenomena of importance." By studying Republican keynoting as a rhetorical genre, the writer has sought to follow Bain's suggestion that the activities in political conventions "merit more attention than they could be given . . . especially since suitable research techniques need to be developed for coping with their special aspects." In order to cope with the special aspects of keynote speaking, this study uses such a technique.

CONTRIBUTORY STUDIES

Only recently has scholarly attention been focused on conventions per se. Numerous studies, however, have been completed which relate to the subject of Republican keynote speaking. Included among these studies are the following:


16Bain, op. cit., p. 9.


27 (New York: privately printed, 1911).
3. Popularized convention histories, including Edwin P. Hoyt's *Jumbos and Jackasses*; Herbert Eaton's *Presidential Timber*; and Ralph G. Martin's *Ballots and Bandwagons*.

4. Specialized convention studies, such as Richard C. Bain's *Convention Decisions and Voting Records*; Gerald Pomper's *Nominating the President*; and David, Goldman, and Bain's *The Politics of National Party Conventions*.

Only two scholarly writers have concerned themselves specifically with keynote speaking: Edwin A. Miles and E. Neal Claussen.

The various articles, books and monographs dealing with certain aspects of conventions and convention speaking are too numerous to list here, but the more helpful of these materials are included in the bibliography.

**SOURCES OF MATERIAL FOR THIS STUDY**

Numerous obstacles confront the researcher of intra-party decision-making. In addition to the obvious problem of secrecy, the sheer passage of time tends to obscure


31*Loc. cit.*  

32*Loc. cit.*

33*Loc. cit.*


35*Loc. cit.*
information valuable to researchers probing into the back­
grounds of convention activity. Consequently, this writer
used a variety of research tools in the attempt to discover
why and how certain events took place.

Chapters I and II are based almost wholly on histori­
cal and descriptive research. The material for these two
chapters was gleaned from newspapers, news magazines, text­
books, monographs, and scholarly periodicals.

The remainder of the study is based on a variety of
materials, including the sources just mentioned. The writer
interviewed or corresponded with all of the living Republican
keynoters; interviewed Joseph Martin, Clarence Brown, and
several other Republican leaders; visited Republican National
Headquarters and discussed the project with Josephine Good,
Executive Director of the 1960 and 1964 conventions;
exchanged correspondence with four former Republican national
chairmen; corresponded with twelve members of the Republican
national committee; corresponded with eighty-five former
delegates to Republican national conventions, many of whom
had attended four or more conventions; visited the State
University of Iowa and examined the Lester Jesse Dickinson
Collection; and examined the papers of Theodore Roosevelt,
Elihu Root, Henry Cabot Lodge, the Breckinridge Family, James
A. Garfield, Rutherford B. Hayes, L. T. Michener, Benjamin
Harrison, Moreton Frewen, William McKinley, Calvin Coolidge,
William Howard Taft, and Carl Schurz in the Library of
Congress.
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study is limited in scope. Most of these limitations are the direct result of the availability of sources. The selection of the keynoter, for example, often rests with the arrangements committee. This committee always meets in executive session and such minutes are not available to researchers. The only way the writer was able to get primary information on the selection of the keynoter was by contacting individual members of the arrangements committee. (Even these members were frequently hesitant to discuss fully what transpired in the executive session.)

The second limitation is purposive. The writer has made no attempt to treat matters that occurred only seldom during the one hundred and eight years covered by this study. Only items dealing with keynoting that occurred repeatedly have been thought worthy of inclusion in the study.

A third limitation concerns textual authenticity. Keynoters traditionally have been given the opportunity to edit and revise their speeches. Although the writer found several texts for each speech, it was concluded that the speeches reported in the Official Proceedings of the convention were more accurate than those found in newspaper accounts. All texts used in this study, therefore, are taken from the convention's Official Proceedings and have been subject to revision by the speaker.
CHAPTER II

THE SETTING: THE CONVENTION

On April 30, 1789, a throng of people in New York watched the inauguration of George Washington as the first President of the United States.

Around noon there appeared on the Broad Street balcony of the new Federal Hall a tall soldierly figure in a homespun suit of deep brown set off with eagle buttons, white stockings, and a bagwig, a dress sword hanging at his side. With him was Chancellor Livingston of the New York judiciary—the Supreme Court of the United States was not yet functioning—who formally administered the oath of office.  

Although the trappings and the setting have been changed many times, the essence remains the same:

Noon on January 20. The red-jacketed Marine Band strikes up 'Hail to the Chief' as the President and the President-elect emerge from the Capitol and proceed to the front of the inaugural platform. A few minutes later, after prayers and patriotic songs, the President-elect stands beside the Chief Justice and repeats a simple oath. An instant ago he was a private citizen. Now, invested with the authority of the Presidency, he turns and speaks to the Nation and to the world. . . . Symbolically and legally, there has been perfect continuity in the nation's highest office.

The inaugural ceremony itself is indeed brief, yet it is one

---


of the many phases involved in the selection, nomination, and election of a United States President. Many changes have taken place since the electoral college placed George Washington in office. These revisions regulating the orderly transfer of power were necessitated, for the most part, by expediency.

THE SELECTION OF CANDIDATES:

THE PRE-CONVENTION YEARS

The slow and often painful periods of transition in the process of selecting presidential candidates have been discussed by many writers and need not be repeated in this study. Yet, for a full understanding of the significance of keynoting in the conventions, a brief survey of pre-convention history seems desirable.

During the early years of the United States, three methods of selection and election were used in the choice of a President. The first method allowed the members of the electoral college to exercise their independent judgment. The omission of more specific provisions for choosing a President was probably a result of the general expectation that Washington would be the first President, and as long as Washington served the question of a successor presented no immediate problems. This method, of course, proved ineffective with the growth of factionalism and political partisanship.
The second method of selecting candidates resulted from the lack of effective means of communication among the various parts of the country. As one writer put it, "the Congress was the only body that represented the public opinion of the country and that at the same time was able to deliberate. . . ." Consequently, a caucus of party members determined the choice of candidates. This system was not seriously attacked until the election of 1824, when the presidential electors were chosen in a variety of ways, including the legislatures in six states, by congressional districts in seven states, and on a state-wide ticket in eleven states. Since none of the candidates had received a majority of electoral votes, the matter was put before the House of Representatives for decision. Adams's victory and the subsequent selection of Clay as Secretary of State caused the Jackson supporters to protest of a "corrupt bargain." Jackson's 1828 victory was the result of a "highly organized popular movement" without any substantial congressional support. This era brought the rise of new men who introduced new issues and new methods into the American political scene. The politics of the Jacksonians was not the politics of Jefferson and Madison. But, as Herbert Agar, has observed, 

---


4DaviD, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 16.

5Ibid., p. 17.
"politics as understood by the 'Jackson men' in 1828 and 1832 marks the beginning of the modern era."⁶ One of the characteristics of this new era was the growth of the national nominating convention. This convention system became the third method of selecting presidential candidates.

THE SELECTION OF CANDIDATES: THE EMERGENCE OF THE CONVENTION SYSTEM

Prior to its public appearance on the national scene, the nominating convention had been used as early as 1808, when disgruntled leaders of the Federalist party held their secret meetings in New York. Although this convention has been called the first "national" nominating convention, it shows little resemblance to our modern conventions, since over half of the states were not even represented and the meeting was closed to the general public.⁷ During the first two decades of the nineteenth century, conventions began to appear more frequently. On the local level, they were used to select nominees for various offices; on the state level, they often discussed public improvements and highway construction.⁸ It was also during this period that many people


⁸Pomper, op. cit., p. 18.
expressed growing dissatisfaction with the caucus system.

When the Hartford Convention of 1814 was called to protest the conduct of the War of 1812, "its organization and procedures presaged many practices of later national conventions. Committees on credentials, rules, and on an official report, or platform, were prototypes of similar groups in modern party conclaves." According to the report of the Secretary of the Hartford Convention, however, there was no speech by the presiding officer. In other words, there was no speech that served as a prototype for the modern keynote speech. Such a model evidently did not appear in national political conventions until the 1832 conventions.

It was primarily because of the efforts of Thurlow Weed that the Anti-Masonic party is usually credited with having held the first national nominating convention. Weed organized the party in Ontario County, New York, in 1827, and the movement grew to the point that a national convention was called in Philadelphia in September, 1830. If the presiding officer of this convention made a speech to the delegates, no record of it appears in the Proceedings. The model for the

---

9Ibid.


modern keynote speech did not occur in the National Republican convention of 1832, for examination of the convention proceedings fails to show that the Chairman pro tem addressed the convention.\textsuperscript{13} In the Democratic convention of 1832, however, the temporary chairman "returned thanks in a brief and pertinent address." Claussen reports that "no copy or transcript of this short speech could be found. This fact was not so surprising when it was understood that the convention did not look favorably upon oratory."\textsuperscript{14} It was not until 1864 that a temporary chairman in a Democratic convention delivered a long address designed to chide the opposition, urge the election of the Democrats over the opposition, and incorporate numerous emotional and partisan appeals.\textsuperscript{15}

The practice of having the temporary chairman of the convention address the delegates after assuming the chair was adopted by the Republicans in 1856. Since this practice was not copied from the Hartford Convention, the Anti-Masonic conventions, or the National Republican convention, perhaps its origin was the Democratic convention of 1832; it is possible, of course, that both Democrats and Republicans copied the practice from some third group. The writer believes that the practice probably did originate in this

\textsuperscript{13}Journal of the Proceedings of the National Republican Convention Held at Worcester, October 11, 1832 (Boston: Stimson and Clapp, 1832).

\textsuperscript{14}Claussen, op. cit., p. 40. \textsuperscript{15}Ibid., p. 104.
1832 Democratic convention, for when the man selected to serve as chairman became ill several days before the convention, another man, Robert Lucas, was selected to serve as "temporary" chairman. Perhaps Lucas felt obligated to express his appreciation for the honor by "returning thanks in a brief and pertinent address."

Both the Democrats and the National Republicans utilized the convention system in 1832. The Whigs did not hold a convention in 1836, but they later reestablished and continued to use it. Only eleven Presidents of the United States have been elected without nomination by a national nominating convention, and its use in selecting candidates for the presidency and vice-presidency began with the election of 1832. The Republicans, of course, have held a convention every four years since their origin in 1856. In order to understand better the setting in which the keynote speech was delivered, it seems important to examine briefly the purpose of the convention, the audience, and the physical surroundings of the convention hall or auditorium.

THE FUNCTION OF THE CONVENTION

It would be a gross understatement to say that conventions are usually misunderstood and poorly analyzed by scholars, delegates, and casual observers, for the bulk of convention commentary is a confusing mass of contradictions.

16 Ibid., pp. 31-40.
At the outset, it is vital to distinguish between the "observable" convention that is seen by the delegates, guests, and television viewers, as contrasted to the "real" convention that controls the decision-making apparatus of the party. It is this first part of the convention—the observable part—that has provoked most of the criticism frequently associated with national political conventions. Admittedly, the keynote speech often has little or no effect upon the decision-making apparatus of the "real" convention. More importantly, however, the keynote address is an integral part of the observable convention, and often is not designed to function as a kind of deliberative rhetoric. This distinction between the dual natures of the convention is essential, for to misunderstand the convention purposes is to misinterpret the function and significance of the keynote speech. In a recent article in the Central States Speech Journal, Kneprath and Mohrmann vigorously attack the speaking in the Republican national convention of 1964 for "masquerading as democratic deliberation." These writers criticize "a situation in which ceremony undermined the entire rhetorical process. . . ."17 As this chapter will later point out, much convention activity is not primarily deliberative in nature—these two writers have consequently oversimplified

the function of the convention and have therefore evaluated
convention speaking by a frequently irrelevant rationale.
In addition to its deliberative function, a national politi-
cal convention usually has a ritualistic function, a cam-
paign-rally function, a cohesive function, a compromising
function, a propaganda function, and a ratifying function.
In order to ascertain the relationship of the keynoter to
these functions, a survey of convention commentary seems
obligatory.

SURVEY OF CONVENTION COMMENTARY

Although the "real" convention is probably the more
important of the national convention's two aspects, it is the
second, or "observable" convention, with which this study is
primarily concerned. Unless otherwise stated then, the term
"convention" as used in this chapter refers to the so-called
"observable" convention. Most convention criticism falls
into rather distinct categories: (1) criticism of the
atmosphere with its noise, confusion, and chaos; (2) criti-
cism that the convention membership is not representative of
the party or the nation; (3) criticism that conventions do
not pick the best man; (4) criticism that the convention is
too large; (5) criticism of the convention in its entirety;
(6) criticism that decisions are made in "a smoke-filled
room" rather than on the floor of the convention; (7) criti-
cism that the proceedings of the convention are drawn out
over too long a period; (8) criticism of the excessive concern for precedent and tradition; and (9) criticism of convention speaking.

Criticism of the Convention's Atmosphere

The majority of convention critics have been disturbed by the so-called "carnival" atmosphere more than any other single facet of the national political convention. The chaos and confusion have provoked sharp criticism from newspaper writers, casual observers, and scholars, as well as from delegates and members of the Republican hierarchy.

The Paris newspaper, Ce Matin, explained a 1948 American political convention to its readers in this fashion: "A manifestation typically American where politics, patriotism and the music hall mingle to create an atmosphere which at the same time becomes a country fair, a religious meeting and a public reunion." 18 A British observer stated in The Economist that many Europeans were distressed by the "clumsy chaos of the nominating conventions..." 19 An American newspaper writer, Irvin S. Cobb, writing in the Chicago American, reported that "a national convention represents more wasted energy, more futile, bootless endeavor, more useless expenditure of noise, money, and talent, than any other institution on earth." 20

---

19August 2, 1952.
20June 10, 1916.
In addition to newspaper writers, many scholars have criticized the atmosphere of the convention. William Anderson, writing in *The National Government of the United States*, said that "it is difficult to imagine an arrangement less conducive to calm thought and deliberation. More than anything else it is a monster 'pep fest,' such as college boys would like to stage on an equal scale before a football game." Ostrogorski was also disturbed by the "incessant uproar" made by the "raving mob which, under ordinary circumstances, could only be formed by the inmates of all the lunatic asylums of the country who had made their escape at the same time." All such criticism of the convention atmosphere, however does not come from outsiders and laymen, for several delegates and numerous practicing politicians also have been critical of this matter. James Farley stated that there is "a carnival spirit, a touch of sawdust and the side show, about a national convention that makes it unique among public institutional gatherings . . . while party conclaves may not always be successful, they are never dull." Raymond Moley

---


said that the "uncontrolled passion" of the convention was partly caused by its "holiday atmosphere."²⁴ Emmett Houeye, a Louisiana delegate to the 1964 Republican convention, complained of the "fan-fare and bally-hoo" that accompanied the convention.²⁵ Another delegate, John N. Dalton, stated that he could not hear portions of the 1964 Republican convention because "there is so much noise and confusion on the floor. . . ."²⁶ Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho, labeled the convention setting as simply a "general melee."²⁷

The obvious question to be answered at this point in the discussion is: what is the purpose of this carnival atmosphere? What does the noise, chaos, and confusion seek to accomplish? In order to answer these questions we must examine what Richard C. Bain calls the "campaign rally function" of the convention.²⁸ This function is best expressed by three hypotheses: (1) political conventions are chiefly ritualistic; their purpose is to reinforce party loyalties in the campaign ahead;²⁹ (2) political conventions

²⁶Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from John N. Dalton, April 5, 1965.
²⁸Bain, op. cit., p. 7.
are mainly hortatory; they exist to stimulate party workers and the public to a high pitch of excitement for the campaign to come;\(^{30}\) (3) conventions exist to provide a middle-ground between the party professionals and the grass-roots laity support.\(^{31}\) These three hypotheses are not intended to be mutually exclusive, but only to suggest the multi-purposive function of the campaign-rally aspect of national conventions. Since a political party is often a loosely structured organization, the national convention should, as one Republican delegate put it, "tie together these loosely connected units."\(^{32}\) In this context, according to Richard C. Bain, "it can be said that the function of the convention as a campaign rally is a necessary one. . . ."\(^{33}\) Each leader, great or minor, who is given the convention stage for a few brief moments is at the same time given a feeling of participation, and his followers identify themselves in participation with him. So, too, the demonstrations give the rank-and-file delegates a sense of belonging to a dynamic movement—at least for the moment, whatever their more sober later reflections may be.\(^{34}\)

Much of the "excitement" is admittedly excessive. Yet the needed sense of unity and belonging could probably not be achieved by cold calculated rationality; hence, the atmosphere

---

\(^{30}\)Ibid.

\(^{31}\)Bain, op. cit., p. 7; also see Herring, op. cit., p. 229.


\(^{33}\)Bain, op. cit., p. 7.

\(^{34}\)Ibid.
of the convention itself is designed to serve specific and premeditated ends. The role of the keynote speech within this atmosphere is discussed later in the study.

**Criticism of the Non-Representative Convention Membership**

A second major category of convention criticism concerns the allegation that convention membership represents neither the party nor the nation. Even though this criticism is significant and often valid, it has little or no relationship to the subject of this study and will not be discussed in detail.

**Criticism that the Conventions Do Not Pick the Best Men**

A third frequently occurring area of criticism is the opinion that conventions cannot—or do not—pick the best men to run for office. This attitude, like the one just mentioned, is outside of the scope of this study.

**Criticism that the Convention Is Too Large**

The fourth indictment of conventions to be discussed is that they are too large—too unwieldy to function efficiently. The conventions of both major parties today are over ten times larger than the original conventions.35

Although the Democrats have about twice the number of

---

delegates that the Republicans have, the huge numbers of alternates, guests, officials, and party leaders have caused important changes in the nature of the national convention.

Increased size has brought increased noise and confusion; this clamor has caused more and more decisions to be made away from the convention floor. With the absence of significant decision-making, spontaneity has virtually disappeared. Consequently, the convention proceedings have become more rigid, formal, and ritualistic. "All action, from inspirational addresses to the format of nominations, is carefully programmed." Pomper noted that "there is some possibility that the convention may become only a ritualistic entertainment, rather than an arena for decision-making." The Republican keynoter is expected to be an important part of this "ritualistic entertainment."

Criticism of the Convention in Its Entirety

A fifth group of critics condemn the convention in its entirety. It seems significant that this response occurred rarely from persons closely allied to politics—the "outsiders" and laymen, however, frequently voiced this complaint. H. L. Mencken, for example, noted that

\[...\] it is instructive to observe these great men at the solemn business of selecting a First Chief for the greatest free Republic ever seen on earth \[...\] one sees them at close range, sweating,

\[36\] Ibid., p. 62. \[37\] Ibid., p. 63.
belching, munching peanuts, chasing fleas. They parade idiotically, carrying dingy flags and macerating one another's corns. They crowd the aisles, swapping gossip, most of it untrue. They devour hot dogs. They rush out to the speak-easies. They rush back to yell, fume and vote.

... The average delegate never knows what is going on. 38

Will Rogers summed up the convention behavior in this fashion:

Thousands of people in a hot stuffy hall up till the early morning hours listening to 'The man I am about to nominate has the qualities of a Jackson, the Statesmanship of a Jefferson and the homely common sense of an Abraham Lincoln.' Then the next one nominated would have all these and then a couple more, mayb [sic] the looks of McKinley and the oratory of Bryan. Hours on hours of that, then they would all get up and march around the hall, part would march and part would hiss. 39

Even though party leaders such as Joe Martin would agree that conventions are probably "on the way out," 40 few would ignore the strengths of the convention system. The "extra-constitutional" nature of the convention allows for considerable flexibility in adapting to changing social and political conditions. Also, the convention system (1) allows new personalities to rise quickly to positions of party leadership; (2) provides time and opportunity for compromise; 41 and (3) is accepted as legitimate by the populace.


41Pomper, op. cit., pp. 210-218; also see Herring, op. cit., p. 230.
Criticism that Decisions Are Made in a "Smoke-Filled Room Rather than on the Floor of the Convention

A sixth frequently occurring criticism concerns the observation that important convention decisions are made prior to the convention or in a "smoke-filled room" rather than being made on the floor of the convention. Much of such criticism is valid, for the "real" convention seldom occurs amid the clamor of the convention hall. As was mentioned earlier, however, it is the "observable" convention with which this study is primarily concerned. Consequently, this sixth criticism is not within the scope of the present study.

Criticism that the Proceedings of the Convention Are Drawn Out Over Too Long a Period

A seventh indictment against conventions is that they are drawn out over too long a period. One delegate to the Republican convention of 1964 discussed the matter in some detail:

As you know, various cities which have facilities for handling large conventions bid against one another for the purpose of landing political conventions. The winning city then has to pay several hundred thousand dollars into the coffers of the particular national committee involved. One of the conditions of the bid is that the convention must last a certain number of days so that the hotels, restaurants, stores, etc., can get their share of the profits.

Actually, there's no reason in the world why both of the 1964 . . . conventions couldn't have been concluded in a single day. This would have left the businessmen of San Francisco and Atlantic City holding the bag, however, so the conventions are
stretched out by a good deal of padding to last for four days. 42

The campaign-rally function and the compromise function of the convention, however, could probably not be achieved if the convention were only to last for a single day. In any event, since the keynote speech usually occurs in the early phases of the convention activity, such criticism is of only minor concern.

**Criticism of the Excessive Concern for Precedents and Tradition**

An eighth area of frequently occurring criticism concerns the convention's excessive concern for precedent and tradition. Such concern is relatively simple to justify, however, in light of the campaign-rally function of the convention. In addition to the aura of legitimacy provided by tradition and precedent, convention procedure is well known to the general public as well as the participants. The effect of these traditions upon the keynoter is discussed later in the study.

**Criticism of Convention Speaking**

The ninth and final category of convention criticism to be discussed concerns convention speaking—not merely keynoting, but all convention speaking. Naturally, an institution which has varied purposes would also tend to

---

produce varied speaking. In order to compare keynoting criticism with criticism of other convention speaking, a survey of commentary on convention speaking seems desirable.

Often, it is the seemingly unending series of speeches and "remarks" that causes consternation and dismay among all types of political observers, including participants as well as outsiders. With typical vehemence, H. L. Mencken categorized many of the speakers as "on furlough from some home for extinct volcanoes." D. W. Brogan, writing in *Politics in America*, classified much of the convention speaking as ritualistic. Brogan stated that

... of course, a great deal of Convention oratory is delivered simply as ritual. Many speeches are specimens of 'rich badness' in oratory that should (and often does) drive the delegates off the floor in swarms.

Richard C. Bain, writing in *Convention Decisions and Voting Records*, has called the displays of oratory "frenetic," while William Anderson has used the phrase "flamboyant."

All of this commentary, however, tells us little of the function of such speaking. According to Goodman, most convention speaking is to (1) impress the general public; (2) maintain the enthusiasm of the delegates; (3) provide a

---


means of publicity for the professional politicians; (4) stimulate party spirit; and (5) serve as "fillers" when there is no other important convention business.47

It is evident that the purposes for convention speaking closely parallel the various functions of the convention itself. Some speeches are designed to serve as part of the campaign-rally, some are added to give delegates a sense of "belonging," some of the oratory is intended to provide a forum for future potential candidates, and some of the speaking is merely intended to occupy unused time in the program between more important events.

The foregoing discussion of the nine major areas of convention criticism demonstrates that conventions and convention oratory are multi-purposive. As a facet of this activity, the keynote speech cannot be considered apart from this premise of multi-purposiveness.

THE CONVENTION SETTING: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

In 1904, Theodore Roosevelt attempted to explain the temporary chairmanship to Elihu Root by stating that "you have the advantage of speaking at the very outset. No one is tired, everyone desires to listen, and they have your speech to listen to--what more is there to be said?"48


48Theodore Roosevelt Special Correspondence, Library of Congress, Roosevelt to Root, June 11, 1904.
Roosevelt's explanation, however, is somewhat naive if not grotesque. Delegates to national political conventions, as a group, can hardly be pictures as an "un-tired," eager, attentive, calm audience. Who are these delegates and what characteristics do they have in common?

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE DELEGATES

David, Goldman, and Bain, relying on studies of the 1948, 1952, and 1956 conventions and certain historical and biographical sources, have attempted to describe delegate characteristics according to age, sex, race, religion, educational status, income level, and occupation. To this writer's knowledge, this study is the only comprehensive and systematic study devoted to the characteristics of delegates to national political conventions. 49

Age

The average age for Republican delegates to the national convention of 1948 was fifty-two. Over 20 per cent of the delegates to this convention were between fifty and fifty-four years old. About 18 per cent were between fifty-five and sixty; 17 per cent were between forty-five and fifty years old. The remainder of the delegates were of varied ages, with about 3 per cent between twenty-five and thirty (the youngest age represented) and about 1 per cent between

49 David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., pp. 325-354.
eighty and eighty-five years of age (the oldest group represented).\textsuperscript{50}

Admittedly, such figures based on a single convention cannot be claimed as representative. Bain's data on principal convention participants from 1832 to 1956, shows that convention leadership has come from men whose ages have ranged from thirty-three to eighty-four, with the average age being between fifty and sixty.\textsuperscript{51} Similar conclusions on the age of members of the national political committees have been reported by Cotter and Hennessy. This latter study shows that "the composite picture of national party committee members [both major parties] from 1948 to 1963" is of middle-age (forty to sixty years old).\textsuperscript{52} Any conclusions regarding the age of delegates to Republican national conventions based on these three sources are highly tentative. It seems probable, however, that the largest single group of delegates would fall within the forty to sixty age group. A survey of the ages of the 365 principal convention participants over a period of 124 years reveals no particular trend concerning the ages of delegates.

\textsuperscript{50}Ibid., pp. 326-327.

\textsuperscript{51}Bain, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 306-324.

Sex

It was not until the 1920 convention (held two months prior to the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment) that women "truly participated in the business of the Convention." Even though a woman was permitted to address the 1876 convention and two women were seated as alternate delegates from Wyoming in the convention of 1892, no real inroads were made on male dominance of the convention floor until after the passage of the Suffrage Amendment. Between 1856 and 1920, a total of only twenty-five women had been seated as delegates or alternates in Republican national conventions. In 1920, the total was 156; in 1936, the figure reached 283, and by 1956, the total number of women delegates to the national convention was 563. In the 1952 Republican convention, over 10 per cent of the delegates were women. In the 1956 convention, 50 per cent of the Montana and Florida delegations were women; Minnesota and Wyoming followed with 42 and 41 per cent. By 1964, Senator Margaret Chase Smith, perhaps with tongue-in-cheek, was an announced candidate for the Republican presidential nomination. It has been only


54Women's Division, Republican National Committee, op. cit., p. 34.

55David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 327.

56Women's Division, op. cit., p. 36.
since 1920, then, that women have played a significant role in the activities of Republican national conventions.

Race

Negro delegates have been prominent in Republican national convention southern delegations from post-Civil War days up until the 1964 convention. David, Goldman, and Bain report that "it is extremely difficult, however, to obtain comprehensive and accurate information on Negro participation."\(^{57}\) In the 1952 convention, thirty-two Negro delegates and fifty alternates were present, representing a total of about two and a half per cent of the total voting strength of the convention. The 1964 convention was often referred to as "lily-white" by contemporary observers. The writer believes, however, that the 1964 convention was exceptional in regard to Negro participation. Although Negroes have been under-represented in Republican national conventions, David, Goldman, and Bain think that the presence of even a single Negro in a previously white delegation may profoundly change behavior regarding civil rights.\(^{58}\) Even a low percentage of Negro delegates, then, can have a disproportionate influence on the convention in regard to civil rights matters.

\(^{57}\)David, Goldman, and Bain, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 329.

\(^{58}\)\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 330-331.
Religion

Protestants made up the largest single religious group represented in the 1948 Republican convention. In this convention, 87.1 per cent of the delegates were Protestant, 6.1 per cent were Catholic, 3.5 per cent claimed no formal religious affiliation, and 0.7 per cent were Jewish.59 (These figures are roughly comparable with the religious preferences of members of the Republican national committee from 1948-1963. In this latter study by Cotter and Hennessy, 85.9 per cent of the committeemen were Protestant and 7.4 per cent were Catholic.)60 Perhaps the most important aspect of religion to be noted here is that the Protestant religions usually linked with high social and economic status were heavily represented at the 1948 convention. Episcopalians led in percentage of delegates with 17.2, followed closely by the Presbyterians and Methodists with 17.0 and 16.8.61 Since the Know-Nothings formed part of the original membership of the party, and since the Republicans have frequently been labeled as a WASP (white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant) party, it seems reasonable to conclude that the majority of delegates to Republican conventions have been Protestants.

59 Ibid., p. 331.
60 Cotter and Hennessy, op. cit., p. 47.
61 David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 331.
Educational Status

Studies conducted on the education of delegates to national conventions of both major parties show that these delegates are unusually well-educated. Fifty-eight per cent of the delegates to the Republican convention of 1948 were college graduates; 34 per cent of these delegates had taken a year or more of post-graduate work. (The figures just cited correspond rather closely with those of Cotter and Hennessy in their study of Republican national committee members from 1948 to 1963. These two writers found that 67 per cent of Republican national committeemen had at least one college degree.) According to a study conducted by the Brookings Institution, a sharp rise in the amount of delegates' education has occurred as recently as the conventions of 1940 and 1944. As a group, delegates to Republican national conventions, particularly in recent years, are well educated. Since lawyers have traditionally played a major role in convention activity, it can be assumed that a significant portion of the delegates to most Republican conventions since 1856 have had an above-average amount of formal education.

---

62 Ibid., p. 332.

63 Cotter and Hennessy, op. cit., p. 47.

64 David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., pp. 332-333.
Income Levels

The median income for delegates to the 1948 Republican convention was $10,900. The reported annual income for these delegates was: 6.3 per cent made less than $3,500; 10.0 per cent earned between $3,500 and $4,999; 31.7 per cent made from $5,000 to $9,999; 31.3 per cent earned between $10,000 and $24,999; 11.3 per cent earned from $25,000 to $49,999; and 9.4 per cent made over $50,000. (Cotter and Hennessy found that members of the Republican national committee from 1948 to 1963 had "moderate to high" incomes.) Since many delegates to the earlier Republican conventions were probably state and local political leaders, it seems safe to assume that they could be classified as having moderate to high income. It seems improbable that people with low incomes could afford the time, money, and effort necessary to become a political activist. The effect of the relatively high delegate income on the keynoters' choices of argument and supporting material is discussed briefly in Chapter V.

Occupations

The occupations of the delegates to the 1948 Republican convention are quite varied. Table I shows the occupational distribution of delegates to this convention. This occupational breakdown reveals that lawyers and businessmen

65David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 333.

66Cotter and Hennessy, op. cit., p. 44.
TABLE I
OCCUPATIONAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE 1948 REPUBLICAN CONVENTIONa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupations</th>
<th>Delegates</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Officials</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers and Judges</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishers and Editors</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Professional Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educators</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others not Classified</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankers</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers-Owners</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchants and Dealers</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Insurance</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers and Ranchers</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Union Representatives</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired Persons</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Others</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aData: David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 333.
comprised a large segment of the 1948 Republican convention. Although labor union officials and public office holders appear frequently in Democratic national conventions, these groups are seldom significantly represented in Republican national conventions. A cursory examination of Bain's listing of major convention participants indicates that these occupational characteristics have probably been true of Republican delegates since the party's origin.

This discussion of the age, sex, race, religion, education, income, and occupation of delegates to the Republican national conventions has been intended to indicate the nature of the audiences that the keynoter faced. Numerous changes have occurred between 1856 and 1964 that influenced the characteristics of the delegates: (1) immigrant groups have changed the nature of the big-city machines; (2) civil service reforms and the passage of the Hatch Act have increased honesty; (3) middle- and upper-class people interested in public service have become more active; (4) political power has shifted from party officials to elected officials; (5) statewide political bosses have virtually disappeared; and (6) standards of education and social responsibility have been raised. After having discussed these factors, David, Goldman, and Bain conclude that "changes of this kind are probably responsible for the fact that while the conventions

67David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 352.
of recent years have had many superficial resemblances to those of 1900, the delegates from many states were of a measurably different type."^®

The facts suggest that the great majority of the delegates were well qualified to deal with the problems of their political parties, and that they were about as reputable a group of individuals as could reasonably be expected in any large political assembly in this imperfect world.

The delegates of recent years were better educated, less boss-ridden, better adjusted to the requirements of an open political system, and generally more trustworthy in all respects than those of a half century earlier.69

THE CONVENTION SITE

Chicago has been the most frequent site for Republican national conventions. Fourteen of the twenty-eight national conventions have been held in this centrally located city: 1860, 1868, 1880, 1884, 1888, 1904, 1908, 1912, 1916, 1920, 1932, 1944, 1952, and 1960. Philadelphia ranks second with five conventions held in 1856, 1872, 1900, 1940, and 1948. Cleveland and San Francisco follow with two each—Cleveland in 1924 and 1936; San Francisco in 1956 and 1964. The remaining conventions were held in Baltimore (1864); Minneapolis (1892); St. Louis (1896); Cincinnati (1876); and Kansas City (1928). There are many reasons involved in the choice of a convention city, including accessibility,

68 David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., pp. 352-353.
69 Ibid.
accommodations for delegates, amount of bid offered, the city's patriotic shrines, facilities for television, and the importance of the state in which the convention city is located. All of these reasons, however, lie outside of the scope of this study and will not be discussed in detail.

With the exception of most of the conventions held prior to 1880, the Republicans have usually held their national gatherings in large, "barn-like" structures. The 1856 convention was held in the Philadelphia Musical Fund Hall, described by the Daily Tribune as "large and well proportioned." The attendance of two thousand delegates, reporters and spectators, however, occupied all of the available space. The New York Times added that "the room engaged was entirely too small to contain the half of those who were entitled to places as delegates and reporters." The speakers stand was located at the front of the hall "with seven tables seating twelve each arranged lengthwise in front of the platform." Unlike many later convention halls, the Musical Fund Hall was said to be "well adapted for sound, so that the speakers can be readily heard."

---

70 Daily Tribune [New York], June 18, 1856, p. 5.
71 Ibid.
72 Ibid., p. 1.
73 Philadelphia Public Ledger, June 18, 1856, p. 1.
74 Daily Tribune [New York], June 18, 1956, p. 5.
Another example of a Republican national convention not held in a large hall was the convention of 1864. This convention was held in Baltimore in an attempt by President Lincoln to represent the Union party as a national organization. As a border-state city, Baltimore was only slightly less rebellious than the rebel states themselves. Mayer reports that Lincoln's arch-foe in the city, Congressman Henry Winter Davis, manipulated to prevent the Unionists from renting the only suitable hall. "So the national committee made arrangements to meet in the Front Street Theatre, where heat, poor acoustics, and street noise harassed the delegates."75

Regardless of the size of the convention hall, however, complaints of noise and discomfort have been frequent. In 1860, for example, the Republican national convention was held in the especially constructed Wigwam in Chicago, a building 180 feet long and 100 feet wide with galleries on three sides, a sloping floor and a seating capacity of over 10,000.76 The easy accessibility of Chicago by the new railroads and by steamboat apparently attracted thousands of visitors to the city, for Roseboom caustically commented that "a carnival spirit replaced the crusading fervor of 1856, and whiskey-drinking politicians far outnumbered abolition

75 Mayer, op. cit., p. 118.

76 Ibid., p. 67.
Delegates and spectators were said to be disorderly and "twenty thousands of Republicans and their wives" milled around outside of the wigwam. In the 1880 convention held in Chicago's Exposition Hall, many delegates complained of being wilted by the heat and crowded conditions. Roscoe Conkling protested for having to sit "idle on uncushioned seats--fortunately with backs." The 1884 convention met in the huge Industrial Exposition Building in Minneapolis. Not only were the delegates forced to suffer from the heat wave gripping the city, but "resin dripped sporadically for the unseasoned pine roof of the convention hall, forcing delegates either to sit on gummy benches or stand in the aisles and receive direct hits on their bare heads." These problems of noise and discomfort were still evident in the 1900 convention. The New York Times reported that,

... excepting only Senator Wolcott on the first day, there have been no speakers who were able to make themselves heard and understood by the delegates and the alternates. The vast throng of spectators were merely spectators. They heard little or nothing. They kept track of what was going on with their eyes,

77 Roseboom, op. cit., p. 160.
78 Bain, op. cit., p. 68; also see Roseboom, op. cit., p. 177.
or through the kindness of those who were near by, and who passed by word of mouth what was going on.®

The sheer immensity of such convention halls prompted one critic to complain that no national convention

... should ever again assemble in a hall that seats more than four thousand, or at most, five thousand persons. It was cruel and unfair to subject such consummate orators as Mr. Root ... to the throat-racking and heart-breaking task of trying to fill with their admirable voices a huge barn lined with a crowd restless because it could hear nothing and see little.®√

In the 1932 convention, the noise even bothered the keynoter. L. J. Dickinson stated that "there is such a state of confusion in the audience at a National Convention that there is not any opportunity for interference from the audience. As a matter of fact, on the platform it is difficult to hear anyone unless they have a loud-speaker connection."®√ As recently as 1964, the problem of noise had not been overcome. In this convention, Mark O. Hatfield faced a crowd of well over 16,000 delegates, guests, and gate-crashers in San Francisco's Cow Palace— an enormous structure covering some sixty-seven acres.®√ One delegate to this convention said that "there is so much noise and confusion on the floor while the keynote speech is being made that the delegates and

---

alternates actually get to hear very little of it."\textsuperscript{85} Regardless of the site of the national convention, delegates have frequently been uncomfortable and unable to hear what was being said on the platform. Demonstrations, singing, slogans, banners, and decorations are discussed as extrinsic means of persuasion in Chapter V.

THE IMPACT OF TELEVISION ON THE CONVENTION SETTING

Television has brought important changes to the national political convention setting. In 1940, NBC and Philco covered the keynote and nominating speeches in both conventions. Some forty thousand to one hundred thousand people were estimated to have watched at least part of the proceedings, but the advent of television made no real impact on the convention procedure.\textsuperscript{86} Because of the war, very little advance was made prior to the 1944 convention of the Republicans, when an estimated fifty thousand people observed part of the proceedings. Earl Warren's keynote speech, however, was filmed in advance by NBC and run simultaneously with the speech itself.\textsuperscript{87} By 1952, about eighteen million

\textsuperscript{85}Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from John N. Dalton, April 5, 1965.


\textsuperscript{87}\textit{Ibid.}, pp. 3-4.
television sets were in use and available to over 50 per cent of the American voters. Estimates reveal that over half of the American people watched at least part of the 1952 conventions on television. The Republicans made no attempt to adapt their procedure to television or to coach the delegates regarding television dress or manners. This unwillingness to modify procedure resulted in the lack of a "head-on picture of the rostrum itself" because Republican managers were unwilling to allow the camera placement to cut into delegate space. By 1956, however, efforts were made to streamline the convention program to meet the demands of television viewers. "Speeches were shortened and there was a reduction in the number of speakers." The importance of television has now grown to the extent that "the use of balloons, the manners of delegates, and the placing of delegation standards are regulated to accommodate the cameras." Pomper comments that as television pressure becomes more and more important, "private deliberations may be impeded, as the demands of entertainment take precedence over the more serious business of party negotiation." The specific influence of television on keynoting is discussed in Chapter IV.

---

88 Ibid., p. 1.  
89 Ibid., p. 33.  
90 Women's Division, Republican National Committee, op. cit., p. 37.  
91 Thompson, op. cit., p. 35.  
92 Pomper, op. cit., p. 63.
SUMMARY

National political conventions are multipurpose.

Some of the more important of these purposes are listed below:

1. Political conventions are primarily deliberative; they exist to choose the best candidate available for public office.

2. Political conventions are chiefly ritualistic; their purpose is to reinforce party loyalties in the campaign ahead.

3. Political conventions are mainly hortatory; they exist to stimulate party workers and the public to a high pitch of enthusiasm for the campaign to come.

4. Political conventions are principally directive; they are intended to make converts to the party's cause.

5. Convention decisions are preliminary—the final decision will take place at the time of the election.

6. The end product of a convention is action, not deliberation.

7. The convention provides a middle ground between the party professionals and the grass-roots laity support.

8. The convention is designed to attract national attention to its operations.

9. The convention can and does function as an implement for compromise.

10. The convention is becoming more of a ratifying body than a decision-making body.

Most of these observations can be classified into two groups—one group dealing with the real decision-making apparatus of the convention; the second group concerned with the noisy and raucous observable convention. It is this second, or observable convention, with which this study is concerned.

Delegates to national conventions are generally male,
well educated, middle-aged, primarily Protestant, and often uncomfortable and noisy.

The foregoing discussion has been only a brief indication of some of the many problems that the keynoter faces when he confronts his immediate audience—noise, drinking, hilarity, apathy, hostility, and masses of humanity. It is little wonder that news commentator David Brinkley had difficulty in explaining the situation to Europeans who were viewing the 1964 conventions via satellite. Brinkley stated that the convention

... is partly political, partly emotional, partly propaganda, partly a social mechanism, partly a carnival, and partly mass hysteria. It can be described as nonsense, and often is—but somehow it works.93

Admittedly, many are not quite sure how it works. Nor are the delegates, Republican party leaders, or keynoters precisely clear on the role that the keynoter should play in this activity known as a national political convention.

CHAPTER III

THE KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

Republican keynoters have included lawyers, governors, a minister, a farmer, a doctor, and a military officer. The youngest of the twenty-seven keynoters was thirty-three; the oldest was seventy-three. Do these men have any common characteristics? Why were they selected? This chapter discusses topically the positions of the keynoters, their residences, the qualifications of the speakers, and the rationale for their selection.

WHO WERE THE KEYNOTERS?

In reply to the writer's request for information about keynoting, one delegate to the 1964 Republican convention asked: "Isn't it true that keynoters drop from sight? Isn't it an invitation to oblivion? I hope that is where Mark Hatfield is headed. . . ."1 As the list below indicates, many of the keynoters were outstanding and influential figures:

1856 Robert Emmet
1860 David Wilmot
1864 Robert J. Breckinridge
1868 Carl Schurz
1872 Morton McMichael
1876 Theodore M. Pomeroy
1880 George F. Hoar*
1884 John R. Lynch
1888 John M. Thurston
1892 J. Sloat Fassett
1896 Charles W. Fairbanks
1900 Edward O. Wolcott
1904 Elihu Root
1908 Julius C. Burrows

1912 Elihu Root*
1916 Warren G. Harding*
1920 Henry Cabot Lodge*
1924 Theodore E. Burton
1928 Simeon D. Fess
1932 L. J. Dickinson
1936 Frederick Steiwer
1940 Harold E. Stassen
1944 Earl Warren
1948 Dwight H. Green
1952 Douglas MacArthur#
1956 Arthur B. Langlie#
1960 Walter H. Judd#
1964 Mark O. Hatfield

QUALITIES AND QUALIFICATIONS OF
THE KEYNOTE SPEAKER

Many qualities and characteristics have been ascribed
to keynoters by newspaper writers, scholars, casual observers,
delegates, and members of the Republican hierarchy. Included
among these qualities and qualifications are oratorical
ability, political prowess, geographical location, and
several additional considerations such as appearance and
political philosophy.

Oratorical Ability

One of the most frequently mentioned characteristics
of the keynote speaker concerned his speaking ability. This

*All four of these men served as both temporary chair-
men and permanent chairman during the same convention.

#During the conventions of 1952-1960, the positions
of temporary chairman and keynote speaker were divided.
These three men served only as keynoters and did not preside
as temporary chairman.
attribute was considered important by "outside observers" as well as delegates and leaders within the Republican party.

Many newspaper writers and scholars agreed that the keynoter should possess some degree of "oratorical" skill. Ranney and Kendall commented that the keynote speaker should have "a reputation as a spellbinder";\(^2\) E. W. Kenworthy commented somewhat caustically that the keynoter should be "silver-tongued";\(^3\) both Goodman and Hinderaker also mentioned that the keynoter should be a competent speaker.\(^4\) George E. Sokolsky, syndicated columnist, observed that the keynoter "must be an orator with a great voice and forensic powers."\(^5\) Several writers specified that the keynoter should have a particular kind of flamboyant delivery. V. O. Key said that "old fashioned keynoting" might be compared to a "hybrid of elocution and calisthenics. . .";\(^6\) an Associated Press writer stated that Robert A. Taft, Jr., who was being considered as


1964 Republican keynoter, was not chosen because he was "not the slam-bang type of speaker usually associated with the keynote address. . . ." 7

Many of the delegates to national conventions with whom the writer corresponded stressed the importance of a keynoter's speaking skill. Dorothy H. Presser, a North Carolina delegate to the last three Republican national conventions, stated that the size of convention halls required "dynamic speaking." 8 F. E. Yerley, a Wisconsin delegate to the last six Republican conventions, stated that the keynote speech should be an "oratorical display." 9 Other delegates expressed similar views by observing that a keynoter should be "an orator," 10 "a good speaker," 11 "a man who must breathe a certain amount of fire," 12 "he must be articulate," 13 and that the keynote speaker should be "dynamic and just about

7Morning Advocate [Baton Rouge, Louisiana], May 14, 1964, p. 2-C.

8Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Dorothy H. Presser, March 9, 1965.


12Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Wilbur N. Renk, March 26, 1965.

the best public speaker that the Party can find. . . ."¹⁴

Several delegates added that the speech of the keynoter was important only if it were "well delivered."¹⁵ A few delegates were more specific about the keynoter's delivery: Philip B. Hoffman stated that "he must be a master in the technique of public speaking." Hoffman added somewhat vaguely that "he must know words, anecdotes, and have proper inflections, dramatics and that sort of thing."¹⁶ Another delegate specified that the delivery of the keynote address "should combine dulcet tones with occasional staccato delivery."¹⁷

There appeared to be little or no difference of opinion among delegates and members of the Republican hierarchy regarding the keynoter's speaking ability. A national committeeman from Rhode Island, for example, stated that one of the two basic criteria for selecting a keynoter was that "he must be an excellent speaker."¹⁸ George L. Hinman, national committeeman from New York, observed that the speech should be

¹⁴Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Louis C. Wyman, March 18, 1965.


¹⁷Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Louis C. Wyman, March 18, 1965.

"well constructed and eloquently delivered." One member of the national committee phrased the matter of speaking ability negatively when he noted that "political organizations are more frequently damaged by incompetent jobs than they are aided by outstanding performances." A Minnesota member of the national committee said that "people will long remember the . . . techniques used by Dr. Walter Judd when he keynoted the 1960 convention. The result was that he was in demand nationally as a speaker and even now is booked almost solidly for a year ahead."

An examination of biographies, histories, and newspapers reveals that many keynoters were noted for their speaking ability. Some of the speakers had reputations as vigorous and aggressive campaigners, others were said to be impressive and dignified in their delivery, while still others had been debaters or orators in high school and college.

Although the descriptions varied, many observers, including scholars, newspaper writers, convention delegates, and members of the Republican national committee, stated that speaking ability is an important qualification for the Republican keynote speaker.

---


Political Prowess

Another frequently mentioned characteristic of the person selected to be keynote speaker was his political prestige. Newspaper writers and scholars agree that a keynoter should have status as a political figure. Sokolsky stated that the "keynoter at most national conventions is a distinguished politician"; Ranney and Kendall added that "he must have a public record that entitles him to speak for the party on issues of the day"; Miles noted that "most keynoters have been possessors of high political office." Similar views were expressed by Hinderaker and Charles W. Thompson.

This so-called "political prowess" tends to fall into two rather distinct groupings: (1) men who already have achieved considerable prestige and power, and (2) men who are being groomed by the party for possible future leadership.

Included in the first category are men such as David Wilmot, who served as temporary chairman in the 1860 convention. Wilmot had helped to organize the Republican party and served as its first vice-presidential nominee. Robert J. Breckinridge (1864) was a lawyer, a minister, a university

---

22 Sokolsky, op. cit., p. 6.
23 Ranney and Kendall, op. cit., p. 300.
24 Miles, op. cit., p. 31.
president, and a member of one of the most respected and influential families in Kentucky. Elihu Root, who keynoted the conventions of 1904 and 1912, had served as United States District Attorney, as Secretary of War and as Secretary of State. Henry Cabot Lodge (1920) was a well-publicized opponent of President Wilson and had served in the United States Senate for twenty-seven years. Earl Warren, the 1944 keynoter, had served California as a city attorney, county attorney, district attorney, attorney general, and governor. Warren had received considerable publicity when he was considered as a possible vice-presidential nominee in 1940. Douglas MacArthur, who keynoted the 1952 Republican convention, was already regarded by many people as a kind of "living legend." Public feeling was so intense over MacArthur's loss of command in Korea that talk of impeaching President Truman was common. MacArthur gave his keynote speech shortly after this dismissal.

The second category of keynoters are those who are chosen partly because they are being groomed by the party for possible future leadership. This group is somewhat more diverse than the first. In some years, for example, a keynoter is selected as a possible "dark-horse" nominee, such as Fairbanks in 1896, Wolcott in 1900, or MacArthur in 1952. Harding (1916), Dickinson (1932), Stassen (1940), and Hatfield (1964) were selected as future party leaders.

Admittedly, these two kinds of political prowess are
seldom the sole basis for the selection of the keynoter; yet many delegates and members of the national committee regarded political power to be as important as oratorical ability.

Most of the delegates with whom the writer discussed the matter of political prowess tended to agree with the first category—that the keynoter should have an established reputation. Many delegates used phrases such as "well respected and highly regarded"; 26 "an established reputation"; 27 "an articulate Republican leader"; 28 "an outstanding member of the Party"; 29 "an established position within the political party"; 30 "a vigorous man of stature," 31 and other similar descriptions. Several delegates, however, tended to support the second category, and felt that the keynote speech should "give a present or future candidate for some office a chance to be heard." 32 A delegate from Idaho felt that the keynoter


28 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mrs. Louis C. Rogers, March 8, 1965.


should be an "outstanding Republican office holder that may be a potential party leader in the future."\textsuperscript{33} Another delegate saw the position of the keynoter as an opportunity for the speaker to become a "national leader rather than a state leader."\textsuperscript{34} Only one delegate with whom the writer corresponded held the opinion that a "nationally known name" was of no real importance.\textsuperscript{35}

The suggestion that a keynoter should be an important political figure is not limited to scholars, journalists, and delegates, however, for William E. Miller commented that "it seems obvious that the honor went to persons who were very powerful in politics."\textsuperscript{36} Other leaders within the Republican hierarchy also expressed opinions regarding the keynoter's political power. In 1924, for example, Republican national committeeman John W. Hart wrote President Coolidge suggesting that Senator William E. Borah be chosen as keynoter on the basis of his "great popularity not only in this intermountain section, but in the more thickly settled centers of the East."\textsuperscript{37} In 1940, national chairman John D. M. Hamilton

\textsuperscript{33}Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Joe McCollum, April 8, 1965.

\textsuperscript{34}Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Richard D. Jones, March 2, 1965.

\textsuperscript{35}Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Louis C. Wyman, March 18, 1965.

\textsuperscript{36}Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from William E. Miller, February 20, 1964.

\textsuperscript{37}Coolidge Papers, Library of Congress, Hart to Coolidge, April 21, 1924.
thought Harold Stassen to be "an astute professional politician" and "personally chose him for the keynoter." According to Bayard Ewing, national committeeman from Rhode Island, Douglas MacArthur was chosen as 1952 keynoter for his "senior status and publicity value." Another member of the national committee agreed with Ewing by stating that "MacArthur was selected as keynoter in 1952 because he was the greatest American general in the Republican Party and they wished to recognize him." The selection of Walter Judd as keynoter in 1960 was partly due to the idea that "Judd typified the support of the Congress."

In 1964, the arrangements committee conflicted over the political prowess of the 1964 keynoter. Josephine L. Good, who served as executive director of the 1960 and 1964 Republican national conventions, stated that the arrangements committee for the 1964 convention was split on the matter of the keynoter's political status. One group wanted to select a relatively unknown figure and another group wanted a man of

---


40 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Katherine Kennedy Brown, April 17, 1965. (Mrs. Brown has been a member of the Republican national committee since 1932.)

prestige.\footnote{42}{Statement by Josephine L. Good, personal interview, March 23, 1965.}

(One of the reasons that Minnesota Republican Chairman Robert Forsythe was not selected as keynoter was that "he was not well known."\footnote{43}{Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Katherine Kennedy Brown, April 17, 1965. (Although Charles Halleck was also rejected as keynoter for this convention, his rejection was primarily based on another consideration. This matter is discussed later in this chapter.)})\footnote{44}{Statement by Clarence Brown, personal interview, March 25, 1965.}

Evidently the group rejected the idea of choosing a new face, for Clarence Brown indicated that the problem was resolved by the "older people" on the arrangements committee who "decided that a senator should be permanent chairman and that a governor should serve as keynoter."\footnote{44}{Statement by Clarence Brown, personal interview, March 25, 1965.}

The matter of political prowess can perhaps be best illustrated by the table below, listing the governmental positions held by keynoters at the time of their service. Prior to 1896, most keynoters were judges, lawyers, ministers, mayors or farmers. Between 1896 and 1940, United States senators were the most frequent choice for Republican keynoters. Four of the six keynoters between 1944 and 1964, however, have been governors. Although an apparent trend has occurred in the matter of governmental positions, the selection of MacArthur in 1952 and Judd in 1960 shows that the qualification of political power is flexible. Thus, as
TABLE II

GOVERNMENTAL POSITIONS HELD BY REPUBLICAN KEYNOTERS
AT THE TIME OF THEIR SERVICE a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governmental Position</th>
<th>1856-1892</th>
<th>1896-1964</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governor</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U. S. Senator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative in U. S. Congress</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Legislator</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other or None</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>10</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 aClassifications taken from a table in David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 66.

committeeman Bayard Ewing put it, "the reasoning is different in each case to fit the circumstances at the moment." 45

Geographical Location

In addition to speaking ability and political prestige, the keynoter's geographical location is often an important factor. The table below indicates the primary place of residence for the nominees and the keynoters. It seems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Presidential Nominees</th>
<th>Vice-Presidential Nominees</th>
<th>Keynoters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>Fremont (Calif.)</td>
<td>Dayton (N.J.)</td>
<td>Emmet (N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>Lincoln (Ill.)</td>
<td>Hamlin (Maine)</td>
<td>Wilmot (Penna.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>Lincoln (Ill.)</td>
<td>Johnson (Tenn.)</td>
<td>Breckinridge (Ky.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>Grant (Ill.)</td>
<td>Colfax (Ind.)</td>
<td>Schurz (Mo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>Grant (Ill.)</td>
<td>Wilson (Mass.)</td>
<td>McMichael (Penna.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>Hayes (Ohio)</td>
<td>Wheeler (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Pomeroy (N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>Garfield (Ohio)</td>
<td>Arthur (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Hoar (Mass.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>Blaine (Maine)</td>
<td>Logan (Ill.)</td>
<td>Lynch (Miss.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>Harrison (Ind.)</td>
<td>Morton (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Thurston (Nebr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>Harrison (Ind.)</td>
<td>Reid (Ohio &amp; N.Y.)</td>
<td>Fasset (N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>McKinley (Ohio)</td>
<td>Hobart (N.J.)</td>
<td>Fairbanks (Ind.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>McKinley (Ohio)</td>
<td>Roosevelt (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Wolcott (Colo.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>Roosevelt (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Fairbanks (Ind.)</td>
<td>Root (N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1908</td>
<td>Taft (Ohio)</td>
<td>Sherman (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Burrows (Mich.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>Taft (Ohio)</td>
<td>Sherman &amp; Butler (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Root (N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1916</td>
<td>Hughes (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Fairbanks (Ind.)</td>
<td>Harding (Mich.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>Harding (Ohio)</td>
<td>Coolidge (Mass.)</td>
<td>Lodge (N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>Coolidge (Mass.)</td>
<td>Lowden &amp; Dawes (Ill.)</td>
<td>Burton (Ohio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>Hoover (Calif.)</td>
<td>Curtis (Kan.)</td>
<td>Fess (Ohio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Presidential Nominees</td>
<td>Vice-Presidential Nominees</td>
<td>Keynoters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>Hoover (Calif.)</td>
<td>Curtis (Kan.)</td>
<td>Dickinson (Iowa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Landon (Kan.)</td>
<td>Knox (Ill.)</td>
<td>Steiwer (Ore.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>Willkie (Ind. &amp; N.Y.)</td>
<td>McNary (Ore.)</td>
<td>Stassen (Minn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Dewey (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Bricker (Ohio)</td>
<td>Warren (Calif.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Dewey (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Warren (Calif.)</td>
<td>Green (Ill.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>Eisenhower (Tex. &amp; Kan.)</td>
<td>Nixon (Calif.)</td>
<td>MacArthur (Wisc. &amp; N.Y.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Eisenhower (Tex. &amp; Kan.)</td>
<td>Nixon (Calif.)</td>
<td>Langlie (Wash.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Nixon (Calif.)</td>
<td>Lodge (Mass.)</td>
<td>Judd (Minn.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>Goldwater (Ariz.)</td>
<td>Miller (N.Y.)</td>
<td>Hatfield (Ore.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aExplanation of symbols: D-Democrat; R-Republican; C-Contested.*

*bSherman died before the election and Butler was substituted on the ticket.*

*cLowden refused the nomination and Dawes was subsequently nominated.*
significant that in no convention were both nominees and the keynoter from the same state. In the conventions of 1876, 1904, and 1912, the keynoter was from the same state as one of the nominees. In all three of these instances, the state represented twice was electorally rich New York. At no time since the 1912 convention has there been any duplication in residence between the nominees and the keynoter. In the last twenty years, the areas most frequently represented by these three positions have been the east, the mid-west, and the west. No southerner has served as keynoter since 1884, when John Lynch, a Negro farmer from Mississippi, was elected after a bitter floor fight. Since 1924, no keynoter has come from a supposedly "safe" or Republican state. Thus, the geographical locations of the keynoters are obviously important. When the 1864 convention met during the Civil War, Robert J. Breckinridge of Kentucky served as keynoter; the choice of a southerner for this position was hardly accidental. The issue of geography was also important in the selection of Edward O. Wolcott in 1900. Wolcott had almost bolted from the party in 1894 over the issue of bi-metallism and being a "westerner" from Colorado, he was perhaps selected to heal party wounds by singing the praises of the gold standard.  

In more recent years, the necessity for geographical distribution of convention participants has become pretty

much a matter of common knowledge. After noting that 1964 Democratic keynoter Pastore's speech was "violent and vituperative," an Iowa delegate thought that the selection of Pastore was influenced by the fact that he "came from a densely populated area."\(^7\) Another delegate suggested that the selection of Mark Hatfield as 1964 Republican keynoter "allowed us to give some geographic balance to our convention program, recognizing the far West."\(^8\)

A member of the Republican national committee stated that among the reasons for Walter Judd's selection in 1960 was his support in the "Middle West." This same committeeman added that "the geographical aspect" is definitely considered when choosing a keynoter."\(^9\) Clarence Brown said that the arrangements committee attempts to select a keynoter who is from a section of the country different from that of the nominees.\(^10\)

**Additional Considerations**

In certain conventions, keynoters were selected for reasons other than speaking ability, political power, and

---

\(^7\) Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mrs. Malcolm Lomas, March 8, 1965.

\(^8\) Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mrs. Louis G. Rogers, March 2, 1965.


geographical location. One such additional quality or qualification has been the keynoter's appearance. Examination of photographs and descriptions of the keynoters shows that many of them have been relatively handsome (or impressive) men. Included in this category are Wolcott, Root, Harding, Lodge, Dickinson, Warren, MacArthur, and Hatfield. (An examination of photographs and descriptions of several of the keynoters, however, has led to the conclusion that attractiveness is not obligatory.) In order to show the increased importance of appearance or "image" with the growth of mass communications, especially television, an examination of the "attractiveness" qualification in the selection of the 1964 keynoter seems desirable.

"A great deal of politics went into the selection of the keynote speaker at the 1964 Republican Convention."51 A portion of the politics mentioned the appearance of the keynoter speaker. Although "appearance" was certainly not the only factor involved in the selection of Mark Hatfield, it did play an important role. When the Republican governors convened, they agreed to recommend to the arrangements committee that Hatfield serve as permanent chairman for the 1964 convention. The Goldwater supporters, however, wanted Thruston Morton to serve as permanent chairman because they thought that he would be less prejudiced than Hatfield in

recognizing delegates. The Goldwater people wanted Republi-
can national chairman William E. Miller to keynote the con-
vention and were willing to give Hatfield the post of tempo-
rary chairman as a concession to the liberal element of the
party. Even the non-Goldwaterites were apparently unwilling
to block Morton's nomination as permanent chairman because of
his popularity with all factions of the party. With the
post of permanent chairman decided upon, the question of
choices for keynoter and temporary chairman remained. Preci-
cisely what happened at this point is not clear. What appears
to have occurred is that William E. Miller visited Minnesota
prior to the convention and casually discussed the selection
of a keynote speaker with Robert Forsythe, chairman of the
Minnesota state committee. Forsythe wanted to be keynoter,
but did not want to serve as temporary chairman. Evidently,
Forsythe misunderstood Miller's intentions and thought that
he had been invited to serve as keynoter. Minority House
leader Halleck also apparently expected the arrangements com-
mitee to follow a precedent set by Joseph Martin when Martin
served as permanent chairman during his years as House
minority leader. (Halleck was not aware that this position

52Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, "A Coup for Mod-

53Personal correspondence of the writer, source
requested not to be identified.

54Statement by Josephine L. Good, personal interview,
had been filled by Morton.)\(^{55}\) Since Morton was to be the national committee's choice for permanent chairman, Hatfield was offered the position of temporary chairman. At this time, the Goldwater supporters still thought that Miller would serve as keynoter. Hatfield, however, regarded himself as the "representative of the 16 Republican Governors" and thought "that the temporary chairmanship was not sufficient notice of the Governors. . . .\(^{56}\) The issue was complicated at this point by Miller's decision to refuse the post of keynoter because he wanted to "bring in newer and younger faces."\(^{57}\) The Goldwater people were left without a pre-arranged alternate choice for keynoter and turned to conservative Tim Babcock, Governor of Montana. The move to support Babcock as keynoter, however, was too late, for national committeeman John Martin of Michigan had already recommended a return to the former practice of allowing the temporary chairman to deliver the keynote speech.\(^{58}\) Among the men considered for the dual role were Forsythe (who thought he would be selected because of his conversation with Miller), Halleck, Babcock, and Hatfield. In addition to the factors of speaking ability, political power, and geographical location, the

\(^{55}\)Ibid.

\(^{56}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mark O. Hatfield, May 25, 1965.

\(^{57}\)Morning Advocate [Baton Rouge, Louisiana], May 14, 1964, p. 2-C.

issue of appearance loomed large in the discussions. Although each of the men under consideration had at least some of the needed characteristics of the keynoter, Hatfield was considered to be more "attractive" than Forsythe or Halleck.\(^59\) Thus, this additional consideration of appearance can be said to be a factor influencing the arrangements committee. (Even the delegates are aware of the importance of the keynoter appearance. One phrase used frequently by several delegates was the observation that a keynoter should be "attractive and dynamic."\(^60\)

The Republican party has frequently been badly divided by conflicts between liberal and conservative groups. Consequently, as was illustrated by the discussion of the 1964 convention, intraparty struggles for power exert a pervasive influence on all parts of the convention. Frequently, the selection of the keynoter has been influenced by these intraparty squabbles. This second "additional consideration" regarding the qualities and qualifications of the keynoter can best be illustrated by a discussion of these power struggles in the conventions of 1880, 1884, 1888, 1908, and 1912.

In 1880, the selection of the keynoter was based almost wholly on intraparty manipulations for power. After

\(^{59}\)Statement by several members of the Republican leadership who requested not to be identified.

\(^{60}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letters from Louis C. Wyman, March 18, 1965; Mrs. Louis B. Rogers, March 8, 1965; Mrs. Katherine K. Neuberger, March 12, 1965.
Grant returned from his European tour in the fall of 1879, many of his supporters, led by Roscoe Conkling, began plans to restore the "unit rule" that had created such strife in 1876. This strategy was based on the selection of a partisan temporary chairman who would make a favorable ruling on the unit rule. The supporters of the other two major candidates, James G. Blaine and John Sherman, discovered the plan and threatened to remove pro-Grant national chairman Don Cameron from office if he supported the plot. According to Blaine's biographer, James A. Garfield forced Cameron to abide by the wishes of the majority of the national committee and select George F. Hoar, an anti-Grant man, to serve as temporary chairman. Consequently, the matter of unit rule was decided upon by the convention and not by the prejudices of a pro-Grant chairman. In this instance the selection of the keynoter was based on considerations other than Hoar's speaking ability, or geographical location.

As has been mentioned earlier in the study, the arrangements committee plays a major role in the selection of convention participants. The national committee usually accepts their recommendations and presents the list of convention participants to the convention for a vote.

---

The nomination made by the national committee is usually accepted by the convention without contest or division. If there is opposition, however, any delegate is entitled to place another name before the convention and call for a vote. . . .64

Such a circumstance arose for the first time in the 1884 convention, when the Blaine-controlled national committee selected Powell Clayton to serve as temporary chairman, and the convention rejected the choice. Henry Cabot Lodge moved that John R. Lynch, a Negro delegate from Mississippi, be installed as temporary chairman. This action has been interpreted in several ways. According to one source, Clayton was a Blaine supporter and a "coalition of Blaine's opponents decided that substitution of a colored delegate for chairman would weaken Blaine's appeal to other colored delegates."65 Another source stated that Clayton was originally selected by the Arthur supporters, but that Clayton moved into the Blaine camp when Arthur refused to grant him a postmastership; consequently, the Arthur people decided to punish Clayton by voting against his nomination.66 By an analysis of key votes, Bain concluded that Lynch was nominated and seconded by "members of the pro-Edmunds reformist bloc, and was supported by the Stalwarts, and these two groups, with assistance from favorite son delegations, selected him."67

64Kleeburg, op. cit., p. 119.

65Bain, op. cit., p. 122; Muzzey, op. cit., p. 278, concurs with Bain.

66Bain, ibid.

67Ibid.
The effect of this power struggle was that Lynch's speech was evidently unprepared—the speech was neither well organized nor well supported. The qualities of speaking ability and geographical location were obviously considered to be of less importance in this instance than power struggles within the party.

Four years later, in the 1888 convention, the national chairman was evidently unwilling to risk a repetition of the 1884 floor fight, and presented the temporary chairman to the convention without calling for a vote on his election. A delegate rose and asked if the temporary chairman had been elected and the sergeant at arms replied that "the Temporary Chairman is Mr. John M. Thurston." The delegate then stated,

... [that in] behalf of the Kansas delegation, I desire to say that they decline to be responsible for the action in any manner of the National Committee in this matter. They regard it as a very great mistake. And they desire me to state that they wish to record the vote of their state—that they wish the roll to be called, and if the roll is called they will vote for the Hon. William Warner of Missouri.68

The motion was apparently ignored, for Thurston began his speech immediately.

The circumstances surrounding the selection of Julius C. Burrows as temporary chairman in 1908 merit attention for their illumination of the impending Progressive third party

68Proceedings, 1888, p. 11. (The titles and publishers of Republican convention proceedings have varied from year to year and will be cited simply as Proceedings throughout this study. Complete titles and publishing information is included in the bibliography.)
movement. Apparently, President Roosevelt's choice for keynote was historian Albert J. Beveridge, but the last vestiges of the anti-Taft movement were strong enough to block the selection of Beveridge. Taft wrote Roosevelt that

... [it] appears that all the committee were opposed to Beveridge; that Dover moved his election in the committee, and that by way of opposition to that General Powell Clayton moved the postponement of action until the 3rd of June. The committee agreed to this, though one of them--Mr. Hart of Iowa--expressed the view that the Chairman ought to make the appointment, and the rest of the committee intimated that they were not very much opposed to the Chairman's doing so, though they seemed to have expressed their opposition to Beveridge. The result was that the committee adjourned and Clayton did not know of the appointment of Burrows until he heard by telegram after he had left Chicago... He wished you to know this in a confidential way because he was exceedingly anxious to avoid the impression that he had been in any way concerned in a movement adverse to the Administration. This only confirms what I have already told you, but it shows with even greater distinctness that the appointment was made solely by New.69

As a conservative, Burrows differed with Roosevelt on many issues. Roosevelt felt that Beveridge's progressive ideas would be preferable to those of Burrows. As chairman of the national committee, however, Harry S. New ignored Roosevelt's preference and substituted a man hostile to Roosevelt's progressive policies. Bain observed that the conservatives on the committee joined with New to "sidetrack Beveridge on the grounds that he came from the same state as a potential candidate, Vice-President Fairbanks, and by adroit maneuvering,

managed to install their own choice."70

The final convention to be discussed regarding intra-party power struggles and their influence on the selection of the keynoter is the convention of 1912. In this convention, the selection of the temporary chairman erupted into a floor fight for the second time in Republican convention history. The historic and rather tragic Taft-Roosevelt breach had continued to widen during the months prior to the convention. Since the national committee has a major role in selecting the keynoter, perhaps it would be worthwhile to look briefly at the position of the national committee in 1912. The committee had been selected at a convention dominated by Roosevelt and under rules approved by Roosevelt; yet, at least thirty-seven of the fifty-three members of the national committee were Taft supporters.71 Pringle attempted to explain this by noting that a national committeeman "is a disciplined party leader. His loyalty remains with the titular head of the party, and Taft was now that head."72 Both Taft and the national committee wanted Elihu Root to serve as temporary chairman in the 1912 convention. Root had keynoted the 1904 convention that had nominated Roosevelt, and had

70Bain, op. cit., p. 172.
72Pringle, loc. cit.
served as Secretary of War, Secretary of State, and as a United States senator. The position of temporary chairman was vitally important to both Taft and Roosevelt because of his rulings on the contested delegations. Roosevelt, however, was at first hesitant to oppose a former member of his cabinet until pressure from western progressives forced him to change his mind and fight.73

Roosevelt decided to support the nomination of Governor McGovern of Wisconsin as temporary chairman rather than support the election of Elihu Root. Unless the Roosevelt forces could enlist the support of the La Follette backers he lacked the strength to organize or even to deadlock the convention. The Roosevelt men reasoned that the La Follette Wisconsin delegation would hardly refuse to support their own governor as temporary chairman and then that McGovern could select pro-Roosevelt committees to help overturn the rulings of the national committee over the contested seats.

The prolonged floor battle over the selection of the 1912 keynoter lasted for seven hours, and Root won over McGovern by a close vote of 558 to 551. Taft's margin of victory was slight, but in the 1912 convention, Root's election virtually assured Taft's nomination.

The most frequently occurring characteristics and qualities of Republican keynoters concern their speaking

73 Martin, op. cit., p. 119.
ability, political power, and geographical location. In certain years, these qualities have been outweighed by factors such as physical appearance or intraparty power struggles. In various conventions, specific events caused the national committee and Republican leadership to consider other factors for selecting a keynoter. In 1864, for example, Robert J. Breckinridge was perhaps chosen as a contrast to another member of his family, Democratic nominee John C. Breckinridge, who ran with Douglas in 1860. In 1900, Edward O. Wolcott was chosen partly because of his residence in a Democratic silver-producing state. In 1952, Douglas MacArthur was selected as keynoter partly because of his dispute with President Truman over the conduct of the Korean War. Such variables were frequent, but occurred with so little relationship to each other that they will not be discussed further in this study.

A COMPOSITE VIEW OF REPUBLICAN KEYNOTERS

The characteristic most common among all Republican keynoters was that twenty-three of the twenty-seven keynoters had studied law. Three of the remaining four keynoters were college trained, however, for one was a physician, one was an army general and a West Point graduate, and the third was a Harvard graduate. Only John R. Lynch, who was nominated from the floor of the convention, had received no legal or advanced schooling. (Lynch served in the House of Representatives, however, from 1873-1877, and from 1882-1883.)
The most frequently occurring age for a keynoter was between fifty and fifty-five years old. Table IV shows the ages of the keynoters. Every keynoter since 1936 has been a veteran of military service. No keynoter has ever attended a southern college or university.

TABLE IV
AGE AND NUMBER OF KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUMMARY

It seems evident that there is no single rationale for selecting a keynote speaker in Republican national conventions. Newspaper writers, scholars, and casual observers, as well as delegates and members of the Republican hierarchy agree that the speaker should have some degree of oratorical ability. Another frequently mentioned characteristic of the person selected as keynoter was his political prowess. Most
of the keynoters seem to fall into two rather distinct categories: (1) men who already have achieved considerable prestige and power, and (2) men who are being groomed by the party for possible future leadership. Most of the delegates with whom the writer discussed the matter of political power tended to support the first of the two categories—that the keynoter should have an established reputation. Although "outsiders" had little to say about the keynoter's geographical location, many delegates and members of the Republican leadership indicated that the keynoter's place of residence was important. Occasionally, these three characteristics have been outweighed by additional considerations such as appearance or intraparty power struggles.

The largest single age group represented by the twenty-seven keynoters was between fifty and fifty-five. As a group, the men selected to keynote Republican national conventions have been exceptionally well educated, most of them having studied law. In recent years, all keynoters have been veterans and the majority of the keynoters since 1940 have been governors.
Although the early Republicans had no real continuity of Whig policy, the new party did have several organizational precedents to follow. Prior to their 1856 convention, the Republicans were quick to make use of committees of correspondence, central committees, and a national committee—all of which had been used with success by both Whigs and Democrats. Additionally, there is considerable evidence that the National Republican convention of December 12, 1831, served as the most imitated model of procedure in later conventions of both parties.

Republican national conventions from 1856 to 1888 were begun with a "call to order" read by the national chairman. Each day's session was opened with a prayer by a clergyman with some degree of at least local prestige. The order of the other first day events has varied occasionally, especially

---

1The secretary of the convention began reading this call in 1888.

2These gentlemen are carefully and regularly assorted to avoid offending any particular religious group.
since the advent of radio and television and the arrangements committee's attempts to schedule major events during prime television time. During the earlier Republican conventions, the opening days' activities also included an address by the national chairman, and addresses by both the temporary chairman and the permanent chairman. In later years, "official" photographs were taken, pledges of allegiance were repeated, the delegates were sung to by duets, trios, quartets, octets, and choirs, the convention was "welcomed" by city councilmen, mayors, and governors, and the delegates were frequently prayed over by Catholics, Jews, Baptists, Methodists, and Lutherans, to name only a few of the day's exhausting activities.3

THE KEYNOTE SPEECH: ITS PURPOSE AND FUNCTION

Since the convention itself is multipurpose and the keynote speech is an important part of the observable convention, this chapter examines the purpose and function of the keynote speech from four points of view: (1) views of newspaper writers, casual observers, and scholarly writers; (2) views of the delegates to various Republican national conventions; (3) views of the national committee members and other leaders in the Republican party; and (4) views of the keynoteers themselves.

3The importance of these events is discussed in Chapter V as "extrinsic means of persuasion," pp. 224-227.
Views of Newspaper Writers, Casual Observers and Scholarly Writers

Most of the commentary on keynoting written by "outsiders" is of little value as aids in this attempt to better understand the purpose and function of the keynote speech. Responses by newspaper writers, casual observers, and scholars can be grouped into several separate categories.

Since many outsiders are either unable or unwilling to accept the rally function of the observable convention, they have most frequently dealt with the keynote speech by ridicule. Consider, for example, Edward Lowry's statement that keynoting "implies the ability to make melodic noises and give the impression of passionately and torrentially moving onward and upward while warily standing still."^4 Or consider Sidney Hyman's wry notation that the keynote speaker, "first . . . whets his axe on the grindstone of several thousand fire-spouting words. Then, while his audience shouts its ecstasy, he chops off the head of the President."^5 Robert Bendiner's treatment of the "keynote ritual" is also rather typical of the responses in this category. Bendiner stated that the keynote speaker

... is expected to flay the opposition alive and work up a fine spirit of unity in his own party


before it proceeds to tear itself apart over the nomination. Only partisans of the deepest dye can take seriously these grandiloquent outpourings, which credit only one political sect with genius, patriotism, courage and defense of the American home while holding the other responsible for wars, crime, early frost and the Colorado beetle. They are viewed solely as virtuoso performances. Every rolling period draws an ovation, and mention of the party's historical giants is likely to bring an outburst. . . . 6

A final example of such ridicule was Will Rogers's summary of Simeon D. Fess's 1928 keynote speech:

A Keynote Speech is Press notices of the Republican Party, written by its own members.

Here are just a few things that I bet you didn't know the Republicans were responsible for: Radio, Telephone, Baths, Automobiles, Savings Accounts, Law Enforcement, Workmen living in houses, and a living wage for Senators.

The Democrats had brought in War, pestilence, debts, Disease, Bo [sic] Weevil, Gold Teeth, need of Farm relief, suspenders, floods, famine and Tom Heflin. . . .

Once I thought sure he was referring to 'Our Saviour' till they told me, 'No, it was Coolidge.' The way he rated 'em was Coolidge, The Lord, and then Lincoln.

It was an impromptu address that he had been working on for only six months. He made no attempt at Oratory, he just shouted. 7

The second most frequently occurring response in this category came from scholars who agreed that the speech was multipurposive. Edwin A. Miles noted that "the keynote speech has two primary purposes: to raise the enthusiasms of

---


the delegates to a high pitch and to rally the voters of the nation to the party's standard." Sait saw three functions for the speech. He stated that the keynoter "exposes the weaknesses of the enemy, summons the party hosts to battle, and does his best to silence discords." V. O. Key agreed that the "keynoter inveighs against the opposition," but added that he also "recites the great achievements of his party, invokes the memory of the great party leaders of the past, and generally attempts to set a stirring theme for the convention." A third response voiced by these outsiders was that the speech should deal primarily with campaign issues. David, Goldman, and Bain noted that the keynote address should proclaim "the chief points on which the party will base its appeal to the voters." In a similar vein, Harold Bruce observed that the keynote speech should set forth "the salient aspects and outstanding issues" of the forthcoming election campaign. The fourth group of responses from journalists and

---


10Key, op. cit., p. 453.

11David, Goldman, and Bain, op. cit., p. 65.

scholars viewed the speech primarily as epideictic—"to point with pride and view with alarm."\(^{13}\) Theodore Cousens elaborated on the matter of praise or blame by saying that whether the keynoter will "deal mostly in praise or blame will depend mainly on whether the party is in or out of office.

In the former situation there is little to do but praise the current administration, showing how it has helped the farmer, the laborer, the businessman, the Negro, national prosperity, the cause of peace, the national security, and so on ad infinitum.

\[\ldots\text{[If the keynoter's party is out of office, he]devotes himself largely to vitriolic assaults on the record of the administration, revealing them as crooks and wastrels, the friends of privilege or the foes of honest business.}\ldots\]^{14}

Thus, there are some areas of agreement among newspaper writers, casual observers, and scholars on the function and purpose of the keynote speech. These writers feel that the speech should set forth important issues for the campaign ahead, stimulate the delegates, point with pride to party accomplishments (if in office), and to attack the opposition for any unpopular occurrence.

### Views of Delegates to the National Convention

The most frequently mentioned purpose for the keynote speech from the point of view of the delegates to national

\(^{13}\)See, for example, Pie Dufour, "Pie a la Mode," *Times Picayune* [New Orleans], July 12, 1964.

conventions was that the speech should set the "tone," "mood," "tenor," or "stage" for the convention itself. Most of the delegates who felt that the speech should set a dominant tone or mood felt that the speech should stimulate the delegates. This opinion took various forms of expression, such as "stir up emotions," "key the delegates up," "be a real inspiration," and "pep the listeners up."\(^{15}\)

A second major group of responses dealt with the importance of radio and television coverage of the keynote speech. This point of view was well expressed by a West Virginia delegate who thought that

\[\text{. . . the keynoter should realize that millions of people will be watching, which will include party workers, hard core Republicans, Republicans, Independents [sic], and Democrats. His speech should be directed more at them than to his local audience. I feel a different technique should be used in speaking to television and radio audiences than when speaking only to the assembled delegates.}^{16}\]

A large number of delegates used phrases such as "I think it is now primarily designed for the radio and T.V. audience,"\(^ {17}\)

---


\(^{16}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Cleo S. Jones, March 18, 1965.

\(^{17}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from John N. Dalton, April 5, 1965.
or "TV has turned the whole thing into a show," or, "television is important—the keynoter gives the nation the first look at the issues, hopes, plans and ambitions of that convention—the keynoter is talking to the public—not the delegates." One delegate went so far as to suggest that the keynoter,

... should use illustrations, possibly pictures and certainly an occasional item of interest to the television audience. The necessary slide reproductions and other useful photographic material should be professionally prepared well in advance of the convention by the best skilled public relations people. ... The keynote address should be prepared in draft form at least thirty days before the Convention and each prospective correction and illustration should be proof tested on television, with at least one or two dry runs before it is actually delivered.

A third major purpose for the speech as seen by the delegates was to isolate issues for the forthcoming election campaign. This response, occurring less frequently than the suggestion that the speech should be stimulating, was expressed in a variety of ways, including the following: "to provide the theme for the forthcoming campaign"; an aggressive outline of the party's objectives and opportunities"; to outline the single most important issue in the forthcoming election"; and, "to reflect the principle issues on which the campaign


will be based." This group of delegates, then, evidently viewed the speech as primarily informative or argumentative rather than stimulating.

A fourth purpose expressed by the delegates indicated that the keynote speech should stimulate the nation (but not necessarily inform them about issues). None of the delegates with whom the writer discussed the manner in which this stimulation should occur were very specific about how it was to be accomplished. Several did indicate, however, that the speech was primarily designed for radio and television audiences rather than for the convention participants.

The fifth largest category of responses came from those delegates who felt that the speech was multipurpose, often including one or more of the reasons discussed previously, i.e., to stimulate the delegates, to inform or persuade the nation, and to stimulate the nation. A West Virginia delegate, for example, stated that the speech

... should have three main purposes. First, it should set the 'note' upon which the campaign is waged. Secondly, it should create enthusiasm among the party workers and leaders. Thirdly, since it is given early in the convention it should create such interest that the viewing audience would want to watch more of the convention.  

---


Odin Langen, Congressman from Minnesota, also felt that the speech should have three purposes: (1) to inspire the convention; (2) to carry the message to party leaders; and (3) to inspire the nation as a whole.23 A Wyoming delegate found five purposes for the keynote speech:

The speech is probably designed to (a) kill time while the committees are working; (b) pep the listeners up; (c) give the delegates a background of party positions preparatory to adopting platforms; (d) attempt to unify splinters; (e) give a present or future candidate for some office a chance to be heard.24

Other delegates expressed an awareness of the speech's multiple purpose, but the three examples given illustrate the typical answers in this category.

A sixth major category of responses dealt with attacks on the opposition. This idea was expressed in many ways, including statements such as "a frontal attack upon the Democratic Party," "pinpoint Democratic failures to keep promises as well as duplicity of administration," "indict the opposition," "concentrate on blatant Democratic failures," and "to give the opposition hell--no matter what."25


A seventh category of responses suggested that the speeches were relatively unimportant. Respondents feeling this way said, "I think they all stink and are misleading and without merit" or "I would say that keynote speeches are nothing but a lot of hot air." Also included in this category would be the comments of several delegates who suggested that the keynote speech was merely a tradition—a speech that once served a useful purpose, but no longer is needed.\(^{26}\)

Still other delegates used phrases such as the following to explain the purpose of the speech: "merely frosting on the cake," "the speech should differentiate between the philosophies and methods of the two parties," "the speech should deal with philosophy, not issues," and that the speech should serve as the convention's "State of the Party and of the Union (as we see it) message."\(^{27}\)

Many delegates to the national conventions feel that the primary purpose of the keynote speech is to stimulate the delegates by setting the mood or tone of the convention. Other delegates felt that the speech was primarily designed for radio and television listeners. Still other delegates suggested that the speech should isolate issues for the


\(^{27}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letters from Webster B. Todd, March 29, 1965; Willard E. Strain, March 8, 1965; Paul E. Morris, February 25, 1965; J. Herman Saxon, April 27, 1965.
forthcoming campaign, stimulate the nation, attack the opposition, or fill a combination of all these requirements. Some of the delegates also felt the speech was unimportant.

Views of Members of the Republican Hierarchy

Views of members of the Republican hierarchy regarding the purpose and function of the keynote speech are similar to the opinions of outsiders and delegates. This category includes opinions by former national chairmen, members of the national committee, Republican governors, officials and employees of the Republican party, and congressional leaders. Although the responses from this group of political activists were quite varied, they can be separated into categories similar to those used earlier in this chapter. The large majority of respondents in this category regarded the purpose of the keynote speech as primarily stimulating or inspirational. Clarence Brown, a long-time member of the arrangements committee, said that the speech should be "unifying and inspirational rather than controversial."^28 Wirt A. Yerger, Jr., Chairman of the Southern Association of Republican State Chairmen, felt that the "keynote speech is certainly an excellent opportunity to set the tone of the convention, and it can inspire the delegates in a significant way."^29 Other

---


Republican leaders used phrases such as "light a spark of enthusiasm," "contribute materially to the tone and morale of the convention," and "set the tone for the convention." (About half of the persons in this third category with whom the writer discussed the purpose of keynoting used the phrase "tone of the convention.")

The second largest group of responses dealt with the importance of radio and television as they were related to the purpose of the keynote speech. The long quotation that follows expresses this particular point of view quite well:

The National Convention of a political party today is perhaps the greatest single opportunity of that party to put its candidate and its program before the people of the Country. I was told in San Francisco by the networks that there were two high points in the convention: one the keynote speech, and the second the acceptance speech. The audience on these two occasions might well run as high as 50-million people and was expected by each party to exceed 40-million.

Never again during the entire campaign can either party expect their audience to be as large as this except in the unlikely event of a Nixon-Kennedy debate. Once the campaign positions of the public begin to harden they tend to screen out material offered by the side which they do not favor. Yet the figures seem to indicate that they will listen to the keynote and acceptance speeches. For this reason the entire timetable of the convention is geared to these two events.

Another factor is that the keynote historically is expected to be a long speech, far longer and more

comprehensive than any single campaign appearance. Consequently, the keynote speech is one of the two or three most important efforts of the entire campaign and must of necessity serve as a showcase for the philosophy and achievements of the party . . . and most likely will rehearse the program of the party in the Congress just concluded . . . . In addition, if the speech is organized about ideas which are common to a majority of the Congressional caucus it probably will be 'safe' as a matter of party doctrine.

Naturally there is a negative side to all of this and the speech will also attack the opposition. However, in my view, if the attack is limited to horrible examples from which a positive policy or conclusion can be drawn, rather than to make the attack merely for the sake of attack, the technique is more effective. 31

Robert E. Smylie, Governor of Idaho, echoed similar sentiments when he stated that "TV, radio and the superheated news" require that the convention "create a show-case of the party's leadership and to gain national recognition for those who will be obliged later to carry the main brunt of the party's case-in-chief."

George L. Hinman, National Committeeman from New York states that,

. . . . because of the size of the TV and radio audience that is tuned in on the convention, I think it is an unexcelled opportunity for the party to get its message across to the country, and it can be, of course, an opening tocsin for the party's campaign. 33

Joe Martin, admittedly an authority of convention behavior,
stated that the keynote speech "was directed to the public—not the delegates, they won't change."\(^{34}\)

The third major category of responses consisted of those persons who felt that the purpose of the keynote speech depended on whether or not the party's nominations would be hotly contested. This position was best expressed by Charles H. Percy. Percy thought that the keynote speech is usually designed to remind the delegates that they are all of one party by emphasizing those themes which the delegates agree on. A convention is often a scene of fierce contention, out of which the delegates hope to achieve a strong measure of unity. The keynoter speaks before the battle for the nomination. When the outcome is in doubt, he tries to avoid favoring one candidate and his views. He therefore emphasizes those issues on which the party as a whole agrees, in opposition to the other party. And in doing so, he of course strives to create enthusiasm for the party as a whole and its cause, in hopes that this shared enthusiasm will persist throughout the intense intraparty combat about to take place, and perhaps even temper and limit it.

When there is to be no competition for the nomination, the task of the keynoter is much simpler and we see only the effort to state the position of the unified party, to attack the opposition, and to arouse the party faithful to great effort in the general election.\(^{35}\)

Ted H. Hardwick, Chairman of the Republican State Central Committee of Kentucky, expressed this same idea somewhat more concisely when he stated that,

\(^{34}\)Statement by Joseph Martin, personal interview, March 22, 1965.

... if there is a contest on, the keynoter properly plays down controversial issues between the prospective candidates of the particular party. When the candidate of the party is a foregone conclusion it takes on the tone of a campaign speech and hammers out arguments in favor of the platform.36

The fourth major category deals with those respondents who felt that the keynote speech was multipurposive. Melvin E. Lundberg, National Committeeman from Nevada, stated that...

... my ideas concerning a keynote speech or the purpose of such a speech are not particularly fixed, nor do I feel that the purpose has been, as far as my experience is concerned, a fixed purpose but changes with the needs at the time of convention.

A keynote speech, I suppose, serves to create an atmosphere and engender excitement or a proper mood for a convention. It serves to set the goal or to explain to the delegates the plans that have been carefully prepared by the party officials, sugar-coated for easy acceptability. A keynote speech, also, generally provides a highly critical analysis of the conduct of the opposition, especially when the opposition is in power, and it serves to express the virtues of the Republican Party.37

Mrs. R. T. Lund, National Committeewoman from Minnesota, also saw the keynote as multipurposive:

The importance of the keynote speech is to set the tone for the convention and the campaign that follows. The keynoter takes the opportunity to criticize the opposition party and the Administration performance, if the Party of the keynoter is not in office. He then sets forth his Party's position on the issues and the fundamental beliefs


and principles which the presidential nominee of his Party would likely support.\(^{38}\)

A sixth category of Republican activists regarded the keynote speech "to be of only minor importance," and "to be vastly overrated." Only one member of the National Committee dismissed the speech completely by stating that he "could see no purpose whatsoever for a keynote speaker or a keynote speech in a political convention."\(^{39}\)

The final group of responses to be considered can only be labeled as miscellaneous commentary, yet several of the responses seem worthy of at least brief attention. Joe Martin, who "has been attending conventions since the time of Root," stated that in his opinion the keynote speaker should "brighten up the convention—simply make it more attractive."\(^{40}\) W. W. Wannamaker, Republican National Committeeman from South Carolina, said,

\[
\text{I do not believe a keynote speech achieves any important result but on the other hand I do not believe that it is an anachronism which should be discarded. It is a formality which adds to the dignity of the gathering even though it does not affect the result.}\(^{41}\)
\]

\(^{38}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mrs. Russell T. Lund, March 16, 1965.

\(^{39}\)Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from John W. Tyler, March 15, 1965.


Warren P. Knowles, Governor of Wisconsin, observed that the keynoter

... takes a high and lofty position as to the posture of the party and attempts to assess the historical background of the party and emphasizes its principles, ideals and aspirations.42

It seems evident that although the majority of the respondents in these categories stressed the importance of stimulating and exciting the delegates, that numerous commentators in all three major categories saw additional purposes for the keynote speech—to inform the delegates, to inform the nation, to attack the opposition, to add dignity to the occasion, to stress common Republican principles, to help achieve unity, to "kill time," and to focus attention on the proceedings of the convention. In the light of this multiplicity of opinion from newspaper writers, scholars, casual observers, delegates, and leaders in the inner circle of the party, it is interesting to observe how the keynoters themselves view their own role. How do these men who have been chosen to give the keynote address attempt to meet the somewhat amorphous demands that have just been discussed?

Views of the Keynoters Regarding the Purpose of the Keynote Speech

Many of the keynoters evidenced an awareness of the complexity of the keynote situation. In 1904, Elihu Root

42 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Warren P. Knowles, April 21, 1965.
explained to President Roosevelt that he "would deliberately refrain from discussing issues . . . [for] it does not seem to me quite the correct thing for the temporary chairman to discuss issues in advance of the platform." Root went on to explain the speech's purpose as he saw it:

\[\ldots\] I have treated what has been done from an administration rather than from a personal standpoint. I have tried to make everybody feel as if he was getting a share of the honor, and have made the issue of the party prominent.\]

Root ended his letter with the observation that the keynote speech "should set forth the important acts of public administration." As an in-power keynoter, Root felt that the purpose of the speech was primarily threefold: (1) avoid issues; (2) share the glory with all the party rather than merely lauding the incumbent President; and (3) review the accomplishments of the administration. In 1932, although he was also an in-power keynoter, L. J. Dickinson faced a problem of a different nature. As he put it,

\[\ldots\] in my keynote speech at the Chicago National Convention I was confronted by a very difficult political situation, times were hard, prices were low, many laborers unemployed, and there was not much that President Hoover could brag about so far as the condition of the country was concerned. \ldots\]

My purpose was to show that regardless of the economic and financial condition of the country that Hoover was the best man to lead it out of the chaos. I still think I was right in that

\[43^{\text{Theodore Roosevelt Papers, Library of Congress, Root to Roosevelt, June 13, 1904.}}\]

\[44^{\text{Ibid.}}\]

\[45^{\text{Ibid.}}\]
contention and my speech was pointed in that direction.46

Thus, in these two situations, the political and social conditions which prevailed at the time partially determined the keynoter's purpose. In 1940, Harold E. Stassen felt that his keynote speech should "set the tone so far as issues are concerned for the Convention until such time as the Party nominee is named. Then his address sets the Party tone."47 It seems important to note that all three of the keynoters just mentioned have stressed party positions and party issues rather than merely personal opinions and positions. Walter Judd, the 1960 keynoter, elaborated on this matter by explaining that the keynoter has "to sell the party, not himself. He must put the views of the party ahead of his own views."48 Judd went on to explain the purpose of the speech as he saw it. According to Judd,

[The] keynote speech should re-state and sum up the party position and show what we will work toward. Traditionally, the speech is designed to unite and arouse the delegates to greater enthusiasm, to "recharge their batteries" by saying the things that they believe. This speech, as I see it, should show the raison d'etre for the party. It simply answers the question, "how do we believe?"49

---


47 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Harold E. Stassen, April 21, 1965.


49 Ibid.
In 1964, keynoter Mark O. Hatfield faced a difficult speaking situation. The convention was deeply split philosophically, and, as one delegate put it,

"... the GOP keynoter obviously cannot represent either of the present two wings of the Republican party so in the nature of things is forced to resort to nothing but cliches and generalities."

Hatfield was intensely aware of his divided audience and rated the delegates present as "neutral for about one-third; friendly for one-third and hostile for about one-tenth." Hatfield, like Judd, saw the purpose of his speech as stimulation of the delegates and the nation. Hatfield stated that his purpose was "to inspire; to give a mood for later convention action; a call to arms." Although Hatfield stressed the importance of party issues and party position, he was also personally concerned about the issue of extremism. The question was, of course, how the matter would be handled. Historically, as will be explained in Chapter V, keynoters often have tended to minimize controversial matters of philosophy. Yet in the 1964 Republican convention, Hatfield spoke out strongly on extremism. Governor Hatfield stated:

Our faith challenges any who would destroy freedom

---


51 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mark O. Hatfield, April 2, 1965.

52 Ibid.
whether they wrap themselves in a false cloak of patriotism or an equally false cloak of religion. There are bigots in this nation who spew forth their venom of hate. They parade under hundreds of labels including the Communist Party, the Ku Klux Klan and the John Birch Society. They must be overcome.

Although the Official Proceedings of the convention will record "cheers and extended applause" following this statement, the speaker was booed and hissed by part of his audience. Walter Judd commented that Hatfield's timing was bad and that Hatfield was speaking for himself. Judd felt that this reference to the Birch Society "caused division because these were not ideas that the party had accepted. Hatfield put his own views ahead of party views." Hatfield, however, stated that he "anticipated the booing at the reference of the JBS." Hatfield later explained his position by stating that "I said what was on my heart and felt it had to be said and I doubted that anyone else would say it. Were I to do it all over again, I would repeat that part of my message." This is the only instance with which the writer is familiar where a keynoter used controversial material knowing that it would provoke a fairly large portion of his immediate audience.

53 Verbatim transcript supplied by Republican National Headquarters.


55 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Mark O. Hatfield, April 2, 1965.

In this instance personal considerations evidently outweighed any other factor.

So far as specific purposes are concerned, there appears to be no fixed and rigid purpose to which the keynoter must adhere, but rather that the speakers felt free to adapt to the specific social and political climates of the times.

In recent years, the keynoters have been faced with the problems of a multiple audience—the delegates, the radio and television audience, and the reading audience. As was discussed earlier, the delegates and members of the Republican leadership are quite cognizant of the importance of these factors involving radio and television. How did the keynoters feel about their multiple audience? L. J. Dickinson, the 1932 keynoter, stated:

It is true that we have many different problems in the U.S. because what Maine may want Louisiana may oppose and vice versa. In other words, different sections of the country have their location problems. Not all of them can become national problems...57

As keynoter in 1940, Harold E. Stassen was aware that "the audience present, the audience then on radio... and the readers of the newspapers must all be taken into account."58 Stassen further explained that "it was recognized that the national radio audience was the most important in its ultimate


58Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from Harold E. Stassen, April 21, 1965.
effect, but that the message must also react strongly with
the Convention audience."59 Walter Judd, 1960 keynoter,
also realized the importance of the radio-television audience.
Judd stated that although the speech has been traditionally
geared toward the delegates that "the addition of television
adds appeal to the general public. Each year the keynote
speech is directed more and more toward the public and away
from the delegates who are present."60 As 1964 keynoter,
Mark Hatfield remarked that the "speech is seen and heard by
millions . . . the convention audience and the television
audience have to be equally prominent in the keynoter's
mind."61

Even prior to the days of television, the keynoters
were aware of their multiple audience, for Elihu Root
explained to Theodore Roosevelt that his 1904 keynote address
would "take about an hour and twenty minutes to deliver in
full. My idea is to cut it in delivery to less than hour;
but there is not a sentence left in the paper which I do not
want to have in the speech as it is printed unless you see
some objection to it."62

59 Ibid.


61 Personal correspondence of the writer, letter from
Mark O. Hatfield, April 2, 1965.

62 Theodore Roosevelt Papers, Library of Congress,
Root to Roosevelt, June 13, 1904. (Underlining is my own.)
SUMMARY

Newspaper writers, scholars, casual observers, delegates, and members of the Republican hierarchy felt that a keynote speech should:

1. stimulate the delegates
2. stimulate the nation
3. inform the delegates
4. inform the nation regarding party positions on issues (or convince them to accept the positions)
5. promote unity
6. provide a forum for a present or potential leader
7. deal with philosophy rather than issues
8. present party views rather than the personal views of the keynoter
9. point with pride (if in office) and view with alarm (if opposition is in office)
10. attract attention of radio and television auditors

The keynoters themselves were often in substantial agreement with these purposes, yet in all instances allowed for some flexibility of purpose to meet the immediate demands of the audience and occasion.

The purpose of the keynote speech extends far beyond the demands of the immediate audience. Even in those cases where a keynoter felt the need for argument, he also was aware of the need to stimulate and excite; in the cases where a keynoter desired to ridicule his opposition to the delight
of his immediate audience, he was aware of the possible re-
actions of the reading or listening audience.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it appears that the keynote speech cannot be consistently classified under one of the five "general ends" of speech. As a politi-
cal document, the speech of the keynoter must be flexible enough to meet the changing political climate.
CHAPTER V
THE SPEECHES: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

In his 1960 address to the Republican national convention in Chicago, keynoter Walter H. Judd stated:

... I do not believe you want me to indulge in the traditional keynote speech, blaming the other party for everything that is bad, taking credit to ourselves for everything that is good, and promising that if you voters will just elect us to office this fall, we will solve every problem, increase every benefit, expand every existing program, start a whole flock of new ones, give everyone everything he wants—and reduce the national debt at the same time!¹

Although Judd intended his remark to be humorous, this statement contains elements of truth. Many of the twenty-eight keynote speeches delivered in Republican national conventions have classified the Republican administrations as honest, efficient, dedicated, forward-thinking, and successful. These same keynoters frequently characterized the Democrats as idle, corrupt, ineffective, insincere, and incompetent. By analyzing repetitive rhetorical patterns of (1) themes and arguments; (2) supporting materials; and (3) organizational techniques, this chapter seeks to determine whether the characteristics suggested by Judd are inherent in the rhetorical genre of keynoting. If these characteristics are not

¹Text supplied by Republican National Headquarters, p. 1.
Inherent, the study will describe those qualities that are inherently characteristic. Although demonstrations, slogans, prayers, singing, and flag-waving are often linked with the keynote speech in the convention program, these extrinsic means of persuasion are discussed separately at the end of this chapter.

In order to analyze the appeals contained in the twenty-eight keynote speeches, this portion of the discussion views the speeches from several vantage points. First, the dominant themes and arguments are isolated and, second, the forms of support used with these various themes and arguments are analyzed according to type and function.

MAJOR THEMES

As might be expected from a kind of speech that has been delivered every four years for one hundred and eight years, several dominant themes and numerous minor themes occur with some degree of regularity and repetition. These major themes are listed according to their importance:

1. Our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders.
2. The Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism.
3. We need unity and harmony.
4. America is wonderful.
5. Our fiscal policies are excellent.
6. The centralization of power is dangerous; we are concerned about the individual American citizen.
7. Our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing.
8. Our policies are of benefit to agriculture.
9. Our policies aid the labor force.
10. Our policies on tariff and trade are sound.

The first significant theme to be discussed includes the arguments and ideas centered around historic events, popular national figures, past Republican leaders, and general party history. This discussion attempts to determine which heroes or what history were used to channel the delegates' emotions toward a predetermined goal.

Howell and Hudson, in their monograph on Daniel Webster, comment on the importance of Webster's epideictic oratory

"... [for giving] to his youthful country what it needed—heroes, shibboleths, and myths. Such intangibles as our common government and national heritage are possessed only so far as they are realized imaginatively. To this end symbols are necessary, even such symbols as the flag, ... the capitol ... battlefields. ... But behind and above these physical symbols—myths, if you will—and symbolic concepts, which, as embodied in phrases, are but catchwords to those who live by catchwords but which are capable of a rich and more or less definite content."

---

Just as nationalistic symbols played a major role in the growth of patriotic sentiment, so did "Republican symbols" contribute to the mythology and tradition of the neophyte party. From what sources were these "symbols" to come? (1) They could be borrowed from American history and forcibly related to the Republican party; (2) they could be borrowed from the Democrats; (3) or they could be created. The Republicans chose to utilize all these methods.

Our Party is Worthy of Praise for Its Glorious History and Outstanding Leaders

Over the years, a common appeal revolved around the party's history and heroes. Almost without exception, Republican keynoters praised their party's accomplishments and/or leaders.

Abraham Lincoln

The man most commonly praised was Abraham Lincoln. In seventeen of the keynote speeches, the keynoters referred directly or indirectly to Lincoln's greatness. For example, in 1888, John M. Thurston referred to Lincoln as "another Moses . . . that great man of the people . . . who led us through the parted waters of the sea, past the wilderness of battle, over the Jordan of Safety into the Promised Land."\(^3\)

In 1908, Julius C. Burrows praised Lincoln for his "patriotism

and sagacity."^4 In 1868 and 1916, the keynoters referred to Lincoln's "glory and immortality."^5 In addition, Lincoln was cited by keynoters for "his noble instincts";^6 "principles and leadership";^7 and "having preserved the Union."^8 Other keynoters were more oblique in their use of the Lincoln symbol. In 1892, for example, the keynoter stated:

The Campaign that is to follow the work of this Convention is not to be a campaign of the candidates, by the candidates and for the candidates, but a campaign of the party, by the party and for the party, in the interests of the whole people. . . . With malice towards none, but with affection and respect towards all, each of us, according to his light, as God gives him to see the light, should subordinate all merely local and personal considerations. . . .^9

A similar stylistic technique was used by L. J. Dickinson in 1932, when he paraphrased Lincoln's speech at Gettysburg:

Three score and twelve years ago our Nation was at grips with its most perilous political crisis. It faced the proposition of whether this Republic--dedicated by the blood of patriots on a score of battlefields--should endure.

In that dark hour, the Republican Party gave to the country its first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln. [Applause.] He preserved the Union and made it certain 'that government of the people, by

---

^4Proceedings, 1908, p. 45.

^5Proceedings, 1868, p. 9; Proceedings, 1916, p. 16.


^8Proceedings, 1900, p. 47.

the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.' [Applause.]

Still other keynoters merely mentioned Lincoln's name or quoted excerpts from his speeches and writings.  

Secondary Heroes

The keynoters praised many other Republican heroes, including U. S. Grant, James G. Blaine, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and John Foster Dulles. The majority of the references to these men occurred in one of three kinds of contexts. The first of these contexts occurred when a man was serving as incumbent President (or titular head of the party if out of power) and was to be renominated for a second term. The following excerpts are typical of such eulogies:

In this grave hour the Republican Party meets again in National Convention to nominate another stalwart American, Herbert Hoover. (Applause, loud and prolonged, continued for five minutes.)

Now listen! I am going to give you something to talk to your esteemed brethren about. So get this. [Applause, and cries of 'Hurrah for the Temporary Chairman!' 'Tell 'em about it!' 'We are with you!']

'It offers this great leader with pride and confidence. Pride in his achievements in the face of tremendous odds; confidence in the judgment of the

---

10 See, for example, Proceedings, 1928, p. 18; Proceedings, 1876, p. 8; Proceedings, 1880, p. 6; Proceedings, 1956, p. 82; Proceedings, 1912, p. 100.
people to keep at the helm the captain, who alone, has demonstrated a capacity to steer our economic ship to safe harbor.

Perhaps it was with prophetic vision that the American people elected Herbert Hoover four years ago with the greatest popular and electoral college vote any President ever received. (Applause.) At any rate, he had scarcely taken the oath of office before economic storm clouds had begun to cast their sinister shadow over the nations of the world.12

Although somewhat more impassioned, Morton McMichael's defense of President Grant is also typical of this first category of praising the man to be renominated. McMichael stated:

It does not need, nor, considering my temporary occupation of this chair, would it be suitable that I should enter into any elaborate commentary as to the merits of our candidate. But this I will say, that not withstanding all the malignant venom that has been spit at him; all the odious calumnies that have been heaped upon him; all the disgraceful slanders that have been circulated in regard to him, General Grant at this moment enjoys more of the confidence of his countrymen, is believed by them to be an honester, truer, and better man than any of his detractors. [Great applause and cries of assent.] No one in our day has been more thoroughly vindicated. The great heart of the American people beats responsibly to truth and justice, and as they have tried and tested and trust him; as they know that his administration has been wise and faithful; as they have seen the nation prosper under his rule as it has never before prospered, they will stand by and defend, and, when the ballot-box gives them a chance to do so, avenge him. [Cheers, and cries of 'They will.'] Remembering the sore trials which, along with his fellow-soldiers, he underwent during the war, his sacrifices of ease and comfort, his perils by day and by night, the exposure by means of which those who now revile him were able to secure luxurious repose at a safe distance from danger, they

---
are quite willing that he should indulge in 'palace cars and cigars and seaside loiterings,' [cheers and laughter;] and they mean to furnish him with the opportunity of enjoying these for at least four years to come.13

A final example, taken from Elihu Root's 1904 keynote address, should suffice to indicate the nature of this category of eulogies. After lamenting the death of McKinley, Root stated that Roosevelt

... [had] been equal to the burden cast upon him. Widely different in temperament and methods, he has approved himself of the same elemental virtues—the same fundamental beliefs. With faithful and revering memory, he has executed the purposes and continued unbroken the policy of President McKinley for the peace, prosperity, and honor of our beloved country. And he has met all new occasions with strength and resolution and far-sighted wisdom. . . .

Our President has taken the whole people into his confidence. Incapable of deception, he has put aside concealment. Frankly and without reserve, he has told them what their government was doing, and the reasons. It is no campaign of appearances upon which we enter, for the people know the good and the bad, the success and the failure, to be credited and charged to our account. It is no campaign of sounding words and specious pretenses, for our President has told the people with frankness what he believed and what he intended. He has meant every word he said, and the people have believed every word he said, and with him this convention agrees because every word has been sound Republican doctrine. No people can maintain free government who do not in their hearts value the qualities which have made the present President of the United States conspicuous among the men of his time as a type of noble manhood. Come what may here—come what may in November, God grant that those qualities of brave true manhood shall have honor throughout America, shall be held for an example in every home, and that the youth of generations to come may grow up to feel that it is better than wealth, or

office, or power, to have the honesty, the purity, and the courage of Theodore Roosevelt. 14

Still another context for the praise of these heroes was as a kind of political funeral eulogy—when the hero was dead, or was unable or unwilling to seek the party's presidential nomination. Theodore E. Burton's 1924 keynote speech abounded with such eulogies:

Not far away are the resting places of Garfield, McKinley, Hayes, and Harding. There are inexpressible sadness in the death of three of these, and I hope I may be pardoned when I utter words of praise prompted by friendship. The tomb of James A. Garfield and a monument to his memory are within the city limits. He was born on a barren farm in this country, and in rising step by step from lowly station to the highest executive position in the world none displayed more clearly than he the wonderful possibilities of American life. Leader in peace and war, he was the victim of the revengeful frenzy of a disappointed office seeker. What a terrible deed! If his worst enemy had contemplated such a frightful crime, he would have shrunk from it in horror and might have exclaimed after Macbeth:

'***Besides this Garfield
Hath borne his faculties so meek, hath been
So clear in his great office, that his virtues
Will plead, like angels [sic] trumpet-tongued, against
The deep damnation of his taking off.'

McKinley, too, was stricken down in his splendid prime by one whose brain was reeking with the monstrosities of anarchy. How sorrowful the death of one whose name will be forever associated with that captivating charm which compels admiration and love!

Almost equally pathetic was the death of Warren G. Harding, whose untiring labors made him a martyr to service and brought an early death quite as sad as that of the soldier who perishes with all his armor on. The exacting duties of his high office did not slacken his constant striving, though ill health and weakness hung threatening as a sword above his head. A Nation bowed in grief mourned his death; the whole

14Proceedings, 1904, pp. 55-57.
world mourned him as a lover of peace and good will. If ever he made those mistakes which mortals must make, it was because of the kindness of his heart, because of a noble mind which thought no ill of friend or foe but reposed trust in everyone.

If I may imitate and enlarge upon the words of a funeral eulogy uttered by a famous orator, it may be said of Harding that if all who gained inspiration by listening to his eloquent words, everyone who has felt the warm grasp of his friendly hand, the many who received his sympathy in days of sorrow, were to plant a flower upon his grave, a tangled wilderness of flowers would surround his tomb; the snowwhite anemone, the blue violet, blossoms of golden hue or brightest red, poppies like those from Flanders Field would spread a garment of beauty all around. Rest, Wearied Spirit, rest in peace, secure in that lasting remembrance which belongs to the immortals. 15

Another example of this type of eulogy occurred in John M. Thurston's 1888 keynote address. In referring to James G. Blaine, the keynoter stated:

With the infinite magnanimity of his incomparable greatness he has denied us the privilege of supporting him in this convention. Holding above all other things party harmony and success, he has stepped from the certain ladder of his laudable ambition that some other man may climb to power. As his true friends we must not, dare not, commit the political crime of disobedience to his expressed will. We cannot place him at the head of the ticket, but we can make him commander-in-chief of the forces in the field, where he will be invincible. And though James G. Blaine may not be our President, yet he remains our uncrowned king, wielding the baton of acknowledged leadership, supreme in the allegiance of his devoted followers, honored and respected by all honest and loyal men—that greatest living American, and the worthy object of our undying love. 16

A third context for the praise of these secondary


lumunaries was frequently an argumentative or stimulative reference to boyhood heroes, the hero's patriotism, or quotations from the hero's writings or speeches. In 1964, for example, keynoter Mark Hatfield stated:

Herbert Hoover, a great Republican and one of the world's greatest humanitarians—(Applause)—and may I always say to any Republican in an American audience, my boyhood hero 30 years ago made this very eloquent statement of the Republican Party's faith in the future when he said: 'Advancing thought, science, discovery, and invention are constantly imposing new surroundings upon us. Constant reform is an essential part of the protection of liberty, and society, to be successful, must secure the effort and the initiative of its citizens.' These were Hoover's words 30 years ago that are as appropriate today as they were when they were stated. (Applause.)

In 1956, keynoter Arthur B. Langlie used this technique by quoting from Dwight Eisenhower's 1953 Inaugural Address. Langlie said:

Four years ago next January, President Eisenhower, immediately after he took the oath of office, asked millions of Americans to join with him in prayer to Almighty God, that he and those associated with him might be guided in their decisions for the good of all the people.

In describing the role of the Republican party to the 1960 convention, Walter Judd asked:

What then is our role to be? Listen again to Lincoln in his message to the Congress in 1862, 'The dogmas of the quiet past and inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is

---

17Hatfield's text supplied by Republican National Headquarters, pp. 4-5.

18Proceedings, 1956, p. 83.
new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthral ourselves, and then we shall save our country.  

Thus, the keynoters were able to incorporate references to various party leaders into almost any political setting. Occasionally, however, the keynoter was apparently unwilling to rely on references to a single man, regardless of his fame or importance. In ten of the speeches studied, the keynoters used combinations of party heroes, including most of the ones cited earlier.

Combination of Heroes

One of the first keynoters to utilize the listing of party heroes was J. Sloat Fasset. In an obvious attempt to secure an immediate and overt response from his audience, Fasset asked the delegates to

... count me over our chosen heroes, the men whom you and I are teaching our children to love, emulate and revere, and they shall be Republicans, every one...  

Fasset then presented his list of heroes, which resembled Webster's roll-call in the Bunker Monument speech:

Lincoln [applause], Seward [applause], Grant [great applause]. When the spirit of Republicanism fills

---


20 Although several of the critics mentioned earlier in the study cited the listing of heroes as characteristic of the genre, two-thirds of the speeches do not exhibit this feature.

a man, it seems to have the power of transfiguration. These men are great. These men will always remain great, because of their growth in the line of devotion to Republican doctrine and Republican principles. [Applause]

Sherman [applause], Garfield [great applause], Logan [applause], Harrison and Baine [long continued applause]. These are only a few of our jewels and we may proudly turn upon our Democratic friends and utter the defiant challenge, Match Them! [Applause.] 22

Although Fasset's list of heroes was lengthy, some of the keynoters were more selective in their enumeration. Julius C. Burrows, for example, praised the "patriotism and sagacity of a Lincoln, the tenacity of a Grant, the wisdom and moderation of a McKinley, and the courage of a Roosevelt." 23

Still other keynoters combined their lists of heroes with several kinds of "purple passages" often associated with keynote speaking. In 1888, for example, keynoter John M. Thurston said:

We hoped and believed that 1888 would right the great political wrong of 1884. Right it, not only

22 Proceedings, 1892, p. 13.

23 Proceedings, 1908, p. 45. The reference to President Roosevelt was not particularly complimentary. The selection of Burrows as keynoter for this convention was primarily the result of intraparty squabbling. Roosevelt wanted to allow Albert Beveridge the privilege of keynoting the convention, but his wishes were ignored by Harry New, chairman of the Republican national committee. Burrows employed few references to the party's heroes and only mentioned the incumbent Roosevelt's name twice. One writer reported that when "aged Julius Caesar Burrows, the temporary chairman, tried to utter Roosevelt's name, he stammered and choked as though he were gagging on the syllables." Blair Bolles, Tyrant from Illinois (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1951), p. 133.
for the Republican party, but for the grand and glorious candidates whose names were the inspiration of that wonderful campaign. The wisdom of an all-wise Providence has otherwise decreed. One of them—that citizen soldier, that warrior statesman, the Black Eagle of Illinois, has been summoned by the Silent Messenger to report to his old commander beyond the river—But John A. Logan—dead in the body—lives in the illuminated pages of his country's most splendid history—lives in the grateful love of a free people, whose union he so gallantly fought to preserve—lives in the blessings of a downtrodden race, whose freedom he so manfully struggled to achieve—lives in the future song and story of a hero-worshipping world; and along the highway of the nation's glory, side by side with old John Brown, Abraham Lincoln and Ulysses S. Grant, his soul goes marching on. The other—that gallant leader, that chevalier of American politics, the glory of Republicanism and the nightmare of Democracy, our Henry of Navarre— is seeking in foreign travel needed relaxation and rest from the cares and responsibilities of long public life and service.

Elihu Root, the only man to keynote two Republican conventions, introduced his list of notable Republicans after stating that his party was the party of "... Lincoln, and Sumner, and Seward, and Andrew, and Morton, and Grant, and Hayes, and Garfield, and Arthur, and Harrison, and Blaine, and Hoar, and McKinley. ..." A similar approach was used

---

24 Logan had died in 1886.

25 This seems to be the only time a keynoter included Brown among the party's heroes. (Lincoln, in his Cooper Union speech, had claimed that "John Brown was no Republican!")

26 James G. Blaine. Blaine was in Italy during the time of the convention recuperating from a stroke.


28 Proceedings, 1912, p. 90. As a result of the party split, Root carefully eschewed mention of either Taft or Roosevelt.
by Theodore E. Burton in 1924. As a native of Ohio, Burton stated:

Of the 11 of our party who have held the great office of President, 7 have been natives of this Buckeye Commonwealth and 5 were elected from our state. . . . You will recall the names of Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Harrison, McKinley, Taft, and Harding. . . .29

Although keynoters still occasionally list the party's heroes, they do not do so as extensively or grandiloquently as their predecessors.

In addition to their discussion of Republican heroes—individually as well as collectively—many keynoters attempted to instill pride in their auditors by recalling Republican history and principles.

Republican History and Principles

Fifteen of the keynoters specifically mentioned Republican history or Republican principles in their addresses. As early as 1876, Theodore Pomeroy attempted to capitalize on Republican history. He stated that during the party's twenty-year life span

. . . [it] kept pace with the progress of the times, accepting each added responsibility of war, emancipation, taxation and reconstruction, till the brightest pages of American history are but the life story of the Republican party.30

29Proceedings, 1924, p. 17.

30Proceedings, 1876, p. 8. It seems reasonable to speculate that at least part of the rationale for such an innovation was due to the many important events that had occurred between 1872 and 1876. Numerous scandals had rocked the Grant administration during both terms, carpetbaggers
In the years following this speech, many conventions were to hear Republican history told, retold, and occasionally re-written. Elihu Root, for example, stated in his 1904 address:

When the course of the next administration is but half done the Republican Party will have completed the first half century of its national life. Of the eleven administrations since the first election of Abraham Lincoln, nine—covering a period of thirty-six years—have been under Republican Presidents. For the greater part of that time, the majority in each House of Congress has been Republican. History affords no parallel in any age or country for the growth in national greatness and power and honor, the wide diffusion of the comforts of life, the uplifting of the great mass of the people above hard conditions of poverty, the common opportunity for education and individual advancement, the universal possession of civil and religious liberty . . . sympathy with humanity and love of liberty and justice, which have marked the life of the American people during this long period of Republican control. . . .

Root continued his development of party history and principles by arguing that a

. . . great political organization, competent to govern, is not a chance collection of individuals brought together for the moment as the shifting sands are piled up by wind and sea, to be swept away, to be formed and re-formed again. It is a

had lost much of their earlier control of the Southern electoral votes, the Democrats had made substantial gains in the 1874 elections, and the Republican party was split into three groups of relatively equally strength. The use of party history, then, was perhaps designed to avoid alienating Radicals, "Half-Breeds," and Reformers, by focusing attention on symbols common to all groups. In contrast, Pomeroy carefully placed both Lincoln and Grant in a safely neutral historical context by noting that "events have chased . . . each other rapidly, from the inauguration of President Lincoln to the closing year of the administration of General Grant. . . ."

Proceedings, 1876, p. 8.

growth. Traditions and sentiments reaching down through struggles of years gone, and the stress and heat of old conflicts, and the influence of leaders passed away, and the ingrained habit of applying fixed rules of interpretation and of thought,—all give to a political party known and inalienable qualities. . . . 32

Such examples of the recitation of party history are legion.

In his 1916 address, Warren G. Harding stated:

Recalling that the mightier forward strides have been taken under a half century of Republican control, after we led in fixing the indissoluble ties of union, the retrospection, the contemplation and the anticipation combine to fill the Republican breast with pride and hope, and trust and faith, and magnify our obligations in this crucial year of our national life. . . . 33

Some of the speakers were more concerned with principles than with history per se. The 1964 keynoter, for example, stated: "The Republican Party is committed to a set of principles. This commitment is an act of unwavering faith in the American people in the cause of freedom, in the eternal principles of morality. . . ." 34 Equally concerned with Republican principles, Theodore E. Burton explained

. . . [that] the word "Republican" is not a mere

---

32 Ibid., pp. 31-32. Root's technique, similar to that of Pomeroy in 1876, was a skillful attempt to avoid comparing Hanna's "damn cowboy"—the progressive Roosevelt--to the conservative McKinley.

33 Proceedings, 1916, p. 16. This entire speech, if described in Harding's own style, would be labeled as "vague, vapid, and venomous." The most apt description is a phrase used elsewhere—this is indeed "drenching rhetoric."

34 Mark O. Hatfield, text supplied by Republican National headquarters, p. 1.
name; it is not a label which anyone can wear. (Applause.) It is not a cloak for individual vagaries. The strength and usefulness of the Republican Party must depend on the maintenance of enduring principles in the advocacy of which triumph can only be secured by party solidarity and an organization whose members unite in closed formation to do battle to every foe. (Applause.)

Two final examples should suffice to indicate how the keynote-makers used both Republican history and Republican principles to direct the listeners' loyalties toward specific ideas and events. The first such example is taken from the speech of the 1924 keynoter:

Just 70 years ago this was a small but gallant band, actuated by the highest ideals; then, in 1856, a multitude, defeated but alive and undaunted. Next, a mighty conquering host, which through a long tract of years shaped and guided the destinies of this Republic, leading it always to new heights of greatness and renown. What shining pages of history were written when Abraham Lincoln grasped the helm of state in 1861? (Applause.)

History has recorded no party organization whose achievements can compare with ours. In its triumphant course it has stood unshaken for the Union and the Constitution. It removed the curse of slavery, resisted repudiation and powerful currents of opinion which threatened folly in our economic life, and has upheld the rights of all, however humble. In every emergency, in days that were dark as well as those that were bright, it has been a party of broad vision, full of hope and of faith. (Applause.)

The final example in this category is taken from Simeon Fess's 1928 keynote speech. Fess followed the precedents laid down by his predecessors regarding the manner for handling history.

---

\[^{35}\text{Proceedings}, 1924, p. 31.\]

\[^{36}\text{Proceedings}, 1924, p. 36.\]
We are met in the Nineteenth National Convention since the birth of our party. Since that date during a period of seventy-two years the choice of the convention has been ratified at the ballot box by the American people in every case save Buchanan, Cleveland and Wilson. Beginning with the election of 1860, the management of our national affairs has been under the control of the Republican Party up to this hour, a period of sixty-eight years, interrupted but twice. . . . 37

Many keynoters, however, were not satisfied merely to employ Republican symbols of great deeds, great men, and great principles. Most of the speakers began ransacking American history to find other symbols for their purposes.

Supplementary Symbols from American History

Finding the symbols they sought in the broad spectrum of American history and culture, the Republican keynoters also employed (1) national heroes; (2) national history or historic sites; (3) the flag; (4) the Constitution; (5) the American war dead; and (6) the glories of the Union.

Almost two-thirds of the speeches contained references to various national heroes. Eight of the speakers referred specifically to such revered men as "our founding fathers," "the framers of the Constitution," "our fathers," and the "signers of the Declaration of Independence." An example from Warren G. Harding's keynote address is typical of these kinds of references. Harding stated

37Proceedings, 1928, pp. 34-35. (The speaker then listed the accomplishments of every Republican administration from Lincoln through Coolidge.)
... [that] we ought to be as genuinely American today as when the founding fathers flung their immortal defiance in the face of old-world oppressions and dedicated a new republic to liberty and justice. We ought to be as prepared for defense as Washington urged amid the anxieties of our national beginning, and Grant confirmed amid the calm reflections of union restored. (Applause.)

Another keynoter stated that the party's mission was to restore the original policy of the government and to "place it again in that rank upon which our fathers organized and brought it into existence." Still another keynoter implored his listeners to "let loose in the world the dynamic forces of freedom in our day as our forefathers did in theirs..." In addition to the eight speeches that contained such general references to the nation's fighters, founders, and signers, over half of the keynoters mentioned specific American hero-figures of varying degrees of significance. Included among those mentioned were Washington, Jefferson, both Adamses, Madison, Jackson, Van Buren, Polk, Monroe, Hamilton, Marshall, and Franklin. One keynoter, for example, presented a veritable presidential roll-call when he stated:

The safety of our liberty, the security of all we

38 Proceedings, 1916, p. 15. (Later in the speech, Harding emerged from ambiguity long enough to express his "deep conviction that the founding fathers were divinely inspired. . . ." Ibid., p. 16.


40 Walter H. Judd, 1960, text provided by Republican national headquarters, p. 8.
hold valuable, demands that we should take possession of this government and administer it upon those broad Constitutional doctrines that were recognized for the first sixty years of the existence of our government—that were recognized by Madison, by Monroe, by Adams the younger, by Jackson, by Van Buren, even down to the time of Polk. . . . 41

Another keynoter mentioned only two national heroes, but incorporated several other techniques into his narrative. 42

The keynoter stated:

At the close of the constitutional convention, George Washington remarked to Benjamin Franklin that he believed the constitution as finally evolved was a great and noble charter of liberty upon which the several states could rally, unite and prosper. 'Yes, General,' Franklin responded, 'if we can make it work.'

We have made it work in the days of our great past. And come November, we will make it work again—so help us God! 43

In addition to their mention of national heroes, several keynoters included national history or historic sites in their stockpile of symbols. Included in this category were references to Appomatox, Gettysburg, the nation's capitol, specific geographical areas of the United States, all of the wars in which the United States participated, the Fourth of July, and other assorted and infrequent dates, places, and events. The amount of time and space given to this category of national history and national sites in the

41 Proceedings, 1860, p. 86.

42 The appeal to patriotism and deistic references are discussed later in this chapter.

43 Proceedings, 1952, p. 76.
keynote speeches is insignificant, and cannot be classified as an inherent feature of the address.

A third such supplementary symbol to be considered is the United States flag. One-fourth of the speeches contain references to this national symbol. The keynoters spoke of the "national banner," "old glory," "the old flag washed clean of every stain by the blood of half a million heroes," and of a "flag floating everywhere, honored and respected, over peaceful seas and welcomed everywhere in friendly ports." Other speakers mentioned "the banner of this union," or our "unconquered flag." Such references to the flag are seldom used individually, but rather in conjunction with other similar symbols. An example from Charles W. Fairbanks's 1896 speech will illustrate this technique. Fairbanks stated that the "present high standard of our currency, our honor and our flag will be sacredly protected and preserved by the Republican party."45

Still another such supplementary symbol was the Constitution. Eight of the keynoters mentioned this document, and several of them spent a considerable amount of time expounding its significance. The 1860 keynoter referred to the Constitution fourteen times during the course of his address. Another keynoter, Robert J. Breckinridge, commented:

44See, for example, Proceedings, 1880, p. 85; Proceedings, 1888, p. 12; Proceedings, 1860, p. 85.

45Proceedings, 1896, p. 32.
it is a great error which is being propagated in our land, to say that our national life depends merely on the sustaining of that Constitution. Our fathers made it, and we love it. But if it suits us to change it, we can do so. [Applause.] And when it suits us to change it, we will change it. [Applause.] If it were torn into ten thousand pieces, the nation would be as much a nation as it was before the Constitution was made—a nation always, that declared its independence as a united people, and lived as a united people until now—a nation independent of all particular institutions under which they lived, and capable of modeling them precisely as their interests require.

In this latter example, the speaker was able to utilize the symbolic and connotative value of the Constitution as well as use it as a vehicle for exposition. Walter Judd, the 1960 keynoter, asked: "Why did they [our forefathers] insist on having a bill of rights in that Constitution?" Using the Constitution as his source, Judd explained that "rights are not what our government must do for us; rights are what our government cannot do to us." Another speaker claimed that the "Constitution will be the guiding star" of the Republican party. Still other keynoters merely mentioned the importance or value of the document without elaboration. The use of the Constitution as an American symbol is not standardized—although most of the speakers used the word to evoke emotional connotations of loyalty and patriotism from their listeners, several of the keynoters

46 *Proceedings*, 1964, p. 179.


used the Constitution as a vehicle for exposition or argument.

A fifth supplementary national symbol used by the keynoters with some regularity was the American war dead. The keynoters were not consistent in their use of this symbol, however. Several of the seven speakers who employed this device were quite specific—which battle, what war, what cost; other speakers were more ambiguous when they stated that "American shores were purchased with the priceless blood of heroes and martyrs," or that adequate provisions must be made for the "helplessness and old age of our surviving veterans and the widows and orphans of their dead comrades. . . ."49 Several speakers were more direct in their handling of the war dead. Robert Emmet, for example, asked:

I ask you—you who represent the blood that was shed at Lexington, at Dorechester Heights, and at Concord—are you prepared to submit to such a taunt as that? [Loud shouts of 'no! no!']. . . .50

In contrast to these somewhat pedestrian statements, one of the keynoters was eloquent—even poetic—in his descriptions of the turmoil created after the first World War. After describing the war's chaos and havoc, Henry Cabot Lodge stated:

We find ourselves gazing upon the problems and trials which the huge convulsion has left to us, and with which we must cope and cope successfully if we are to

50 Proceedings, 1856, p. 19.
rebuild and again move onward. The ruined towns, the broken industries, the desolated farms are there before our eyes wherever the battles were fought. Countless little mounds mark the resting places of the dead in the fields and on the hillsides torn and gashed by shot and shell. Signals of mourning throughout the world tell us of the irreparable losses of all nations, which have swept away such an appalling portion of the youth of every land, those in whom were garnered up the hopes and strength of the future.

The splendor of the achievement of our soldiers and sailors, their dauntless courage and unshrinking service will always remain one of the proudest memories in the history of the Republic. But the dead return not and the shadow of the great sorrow for those forever gone will never be lifted from the hearts of the people who sent them forth to battle. . . .

Although several other Republican keynoters dwelt upon the theme of war and death, these examples should serve to indicate the wide variety of application.

A final supplementary national symbol to be considered concerns the Union. Six of the Republican keynoters defended, praised, or explained the federal system of the United States. Most of the speakers used phrases such as "the holy bonds of union," "this mighty union," or "our indivisible union." The other speakers that mentioned the Union were keynoters in the conventions during and immediately following the Civil War. The only speaker to develop fully this symbol was Robert Breckinridge. Breckinridge dealt with the nature of the federal system in much the same manner as his discussion of the Constitution.

---

51*Proceedings*, 1920, p. 15. Although the emotive language is typical of keynoting, the literary and aesthetic quality of Lodge's speech is highly unusual.
Now among these principles . . . the first and most distinct is that we do not intend to permit this nation to be destroyed. [Applause.] We are a nation—no doubt a peculiar one—a nation formed of states, and no nation except as these states form it. And these states are not states except that they are states in that nation. They had no more right to repudiate the nation than the nation had to repudiate them. None of them had even the shadow of a right to do this, and God helping us, we will vindicate that truth so that it shall never be disputed any more in this world. [Applause.] 52

This quotation seems to illustrate Breckinridge's ability to merely not arouse an emotional response to a particular symbol, but to channel that emotion by providing concrete, if somewhat oversimplified, explanations of the immediate significance of those symbols to his auditors.

Republican keynoters attempted to show that their party was worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders. The speakers attempted to accomplish their purposes by eulogizing individual or collective heroes, by explaining Republican history and Republican principles, and by discussing symbols drawn from American history and culture. It is important to point out, however, that no dichotomy existed among these various categories—rather than being mutually exclusive, these groupings of history and heroes were frequently combined by the keynoters. In fact, such combined appeals were used over fifty times in the Republican keynote speeches. The following lengthy excerpts illustrate the kinds of symbol groupings employed by the speakers:

52Proceedings, 1864, p. 178.
When those founders of our nation met in this historic city, a century and a half ago, the dark shadow of despotic government covered most of the earth. The wealth, the traditions and the power of the Old World were all arrayed against them.

Yet they succeeded. The framework for a government of free men which they drafted here became a beacon of liberty and progress for the entire world. The people of thirteen struggling states adopted their work, and made of it the living constitution of these United States. The people took from their number a great leader and made of him, George Washington, their first president.53

No, citizens! This republic was established for the purpose of securing the guarantees of liberty, of justice and of righteousness to the people and their posterity. This was the great object with which the revolution was fought; these were the purposes for which the Union and the Constitution was formed... 54

Bear this well in mind throughout the campaign, for it is the first condition of our ability to enter upon the path which will carry us forward to true progress and to wiser laws. It is the path of Washington, of Lincoln and of Roosevelt from which Mr. Wilson has sought to drag us. We can only regain it by once and for all condemning the man and his associates who have thus endeavored to turn us from the right road into the dark and devious ways which with all nations lead to destruction. We therefore make our appeal for support to all who love America, to all, whatever party name they happen to bear, who are true to the faith of the fathers, to join with us... 55

The American people are neither poltroons nor pessimists, and they will not signalize the dawn of the new century by the surrender of either convictions or territory. (Applause.) Every soldier back from

54 Proceedings, 1860, p. 86.
the islands and they are in almost every hamlet in the land, returns an advocate of their retention. [The Philippines] Our dead are buried along the sands of Luzon, and on its soil no foreign flag shall ever salute the dawn. Whatever may be in store for us in the new and unbeaten track upon which we are entering, we shall not be found 'with the unlit lamp and the ungirt loin.' (Applause.) Our way is new, but it is not dark. In the readjustment of world-conditions, where we must take our place with the other great nations of the earth, we shall move with caution, but not with fear. We seek only to lift up men to better things, to bless and not to destroy. (Applause.) The fathers of the Republic accepted with courage such responsibilities. . . .

Summary

The pervasiveness and frequency evidenced by the theme dealing with heroes and history, tends to confirm the opinions held by delegates, newspaper writers, scholars, and members of the Republican hierarchy that the keynote speech should thrill, excite, stimulate, or key up the convention. One method employed by the keynoters to achieve this purpose has been the use of heroes and history that often are rich in connotative value and elicit emotional responses from the audience. The early Republican keynoters probably used these symbols to focus delegates' loyalties on familiar men and events; later keynoters added Republican heroes to the list of national figures; in recent years, many keynoters rely on such symbols to amplify ideas or support an argument rather than to thrill the auditors.

Supporting Materials for History and Hero Theme

Republican keynoters relied on all three of the Aristotelian modes of proof to support the theme that "our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders." If the three modes were classified according to frequency and importance, their order would be (1) pathos; (2) logos; and (3) ethos.

Pathos.—Without exception, every keynoter discussing this theme relied on emotional proofs more than logical or ethical proofs. Although many motive appeals were employed, including relief of distress, love of family, security, freedom from restraint, ownership or possession, and exploration, appeals to patriotism outnumbered all other appeals by a ratio of over three to one. Emotive language and patriotism abound, for example, in Warren G. Harding's 1916 address:

In the travail of Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness the American soul was born. Set aglow at Bunker Hill, it was reflected in the faces of the patriots of a fearless republic, where men dedicated themselves to the solemn and momentous task which was traced by an infinite hand. They were not all Americans by birth, but they were dedicated Americans in the baptismal rites of a new republic and a new patriotism. They could not all sign the Declaration of Independence, but they committed all Americans to it for all succeeding time. They could not all join in making the constitution, but they pledged the succeeding millions of Americans to its everlasting defense. (Applause.)

There were stalwart Americans then, Americans from Great Britain with British ideals and their devotion to orderly government. There were Americans from the land of Napoleon and Lafayette, to give of the enthusiasm and heroism of France in establishing new freedom. There were Americans from Germany to fight the battles
of the republic and blend their sturdiness and thoroughness in the progress of a new people, not a new race. There were Americans from the green fields of Ireland, with a passion for liberty. Americans from Southern Europe to battle for opportunity. There were Americans who came from oppression and stood erect in the freedom of the republic. They all made common cause. There was lack of homogeneity of race, but there was kinship of soul, and that soul was American. The gates of our ports have swung inward ever since, there has been a welcome to the foreign-born, whom we asked to drink freely of the waters of our political life and find their places in the sun of American opportunity. They are an inseparable and important and valued part of American citizenship, and the few zealots of any origin who violate our neutrality do not and can not impugn the loyalty or the American patriotism of that great body which adds to the swelling chorus of 'My country, 'tis of thee, Sweet Land of Liberty.'  (Applause, loud and prolonged.)

As is obvious from the quotations used throughout this chapter emotional appeals are frequently used with the heroes and history theme. Regardless of which motive appeals were used, they were almost always couched in highly emotive language. Walter Judd, for example, stated in 1960:

In 1860 in this city the Republican Party nominated as its candidate for the Presidency of the United States a man who had risen from the humblest beginnings to become a leader in the effort to end human slavery without destroying the Union.

He led the party to victory, the nation to salvation, and the people to a rededication to the sound principles on which the country had been founded and had grown great.

We want tonight, both to honor Abraham Lincoln and to learn from him.

Please God, we may do as well with our divided world as he did with his divided nation.  

---

58 Text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 2.
In this example, Judd combined appeals to relief of distress, patriotism, and religious belief, all phrased in emotive language. Such combinations of appeals were often employed by Republican keynoters. Earl Warren relied on such a combined appeal to patriotism, love of family, and religious belief, when he stated that the Republican party

... will not be cocksure in good times or depressed and cynical in bad times. (Applause.) It will direct our combined material and spiritual resources against the enemies of our country. It will make any sacrifice to achieve victory even one day sooner so our boys can come home. (Great applause.) It will see to it that they are cared for when they do come home. (Applause.) And we will honor them for the rest of their lives. (Great applause.)

But we will start building right now that finer America, which during the night vigils these men in arms dream of as they look at the stars from their foxholes on land and from their gun turrets at sea and in the air; the America that to them spells happy homes and freedom of opportunity for all; the America that represents unity at home and peace with the countries of the world.

It takes faith to build such an America—a strong faith, the same faith that now sustains our fighting men; a faith that is truly 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.'

With such a faith—which is our faith—we shall march under God toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace. . . .

In addition to patriotic appeals, the keynoters used appeals for relief of distress. Most such motive appeals occurred during the first fifty years of the party's history, and dealt with the emancipation of Negro slaves. Republican keynoters praised their party for freeing "the downtrodden
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slave," "for eliminating the blight of slaveholding," or "for rescuing the Negro slaves." Other appeals for relief of distress were most often concerned with the "white man's burden" in the Philippines and West Indies. One keynoter said, for example, that no chapter

... in the history of nation building has ever been written that will show a more unselfish service and greater humanitarian regard than that relating to what we have done for people like the Philippino and the peoples of the West India Islands.60

Although other motive appeals were used in connection with the history and hero theme, none were used as frequently as were appeals to patriotism and relief of distress. In addition to these two appeals, the history and hero theme was typified by emotive language.

The second mode of proof used by Republican keynoters when discussing the history and hero theme was logical proof. Although logical proofs are less characteristic of this theme than are emotional proofs, logical forms of support appeared with sufficient frequency to merit attention.

**Logos.**—Included among the many methods by which a speaker can support an argument are explanation, description, narration, authority (testimony), specific instances or examples, statistics, analogy (comparison), causal reasoning, and rhetorical questions.61 It is of little significance to

60 *Proceedings*, 1928, p. 33.

61 Although explanation, description, narration, and rhetorical questions do not constitute proof, *per se*, these
state that all of these devices were used in varying degrees by the Republican keynoters when they discussed history and heroes. In fact, the forms of logical support used with this first theme differ very little from the logical proofs supporting the other nine major themes. Rather than relying on concrete supporting materials, most keynoters depended upon assertion and generalization. Following assertion and generalization in terms of frequency, the speakers depended upon specific instances, rhetorical questions, and quotations.

Dwight Green, for example, defended Republican foreign policy by listing the specific examples of Republican leaders who helped formulate American foreign policy:

It was a Republican President and Secretary of State who made Hawaii a part of this nation and an outpost of defense in the Pacific. It was Republican Secretary of State John Hay who opened the doors to China. It was a Republican President and Republican Secretary of State who tried to check Japanese aggression at its outset.

... Seward, Blaine, Hay, Root, Hughes, and Kellogg--these were the makers of real American foreign policy. ... Merely to recall them is to blast the New Deal falsehood that the Republican Party is timid or provincial in its foreign policy...62

This example, when combined with the other excerpts throughout this chapter should amply illustrate the nature of logical proofs by example and specific instances.

methods of amplification are considered in this study to be more directly related to logos than to the other two modes of proof.

Even though rhetorical questions have occasionally been employed as a partitioning device or as a transition, they most often appeared as a means of amplification. The 1960 keynoter stated:

What the American people want to know as they watch us here tonight is: what party has the greatest capacity to keep this country safe and sound?

What party is the most alert to and best understands the powerful forces against us, abroad and at home?

Which party best understands the forces for us, abroad and at home?

Which party has the ablest, the most experienced, the best qualified and the finest men to lead our country through the perilous months and years ahead?63

Another keynoter employed the same technique when he said:

This, briefly, is the record of the progress our crusade has achieved in less than four short years. How has it come about? What have the Republican Party and President Eisenhower brought to our Government that was so lacking during the twenty years that had gone before?64

Frequently, the audience responds to such questions with shouted replies. One such instance occurred when the keynoter asked:

I ask you—you who represent the blood that was shed at Lexington, at Dorchester Heights, and at Concord—are you prepared to submit to such a taunt as that? [Loud shouts of 'no! no!' ] To such an insult? [Reiterated shouts of No! no!] To such a slur upon your political energy? [Continued cries of 'No!']. . . 65

63Proceedings, 1948, p. 47.

64Walter Judd, 1960, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 1.

65Proceedings, 1956, p. 80.
Rhetorical questions were used frequently by the keynoters to amplify their ideas.

Although employed more sparingly than assertion, specific instances, and rhetorical questions, authority or quotation appeared in the keynoters' discussions of the history and hero theme. In 1908, for example, the keynoter stated that in "this free representative Government," all final authority over

. . . officials, parties, and policies rests at all times with the supreme electorate, confirming the declaration of Abraham Lincoln that this is in fact a 'government of the people, by the people, and for the people. . . .'66

Another keynoter, when referring to Lincoln's faith in God, stated:

He never would have succeeded except for the aid of divine providence upon which he at all times relied. 'I feel,' said Lincoln, 'that I cannot succeed without the same divine aid that sustained him [George Washington] and on that same Almighty Being I place my reliance for support and I hope you, my friends, will all pray that I may receive that divine assistance without which I cannot succeed, but with which success is certain.'67

These two examples, when considered along with those cited earlier in this chapter, are typical of the authoritative support employed by Republican keynoters when discussing heroes and history. In summary, the three kinds of logical proofs appearing most frequently with this theme were specific instances, rhetorical questions, and authority (quotations).

66Proceedings, 1908, p. 29.
67Proceedings, 1956, p. 82.
**Ethos.**—Republican keynote speakers utilize many more emotional and logical proofs than ethical proofs. Ethical proof, designed to show the speaker's good will, high character, and intelligence, was used in two ways by the keynoters: (1) to enhance the status of the speaker, or (2) to show the high motives and worthy goals of the party. The first category of speaker ethos (as opposed to party ethos) is not inherently characteristic of this particular history and hero theme. The second category of ethical appeal, however, is characteristic of the history and hero theme. Many keynoters employed appeals designed to enhance the admirable party. This party ethos has traditionally taken two forms: (1) long lists of "beneficial legislation," and (2) appeals for honesty, morality, and integrity in governmental affairs. The first form needs no elaboration, for the essence of this kind of ethos is more often the quantity of the legislation rather than its quality. In this second form of party ethos, however, the keynoters frequently associated their party with "crushing corruption," and restoring "the honor of the Government," and placing "the public service of the country in the hands of honest, true and capable men...."68 Still other keynoters were more specific. One such speaker, after asking what promises the party had made, stated:

---

68 *Proceedings,* 1868, p. 10.
We promised we would clean out the corruption that was a scandal under the previous Administration and led to more than twenty convictions of high officials. I am proud of the fact that there has not been a single conviction for malfeasance in office of any high official of this Administration. That does not mean everything has been perfect. It does mean that whenever and wherever there was any slightest suspicion of impropriety, this Republican Administration has not tried to cover up; it has cleaned up. That is what you wanted it to do. . . .69

A final example of such party ethos is taken from the speech of the 1964 keynoter:

Now, ladies and gentlemen, government is not in the business of dispensing religion. However, government by its example shares in the setting of the moral stands of this nation. . . .70

Thus, Republican keynoters attempted to establish party ethos by showing (1) lists of beneficial legislation, and (2) the importance of honesty, integrity, and morality.

Summary

One of the themes most characteristic of Republican keynoting was that "our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders." Over the years, these keynoters praised such individual party heroes as Abraham Lincoln, U. S. Grant, James G. Blaine, William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Dwight D. Eisenhower, and others. The majority of references to these men occurred in one of three

69Walter Judd, 1960, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 9.

70Mark Hatfield, 1964, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, pp. 9-10.
kinds of contexts: (1) when a man was serving as incumbent President (or titular head of the out-of-power party) and was to be nominated for a second term; (2) when the hero was dead, or was unable or unwilling to seek the party's presidential nomination; and (3) when quotations from the hero's speeches and writings, or references to the hero's patriotism could be included.

Still other techniques included the combination or listing of many such individual heroes, the recitation of Republican history and principles, and employing supplementary symbols from American history and culture. Such supplementary symbols included (1) national heroes; (2) national history or historic sites; (3) the flag; (4) the Constitution; (5) the American war dead; and (6) the Union.

An examination of this first theme tends to confirm the opinion held by delegates, newspaper writers, scholars, and members of the Republican hierarchy that the keynote speech should thrill, excite, stimulate, or key up the convention. In order to achieve this purpose, the keynoters relied on emotional proofs more frequently than logical or ethical proofs.

Although Republican keynoters used many different motive appeals, appeals to patriotism outnumbered all other appeals by a ratio of over three to one. The patriotic appeals were almost always couched in highly emotive language.

Even though the keynoters relied primarily on assertion
and generalization, specific instances, rhetorical questions, and authority for their logical proofs, none of these items were peculiar to this history and hero theme, but were employed with most of the other major themes as well.

Most of the ethical proofs used by the keynoters discussing the history and hero theme were designed to establish party ethos rather than speaker ethos. This party ethos traditionally appeared in one of two forms: (1) long lists of "beneficial legislation;" and (2) appeals for honesty, morality, and integrity in governmental affairs.

One method employed by Republican keynoters to thrill their auditors has been the use of heroes and history that often are rich in connotative nuance and thereby elicit emotional responses from the audience. The early keynoters probably used these symbols to focus delegates' loyalties on familiar men and events; later keynoters added Republican heroes to the list of national figures; in recent years, many keynoters rely on history and heroes to amplify ideas or support arguments, rather than employ such symbols to thrill, excite, stimulate or "key up" their listeners.

The Democratic Party (or a Specific Democratic Administration) is Inferior in Many Ways and Deserves Criticism

Over the years, a second common appeal used by the Republican keynoters revolved around criticism of the Democrats. Without exception, every keynote speech given since 1856 attacked not only Democratic policies, but Democratic
motives, Democratic leaders, Democratic programs, or Democratic history. These attacks were centered in five general areas: (1) criticism of the President or titular head of the Democratic party; (2) criticism that the motives and philosophy of the Democrats are immoral, undesirable, dishonest, harmful, socialistic, collectivistic, or un-American; (3) criticism that the Democratic party's history or membership reflect disunity, turmoil, dissension, or deterioration; (4) criticism of specific Democratic policies and programs regarding defense, currency, agriculture, welfare, labor, manufacturing, taxes, and similar related issues; and (5) generalized criticism or attacks combining the four areas mentioned above.

Criticism of the President or Titular Party Head

One of the most frequent targets of the Republican keynoters was the Democratic President or titular head of the Democratic party. Such attacks were most frequent when the Republicans were out of power. As early as 1856, for example, the keynoter stated that the Democrats

. . . nominated as their candidate, James Buchanan. Now, gentlemen, I have known Hon. James Buchanan for forty years and upwards, intimately; and I say here, that some of the dearest and most cherished recollections of my life are connected with my associations with him. I would defend his personal character if assailed. But his political character—if I were not in deadly hostility to that, I would not be here. [Loud cheers.] I do not complain of Mr. Buchanan because he has been a politician by profession from the time he became a man. There is nothing dishonorable about a man's being a politician by profession— I do not say "by trade." [Laughter and
applause.] And although he is already in the field, I do not blame him for having been a Federalist once. [Renewed cheering.] And for having said in the enthusiasm of the moment (he was a young man at the time), that if he thought he had one drop of Democratic blood in his veins, he would let it out. [Laughter and cheers.] That would do exceedingly for a Fourth of July oration to an audience assembled like that, and at that time. But I do blame him in that, after he had expressed his opinion in regard to the Missouri Compromise, after he had bowed in adhesion to it, as every patriot of the day did, yet when he found certain men of his party breaking down that fabric of liberty, he had not strength to resist. I blame the Hon. James Buchanan for having shown a want of firmness, a want of self-reliance, a want of adhesion to principle, and an over-zealous devotion to party in several acts of his life. . . . He acknowledges that he is no longer James Buchanan, a free agent, with the right of expressing whatever will or opinion he may have of his own; but that he is bound to that platform, and to every plank of it, and that he has no right or power to remove or alter one plank of it—an admission that he has allowed himself to be chained to the Juggernaut of Slavery, and that he allows himself to be dragged headlong by it. [Loud cheers.]

Evidently, the passage of one hundred years has not altered the keynoters' techniques, for the 1964 keynoter proclaimed:

Now, my friends, what we did not fully realize at that time was that the candidate for Vice President of the United States was standing with one foot on the banks of the Rio Grande and the other foot on the banks of the Potomac, and that in these two postures we find that his national foot pointed toward school integration. His state foot pointed toward school segregation. His national foot pointed and advocated the repeal of state right-to-work laws, whereas his state foot endorsed a right-to-work law as 'necessary.' I say to you that one cannot dance for long on two platforms without stubbing his toe. (Cheers and applause.)


72Mark Hatfield, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, pp. 2-3.
Such genial and gentlemenly humor, however, is not completely typical of the Republican keynoter during his attacks on the Democratic President or party leader. In 1920, for example, the keynoter's attack on President Wilson was vitriolic:

... Mr. Wilson and his dynasty, his heirs and assigns, or anybody that is his, anybody who with bent knee has served his purposes, must be driven from all control, from all influence upon the Government of the United States. They must be driven from office and power not because they are Democrats but because Mr. Wilson stands for a theory of administration and government which is not American. His methods, his constant indirect assaults upon the Constitution and upon all the traditions of free government, strike at the very life of the American principles upon which our Government has always rested.73

The 1936 keynoter attacked Franklin Roosevelt's motives when he stated:

We propose to show the forty million now in gainful employment that economic freedom depends upon adherence to a system under which their pay envelopes will not shrink and under which their life insurance policies and savings bank deposits will be protected. If this great group of Americans will assert their heritage as Americans, they need never again fear a debacle such as we had in March, 1933, when a President-elect without a conscience refused for four months to cooperate with a President who had a conscience, resulting in a bank crisis and a panic of fear and fright. (Applause, loud and long continued.) This Nation deserves a government by conscience. In order that its free institutions may be maintained, we have a right to insist upon a President who puts the interests of the people above considerations of personal politics.74

In addition to focusing their attacks on the Democratic leader, the Republican keynoters also claimed that the
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motives and philosophy of the opposition party were immoral, undesirable, dishonest, harmful, socialistic, collectivistic, or un-American.

Criticism of Democratic Motives and Philosophy

A second characteristic attack on the Democrats used by the keynoters charged that Democratic motives and philosophy were inherently undesirable. Among the charges levied by the Republican keynote speakers were immorality, dishonesty, socialism, collectivism, and un-Americanism. The following examples are typical of these attacks. In 1936, keynoter Steiwer claimed that centralization

... of power is the Siamese twin of bureaucracy. Expensive and arbitrary, its supreme evil is greed for money and power. History shows that centralized autocracy invariably seeks to build itself greater and stronger on the ruins of the people's liberties. It reaches for control of the education of children and the formation of thought, and finally all human rights, including religious freedom, must yield to its tyranny. When a Chief Executive finds unconstitutional concentration of power in himself, he should exercise his constitutional power to recommend that Congress take back its authority. This wholesome recommendation will be made in January, by an oath-keeping Republican President. (Ap­plause, delegates rising and waving flags.)

A similar indictment was stated by the 1944 keynoter:

We believe the New Deal is leading us away from representative government. We believe that its centralization of power in the numerous bureaus at Washington will eventually destroy freedom as Americans have always understood it—freedom in the home, freedom of individual opportunity in business
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and employment, freedom to govern ourselves locally. (Great applause.)

Still another keynoter, after attacking the policies of a Democratic administration, asked:

Have we been too harsh in our judgment? No, in fact, we have not even referred to the strong self-indictment of the obvious effort to break down one of our bulwarks of freedom by violating the third term tradition. (Applause.) The saddest chapter of the last four years has been that the National Administration, instead of keeping its eyes, statesmanlike, upon the welfare of the people of this nation, has turned its political gaze upon a third term. This un-American desire for a third term completely undermines their forthrightness in meeting all of our issues. It has destroyed statesmanship. Cleverly and surreptitiously they have strengthened the ironhanded control of the President over the Democratic Party. Building upon the corrupt political machines of Kelly and Nash and Hague and their kind (applause), they have erected as a superstructure a political machine such as this country has never before seen. Democracy within the Democratic Party has been destroyed. (Applause.) With this background they move on towards their convention, tossing aside the traditions of Washington and of Jefferson.

A final example should suffice to indicate the nature of the keynoters' attacks upon the motives and philosophy of the Democratic Party. Henry Cabot Lodge, the 1920 keynoter, charged:

Great reductions in expenditures have been effected but we have been met with resistance in some of the departments and also by habits of waste backed by maladministration, by sacrifice of efficiency to political purposes, never so recklessly indulged in before, and in certain cases by an incompetency so marvellous that it cannot be due to nature, but must

---
be the result of art. (Applause, accompanied by cries of 'That's true. ')\textsuperscript{78}

In addition to their attacks upon the Democratic leaders, motives, and philosophy, the Republican keynoters also criticized the history and membership of the Democratic party.

**Criticism of Democratic Party's History and Membership**

A third indictment of the Republican keynoters stated that the history and membership of the Democratic party reflected disunity, turmoil, dissension, or deterioration. During the early years of the Republican party's existence, most of the keynoters charged that the Democratic party was once great, but that it had deteriorated. In 1856, for example, the keynoter said:

> The great Democratic party of this country—a name which, independent of the late acts of the party, I have always honored and have always looked up to till I ceased to belong to it—that great party calling itself the Democratic Party, has met and adopted their platform. And a worse platform for a Democratic platform I never read. [Loud cheers and laughter.]\textsuperscript{79}

The 1872 keynoter made a similar indictment when he stated:

> The malcontents who recently met at Cincinnati were without a constituency; the Democrats who are soon to meet at Baltimore will be without a principle. [Hearty applause.] The former, having no motive in common but personal disappointment, attempted a fusion of repelling elements, which has resulted in explosion; the latter, degraded from the high estate they once occupied, propose an abandonment of their identity, which means death.\textsuperscript{80}

\textsuperscript{78}Proceedings, 1920, p. 19.

\textsuperscript{79}Proceedings, 1856, p. 17.

\textsuperscript{80}Proceedings, 1872, p. 6.
This same speaker concluded his speech by stating that the Republican party would "have to encounter the decaying remnants of a once powerful party, but now so feeble that it is crying piteously to its enemy for succor..."81 Although such descriptions of the decay of the Democratic party were more numerous in the period from 1856 to 1880, the Republican keynoters of the 1900's also discussed the deterioration of the opposition. In 1944, for example, the keynoter charged:

We believe the New Deal is destroying the two-party system. (Applause.) The New Deal is no longer the Democratic Party. (Applause.) It is an incongruous clique within that Party. (Applause.)82

In addition to such attacks on the Democratic party's history and descriptions of its decline, the Republican keynoters delighted in elaborating upon the disunity and disparate elements within the Democratic ranks. In 1956, for example, the keynoter said:

The Democrat Party is a party of many divisions. It is a party of sectionalism and factionalism. It stands for one thing in the South, another in the North. Under the same roof, this party has some of the leaders of organized labor and some of the bitterest, most reactionary enemies of the men and women who toil in our factories. (Cheers and applause.) It has northern liberals who militantly champion civil rights--up to a certain point--and it has others who abhor civil rights like a plague. They have nationalistic hotheads who rattle their sabers at every opportunity, disturb friendly relations with other nations, and
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they have timid souls who attack and criticize the Administration and accuse us of risking war whenever we act firmly and effectively to prevent war. (Applause.)

In a similar vein, the 1944 keynoter charged that the New Deal retained

. . . its power by patronizing and holding together incompatible groups. It talks of idealism and seeks its votes from the most corrupt political machines in the country. (Great applause.) The leaders of its inner circle are not representatives of the people. (Applause.)

Still other keynoters labeled the Democratic party membership as "sectional and aristocratic," or as "critics and complainers." In addition to attacking Democratic leaders, motives, history, and membership, the Republican keynoters also criticized specific Democratic policies and programs.

Criticism of Specific Democratic Policies and Programs

A fourth target of the Republican convention keynoters was specific Democratic policies and programs regarding defense, spending, agriculture, welfare, labor, manufacturing, taxation, and other specific policies and specific programs. Since there is nothing inherently indicative of a genre in this category of criticism, little more will be said of it. Although these attacks upon specific issues did occur with a
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high degree of regularity in the period from 1856 to 1964, the keynoters' criticisms showed little internal consistency or continuity.

**General Criticism of the Democratic Party**

A fifth and final group of criticism was much less specific than the previous four categories. This fifth classification was composed either of generalized attacks on the Democrats or consisted of criticism combining several of the four categories mentioned previously. The 1896 keynoter, for example, stated "that three years of Democratic administration have been three years of panic, of wasted energy, of anxiety and loss to the American people, without a parallel in our history."\(^{87}\) An earlier keynoter had stated that the nation could endure "anything except the imbecility of a Democratic administration. . . ."\(^{88}\) Warren G. Harding's 1916 keynote speech was equally general when he stated:

> It is not inspiring to recite Democratic failures. I shall not dwell on that party's insincerity or incapacity. The country indicts and the record convicts. It proclaimed the sacredness of its pledges and then profaned them. It professed economy and is staggered by its own extravagance. . . .\(^{89}\)

In addition to such general criticism, the Republican keynoters employed a kind of combined attack on Democratic motives, membership, history, and policies. In 1956, for

---

\(^{87}\) *Proceedings*, 1896, p. 28.
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example, the keynote speaker said:

This party is a coalition of antagonistic factions who periodically get together just long enough to try to get themselves elected. (Cheers and applause.) They spent twenty years trying to implement their inconsistent concepts and wound up with an appalling record of mismanagement and corruption. (Applause) And it was only natural there was a complete loss of the public's respect for and confidence in the highest office of the land. The Democrats left us a staggering national debt, a greatly reduced value of the dollar, a colossal bureaucracy, and vastly increased taxes. . . . Today this party is as divided on foreign affairs as on everything else. They have leaders who are devoted to the ideal of world cooperation and have isolationists like those who drove a great American patriot, Walter George, out of the Senate after a lifetime of devoted public service. (Cheers and applause) They are divided on education, taxation, immigration, and also on almost everything else. The only thing on which they can agree is that they would like to get back into office. (Laughter)

A similar combined attack was employed by keynoter George Hoar in the 1880 convention. Hoar stated:

The single purpose of its being [the Democratic party] was to give political supremacy to the oligarchs of the South, and office, without influence, to their subservient Northern allies.

In the pursuit of that end, every great public interest was sacrificed or disregarded. Expending little for public improvements, either on the coast or on inland river or lake, in 1860 the credit of the Nation was poor, its treasury empty, its six per cent. bonds below par. Our unprotected manufactures contended at fearful odds with the pauper labor of Europe, on whose workshops we depended for a large portion of the necessaries and comforts of life. Our little navy was scattered over the four quarters of the globe. Four millions of our countrymen were in hopeless bondage. To them every new State, as it took its place in the great family, but added a new dungeon to their gloomy prison-house.

---
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At last, as the Democratic party let go its hold on power, the National flag itself seemed about to be folded and laid aside, to be regarded thenceforth as a miserable symbol of the futility and folly of the last great experiment of self-government. The Democratic party confronts us today, as I said, unchanged in purpose, in temper, and in character. United in nothing else, proposing no other measure of policy, it wages its warfare upon the safeguards which the Nation has thrown around the purity of its elections. . . .91

Still another example of this combined criticism can be observed in the keynoter speech given by Earl Warren in 1944. Keynoter Warren stated that President Roosevelt's party leaders were not representative of the people:

They are the personal agents of one man. (Applause.) Their appointments to public office are not made on the basis of efficiency or public approval, but on the basis of loyalty to the clique only. (Applause.) Under their rule, the Constitution has been short-circuited. The Cabinet has ceased to be a voice and has become an echo. (Applause.) . . . these bureaucrats of the New Deal tell the farmer what to sow and when to reap—sometimes without regard for either the seeds or the season. (Applause.) They require him to work in the fields all day and keep books for the government all night. (Applause.) These same bureaucrats tell the worker what union he shall join, what dues he shall pay, and to whom he may pay them. . . .92

Two final examples should suffice to indicate the nature of such attacks upon the Democratic party. In 1900, the keynoter stated that the election of a Democratic President, . . . could paralyze the operation of the new currency law as effectively as if it were wiped from our statute books. A Democratic victory would infuse new life into the Tagal insurrection, cost
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us the lives of thousands of our gallant army in the Philippines, impair or destroy our prestige, if not our power, in the islands, make us a byword among the other great nations of the world, and obliterate our influence in the settlement of the vital questions certain to arise when China shall be opened to foreign commerce. . . . 93

In his defense of President Hoover in the 1932 convention, keynoter L. J. Dickinson said that Democratic opposition,

... hampered the President at every turn. Through a highly subsidized press bureau, Democratic leaders, Democratic Senators and Democratic Congressmen sought to distort his every word; to belittle his every effort at human and economic relief; to impugn his every motive; to frustrate his every move. Their orders were to 'Smear Hoover.'

Upon his shoulders the anvil chorus of Democracy placed the responsibility for every ill at home and abroad. Dreadful pictures of ruin and horror were painted. Public confidence was shaken. Pessimism became rampant. All this our political enemy did without thought of the consequence to the Nation. . . . 94

Summary

The regularity with which these attacks on the Democratic party occurred tends to support the opinions of delegates, newspaper writers, scholars, and members of the Republican hierarchy who felt that one of the primary functions of the keynote speech was to attack the opposition. Every keynote speech delivered from 1856 through 1964 attacks various elements or facets of the opposition party. Most of these criticisms can be grouped into five major categories:

(1) criticism of a Democratic President or titular head of
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the Democratic party; (2) criticism that the motives and philosophy of the Democrats are immoral, undesirable, dishonest, harmful, socialistic, collectivistic, or un-American; (3) criticism that the Democratic party's history or membership reflect disunity, turmoil, dissension, or deterioration; (4) criticism of specific Democratic policies and programs regarding defense, currency, agriculture, welfare, labor, manufacturing, taxes, and similar related issues; and (5) generalized criticism or attacks combining the four areas mentioned above.

Attacks upon the Democratic party increased in frequency and vehemence when the Republicans were out of power. Virtually all of the attacks on a Democratic leader occurred when the Republicans were out of office.

Supporting Materials Used When Criticizing the Democrats

Although the Republican keynoters relied on all three of the Aristotelian modes of proof to support the theme that "the Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism," such an observation is of little value when determining what kind of supporting materials are characteristic of the keynote genre.

Ethical proofs.—The only kinds of ethical proofs that are characteristic of this theme are those employing a negative ethos—those proofs that associate the Democratic party
with corruption, dishonesty, immorality, and other equally unsavory traits.

Logical proofs.—Among the many forms of support used by the Republican keynoters when attacking the Democrats were explanation, description, narration, authority (testimony), examples, statistics, comparison, causal reasoning, and rhetorical questions. Of all of these forms of support, however, only three can be labeled as characteristic: (1) assertion or generalization; (2) rhetorical questions; and (3) comparison (analogy).

Rather than relying on concrete supporting materials to document criticisms of the Democrats, the keynote speakers depended on assertion and generalization. In 1936, for example, the keynoter stated that the New Deal pretended it would protect American interests, yet harbors aliens who are not entitled to remain in America, but are permitted to remain and who compete with the American working man, increase the cost of our struggle against crime and add to our relief burden. It coddles agitators and encourages the purveyors of unrest at a time when the Nation needs a firm and dignified leadership. Not content to employ professors and theorists as economic advisers, the New Deal has placed the affairs of government in their hands. It depends on bookworms for practical experience and on bookworms for energy. . . .95

The 1944 keynoter was also dependent on assertion when he attacked the Democratic party. The keynote speaker stated:

---
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They have threatened our free press. They have intimidated our free radio. They are using every device and excuse to insinuate themselves into control over the public schools of our states. (Applause.) They have injected a low grade of politics into the administration of relief and social welfare.96

A final example can be observed in the speech of the 1896 keynoter:

Three years of Democratic administration have been three years of panic, of wasted energy, of anxiety and loss to the American people, without a parallel in our history.97

These three examples of assertion are representative of those employed to support attacks on the Democratic party.

In addition to assertion and generalization, the Republican keynoters frequently asked rhetorical questions to amplify their attacks on the opposition.

Even though rhetorical questions were occasionally employed as a partitioning device or as a transition, they most often appeared as a means of amplification. In 1960, for example, the keynoter stated:

I would rather not go over the mistakes of the past; there's more than enough to talk about regarding the future. But if Republicans are to be charged with inability to deal with the forces of aggression which those who make the charges helped to build up, then we owe it to the truth to set the record straight. . . . Was it Republicans who recognized the Soviet Union in 1933 and gave it acceptance into our country and world society as if it were a respectable and dependable member thereof? Was it Republicans who, at Tehran, against the urgent
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advice of Mr. Churchill, agreed to give the Russians a free hand in the Balkans? Was it Republicans who secretly divided Poland and gave half of it to the Soviet Union? Was it Republicans who agreed to the Communist takeover of a hundred million people in Eastern Europe who are not Russian?98

The 1964 keynoter also employed the rhetorical question technique by asking:

... was it a Republican Administration that presided over the fiasco at the Bay of Pigs? (Chorus of 'no') Was it a Republican Administration that neutralized Laos and so initiated the chain of events that threatens freedom throughout all of Southeast Asia? (Chorus of 'no') And I ask you: Was it a Republican Administration that ignored the problem in Cuba until it erupted into rioting and bloodshed? (Chorus of 'no') Was it a Republican administration in power when the Berlin Wall was built? (Chorus of 'no').99

Convention audiences have frequently responded to these rhetorical questions by chanting the replies in unison. In 1876, for example, Theodore Pomeroy asked:

I ask the freedmen of the South, if they are ready to accept the Democratic party as the source of power [Voices--'No! No!' Speaker--I know it.] from which is to flow the appropriate legislation as congress may devise?100

A similar situation occurred in 1940, when keynoter Stassen asked:

To whom shall we entrust the leadership on this front? Shall it be to those who have added almost

---
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400,000 men and women to the public payrolls of their political army, but have have added only a few thousand to the payrolls of our regular army? [Cries of 'No.'] Or to those who tried to pack the Supreme Court of these United States? [Cries of 'No.']. . . .

Such responses to rhetorical questions have been frequent, occurring in the conventions of 1868, 1896, 1904, 1916, and 1936, in addition to those just mentioned.

The third form of support that occurred with sufficient regularity to be labeled as "characteristic," was the use of analogy—comparison. The following examples are typical of analogies employed to attack the Democratic party.

In 1936, the keynoter said:

This is the only administration in our history which has deliberately impaired private credit, destroyed confidence and intimidated capital. The prudent, everywhere, abstain from risk which is aggravated by policies that harass and destroy. No one would advocate reform ahead of recovery except the reformers who can experiment and exploit only when the people are in distress. In the fear that if the country recovers it will not take any more of their reforms, they have manufactured turmoil and disorder. The patient needs a competent physician, not these quacks of confusion. Pointing the finger of promise toward abundance, the New Deal has aimed its policies of performance in exactly the opposite direction. If Noah, in anticipation of the flood, had installed an irrigation system instead of building the Ark, his mistake would have been no worse than have been the New Deal economic blunders. (Laughter.)

---

101 *Proceedings*, 1940, p. 57.

102 In the 1936 convention, many of keynoter Steiwer's rhetorical questions were answered by the audience with the phrase, "three long years." This chant became a popular slogan throughout the 1936 campaign.

Another keynoter, in his attack upon the Democrats, stated that some "of the master minds of the Democratic party are now chirruping away like incessant little birds. . . ."\textsuperscript{104}

A final illustration of the keynoters' use of comparison can be taken from the speech of George Hoar:

> It is twenty years since the Republican Convention met in this city, and after a stormy but friendly contest, put in nomination Abraham Lincoln and Hannibal Hamlin. Lincoln has gone to his rest. His companion upon the ticket, in fresh and vigorous age, is present with us to-day, to give us counsel from the stores of an experience gathered from a life of honorable public service. Lincoln has gone to his rest. Douglas and Breckinridge, his two competitors for the great office of the Presidency, sleep by his side. But, the parties which confronted each other then, confront each other now, unchanged in purpose, in temper, and in character. The Democratic party was ruled then, as now, by the South. The single purpose of its being was to give political supremacy to the oligarchs of the South, and office, without influence, to their subservient Northern allies.\textsuperscript{105}

Thus, the three logical proofs most often employed by the Republican keynoters were (1) assertion and generalization; (2) rhetorical questions; and (3) comparison.

**Emotional proofs.**—Although most of the Republican keynoters employed numerous emotional appeals in their attacks upon the Democratic party, only two items occurred with sufficient regularity to merit attention. The two aspects of the speeches are (1) emotive language and (2) sarcasm, ridicule, and humor. These two elements of
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Republican keynoting are among the few truly inherent characteristics of this genre of speaking.

The 1952 keynote speech was notable for its use of emotive language. After attacking President Truman's foreign policy as being "vacillating and negative," the keynoter stated that Democratic leadership in the Korean War was characterized by "irresponsibility, recklessness, weakness, and indecision. . . ." The keynoter speaker added:

Korea stands today as the hallowed graveyard for countless American dead. We must not let it become as well a graveyard for American hope, American faith and American honor.106

The 1948 keynoter also employed emotive language when he said:

Human institutions have human faults. The Republican Party is a human institution. But it has never harbored anything like the motley collection of embittered failures, back-alley revolutionaries, and parlor anarchists with which the New Deal has disgraced the party of Jefferson and Jackson.107

This same speaker added that the "Cold War we face today is the lusty child of the New Deal's rendezvous with destiny."108

A final example should suffice to indicate the nature of emotive language in these speeches. In 1944, the keynoter attacked Democratic leaders by stating:

They are the personal agents of one man. (Applause.) Their appointments to public office are not made on
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the basis of efficiency or public approval, but on the basis of loyalty to the clique only. (Applause.) Under their rule, the Constitution has been short-circuited. . . . Both Congress and the judiciary have been intimidated and bludgeoned to make them servile. (Applause.) Over all of this—and over all of us—is the ominous, gargantuan figure of an arrogant, power-intoxicated bureaucracy. (Applause.)

In addition to emotive language, the keynote speakers relied on sarcasm, ridicule, and humor when attacking the opposition. This category of humorous or sarcastic statements is one of the most obvious and significant characteristics of Republican keynote speaking. In 1888, for example, keynoter Thurston ridiculed his opposition by ironically stating that the Democrats had now been in power

. . . nearly four years. Its administration has been most satisfactory to those who hold office under it. Its loyalty has been so pronounced as to receive the approval of every enemy of the Government. The courage of its foreign policy has amused the Great Powers and pleased every coward. . . . Its justice to the disabled soldiers has won golden opinions from those who gave them their wounds. . . .

An example of more genial humor occurred in the speech of the 1944 keynoter:

To perpetuate themselves in power the New Deal clique has always capitalized upon some crisis. It has always had the indispensable man—the same man—for each succeeding crisis. [Great applause.] The first time it was the depression. The second time it was the recession. Last time it was to keep us out of war. [Applause.] This time it will be to achieve peace. [Applause.] The next time—who knows what crisis it will be? That there will be one and that the indispensable man will still be indispensable, we can rely

---

109 *Proceedings*, 1944, p. 54.
on the New Deal clique to assert. [Applause.] The New Deal came to power with a song on its lips: 'Happy Days Are Here Again.' That song is ended. Even the melody does not longer on. Now we are being conditioned to a new song: 'Don't Change Horses in the Middle of the Stream.' That melody isn't likely to linger either. For eleven long years we have been in the middle of the stream. We are not amphibious. We want to get across. We want to feel dry and solid ground under our feet again. [Great applause.]111

Still another keynoter, employing *reductio ad absurdum*, stated that the Democratic party had exhausted an entire congressional year,

... in vain assaults upon three items in a tariff bill, containing over 2,500 items, and if their party should be continued in power it will take them, to complete their tariff reform ... at their present rate of progress, about eight hundred years. [Applause.]112

Dwight Green, keynoter in the 1948 convention, quipped that the Democrats had promised efficiency, but "its Grecian gift was a Trojan donkey filled with swarming bureaucrats turned loose within our citadel. ..."113 In a similar vein, the 1964 keynoter said that the "current administration should wage war on the poverty of its own ideas. (Applause.)"114

Still other keynoters employed humor to defend Republican actions against Democratic criticism. In 1900, for example, the keynoter defended the necessity for the Spanish-American
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There are parallels in our own history. For five millions of dollars and other valuable considerations we purchased Florida from Spain in 1821, when it had four thousand white settlers. The Seminoles, natives of the soil, brave, resolute, have far greater intelligence and character than the Tagals, disputed our possession. We sent Andrew Jackson down to fight them, and it took us twenty-one years to subdue them and send what was left of them west of the Mississippi. If the 'Anti-everythings' had lived then, they would, I suppose, have urged us to turn over Florida to Osceola, the Aguinaldo of the Seminoles! [Laughter.]115

A final example of sarcasm, ridicule, and humor can be taken from the speech of the 1940 keynoter. The speaker stated that after the outbreak of the Second World War,

... [and the] news swept across the country, the President went on the radio and in an extremely clever, but dangerously deceptive manner, lumped together the equipment that was 'on hand' and 'on order' (applause and cries of 'He sure did!') in an effort to smooth over the failure to fulfill the trust that the American people placed in his administration. The cold facts are that in many instances the totals the President gave 'on hand' and 'on order' were about one-fifth 'on hand' and four-fifths 'on order' and those orders sadly delayed in their fulfillment. (Applause.)116

Later in the speech, the same keynoter stated:

For too long a time we have wasted millions and millions of dollars on 'Passamaquoddi's and 'Florida Canals' while neglecting needed defenses. (Applause.)

For too long a time our leaders have strutted down the avenues of the world jauntily knocking chips off shoulders without even preparing to raise our arms in self defense. (Applause.) For too long a time we have talked boldly of quarantining aggressors in order
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to protect other nations and now find we are not even prepared to protect ourselves. . . . For too long a time our foreign policy has been one of a big noise and a little stick, and even that little stick 'on order.' (Laughter and applause.) We need again a calm, resolute voice and a big stick. (Cries 'Oh, man!')

In the heat of partisan controversy, the humor, sarcasm, and ridicule has occasionally degenerated into name-calling, guilt-by-association, and *ad hominem* attacks. President Franklin Roosevelt, for example, was called a "New Deal Caesar" by the 1936 keynoter, and labeled as "un-American" by the 1940 keynote speaker. One keynoter employed the fallacy of guilt by association when he said that the federal training camps suggested by Roosevelt was "the method of Hitler and Mussolini and Stalin." 

The use of humor, sarcasm, and ridicule has been an inherent characteristic of Republican keynote speaking since the first convention in 1856. The humor itself, however, is less consistent—usually caustic, occasionally clever, and frequently heavy-handed—but always partisan.

**Summary**

The second most characteristic theme of the Republican keynoter was that "the Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism." Such attacks upon the Democrats were centered

---
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in five general areas: (1) criticism of the President or titular head of the Democratic party; (2) criticism that the motives and philosophy of the Democrats are immoral, undesirable, dishonest, harmful, socialistic, collectivistic, or un-American; (3) criticism that the Democratic party's history or membership reflect disunity, turmoil, dissension, or deterioration; (4) criticism of specific Democratic policies or programs regarding defense, currency, agriculture, welfare, labor, manufacturing, taxes, and similar related issues; and (5) generalized criticism or attacks combining the four areas mentioned above.

Every speech given from 1856 through 1964 employed one or more of these criticisms, with the attacks increasing in frequency when the Republicans were out of power. A detailed examination of this second major theme seems to reinforce the opinions expressed by delegates, newspaper writers, scholars, and members of the Republican leadership that one of the main purposes of the keynote address was to flail the opposition.

Characteristically, the Republican keynoters supported this second theme in the following fashion: (1) most of the ethical proofs employed were negative—those that associated the Democrats with corruption, dishonesty, and immorality; (2) although the speakers relied on a variety of logical proofs, only three were consistently associated with the theme—assertion or generalization, rhetorical questions, and comparison; (3) most of the keynoters depended heavily
on emotive language and sarcasm, ridicule, and humor.

As was mentioned earlier in this study, one of the purposes of the national political convention is to prod the delegates and general public to action. One of the methods employed to achieve this goal is the keynoter's attempt to infuse harmony and a sense of unity into the convention atmosphere.

We Need Unity and Harmony

Appeals for unity and harmony have been frequent in Republican national conventions, occurring in over four-fifths of the conventions, and in every convention from 1920 to 1964. The third major theme to be discussed, then, is "We need unity and harmony." As early as 1856, Republican keynoters began stressing the importance of party unity. Robert Emmet, keynoter for the first Republican convention, stated:

Let us proceed to nominate a man as our candidate for the office of President. . . . Each man cannot have his favorite. We come here to make concessions. We come here to act in harmony. We come here to act unanimously in the cause, as I hope and trust we will. . . . And although it is natural and it is proper that there should be preference of particular men, preference for a man is not the true principle upon which we should act in this Convention. . . . 119

Although this particular theme ranks high in frequency among the twenty-seven keynote speeches, there are few characteristics that can be labeled as significant or inherent. Even
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though the speakers have urged unity when the party is badly split, they have also used the same appeal when harmony prevails within the party ranks. The only apparent differences that occurred in this unity theme were that the appeals for harmony were longer and more detailed when (1) the party was leaderless or badly split; or (2) when a floor fight developed over the selection of the keynoter. One of the longest and most detailed pleas for unity and harmony came in J. Sloat Fassett's 1892 keynote speech. Fassett attempted to achieve harmony by stating:

We are not here as warring factions, seeking supremacy by strife, under favorite leaders, but we are here as members of one great party seeking to elect from the shining roll of our honored great men, the type of statesman who shall be regarded as the soundest and completest embodiment of the cardinal doctrines of the Republican party. . . . If there is ever a time when it is proper that Republicans should differ, that time is now, and the occasion is here. We are here for the express purpose of comparing divergent views and divergent opinions, meaning out of the clash and conflict of opinions to arrive at ultimate unity. . . .

In the delicate and wide-sweeping questions growing out of the selection of standard-bearers for a great party, there has always been, and always will be, a wide opportunity for differences of opinion among honest and independent men . . . and the more earnest the men, the more honest the opinions, the more vigorous and determined will be the conflict, and the

---

120Party unity was lacking at the time of this convention, for although James G. Blaine was aged and ill, he had received substantial publicity as President Harrison's Secretary of State, and had then resigned his office shortly before the convention took place. Although Blaine still had considerable support within the party, many new leaders were emerging who wanted the nomination. Unity was further hampered by the mass movement of many farmers toward the third-party coalition.
more complete the unification ultimately reached. . . . The air is always sweeter and purer after a storm, and indicates a brighter tomorrow. . . .

Elihu Root's appeal for unity in the 1912 convention was also somewhat more detailed than the usual appeal for harmony. Root began his thematic development by stating that a party's fitness to govern depended upon

. . . the willingness of the members of the party to subordinate their varying individual opinions and postpone the matters of difference between them in order that they may act in unison upon the great questions wherein they agree. . . .

Without these things there can be no party worthy of the name. Without them party association is a rope of sand, party organization is an ineffective form, party responsibility disappears, and with it disappears the right to public confidence.

Unlike the two examples just cited, most of the keynoters' appeals for unity and harmony were brief and perfunctory. In 1888, for example, the keynoter stated:

We enter upon the proceedings of this convention prepared to submit individual judgment to the wisdom of the majority, and to lay down personal preferences on the altar of party success. When our candidates are nominated we will all join, heart and soul, in the grand chorus of rejoicing. . . .

Another keynoter merely asked "that a spirit of patriotism
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and harmony will guide us. . . ."125 Still another speaker said that he realized that some delegates "will at first favor one man, some another, but we shall all strive to obtain the best man; and when the choice is ultimately made I trust we shall all feel that we have succeeded. . . ."126 A final example can be taken from the 1916 speech of keynoter Harding. In referring to the vicious 1912 convention, the speaker said:

We did not do very well in making for harmony the last time we met. [Laughter and applause.] The country has regretted, let us forget--and make amends to our country. . . . Let us forget the differences, and find new inspiration and new compensation in an united endeavor to restore the country. . . .127

Such appeals for harmony and unity have been frequent in Republican national conventions.

Supporting Materials for Unity and Harmony Theme

Unlike the two themes discussed earlier in this chapter, the unity and harmony theme lacks any significant repetitive characteristics of supporting materials.

Summary

Appeals for unity and harmony constitute the third major theme of the Republican keynoters, occurring in over
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four-fifths of the speeches and in every convention since 1920. Most such appeals were brief and perfunctory except (1) when the party is leaderless or badly split, and (2) when a floor fight developed over the selection of the keynote speaker. This unity theme lacks any characteristic forms of supporting material. Apparently, the delegates, outsiders, and Republican leaders were correct in their observation that one of the purposes of the keynote speech is to stimulate the delegates' desire for harmony and unity within the party.

According to many texts on public speaking or persuasion, appeals to patriotism or loyalty can often be of value to the speaker, whether the speech be deliberative, forensic, or ceremonial. A fourth major theme of the Republican keynoters focused on such motive appeals.

**America is Wonderful!**

A fourth theme that appeared frequently in the twenty-eight keynote speeches stated that "America is wonderful!" Although this idea did not appear as often as the three themes discussed previously, it was employed with enough regularity to merit brief attention. The keynoters stated a variety of reasons why their listeners should believe that America is wonderful, including: (1) our humanitarian motives; (2) our manifest destiny--some said ordained by God--others were less presumptuous; (3) our "spiritual
heritage; (4) our concern for the dignity of the individual; (5) our belief in the importance of education; (6) our "perfect" form of government; (7) our party (Republican) helped make it great; (8) our free enterprise system; (9) our desire for continual progress; (10) our "fine basic character"; (11) our natural resources; (12) our youth and vigor; (13) our agricultural skills; (14) our excellent labor force; (15) our industrial capacity; and (16) our standard of living. Only two of these reasons were presented with sufficient regularity to merit discussion. Appeals designed to show American prosperity outnumbered all other appeals by a ratio of over four to one. The second most frequently stated reason for American greatness was based on the desirability of our form of government.

(Although a third reason will be discussed in this portion of the analysis, it consists of a combination of several of the sixteen items stated earlier.)

Over half of the Republican keynote speakers contended that one important reason why "America is wonderful!" was due to our prosperity. The 1940 keynoter said that America "has given to our people the highest standard of living in the

128 This list is by no means exhaustive, but the nature of the remaining reasons can be typified by Harding's reasoning: America is wonderful because our form of government is wonderful; the founding fathers established our wonderful form of government; therefore, the founding fathers were divinely inspired. (Proceedings, 1916, p. 16.)
The 1964 keynoter reminded his listeners that "capitalism in the United States has brought us to the highest standard of living in the history of the world. . . ." Although the 1956 keynoter said that our "idealism and our faith in God" were more "meaningful than our material wealth," the speaker also said that "America stands today as the richest, freest, finest country in the world. We live in a land of abundance, a land rich in resources. We are a prosperous people. . . ."

Still another keynoter pointed out "that we are in the midst of an unparalleled material development. . . ." Several speakers were more specific in their development of this theme. The 1960 keynoter, for example, said that American workers, . . . have better food and clothing for themselves and their families, more homes, more automobiles, more refrigerators, more TV's, more free time for study, for recreation, for sports, for travel, for whatever.

Still other speakers spoke of "high wages," "control over inflationary pressures," or listed the luxuries available to Americans.

---
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In addition to prosperity, several of the keynoters thought that our form of government was a major factor in American greatness. In 1916, for example, the keynoter expressed this point of view:

It is not alone the miracle of accomplishment which deepens our reverence; it is not alone the conviction that we have built the first, seemingly dependable, popular government on the earth and exalted all its citizenship, which adds to our faith; but we are the oldest of existing civilized nations, with one passing exception, continued under one form of government, and under that form we have developed the highest standard of living in all the world. Surely we must be right. (Applause.)

This idyllic view of our governmental system was also expressed by the 1912 keynote speaker, when he said that "nowhere on earth" were the "true ends of government more fully secured . . . than in the life of America today. . . ."

Still a third group of speakers preferred to support their claim that "America is wonderful!" by combining a number of the reasons mentioned earlier in the discussion. The 1964 keynoter, for example, stated:

We have faith that the American nation and system will prevail against the Communist menace that stalks and threatens to bury us and against the Fascist that lurks and threatens to capture us. . . . And, we have the energy, the knowledge of the enemy, and the faith in freedom that will maintain our liberty against either danger. We have faith in our educational system, as the foundation of self-government, as the mainspring of economic progress, as the [sic] source of brain power
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for the defense of the state. We have faith in the free enterprise system in the Republican Party. (Applause.)

A final example of this combined support for the "America is wonderful!" theme can be taken from Root's 1912 speech:

That nowhere on earth is there such unfettered scope for the independence of individual manhood; nowhere greater security and competency for the family home; nowhere more universal advantages of education for rich and poor alike; nowhere such universal response for all demands of charity and noble plans for relieving the distress and improving the condition of mankind; nowhere a more ready quickening of public spirit under the influence of high ideals . . . than in the life of America today. . . .

Although Republican keynoters listed a variety of reasons for American greatness, only several can be labeled as characteristic: (1) America is wonderful because of her prosperity; (2) America is great because of her form of government; or (3) America is wonderful because of a combination of these reasons.

Supporting Materials Used with the "America is wonderful" Theme

Since the keynoters could assume a partisan attitude toward their expressions of American greatness, it is little wonder that the supporting materials for this theme primarily consist of assertions and appeals to patriotism.
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Logical proofs.--Although several keynoters supported their ideas on this theme with specific instances, comparisons, statistics, and causal reasoning, assertion outnumbered all other forms of support by a ratio of over ten to one. (The examples cited earlier should suffice to indicate the exact nature of these assertions.)

Emotional proofs.--As might be expected by the nature of the arguments, those keynoters who thought that American greatness was characterized by her prosperity primarily relied on appeals to ownership or possession; on the other hand, the speakers who stated that American greatness resulted from the form of government depended on appeals to loyalty and patriotism. When advocating the prosperity point of view, only one out of every five speakers would include any emotional appeals whatever with his assertions. Even in these instances, the appeals were indirect or implied --the listener was left to draw the obvious conclusion that higher wages, lack of inflation, and more leisure time would be of personal benefit to him.

For those speakers who advocated that American greatness resulted from our governmental structure, the opposite ratio of assertion to emotional appeal resulted. Appeals to patriotism and loyalty outnumbered all other forms of support by about five to one. In contrast to the appeals used with the prosperity position, the emotional proofs used with the governmental position were neither indirect nor implied. In
stressing the impact of our system of government, the 1916 keynoter said:

In building the surpassing temple of the Republic, which we have been doing to the astonishment, sometimes the envy, sometimes the admiration of the world, and oftentimes inspiring others by our example, there will ever be modifications. . . to meet the public need and conform to popular ideals.

. . . The wisdom of representative popular government is proven in the surpassing achievement. . . .\(^\text{138}\)

The 1912 keynoter was even more explicit in his appeal to patriotism:

We shall not apologize for American institutions. We cherish with gratitude and reverence the memory of the great men who devised the American constitutional system— their unselfish patriotism, their love of liberty and justice, their lofty conception of human rights, their deep insight into the strength and the weakness of human nature, their wise avoidance of the dangers which had wrecked all preceding attempts at popular government, their breadth of view which adapted the system they devised to the progress and development of a great people. We will be loyal to the principles they declared and to the spirit of liberty and progress, of justice and security, which they breathed into that immortal instrument.\(^\text{139}\)

These two examples of emotional proof are representative of those employed to support the theme that "America is wonderful" due to her form of government.

**Ethical proofs.**—Ethical proofs are not characteristically employed with the theme that "America is wonderful!" (Although some ethos is evident in the quotations used throughout this section of the analysis, these instances of
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ethical proof are incidental to the other two modes of proof.)

**Summary**

A fourth theme that is characteristic of Republican keynoting states that "American is wonderful!" Although the speakers offered numerous reasons for America's greatness, two reasons were listed more often than any others: (1) America is wonderful because of our prosperity, high standard of living, and general material wealth; (2) America is wonderful because of our form of government. Several keynoters supported this theme by presenting a combined list of reasons for American greatness.

Speakers who supported the prosperity idea relied on four-fifths assertion and one-fifth implied emotional appeals to ownership and possession. Speakers who preferred the governmental importance position supported their stand by employing four-fifths appeals to patriotism and loyalty, and one-fifth assertion. The emotional proofs supporting the latter position (importance of government) were much more forceful and direct than those used with the prosperity idea.

The purpose of such a theme in Republican keynoting is probably multiple. The most obvious reason for the speakers to state that "America is wonderful!" is to instill pride in the auditors. Pride alone, however, regardless of its merits, is inadequate as a purposive political tool. Consequently, the Republican keynoters attempted to
associate American greatness with the G.O.P., implying some degree of causality in the association of the two.

Our Fiscal Policies Are Excellent

One of the alleged characteristics of the Republican party is their concern for fiscal "responsibility." The fifth dominant theme that appeared in the speeches of the keynoters centered around various aspects of fiscal policy. Arguments based on financial policy usually were expressed by three frequently occurring propositions: (1) the federal government must be run efficiently on a "business-like" basis; (2) that the national debt must be paid (or at least reduced); (3) that a sound currency was vital to the nation's economic stability. The twenty-eight keynote speeches reveal that Republican fiscal policies have changed since they were first expounded in Theodore Pomeroy's 1876 keynote address. Although the Republican speakers have consistently stressed the need for efficiency and freedom from controls, certain variations have occurred:

1. Unmitigated praise for Republican economic policies was modified soon after the turn of the century. At this time several keynoters admitted the need for certain reforms. In 1908, for example, what keynote Burrows called "our recent financial disturbance," prompted a closer examination of fiscal policies. Burrows stated that there "is something inherently defective in the system itself, which
can only be reached by a thorough overhauling." Burrows was quick to defend Republican monetary policy, however, for he stated that such a fiscal policy,

\[\ldots\] confessedly defective in its inability to respond at all times to the varying and exacting demands of trade, yet, during the forty-five years of its existence, has served a wise and beneficient purpose.\textsuperscript{140}

A later keynoter echoed the same phrases, stating that "the national currency \ldots is no longer adapted to our changed conditions. It is inelastic."\textsuperscript{141}

2. Certain controls and regulations upon the national economic structure were first abhorred; in later years they were labeled as artificial, socialistic, or temporary. Actually, it was not until the Second World War that keynote speakers began to admit the necessity for certain kinds of economic regulative policy. Senator Steiwer's 1936 keynote speech typified Republican hostility to the economic "experimentation of the New Dealers." The speaker said that

\textsuperscript{140} Proceedings, 1908, p. 40. The period of transition was obviously incomplete at this point, for Senator Burrows promptly itemized the beneficial results of the "confessedly defective" policy which had restored public credit, established the gold standard, standardized the currency, and lowered the national debt by $103,996,420. (Ibid.)

\textsuperscript{141} Proceedings, 1912, p. 90. Senator Root explained that the Republican administration had established a Monetary Commission to study the problem and that the commission's findings were being considered by the Congress. (At this point in his discussion, Root stated that it is for the "interest of every business man in the United States that the party controlling the government [the Republicans] should not be changed until this policy has been carried into execution.") (Proceedings, 1912, p. 93.)
the New Deal politicians

... [tell] us that prosperity has been returned through their efforts. The improvement that has come has been largely purchased at the expense of the public treasury, and we have paid for more prosperity than we have received. Improvement purchased on credit is a dear luxury, uncertain to this generation—unjust to the next. When national resources and credit are exhausted, the Nation will find itself face to face with these unpleasant facts: that purchased business activity is not enduring; that our duty to the 10 million unemployed has not been met; and, furthermore, that the power of the Federal Government to provide for those who are destitute has been frittered away until the Nation itself has become destitute.142

 Apparently unwilling to accept the principle of direct governmental spending as a spur to the economy, Steiwer argued "... [that] no one would advocate reform ahead of recovery except the reformers who can experiment and exploit only when the people are in distress."143

The first inroads upon the stubborn theme of "natural" Republican economic policies as opposed to "artificial" Democratic experimentation were not fully expressed until the 1940 convention. Keynoter Stassen began his argument with the same old Republican economic theme song that "the great productive processes of a free people under a system of individual enterprise have made this nation the great power that it is."

It has given to our people the highest standard of

142proceedings, 1936, p. 37.
143proceedings, 1936, p. 38.
living in the world. This system has been and will be subject to depressions and its recessions, its maladjustments and readjustments as the years roll by. We must recognize that government should furnish a cushion against the sharper fluctuations of this economic system, but that it cannot successfully furnish a bed upon which society can go to sleep. . . .

The latter part of Stassen's argument is the first admission by a Republican keynoter that governmental control of economic fluctuations is not necessarily undesirable, artificial, or un-American. Although several later keynoters implied that there was something less than "real Americanism" in certain Democratic economic policies, it was not until 1956 that a Republican keynoter labeled them as "socialistic." The keynoter stated:

After World War II was over, the Democrats fought to keep socialistic war controls over every phase of a free American life, and when a Republican Congress restored freedom to the people the Democrats predicted wild and wanton inflation and economic disaster, but it did not happen. . . . The Democrats claimed that we could not relax controls and maintain economic stability; yet, we did it.

By 1960, the Republican keynoters had moved from "artificiality" to "socialistic" and back to "artificiality" again. Although the 1960 keynoter did not label Democratic controls as "artificial," he referred to them as "temporary":

It is the obligation of the Republican Party and its members to show that loose fiscal policies, while temporarily gratifying, in the end inhibit growth rather than expand it. . . .

144 Proceedings, 1940, p. 55.

145 Proceedings, 1956, pp. 81-82.
... the first requirement was to stabilize our economy and slow down the inflation ... how could inflation best be checked? The Democrats clamored for more controls. President Eisenhower announced he would take off the controls. ... we achieved stability not by changing our free system, but by using it. It works better than those of little faith in the American people give it credit for.146

The chronological development of these two aspects of Republican fiscal policy is designed to point out that although financial matters are a major theme of the keynoters, the attitudes on fiscal policies are far from static. Furthermore, even though virtually every keynoter discussed some aspect of Republican fiscal policy, the preceding discussion indicates the improbability that their positions were identical. Consequently, about the only true characteristic of Republican fiscal policy at this point is that Republican keynoters do not favor "temporary" or "artificial" controls over the "American system of free enterprise."

3. Democratic spending has usually been labeled as excessive, although this criticism occurred most frequently during the period from 1932 to 1944. This third area of financial policy is much more consistent and repetitive than the two items just mentioned. As early as 1876, a Republican keynoter said that the Democratic party

... claims to accept the situation respecting the sacredness of the national debt and the inviolability of the national credit, and yet $20,000,000 of

146 Judd, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 9.
taxation will not make good the annual loss to the American people, from the undefined and undefinable attitude and intentions of that party in regard to the payment of the principal of the public debt. 147

A similar concern for Democratic spending was expressed by the 1916 keynoter. After enumerating the economic changes that had occurred since the party last convened, the speaker quipped:

There are new wonders and new hindrances in commerce, changed balances of trade, new marvels in finance and utterly changed economic conditions. . . . Everything is abnormal except the depleted condition of the federal treasury, which is characteristic of Democratic control, and the facility of the administration for writing varied notes without effective notice. . . . 148

For the next sixteen years, even in the midst of the depression, the Republican keynoters continued to stress the same three financial propositions, especially excessive Democratic spending and the need for a balanced budget. In 1932, the keynoter said that "a balanced budget was the first essential to economic recovery." 149 The speaker said that the Democrats in the House and Senate "proposed billions in bond issues for unnecessary and unproductive public works, presumably on the theory that when your budget is unbalanced--when your outgo exceeds your income--you can squander yourself into prosperity. . . ." 150 Continuing to overlook the

147Proceedings, 1876, p. 9.
149Proceedings, 1932, p. 23.
present economic condition of the country, Dickinson said that "the Republican Party is still the party of sound money, and of wise and conservative fiscal policies . . . the Hoover Administration has rigidly adhered to this fundamental Republican doctrine." Dickinson concluded this portion of his argument by cautioning against any form of "fiscal experiments" that would endanger the national financial structure.\textsuperscript{151} As late as 1964, Republican keynoters were still critical of Democratic spending, for the 1964 convention keynoter stated: ". . . the complexities of the present can not be met . . . by spending large sums of money on ill-considered programs that deal only with symptoms and not the causes. . . ."\textsuperscript{152} It seems evident that one of the most pervasive elements of Republican fiscal policy is concern for a balanced budget (or reducing the national debt and avoiding further deficit spending). Although such criticism of Democratic spending has been occurring with a high degree of regularity since 1876, the criticism was most vitriolic during the lengthy administration of President Franklin Roosevelt.

\textsuperscript{151}Proceedings, 1932, p. 26. (Underlining is my own.)

\textsuperscript{152}Mark Hatfield, 1964, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 4.
Supporting Materials Employed With the "Our Fiscal Policies Are Excellent" Theme

Unlike the first four major themes discussed in this chapter, the fifth theme is characterized by a preponderance of logical proof over emotional and ethical proofs. In order to prove that their fiscal policies were sound and superior to those of the Democrats, the Republican keynote speakers used a variety of logical, ethical, and emotional proofs.

Logical proofs.—Republican keynoters employed numerous types of logical proofs to show that their fiscal policies were excellent. In addition to assertion and generalization, the most predominant kinds of proof were examples, causal reasoning, comparison, and statistics.

To illustrate the keynoters' use of examples and specific instances, we can examine the statement of the 1936 keynoter:

Let us consider the accumulation of the last three long years. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1934, the deficit was approximately four billion dollars. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, it was in excess of three and a half billion dollars. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and eliminating any requirement for the payment of the soldiers' bonus, the deficit is between three and a half and four billion dollars.153

The 1896 keynoter praised Republican financial policy by listing specific examples of Democratic fiscal failures.

153 *Proceedings*, 1936, pp. 43-44.
The speaker stated:

Look at its ante-bellum currency record! Consider its hostility to the currency rendered necessary by the exigency of war; and, later, its efforts to inflate the currency in a time of peace by the issue of greenbacks.\textsuperscript{154}

Without exception, every keynoter who discussed the excellence of Republican fiscal policy employed at least one example or specific instance to support his argument. In addition to the use of example, however, a second favorite logical proof was causal reasoning.

Many of the keynoters employed cause-to-effect, effect-to-effect, and effect-to-cause reasoning to support Republican financial policy. In 1896, for example, the speaker stated:

A change from the present standard to the low silver standard would cut down the recompense of labor, reduce the value of the savings in savings banks and building and loan associations, salaries and incomes would shrink, pensions would be cut in two, the beneficiaries of life insurance would suffer, in short, the injury would be so universal and far reaching that a radical change can be contemplated only with the gravest apprehension.\textsuperscript{155}

The 1936 keynoter also employed causal reasoning when he said:

By July 1 the present administration will have increased the national debt more than 14 billion dollars, and has announced that before a balanced budget can be obtained there will be a further increase of several additional billions. I warn you that if America is to survive, debt expansion must

\textsuperscript{154}Proceedings, 1896, p. 30.

\textsuperscript{155}Proceedings, 1896, p. 31.
be ended. A resolute and uncompromising purpose to secure a balanced budget and honest assurances of reduction in debt are essential to restoration of public confidence. Then the business world will know there will be no further devaluation of the dollar; that we will no longer stand at the brink of inflation; that there will be no further repudiation of public obligations; and that there will be no additional exactions by the tax collector. These essential assurances will start in motion the wheels of industry. (Applause.)

Still another typical example of argument from causality can be observed in the speech of the 1924 keynoter:

Among the pending issues of the day economy in public expenditures and reduction of taxation must assume the utmost importance. The Federal Government, States, and communities have been engaging in a riot of lavish expenditures, attended by mounting indebtedness. The burden of increased taxation must shackle enterprise and diminish employment. It adds almost crushing weight to the cost of living and closes the doors of opportunity. Excessive public expenditures create a fatal example, stimulating prodigality and waste among all the people in every form of activity. Public economy promotes individual initiative and prevents that reliance upon paternalistic government which weakens the morale of any people and brings with it the depressing rule of bureaucracy. (Applause.)

These examples are typical of the causal reasoning employed by Republican keynoters to glorify their financial policies.

In addition to examples and causal reasoning, many of the keynote speakers relied on analogy and comparison to demonstrate the worth of Republican fiscal policy. In 1936, for example, the keynoter said:

The administration has demonstrated that it is unable

---

156Proceedings, 1936, p. 42.

to obtain even a semblance of prosperity except by buying it, and its purchases are on a basis so vast and so impractical that they ultimately would destroy America. By midsummer the amount of their spending will equal the value of all the farm land and all the farm buildings in the United States, and the New Deal harvest is yet to come. . . .158

The 1916 keynote speaker employed comparison when he said:

The Democratic party is always concerned about the American consumer. Our Republican achievement is the making of a nation of prospering producers. . . . Far better a high cost of living and ability to buy than a lowering of cost attended by destruction of purchasing capacity. (Applause.)159

Still another keynoter compared per capita expenses during several different years:

As an illustration of present conditions, the per capita expenses of the United States Government in the fiscal year of 1910 were $7.74; in 1919, the year of the peak of expenses, they were $173.54; and for the last year they were $33.44, more than fourfold those of 1910.160

The final type of characteristic supporting material to be discussed in connection with the financial policy theme is statistics.

The Republican keynoters frequently employed statistics to show that the G.O.P. fiscal policies were admirable. In some cases the speakers used statistical data that were virtually impossible to present orally with any degree of intelligibility. In 1904, for example, the keynoter presented a mass of statistical data when he stated:

---

158Proceedings, 1936, pp. 41-42.
On the 1st of March 1897, when the first administration of McKinley began, we had in the country, including bullion in the Treasury, $1,806,272,076. This was $23.14 per capita for our population, and of this 38.893 was gold. On the 1st of March, 1901, when the second administration of McKinley began, the money in the country was $2,467,295,228. This was $28.34 per capita, and of this 45.273 per cent was gold. On the 1st of May last the money in the country was $2,814,985,446, which was $31.02 per capita, and of it 48.028 per cent was gold.\textsuperscript{161}

The statistical supports employed by the 1924 keynoter were equally difficult to comprehend:

As a proof of the futility of these high taxes, it is to be noted that in 1916 when the total surtaxes were $121,900,000 and the highest rate 13 per cent, $81,400,000 of these taxes were collected from incomes in excess of $300,000; but in 1921, when surtax collections were $411,300,000, over three times as great, under a maximum rate of 65 per cent, the collections from incomes of $300,000 and over were only about $3,000,000 more than in 1916, or $84,700,000. . . .\textsuperscript{162}

Other speakers, however, were clearer in their presentation of the statistical information regarding fiscal matters. In 1936, for example, the speaker stated that under "this administration average wages have increased about 8 percent while the cost of living has increased approximately 20 percent."\textsuperscript{163} Still another speaker stated that prices "which had been rising alarmingly--48\% in the seven Truman years--promptly leveled off and stayed practically stable for four

\textsuperscript{161}\textit{proceedings,} 1904, p. 35.
\textsuperscript{162}\textit{proceedings,} 1924, p. 25.
\textsuperscript{163}\textit{proceedings,} 1936, p. 42.
years. The total rise in prices . . . is less than 10%.”

Although several speakers relied on explanation, description, authority, definition, or narration to support their arguments on fiscal policy, only the four types of supporting materials just mentioned can be labeled as characteristic—examples, causal reasoning, comparison, and statistics.

**Emotional and ethical proofs.**—In discussing Republican fiscal policies, virtually all of the keynoters relied on logical proofs more heavily than on ethical or emotional appeals. Although the keynoters employed a wide variety of both ethos and pathos, neither mode of proof tended to show consistent or regular lines of development.

**Summary**

A fifth major theme that characterized the twenty-eight Republican keynote speeches stated that "our fiscal policies are excellent." This financial theme was most often expressed by three frequently occurring and often interrelated propositions: (1) the federal government must be run efficiently on a "business-like basis"; (2) that the national debt must be paid (or at least reduced); and (3) that a sound currency was vital to the nation's economic stability. Although the keynoters consistently stressed the need for efficiency and freedom from controls, several

---

164Walter Judd, 1960, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 9.
variations occurred in the development of the three financial propositions: (1) unmitigated praise for Republican economic policies was modified soon after the turn of the century. At this time, several keynoters admitted the need for certain reforms; (2) certain controls and regulations upon the national economic structure were first abhorred; in later years they were labeled as artificial, socialistic, or temporary. It was not until the Second World War that keynoters began to admit the necessity for certain kinds of economic regulative policy; (3) although the keynoters have consistently labeled Democratic spending as excessive, these charges seemed to increase in frequency and vehemence during the period from 1932 to 1944. Supporting materials for this financial theme were primarily logical, with examples, causal reasoning, comparison, and statistics being more characteristic.

The Centralization of Power is Dangerous; We Are Concerned About the Individual American Citizen

A sixth major theme expounded by the Republican keynote speakers linked two propositions related to the power of the government versus the freedom of the individual. Over three-fourths of the keynoters argued that the centralization of power was dangerous and that the Republican party was concerned about the individual American citizen. Although both of these propositions occurred regularly, they received
particular emphasis following wars and during the New Deal era.

In 1924, for example, the keynoter warned against the dangers of control by a central government agency, and urged freedom for the individual citizen:

Let us secure for every individual the greatest possible equality of opportunity and leave to the States and minor political divisions a broad field of activity in their proper sphere. . . . Thus we shall avoid an unwieldy central government in constant danger of toppling over. . . . 165

In 1960, the keynoter developed both propositions simultaneously:

We Republicans deeply believe that the first function of a good government is to protect the liberty of the individual citizen, not to take it away. . . . There have never been but two basic philosophies of government—government from the bottom up, and government from the top down. . . . One group begins with the assumption that the more complex and complicated a society becomes, the more its control and management must be centralized in an increasingly powerful government. . . .

We are not against adequate Federal Government. There must be such government to prevent abuses of power. We merely want to keep it limited to its proper fields, so that the liberty of individuals will be protected. . . . 166

Still other keynoters, including Warren (1944), Green (1948), and MacArthur (1952), warned of the federal government's usurpation of the rights of individuals, states, and communities. This same theme was expressed somewhat more

165 Proceedings, 1924, p. 27.

166 Judd, text supplied by Republican national headquarters, p. 12.
emotionally by the 1880 keynoter:

National wealth may exist, manufactures may flourish, commerce may increase, in a nation whose people are degraded and enslaved. The keynote of every Republican union, is found in its respect for the dignity of the individual man. Until that becomes the pervading principle of the Republic, from Canada to the Gulf, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, our mission is not ended.167

These examples are representative of the keynoters' attempts to show that the centralization of power is dangerous and that the G.O.P. was concerned for the individual liberties of the citizen.

Supporting Materials for "Centralized Power Versus Individual" Theme

Republican keynoters employed a variety of methods to show that the centralization of power was dangerous and that Republicans were concerned about the individual American citizen. Only one of these modes of support, however, can properly be labeled as characteristic of the theme.168 The emotional appeal to freedom from restraint appeared far more often than any other form of support, including both ethical and logical appeals. In 1936, for example, the keynoter said that centralization of power

... is the Siamese twin of bureaucracy. Expensive


168Although many of the speakers implied that the centralization of power was dangerous, threatening, ominous, evil, or foreboding, the motive appeal to sheer fear was seldom stated explicitly.
and arbitrary, its supreme evil is greed for money and power. History shows that centralized autocracy invariably seeks to build itself greater and stronger on the ruins of the people's liberties. It reaches for control of the education of children and the formation of thought, and finally all human rights, including religious freedom, must yield to its tyranny.\textsuperscript{169}

Although the 1912 keynoter utilized the same appeal to freedom from restraint, his approach was much less emotionally phrased:

\begin{quote}
The Republican party will maintain the power and honor of the nation, but we still observe those limitations which the constitution sets up for the preservation of local self-government. This country is so large and the conditions of life are so varied that it would be intolerable to have the local and domestic affairs of our home communities, which involve no national rights, controlled by majorities made up in other states thousands of miles away or by the officials of a central government.\textsuperscript{170}
\end{quote}

A final example of this kind of appeal can be taken from the speech of the 1944 keynoter. In his attacks on the centralized power of the New Deal, the speaker stated:

\begin{quote}
These bureaucrats of the New Deal tell the farmer what to sow and when to reap—sometimes without regard for either the seeds or the season. . . . They require him to work in the field all day and keep books for the government all night. . . . They tell the worker what union he shall join, what dues he shall pay, and to whom he may pay them. They soon will tell the worker where he can work and where he cannot work. . . .

These bureaucrats encumber the small businessman with a multitude of rules, regulations, orders and decrees which entangle him, stifle his business, and
\end{quote}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{169}\textit{proceedings}, 1936, p. 35.
\item \textsuperscript{170}\textit{proceedings}, 1912, p. 98.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
darken his future. They move in, like political commissars, to watch over the shoulders of our industrialists, to say what, where and how industry can produce.\textsuperscript{171}

Summary

A sixth major theme of the Republican keynoters stated that the centralization of power was dangerous and that the Republican party was concerned about the individual American citizen. Even though three-fourths of the keynote speakers dealt with this theme, it received particular emphasis following wars and during the administration of President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Although a wide variety of supporting materials were employed in connection with the theme, the only characteristic appeal was to freedom from restraint.

Although the seventh, eighth, and ninth major themes were frequently discussed separately in the various keynote speeches, they were often linked together by the keynoters. These themes stated that Republican policies benefited all segments of the American economy.

Our Policies Provide an Impetus for Business and Manufacturing; Our Policies Are of Benefit to Agriculture; Our Policies Aid the Labor Force

As early as 1872, Republican keynoters attempted to show that their party's policies were beneficial to all people,

\textsuperscript{171}\textit{Proceedings}, 1944, p. 54.
including the "laboring masses, wherever and however employed, in town or country. . . ." Still another keynoter said that the Republican party wanted to protect "our farmers and manufacturers, and to insure the steady and remunerative employment to those who labor." The 1908 keynoter attempted to be more specific by listing the economic growth of the nation in terms of flocks, herds, coal, gold, savings accounts, cotton, silk, shipping, and exports. The speaker summarized by stating:

This record of material activity in field and forest, factory and farm, mines and mills during the last four years might be indefinitely extended, but this will suffice to show the development and robust condition of our industrial life.

These examples will illustrate the attempts of the Republican keynoters to appear impartial toward any particular segment of the economy. A more detailed examination of these three themes, however, reveals that labor, agriculture, and business were not given equal consideration by the Republican keynote speakers. In order to examine these differences in treatment, each of these three themes will be discussed briefly.

173 Proceedings, 1900, pp. 35-36.
174 Proceedings, 1908, p. 31.
Our Policies Provide an Impetus for Business and Manufacturing

Many Republican keynoters stated that "our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing." Many of these same speakers, however, were exceedingly vague in relation to the G.O.P. position on trusts and large monolithic corporations. In 1888, for example, the keynoter said that the Republican party was strongly opposed to "... all unlawful combination and unjust exaction of aggregated capital and corporate power... ."175 Other keynoters skirted the trust issue and were more general: "It is the purpose of the Republican party not only to develop our domestic trade, but to extend our commerce into the uttermost parts of the earth."176 Still other keynoters were a bit sensitive about the trust issue. In 1900, for example, the keynoter stated:

Whenever a Republican administration is in power there is constant talk of trusts. The reason is not far to seek. Aggregations and combinations of capital find their only encouragement in prosperous days and widening commerce. Democratic administration in this country has universally meant industrial stagnation and commercial depression, when capital seeks a hiding place instead of investment.177

After Theodore Roosevelt's much publicized "trust-busting," 1904 keynoter Root was careful to explain that, "no

---

176 *Proceedings*, 1896, p. 31.
177 *Proceedings*, 1900, p. 38.
investment in lawful business has been jeopardized, no fair and honest enterprise has been injured. . . ."178 The 1916 keynoter, unlike several of his predecessors, did not mention the elimination of trusts; rather, after arguing that the Democrats were hostile to American industry and business success, the speaker stated:

No honest business in this country is too big to be good and useful, or too little to be protected and encouraged and both big and little deserve the American shield against destruction. . . . Business and its agencies of transportation are so inseparable from each other and from the common weal that the political party which does not pledge them a square deal, no more and no less, does not deserve the confidence of the people. The strength of the business heart shows in every countenance in all the land, and the weakness of that heart holds a nation ill. We must strengthen the heart of American business in government co-operation rather than official opposition.179

The final stage in the keynoters' development of the business theme did not appear until 1936, when the keynoter attacked governmental controls on industry as well as direct government spending:

Government regimentation of business works to destroy business. Business halfSlave, half-free, cannot pay adequate wages and cannot adequately serve the consumer. The direct competition of government


179Proceedings, 1916, p. 23. The extent to which "business" considerations dominated the Republican party's value system is readily apparent in the speech of the 1924 keynoter: "The adoption of policies for the exclusion of Japanese immigrants by no means implies any claim of their inferiority, but . . . in standards of living, which render them uncongenial to our industrial way of life. . . ." (Proceedings, 1924, p. 22.)
in business uses the money of all of the people to destroy the property of a part of the people.  

Thus, although Republican policies regarding business and manufacturing were not always concise or well articulated, these policies were much more consistent and more fundamental to the party's philosophy than were arguments concerned with labor or agriculture. In order to examine these differences, it would be well to scrutinize precisely why the Republican keynoters felt that their "policies were of benefit to agriculture."

Our Policies Are of Benefit to Agriculture

An examination of the keynoters' claims that "our policies are of benefit to agriculture," reveals several major shifts in Republican agricultural policy. During the period prior to 1900, no keynoter discussed Republican agricultural policies in depth. Rather, the speakers typically stated that the G.O.P. "stands for the protection . . . of American agriculture. . . ."  

"or, that certain Democratic policies were ". . . a flagrant wrong to the farmers of the United States. . . ."  

"or, that the Republican party wanted to "protect our farmers."  

\[\text{\textsuperscript{180}Proceedings, 1936, p. 34.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{181}Proceedings, 1888, p. 13.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{182}Proceedings, 1896, p. 29.}\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{183}Proceedings, 1872, p. 7.}\]
The keynote speeches given after the turn of the century expressed considerably more concern for the farmer. In 1904, for example, the keynoter said, "that the Department of Agriculture has been brought to a point of efficiency and practical benefit never before known." The speaker concluded:

To increase the profit of the farmer's toil, to protect the farmer's product and extend his market, and to improve the conditions of the farmer's life; to advance the time when America shall raise within her own limits every product of the soil consumed by her people . . . these have been cardinal objectives of Republican administration. . . .184

Another keynoter was even more specific in his praise of the Department of Agriculture:

The Agricultural Department has continued its work in promoting the interest of the farmers by diversifying their products; supplying new and valuable seeds and plants especially adapted to our climate and soil; eradicating diseases which infest and destroy animal and vegetable life. . . .185

1920 marks still another transition in the keynoters' statements regarding agricultural policy. The 1920 keynoter said:

. . . the most essential remedy for high costs is to keep up and increase production, and particularly should every effort be made to advance the productivity of the farms. . . . Just how much the Government can do in this direction is uncertain. . . .186

This transitional period was completed when the 1924 keynoter admitted "that the condition of agriculture is today one of

184Proceedings, 1904, pp. 40-42.
185Proceedings, 1908, p. 31.
186Proceedings, 1920, p. 22.
our most perplexing problems . . . we deplore the depression which rests upon various branches of production."187 This same speech reflected the pervasiveness of Republican distrust for artificial controls upon any segment of the economy. Republican reliance upon natural processes and their hostility toward certain types of economic supports are clearly indicated in the following statement from Burton's speech:

The Republican Party has shown its willingness to extend liberality to the last degree in the enactment of legislation which will aid the farmer, but it can not respond to impracticable theories or accept measures which will only aggravate the situation. Any artificial stimulus to prices which are depressed by irresistible causes can only postpone the evil day and add to the distress. Inexorable laws demand decreased acreage in certain staple products and a wider diversification. Numerous remedies proposed for relief fail utterly when subjected to careful analysis . . . Nothing which promises a solution has been proposed, but I trust some remedy may yet be found . . . .188

A later keynoter was equally unable to cope with the farm problem, and stated:

Sound relief will avoid artificial stimulus such as government price fixing or government buying and selling. Such remedies will but defer the day of reckoning. All relief measures to be of permanent value must be constructive and grounded in economic principles underlying production and consumption. The solution is primarily economic, not political. It is more individual and collective than governmental. Whatever aid the government may give, the remedy lies largely with the farmer himself . . . .189

187Proceedings, 1924, p. 22.
188Proceedings, 1924, p. 23.
189Proceedings, 1928, p. 49.
Still a third period of transition occurred about the time of the New Deal programs. After discussing the "plight of agriculture" and the "make-shift" remedies of the New Deal, the keynoter said:

The farm problem must and will be met, without violation of the Constitution, without regimentation, without burdensome taxes, and without any program of curtailment or ruthless destruction of food needed in a hungry world. . . .190

Still another keynoter admitted that farmers should be assisted, but said:

These aids again must not be looked upon as a solution to the agricultural problem, but only as a temporary expedient to ease the maladjustment that exists. We must seek real solutions in keeping with the natural economic forces that are involved in our system. . . .191

The final phase in the evolution of Republican agricultural policy revealed in the keynote speeches came in 1956. Arthur B. Langlie, keynoter for the 1956 convention, completely reversed the party's position on agriculture. Stating that he "wanted to keep history straight," Langlie said:

The decline in farm prices began right after World War II. . . . By the time this Republican Administration took office the bottom was falling out. Quickly we shored up the falling prices. Flexible

---

190 *Proceedings*, 1936, p. 39. Senator Steiwer failed to explain, however, precisely how this solution was to be implemented. Virtually all of his remarks about farming (as well as business and labor) stressed the importance of avoiding "artificial" controls and allowing the normal cycles of economic law to assert themselves again.

price supports took hold with the 1955 harvest. . . 192

Governor Langlie apparently disagreed with several of his fellow keynoters who had bemoaned the fate of the farmer in the 1920's and 1930's! More importantly, however, it is interesting to observe that "flexible price supports" are no longer "artificial," but have become an important element of Republican agricultural policy. With this speech, the full cycle of Republican attitudes toward farming was completed—from slight interest, to involvement, to concern, to avoidance of artificial measures, to the adoption of artificial measures on a temporary basis, and, finally, to the acceptance of flexible price supports.

In addition to claims that Republican policies provided an impetus for business and manufacturing, and in addition to assertions that Republican policies benefited agriculture, the Republican keynoters said that their policies aided the labor force.

Our Policies Aid the Labor Force

The claims of Republican keynoters that "our policies aid the labor force" have been characterized by superficiality and ambiguity. Unlike the discussions of agriculture or manufacturing, the labor policies advanced by the keynote speakers were brief and lacking in any discernable evolution
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or development. Many of the keynoters, for example, merely stated that under Republican administrations, "... labor received higher wages than ever..."193 another keynoter listed advances for seamen, working women and children, and the exclusion of Asiatic workers;194 still another speaker said that his party wanted "social justice" for the laborer;195 one speaker explained that his party wanted to improve the status of the working man. He stated:

To the safety and inviting environment of the laborer we must add his growing merits of compensation. There can be no permanent material good fortune that is not righteously shared, there can be no real moral achievement that does not lift the great rank and file to an ever higher plane. . . .196

These few examples are typical of the comments made by Republican keynoters regarding their party's policies toward labor.

Supporting Materials Used With the Three Themes That Republican Policies Benefit Business and Manufacturing, Agriculture, and Labor

Although the keynote speakers used virtually every kind of logical support for these three themes, no form of support was employed with sufficient regularity to be
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regarded as characteristic. Additionally, no ethical or emotional proofs were consistently used to support the themes.

**Summary**

Over the years, Republican keynoters have claimed that their party's policies were beneficial to all segments of the economy. The seventh, eighth, and ninth major themes expressed this idea. The seventh theme stated that "our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing." Although the keynoters spoke consistently in support of business, their attitude toward trusts and large corporations was less clearly articulated. The eighth theme said that "our policies are of benefit to agriculture." The Republican position on this theme gradually evolved from distrust of any governmental controls to acceptance of flexible price supports. The ninth theme asserted that "our policies aid the labor force." This theme was characterized by vagueness and superficiality. Although a variety of supporting materials were employed with these three themes dealing with business, labor, and agriculture, no form of support was inherently characteristic.

**Our Policies on Tariff and Trade Are Sound**

The final major theme to be discussed, and one that permeated most of the keynote speeches during the middle period of Republican history, claimed that "our policies on tariff and trade are sound." Republican attitudes toward
tariff and trade can be grouped into three categories: (1) unmitigated praise; (2) admission for need to reform or revise; and (3) abandonment.

The first point of view toward Republican tariff and trade policies, that of unadulterated praise, was frequently expressed by the keynoters of the 1880's and 1890's. The 1888 keynoter, after stating that the Republican party was the party of protection, said:

... it stands for the protection of American commerce, American manufacture and American agriculture from disastrous foreign competition; stands for the protection of home invention, home skill and home labor from the free trade heresies which would degrade and pauperize them all... 197

Other keynoters in this period explained that Republican tariff policies "were fitted to meet the requirements of our necessary expenditures, to furnish the needed protection to our farmers and manufacturers, and to insure the steady and remunerative employment to those who labor. ..." 198 This unmitigated praise for the protective tariff policy continued until 1912, at which time the keynoter realized a need for reform. This speech marks the beginning of the second category of attitudes toward tariff and trade.

Recognizing that the policy of protection had been abused, the 1912 keynoter stated:

We stand not for the abuses of the tariff but for
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the beneficent uses. . . . The chief cause of abuse has been that we have outgrown our old method of tariff making. Our productive industries have become too vast and complicated, our commercial relations too extensive, for any committee of Congress of itself to get at the facts to which the principle of protection may be properly applied. The Republican party proposes to remedy this defective method. . . .

Although the protective tariff was mentioned in the conventions from 1916 to 1928, it was not until the 1932 convention that a Republican keynoter returned to hearty praise for a protective tariff. The 1932 speaker said:

Since the beginning of the depression, the Democratic Party has shown an utter lack of cohesion on every important issue, and on none has it been more divided than on the tariff. . . .

In contrast to the wabbling of the Democrats, the Republican Party has followed a straight course on this as on every great issue. . . . Coming into existence as the party of protection --protection to the American farmer, to the American working man and to the American industry --our party has remained true to this principle. And the soundness of its position was never more abundantly demonstrated than in this period of world crisis. . . .

The speech of the 1936 keynoter marks the end of this second category of ideas regarding the protective tariff. The 1936 speaker observed that one of the "fundamentals of established national policy is tariff protection of efficient American

199 Proceedings, 1912, pp. 91-92.

200 By 1932, the depression had apparently enhanced the appeal of protective tariff policies. L. J. Dickinson returned to the same refrain that had been repeated by Republican keynoters since 1888, and sang the praise of protection.

production. America does not propose to destroy the opportunity of our citizens by giving up this protection."202

No keynoter since 1936 has returned to the protective tariff theme. Thus, Republican keynoters have praised the protective tariff and trade policies without reservation, later admitted the need for certain reforms, and, finally, abandoned the theme that "our policies on tariff and trade are sound."

Supporting Materials Employed With the Tariff and Trade Theme

While most of the keynoters employed varied supporting material for the idea that Republican tariff and trade policies are sound, only one type of logical proof can be labeled as a characteristic form of support for this theme.

Logical proofs.—Among the keynote speakers who discussed the tariff and trade theme, virtually all of them relied on supporting evidence by causal reasoning. In 1932, for example, the keynoter said that the "Republican tariff has preserved the American market for the American producer."203 The 1896 keynoter also employed causal reasoning when he stated:

The Democratic party had at Chicago condemned the protective tariff principle as unconstitutional;

and solemnly pledged itself to the overthrow and destruction of the McKinley law and to the adoption of free trade as the policy of the United States. This bold, aggressive attack upon the long settled principles of the Republican party brought its natural fruit in shaken confidence, unsettled business; and we were seen drifting against the rock of destruction.204

Still another keynoter said that under Republican leadership

. . . the policy of protection to American industry and American labor was established, developed, and vindicated; and the markets of the world opened by the bright, persuasive logic of reciprocity, to the products of the American farm, as well as to the American workshop, until to-day the nations of the earth are paying tribute to the sagacity of our legislation and diplomacy, in millions of dollars increased annual purchases.205

These examples are representative of the keynoters' attempts to show through causal reasoning that "our tariff and trade policies are sound."

**Ethical and emotional proofs.**—Other than a few vague and amorphous appeals to security, no ethical or emotional appeals characteristically appeared with the tariff and trade theme.

**Summary**

The tenth and final major theme advocated by the Republican keynoters stated that "our policies on tariff and trade are sound." Prior to the turn of the century, most keynoters had abundant and unqualified praise for protective
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tariffs. Later, several of the speakers admitted the need for slight revision and reform. During the depression era, two keynoters returned to unmitigated praise for protection. By 1936, the theme that "our policies on tariff and trade are sound" had been abandoned. The only characteristic form of support consistently accompanying this theme was causal reasoning.

These ten themes were the major arguments advanced for over one hundred years by twenty-eight Republican keynote speakers. In addition to these ten themes, however, numerous minor themes emerged during the years studied.

II. MINOR THEMES

Over the years, numerous minor themes appeared in the twenty-eight keynote speeches, each receiving varying degrees of emphasis. Included among these minor themes were: (1) our party has been instrumental in gaining civil rights for all citizens; (2) Democratic administrations consistently misconduct wars; (3) the United States is a more effective world power when under Republican control; (4) Republicans are effective anti-Communists. The minor theme that appeared in the speeches from 1856 through Grant's administration was that the Republican party had abolished slavery and had saved the union.

All these minor themes occurred with so little consistency and such irregularity that they are not discussed
further in this study.

In addition to the foregoing analysis of major themes and supporting materials, this study will attempt to describe characteristic organizational techniques employed by the keynoters.

Organization

It is exceedingly difficult to formulate meaningful generalizations regarding inherent organizational techniques of Republican keynote speeches. One reason for this difficulty is the multipurpose nature of the speeches themselves. Seldom does a keynote speech have a clearly stated central thought or proposition. It is of little value to argue that each speech has an implied proposition that "our candidates are splendid and will win the election," for such a proposition is inherent in the nature of the convention system—each party in each convention pays at least lip service to this argument.

An examination of the themes and supporting materials seems to indicate that most of the speeches are designed to stimulate rather than to inform, convince, or persuade. When the party is in power, the major arguments and themes tend to be phrased defensively, e.g., Burton's argument that the "entire government is not corrupt." When the party is out of power, the keynoters' themes and arguments are often
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stated as a need to change the status quo, e.g., "Democrats are hostile to business and cause depression (or inflation)."

Other than this rather obvious conclusion, little can be said regarding inherent features of the emergence of central themes in the speeches.

With the exception of Root's two speeches in 1904 and 1912, and Stassen's 1940 speech, none of the keynote speeches are notable for their clear and effective organization. These three speeches make extensive use of previews, transitions, and summaries, while most of the other keynote addresses lack such organizational devices. This deficiency probably creates no real difficulty, however, for almost all of the speeches are partitioned topically, and the shift from one area of discussion to another is usually apparent.

In addition to emergence of the central thoughts and the choices of organizational devices, certain aspects of the introductions are worthy of brief discussion.

**Introductions**

The introductions of the keynote speeches fall into two distinct groupings: (1) the speeches from 1856 to 1896, and (2) the speeches from 1900 to the present.

For a period of forty years—from 1856 to 1896, every Republican keynoter began his address with an attempt to gain the good will of his audience by expressions of appreciation, humility, or unworthiness. Several examples should suffice to indicate the nature of these ethical proofs. In 1856,
for example, the keynoter began his speech by stating:

Gentlemen, Delegates to the Republican Convention: I feel deeply the honor which you have just conferred upon me, and I return you my sincere thanks for it. Certainly it is owing to no merit of mine that I have been singled out for this compliment. Nothing beyond the zeal which I feel in the common cause that has brought us here together could possibly entitle me to it. And in that respect I claim not to be behind any one of you. . . .207

The introduction of the 1860 keynoter is also typical of this early period. The keynoter began:

I have no words in which properly to express my sense of the honor—and the undeserved honor, I think it is—of being called upon to preside temporarily [sic] over the deliberations of this Convention.

I shall not attempt a task which I feel inadequate to perform. Be sure, gentlemen, that I am not insensitive to this high and undeserved honor. I shall carry the recollection of it, and of your manifestation of partiality with me until the day of my death.208

These examples are characteristic of the introductions to the keynote speeches delivered from 1856 to 1896.

None of the speeches given after 1896 begin with such expressions of humility or unworthiness.

Although most of the Republican keynote speeches are lengthy, the introductions are consistently short—seldom longer than three paragraphs. There seem to be several reasons for this brevity: (1) since the speaker is often prestigious and the audience's attention should be voluntary, material designed to gain involuntary attention is often
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omitted; (2) since the speaker is chosen partly because of his political prowess, ethical appeals to show his qualifications are omitted;\textsuperscript{209} and (3) since the role of the keynoter is steeped in tradition and custom, there is little need for the speaker to secure an intelligent hearing by explaining or defining his role in the convention program.

Conclusions

Insofar as characteristics of the keynote genre are concerned, the conclusions of the speeches are particularly significant. The conclusions of the keynote addresses are somewhat more revealing than the introductions. Seldom do Republican keynoters summarize or re-state arguments; rather, the conclusions are consistently centered around an appeal—patriotic, religious, or a combination of both. In 1940, for example, the keynoter concluded:

Let us remember the words George Washington spoke in this very city: 'If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterwards defend our work. Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God.'\textsuperscript{210}

A similar combination of patriotic and religious appeal occurred in the conclusion of the 1936 keynote speech:

And now I ask the simple questions—will America live or die? And I answer that America will live

\textsuperscript{209}Except for isolated references in the speeches since 1932, the introduction of radio and television seems to have had little or no influence on the speakers' use of ethical appeals.

\textsuperscript{210}\textit{Proceedings}, 1940, p. 60.
because the people are firmly resolved that our Nation shall not die. When have we ever tested the full measure of the people's strength?. . . . The full measure and depth of a great people's will is unknown, even to themselves. The secret lies hidden in the omnipotent mind of the Creator of all courage and all resolution. To Him let our prayers be offered that an aroused America, casting out all doubt, will vindicate the faith of the fathers. We shall not falter, but in new found strength will hold high, in the splendor of a bright dawn, the banner of a Nation's liberties. 211

Still another such example can be taken from the conclusion of the 1944 speech:

It takes faith to build such an America—a strong faith, the same faith that now sustains our fighting men; a faith that is truly 'the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.'

With such a faith—which is our faith—we shall march under God toward victory, toward opportunity, toward peace. 212

These several examples of appeals should suffice to illustrate the kinds of conclusions present in over four-fifths of the keynote speeches.

In only two instances did keynoters restate what they considered to be the most important part of their speech. In 1896, for example, the keynoter stated:

My friends, the campaign of 1896 is upon us. The great questions for debate in the august forum of the United States are Free Trade and Free Silver against a Protective Tariff and Sound Money. . . . 213

The only other instance of restatement came in the conclusion of the 1920 keynote address of Senator Lodge. The speaker
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instructed his auditors that the League of Nations was the most important of the campaign issues. Lodge stated:

We of the Senate believe that we have performed a high and patriotic duty and we ask you, representatives of the Republican party, to approve our course and stand by what we have done. . . . The next act will fill a larger stage and the people will decide between us and the President. The League must be discussed in every district and in every State and we desire to have the verdict so clearly given that no man who seeks to represent the people in the Senate, in the House or in any place or any degree, can have the slightest doubt as to his duty. . . . We make the issue; we ask approbation for what we have done. The people will now tell us what they think of Mr. Wilson's League and its sacrifices of America. . . .

In these two examples, the keynoters isolated the issue or issues for the forthcoming campaign. With the exception of the earliest Republican keynoters, who wanted to rid the nation of the blight of human slavery, no other Republican keynote speakers used such techniques. These latter examples are important, for they partially substantiate the opinions held by delegates, outsiders, and Republican leaders that one of the functions of the keynote speech is to focus attention on the issues to be raised in the November election. These two speakers evidently felt that their primary purpose was to urge the convention delegates to isolate the important issues and to wage the campaign on them; otherwise, it seems dubious that a speaker would talk for over an hour about many issues, and not single out the one that he regarded as most vital. On the strength of
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these few examples, however, it could not be said that a primary purpose of the keynote genre is the isolation of issues for the forthcoming campaign.

**Extrinsic Means of Persuasion**

Most of the factors discussed thus far in this chapter have concerned **intrinsic** elements of persuasion—the result of the speaker's inventive process. This portion of the analysis suggests several forms of **extrinsic** persuasion that lie beyond the speaker's invention and that are often present in the convention situation.

1. The common response: As was mentioned earlier in the study, one of the characteristics of the keynote speech is the frequent oral response by the audience to the speaker's rhetorical questions. Other such mass responses include singing, chanting, parading, reciting the Pledge of Allegiance, and clapping. All of these activities form an important segment of the campaign-rally function of the convention. All of these mass responses contribute to the delegates' feelings of belonging to a united movement rather than a collection of individuals from various states. The very fact that the delegates are usually crowded together with little space to move around, increases the probability of common responses to a given stimuli.

2. Other events on the agenda: Additional events have been added to the convention agenda since the original convention of 1856. The prayers given in Republican national
conventions, for example, merit brief attention for their incorporation of the history and hero theme! In 1872, the minister's prayer incorporated references and quotations from Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address. The Rev. Dr. Alexander Reed prayed: "We thank thee for our new birth of freedom." The 1884 prayer was even more prolific in its thanks for "our glorious National heritage," Plymouth Rock, Yorktown, Appomattox, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, land, laws, institutions, and the Emancipation Proclamation. Frequently, such patriotic symbols are also presented by the national chairman, the permanent chairman, the mayor, the governor, and finally are sung by various choirs, quartets, or soloists. It is probably little wonder that keynoters in recent years have tended to lessen their reliance on such heroes and history.

It is difficult to exaggerate regarding such items on the program, for at some time or another even the most far-fetched events have occurred. In 1900, for example, the New York Times reported that following the singing of the Star Spangled Banner,

... a remarkable tribute to the flag and the pioneers of the Republican Party then occurred. Mr. Wolcott stepped forward and stated that fifteen survivors of the first Republican Convention called at Pittsburg
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forty-four years ago, were present with the same old flag used in that convention. At that moment a file of white-haired patriarchs appeared from the rear, bearing at their head a faded American flag, tattered and barely held together by a cross staff.

As the flag appeared the audience rose, delegates, spectators, and guests, and a deafening salute went up for the faded standard and its venerable upholders. . . .  

In the 1936 convention, Alfred M. Landon's favorite song—"Oh Susanna"—became the convention's theme song. Delegates, alternates, guests, and musicians sang and played the song over eight hundred times before the convention adjourned.  

To reinforce the idea that U. S. Grant was a man of peace, white doves were released in the convention hall when Grant was nominated in 1868.  

3. Physical effects: In the 1924 convention held in Cleveland, each time a patriotic event took place in the hall (the Pledge of Allegiance, the "Star Spangled Banner," and the singing of "America"), "... the enthusiasm of the multitude was heightened by a flooding of the convention with red, white, and blue lights from the ceiling." As far back as the 1860 convention, large portraits of the party leaders have been displayed in prominent places in the convention hall.
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4. Prestige personalities: In addition to the appearances of famous entertainers such as Ethel Merman, such operatic figures as James Melton and William Warfield, and such conductors as John Philip Sousa, the keynoter's ethos is enhanced by the band of party leaders who traditionally escort him to the speaker's platform.

Although the specific effects of these extrinsic means of persuasion are difficult to determine, it seems obvious that they: (1) provide physical aids to focus the attention of the delegates; (2) help achieve unity by common responses from the audience; (3) supplement (or perhaps detract from) standard emotional themes of the keynoter; (4) supply a large quantity of the ritualism necessary for the campaign-rally function of the convention; and (5) provide some common ground of emotion between the laity and the party professionals.

Summary

An analysis of the Republican keynote speeches delivered between 1856 and 1964 revealed ten major themes that occurred regularly. These major themes are listed below according to their importance:

1. Our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders.

2. The Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism.

3. We need unity and harmony.
4. America is wonderful.
5. Our fiscal policies are excellent.
6. The centralization of power is dangerous; we are concerned about the individual American citizen.
7. Our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing.
8. Our policies are of benefit to agriculture.
9. Our policies aid the labor force.
10. Our policies on tariff and trade are sound.

One of the themes most characteristic of Republican keynoting was that "our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders." Over the years, keynoters praised party heroes, national heroes, national history or historic sites, the flag, the Constitution, the American war dead, and the Union. Although a variety of supporting materials were used with this theme, appeals to patriotism, emotive language, assertion, specific instances, rhetorical questions, authority, beneficial legislation, and appeals for morality were most common.

The second most characteristic theme of the Republican keynoter was that the "Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism." Such attacks usually were centered on party leaders, party motives, party history, or specific party policies. Every speech given from 1856 to 1965 contained at least one example of this second theme. The Republicans supported this theme with negative ethos against the Democrats, and by the use of assertion, rhetorical questions, comparison,
sarcasm, ridicule and humor.

Appeals for unity and harmony constituted the third major theme of the Republican keynoters, occurring in over four-fifths of the speeches. Such appeals were usually brief except when the party was split or leaderless. This third theme lacks any characteristic forms of supporting material.

A fourth theme that is characteristic of Republican keynoting states that "America is wonderful!" Although a variety of reasons were given to support this theme, the two reasons that were most common were (1) our material wealth, and (2) our admirable form of government. This theme was supported by appeals to ownership and possession, appeals to patriotism, and assertion.

A fifth major theme that characterized the Republican keynote genre stated that "our fiscal policies are excellent." Many of the speakers argued for efficiency, less spending, sound currency, and freedom from controls. Republican positions on each of these matters varied throughout the period studied. Supporting materials for this financial theme were primarily logical, with examples, causal reasoning, comparison, and statistics being most characteristic.

A sixth major theme of the Republican keynoters stated that the centralization of power was dangerous and that the Republican party was concerned about the individual American citizen. This theme was most frequent during the New Deal era and was most often supported by appeals to freedom from restraint.
The seventh major theme advocated by Republican keynote speakers stated that "our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing." Although many of the speakers were vague in the matter of trusts, the keynoters consistently supported the importance of business in the American economy.

An eighth major theme claimed that "our policies are of benefit to agriculture." The keynoters' ideas reflected a change in Republican policies regarding farming, moving from distrust to artificial controls to acceptance of flexible price supports.

The ninth major theme enunciated by Republican keynoters was that "our policies aid the labor force." This theme was characterized by vagueness, superficiality, and lack of logical progression.

The final major theme advocated by Republican keynoters urged that "our policies on tariff and trade are sound." The party's position on the matter of protection shifted from unqualified support to the need for reform, and finally, to abandonment. This theme was most often supported by causal reasoning.

Although several minor themes emerged from the keynote speeches, they lacked consistency and regularity.

With only a few exceptions, the speeches were not particularly notable for their organization. All but three were organized topically; introductions were brief, omitting appeals for interest, attention, and intelligence, and
relying on good will; all of the early keynoters began their speeches with expressions of humility or unworthiness—this practice was discontinued by 1900. In all but two instances, conclusions utilized appeal rather than summary or restatement. The majority of such appeals combined patriotism and religious feeling.

Although their specific influence cannot be determined, extrinsic means of persuasion exerted an effect upon the campaign-rally function of the convention, and consequently upon the keynote speech.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to analyze the speaking of the keynoter in Republican national conventions from 1856 to 1964. The study sought to determine the purposes and characteristics of the keynote speech and to analyze the methods and significance of the Republican keynote speaker. Specifically, the question posed by this study was: When viewed as a genre—as a type or kind of speech—what are the inherently unique features of the Republican keynote address?

KEYNOTING DEFINED

Traditionally, the speech of the temporary chairman of the convention has been labeled as the keynote speech. The only three exceptions to this procedure occurred in the Republican national conventions of 1952, 1956, and 1960. In these years, the Republican national committee created two separate positions—a temporary chairman to preside while the permanent organization was being formed and a keynote speaker whose sole responsibility was to give a speech. As it appears in this study, the keynote speech is a long, often vitriolic, usually ill-supported, carefully prepared, well
publicized speech, that historically has been designed to stimulate, convince, or persuade both the delegates and the public of the desirability or undesirability of a course of action, an administration, a party, a party faction, or an individual. In recent years, the speech has been increasingly directed to radio, television, and the press rather than to the assembled delegates and guests. Additionally, the speech usually reflects the position of the party rather than merely voicing the opinions of the speaker. The keynote speech has long been a part of convention activity.

WHY STUDY KEYNOTING IN REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTIONS?

This study of Republican keynoting seemed justified for the following reasons:

1. The fact that the keynote address has existed for over a hundred years appears to indicate that it has at least minor importance in the affairs of the convention.

2. Many outstanding speakers have keynoted Republican national conventions between 1856 and 1964.

3. The importance of the convention system in American political life is undisputed. All aspects, however tangential, of such an important institution, merit analysis and evaluation.

4. The keynote speech of a national political convention usually receives widespread attention and publicity.

5. This study, when paralleled with E. Neal Claussen's
analysis of Democratic keynoting, will offer a complete and thorough treatment of keynoting in both major political parties.

6. This study of Republican keynoting provides an opportunity to examine the evolution of this kind of speaking over a period spanning a century of American political life.

METHOD OF DEVELOPMENT

In order to examine the highly complex relationship that exists among keynoter, party, occasion, and delegate, this study attempted to focus attention on keynote speaking as a genre—as a type or kind of speaking. Consequently, the direction of the study was to ferret out recurring ideas, themes, methods of argument, and forms of support, rather than to discuss techniques or ideas that occurred only occasionally.

Among the numerous questions posed by this study were:

1. Who were the keynoters and what qualities or qualifications did they possess?

2. What common characteristics or qualities can be observed among all twenty-eight keynoters?

3. What rationale does the national committee use when they select a keynoter?

4. What is the role of the arrangements committee and the national chairman in the selection of the keynoter?

5. What are the attitudes of the delegates regarding the selection of the keynoter?
6. What is the place of the speech in the convention organization?

7. What are the views of newspaper writers, casual observers, delegates, members of the Republican leadership, and of the keynoters themselves regarding the purpose of the speech?

8. Do the specific purposes of the keynote speeches vary?

9. What common themes and arguments occur repeatedly in all of the Republican keynote speeches?

10. How did the keynote speakers support their ideas?

11. What motive appeals, if any, were most often employed?

12. Do the speeches reveal the use of popular symbols and heroes?

13. Is the style of the keynote speeches highly emotive?

14. Do the ethical proofs establish the credibility of the speaker, of the speaker's party, or both?

15. Do the speeches reveal common organization techniques in partitioning or development?

16. What are the inherently unique features of the Republican keynote address?

17. What is the significance of Republican keynoting?

18. What major changes have occurred during the evolution of the Republican keynote speech?

In order to fully understand the social and political
setting in which the twenty-eight keynote speeches were delivered, Chapter II attempted to analyze the nature of conventions and convention audiences.

THE SETTING: THE CONVENTION

During the early history of the United States, three methods of selection and election were employed in the choice of a President. The first method allowed the members of the electoral college to exercise their independent judgment. The second method provided that a caucus of party members determine the choice of candidates. The third method of selecting candidates was the national nominating convention.

The practice of having the temporary chairman of the convention address the delegates after assuming the chair was adopted by the Republicans in 1856. Although the origin of this practice is open to question, the tradition probably began in the 1832 Democratic convention.

In order to better understand the setting in which the keynote speeches were delivered, it seems important to examine briefly the purpose of the convention itself.

The Function of the Convention

At the outset, it is vital to distinguish between the "observable" convention that is seen by the delegates, guests, and television viewers, as contrasted to the "real" convention that controls the decision-making apparatus of the party. This distinction between the dual nature of the convention
is essential, for to misunderstand the convention purposes is to misinterpret the function and significance of the keynote speech. It is of little value to criticize the keynote speech for having slight effect upon the decision-making apparatus of the "real" convention. Indeed, the keynote speech is an integral part of the observable convention, and often, is not designed to function as a kind of deliberative rhetoric. As this study points out, a national political convention usually has, in addition to its deliberative function, a campaign-rally function, a cohesive function, a compromising function, a propaganda function, and a ratifying function. In order to ascertain the relationship of the keynoter to these various functions, several categories of convention criticisms were examined in the earlier part of the study. (Since this study was concerned with the "observable" convention rather than the "real" convention, the term "convention" refers to the former of the two purposes.)

Most convention criticism falls into rather distinct categories:

1. The "carnival" atmosphere of the convention with its noise, confusion, and chaos, has been deplored by newspaper writers, casual observers, scholars, delegates, and members of the party leadership.

Since the keynote speech is often a part of this "carnival" atmosphere, it is important to establish a rationale for the seeming chaos and confusion. One of the
primary explanations for this atmosphere is the nature of the "campaign-rally" function of the convention—to reinforce party loyalty prior to the campaign; to stimulate the party and the public; and to provide a seemingly dynamic setting in which the grass-roots laity supporters can mingle with the party professionals.

Much of the excitement and turmoil is admittedly excessive. Yet, the needed sense of unity and belonging could probably not be achieved by cold calculated rationality; hence, the atmosphere of the convention itself is designed to serve specific and premeditated ends.

2. Many critics felt that national political conventions were too large—too unwieldy to function efficiently. This criticism is significant, for increased size indirectly brought about increased rigidity, formality, ritualism, and lack of spontaneity to the convention activities.

3. Many critics condemned the convention in its entirety. Such critics overlooked (a) the flexibility of the system to meet changing social or political conditions; (b) the advantage of allowing new personalities to rise quickly to positions of party leadership; (c) the necessity of providing time and opportunity for compromise; and (d) the important fact that the convention system is accepted as legitimate by the populace.

4. Still other critics of the convention system felt that the proceedings were drawn out over too long a period. The campaign-rally function and the compromise function of
the convention, however, could probably not be achieved if the convention were shortened to one or even two days.

5. Another frequently occurring criticism of conventions argued that concern for precedent and tradition was excessive. Although such criticism has validity, this concern for precedent seems to add to the aura of legitimacy, as well as being well known to the general public and the participants.

6. Finally, many critics were distressed by the length, the quality, and the number of speeches delivered in national political conventions. An institution which has varied purposes produces a variety of speeches. Some of the speeches are designed to (a) impress the general public; (b) maintain the enthusiasm of the delegates; (c) provide a means of publicity for the professional politicians; (d) stimulate party spirit; and (e) serve as "fillers" when there is no other important convention business.

These areas of convention criticism indicate that conventions and convention speaking are multi-purposive. As a facet of this activity, the keynote speech cannot be considered apart from this premise of multi-purposiveness.

THE CONVENTION SETTING: GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Information regarding delegates to Republican national conventions from 1856 to 1964 is sparse. On the basis of a limited sample, however, the average delegate was between fifty and sixty years old, male, Caucasian, Protestant,
reasonably well educated, and having above average income.

Half of the Republican national conventions have been held in Chicago. Regardless of the site of the convention, delegates have frequently been uncomfortable and unable to hear what was being said on the platform due to the physical surroundings of the convention hall.

The growing significance of the television audience has resulted in the impediment of private deliberations, the shortening of speeches, and the streamlining of the convention program.

The setting for the keynoters' speeches have often been characterized by noise, drinking, hilarity, apathy, hostility, and masses of humanity.

The third chapter of the study discussed the positions of the keynoters, their residences, their qualifications, and the rationale for their selection.

THE KEYNOTE SPEAKERS

There was no single rationale for selecting a keynote speaker in Republican national conventions. Newspaper writers, scholars, and casual observers, as well as delegates and members of the Republican hierarchy agreed that the speaker should have some degree of oratorical ability. Another frequently mentioned characteristic of the person selected as keynoter was his political prowess. Most of the keynoters seemed to fall into two distinct categories: (1) men who already possessed considerable power and prestige,
and (2) men who were being groomed by the party for possible future leadership. Most of the delegates with whom the writer discussed the matter of political power tended to support the first of the two categories—that the keynoter should have an established reputation. Although "outsiders" had little to say about the keynoter's geographical location, many delegates and members of the Republican leadership indicated that the keynoter's place of residence was important. Occasionally, these three characteristics have been outweighed by additional considerations such as appearance or intraparty power struggles.

The largest single age group represented by the twenty-eight keynoters was between fifty and fifty-five. As a group, the men selected to keynote Republican national conventions have been exceptionally well educated, most of them having studied law. In recent years, all keynoters have been veterans and the majority of the speakers since 1940 have been governors.

Chapter IV of the study presented general information regarding the keynote speeches.

THE KEYNOTE SPEECHES: GENERAL INFORMATION

Since the convention itself is multi-purposive and the keynote speech is an important part of the observable convention, this portion of the analysis examined the keynote speech from four points of view: (1) views of newspaper writers, casual observers, and scholarly writers; (2) views
of the delegates to various Republican national conventions; (3) views of the national committee members and other leaders in the Republican party; and (4) views of the keynoters themselves.

Many of the "outsiders" (newspaper writers, casual observers, and scholars) agreed on four functions for the keynote speech: (a) set forth important issues for the campaign ahead; (b) stimulate the delegates; (c) point with pride to party accomplishments (if in office); and (d) attack the opposition for any unpopular occurrence.

A large number of delegates to the national conventions felt that the primary purpose of the keynote speech was to stimulate the delegates by setting the mood or tone of the convention. Other delegates felt that the speech was primarily designed for radio and television listeners. Still other delegates suggested that the speech should isolate issues for the forthcoming campaign, stimulate the nation, attack the opposition, or fill a combination of all these requirements. Some of the delegates felt that the speech was unimportant.

Members of the Republican leadership were equally divided as to the purpose and function of the keynote speech. The largest number of respondents in this category regarded the speech as primarily stimulating or inspirational. Other party leaders suggested (2) that the importance of the speech lay in radio and television viewers; (3) that the purpose of the speeches vary, depending on whether or not the nominations
would be hotly contested; (4) that the speech has a number of different purposes; and (5) that the keynote speeches were insignificant.

Many of the keynote speakers evidenced an awareness of the complexity of the keynote situation. Although most of the speakers agreed with the purposes and functions expressed by the other three groups of commentators, the keynoters were cognizant of the importance of current social, political, and economic conditions.

In summary, newspaper writers, scholars, casual observers, delegates, and members of the Republican hierarchy felt that the keynote speech should: (1) stimulate the delegates; (2) stimulate the nation; (3) inform the delegates; (4) inform the nation regarding party positions on issues (or convince them to accept the positions); (5) promote unity; (6) provide a forum for a present or potential leader; (7) present philosophy rather than issues; (8) present party views rather than the personal views of the keynoter; (9) point with pride (if in office) and view with alarm (if out of office); and (10) attract the attention of radio and television auditors.

The keynoters themselves were in substantial agreement with these purposes, yet in all instances allowed for some flexibility of purpose to meet the immediate demands of audience and occasion.

The purpose of the keynote speech extends far beyond the demands of the immediate audience. Even in those
instances where a keynoter felt the need for argument, he also was aware of the need to stimulate and excite; in the cases where a keynoter desired to ridicule his opposition to the delight of his immediate audience, he was aware of the possible reactions of the reading or listening audience.

On the basis of the preceding discussion, it appears that the keynote speech cannot be consistently classified under one of the five "general ends" of speech. As a political document, the speech of the keynoter must be flexible enough to meet the changing political climate.

The fifth and final section of the study dealt with the rhetorical characteristics of the keynote speeches.

THE SPEECHES: A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS

By analyzing various repetitive rhetorical patterns, Chapter V sought to determine the characteristics of the keynote genre. This analysis revealed ten dominant themes that occurred with a high degree of regularity and repetition. Additionally, many of these themes were characterized by a specific type of supporting material.

The theme most characteristic of Republican keynoting was that "our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders." This theme was most often supported by appeals to patriotism, emotive language, assertion, specific instances, rhetorical questions, authority, lists of beneficial legislation, and appeals for morality.
A second characteristic theme charged that the "Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism." This idea was most often supported by negative ethos, and by assertion, rhetorical questions, comparison, sarcasm, ridicule, and humor.

A third major theme called for "unity and harmony" within the party. This theme lacked a consistent form of supporting material.

The fourth theme that is typical of Republican keynoting claimed that "America is wonderful." This theme was supported by appeals to ownership and possession, appeals to patriotism, and by assertion.

The fifth major idea advocated by the keynoters claimed that "our fiscal policies are excellent." Supporting materials for this theme were most often examples, causal reasoning, comparison, and statistics.

A sixth major theme of the Republican keynoter speakers stated that the "centralization of power is dangerous; we are concerned about the individual American citizen." This particular theme was characterized by appeals to freedom from restraint.

The seventh theme of the Republican keynoters was that "our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing." This theme lacked any characteristic supporting materials.

An eighth major argument claimed that "our policies
are of benefit to agriculture." This theme also lacked characteristic forms of support.

The ninth major theme presented by the Republican keynote speakers said that "our policies aid the labor force." Like the themes regarding business and agriculture, this theme lacked any characteristic type of supporting details.

The final major theme advocated by the keynote speakers urged that "our policies on tariff and trade are sound." This argument was most often supported by causal reasoning.

With only a few exceptions, the speeches of the Republican keynoters were not particularly notable for their organization. All but three of the speeches employed topical organization; introductions were usually brief, omitting appeals for attention and interest, but relying on appeals for good will. All of the early keynoters included expressions of humility or unworthiness in the speech introductions—this practice was discontinued by 1900. In all but two speeches, the conclusions employed appeal rather than summary or restatement.

Although their specific influence is difficult to determine, extrinsic means of persuasion exert an influence upon the campaign-rally function of the convention, and consequently upon the keynote speech and the keynote speaker.

In view of the stated purposes of this study, and in view of the foregoing summary, several conclusions can be drawn regarding Republican keynote speaking as a rhetorical genre.
Conclusions

The first and most obvious question to be posed at this point in the study is: do these individual keynote speeches actually constitute a kind of rhetorical genre? If so, what are the inherent characteristics of this genre?

Although drastic changes have occurred to modify, if not to eliminate many of the factors that were influential in the origin and growth of the Republican keynote speech, the speech has not become a purposeless vestige of the convention. In fact, one of the probable reasons for its continued existence has been the flexible nature of the speech in relation to the speaker, the convention, the multiple audience, the party, and the immediate social or political issues of the day. Regardless of these variables, however, certain facets of the keynote speeches tend to occur with sufficient consistency and regularity to merit the term "characteristic." It is these "inherent" or "characteristic" qualities of the keynote speeches that justifies calling the twenty-eight speeches a genre.

INHERENT CHARACTERISTICS OF THE REPUBLICAN KEYNOTE SPEECHES

Before discussing the specifically inherent characteristics of the Republican keynote speech, it would be beneficial to bear in mind that any conception of keynoting must take into account its dimension of time. It may be even more useful to think of the keynote speeches as an historical
process rather than a patterned institutional behavior. If the keynote genre is viewed through time, additional aspects of its multiplicity may be identified.¹

One of the important qualities of the keynote genre is the nature of the keynoter's role. The speaker is expected to present party views rather than personal views; in the event of a contested nomination, tradition demands that the keynoter remain neutral. The keynoter should avoid usurping the function of the platform committee as well as acknowledging any suggestions about his speech from the known or probable nominees. In effect, the keynoter should be an image-maker rather than a policy-maker. In many ways, the role of the keynote parallels Cotter and Hennessey's description of the national chairman:

. . . [He] is expected to deal primarily with what might be called public attitudes, loosely defined feelings or mental habits of goodness or badness, rather than public opinions. His job as party image-maker has its parallel in the 'institutional advertising' of industrial public relations, where generalized goodwill, rather than specific sales, is sought. His hope is to make the audience identify or empathize with his cause by appealing to symbols with emotional content.²

Furthermore, the role of keynoter is becoming progressively more clearly defined by the dictates of tradition and precedent. Whereas the earliest keynoters were relatively free

¹These phrases borrowed from V. O. Key, Politics, especially pages 218-249.

²Cotter and Hennessey, op. cit., p. 69.
to discuss anything from platform issues to pansies, the modern keynoter must deliver a keynote speech that approximates that anticipated by the immediate and greater audience. A keynote speech that does not coincide with a "traditional" preconception held by the auditors may be poorly received.\textsuperscript{3} As was pointed out in Chapter IV, many people, including delegates, scholars, representatives of the press, and Republican party leaders, are in virtual agreement that the speech of the keynoter should attack the Democrats, discuss some of the major campaign issues, thrill the delegates, excite the public, and appeal for unity. There appears to be little doubt that one of the characteristics of the Republican keynote genre is the somewhat stereotyped role of the keynote speaker. Although the speaker may vary the specific content of his speech, the keynote format is primarily dictated by precedent and tradition.

A second important quality of the keynote genre concerns the attempts of the keynoters to fulfill the purposes of the "observable" convention. An analysis of the themes and supporting materials utilized by the Republican keynoters tends to support the observation of Harold Lasswell and Murray Edelman that "key signs provide an unifying experience" exciting sentiments that often transcend limitations.

\textsuperscript{3}A good example of such an event occurred in the 1964 Republican convention, when Governor Hatfield broke precedent by expressing his personal views on the John Birch Society. Although such action was certainly not unethical or in poor taste, it introduced an idea contrary to the dominant mood of the convention.
of culture, race, religion, class, and personality. Edelman explains that one sense "in which key signs unify is through so shaping the perception of experience as to still or minimize discontent." As will be pointed out later, these "key signs" are simply the major themes and arguments of the Republican keynoters. In order to stir the emotions of the audience the keynoters engage in an endless search for a few clever variations on the same basic themes. These basic themes that characterize the speeches of the Republican keynoters have been discussed in Chapter V. Five of the ten major themes are related directly to the purpose and function of the observable convention. Furthermore, each of these five themes seems designed to stimulate or excite, rather than to persuade or convince. These five themes are: (1) our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders; (2) the Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism; (3) we need unity and harmony; (4) America is wonderful; and (5) the centralization of power is dangerous; we are concerned about the individual American citizen.

The first of these five stimulative themes is the "most characteristic" aspect of Republican keynote speaking. Almost without exception, Republican keynoters claimed that

---


5 Ibid., p. 129.
"our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders." Among the many techniques employed by the keynoters to establish this theme were references to the party's history and heroes. In addition to their praise of specific leaders such as Lincoln, Grant, Blaine, McKinley, and others, the speakers often employed a "roll-call" type of enumeration, in which they listed a series of party heroes. Still other keynoters recited the glorious history of the Republican party from its origins to the present, or mentioned national heroes, national history, the flag, the Constitution, the American war dead, or the glories of the Union. The emotional impact of these key symbols is due to the fact that "they evoke the emotions associated with the situation. They condense into one symbolic event, sign, or act patriotic pride, anxieties, remembrances of past glories or humiliations, promises of future greatness. . . ."

Through this major appeal to history and heroes, the keynoters were able to focus the listeners' loyalties on specific ideas and events.

6Ibid., p. 6. After commenting that such signs are extremely powerful, Edelman states: "While the content of sign structures differ, they are alike in requiring man to identify himself with something perceived as guiding his course: the right, the true, the inevitable. Thereby his dubious acts are sanctified and his responsibility as an individual entity minimized. The constitution, the laws of nature, reason, or other potent symbols justify man's lot and his acts; and they are invoked not only explicitly but also implicitly through the structure of language." (Ibid., p. 129.)
This appeal is significant in its relationship to the audience and the nature of the observable convention. The keynoters' appeal to history and heroes could easily serve to establish common ground between the laity and the party professionals. Also, such an emotionally charged appeal would undoubtedly contribute to the "atmosphere" of the convention by attempting to stimulate and excite the listeners. Still another factor to be considered is that such a history and hero theme could contribute a sense of unity to a collection of "New England Republicans, prairie Republicans, and lily-white Republicans. The varied natures of their Republicanism result from their local traditions, loyalties, and economic and social conditions."7

This major theme that "our party is worthy of praise for its glorious history and outstanding leaders," was made even more typical of the observable convention by the nature of the supporting materials used to substantiate the keynoters' claim. In addition to reliance on highly emotive language, appeals to patriotism, and relief of distress, the keynoters virtually assured a common response from the audience by asking numerous rhetorical questions and inviting the audience to respond in unison.

The pervasiveness and frequency evidenced by this first major theme dealing with heroes and history, tends to confirm the opinions held by delegates, newspaper writers, 

scholars, and members of the Republican hierarchy that the keynote speech should thrill, excite, stimulate, or "key up" the convention. One method employed by the keynoters to achieve this purpose has been the use of national and party symbols that often were rich in connotative value and elicited emotional responses from the audience. The early Republican keynoters probably used these symbols to focus delegates' loyalties on familiar men and events; later keynoters added Republican heroes to the list of national figures; in recent years, many keynoters rely on such symbols to amplify ideas or support an argument rather than to thrill the auditors.

A second major theme that was highly characteristic of Republican keynoting was that "the Democratic party (or a specific Democratic administration) is inferior in many ways and deserves criticism." Although this criticism tended to be most frequent when the Republicans were out of power, the difference in quantity of criticism was slight. The regularity with which these attacks on the Democrats occurred seemed to support the opinions of delegates, outsiders, and members of the Republican hierarchy who felt that one of the primary functions of the keynote speech was to attack the opposition. Two of the forms of support employed with this theme were particularly significant. The first was a kind of negative ethos--those proofs that attempted to associate the Democratic party with corruption, dishonesty, immorality, and other equally unsavory traits. The second type of proof
was emotional—(1) emotive language and (2) sarcasm, ridicule, and humor. These pathetic proofs for the attacks on the Democratic party were among the few truly inherent characteristics of Republican keynote speaking.

The use of humor, sarcasm, and ridicule has been an inherent characteristic of the Republican keynote speech since the first convention in 1856. The humor itself, however, is less consistent—usually caustic, occasionally clever, and frequently heavy-handed—but always partisan.

A third stimulative appeal coincided with the stated purposes of the convention itself—"we need unity and harmony." Apparently, the delegates, outsiders, and Republican leaders were correct in their observation that one of the purposes of the keynote speech was to stimulate the delegates' desire for unity within the party.

A fourth theme that appeared frequently in the twenty-eight keynote speeches stated that "America is wonderful." Although a variety of supporting materials were employed to support this stimulative theme, the most interesting proofs in relation to the relatively high income audience were the appeals to ownership and possession. The only forms of support that characterized this theme were assertion and appeals to patriotism. The Republican keynoters evidently hoped that their auditors would causally relate American greatness to G.O.P. programs.

The final stimulative theme expounded by the speakers linked two propositions related to the power of the government
to the freedom of the individual. Over three-fourths of the keynoters argued that "the centralization of power is dangerous; we are concerned about the individual citizen." This theme is often significant, primarily because of the supporting materials associated with it. This theme abounded with appeals to freedom from restraint, bemoaning Democratic bureaucracy that stifled "individual initiative," and encroached upon the individual liberties of the American citizen.

These five "stimulative" themes and forms of support associated with them tend to confirm the opinion of many observers, both "insiders" and "outsiders," that the purpose of the keynote speech is to stimulate or excite rather than persuade or convince. Even though emotional proofs outnumber logical or ethical proofs, these emotional appeals seem designed to heighten the emotional involvement of the partisan rather than to persuade the neutral or convince the skeptic. The emotive language and connotative symbols "serve chiefly to provide motive force for incipient gestures rather than to change the gestures."\(^8\)

The five remaining major themes differ considerably from those just discussed. These five themes are: (1) our fiscal policies are excellent; (2) our policies provide an impetus for business and manufacturing; (3) our policies are of benefit to agriculture; (4) our policies aid the labor

\(^8\)Edelson, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 122-123.
force; and (5) our policies on tariff and trade are sound. Although these five themes occurred repeatedly in the Republican keynote speeches, they are of less significance than the five "stimulative" themes. With several notable exceptions, the Republican position on these latter five themes has not been characterized by consistency nor clarity. In fact, their significance lies in the following considerations: (1) whereas the first five themes were stimulative in purpose, the latter five are primarily convincing or persuasive; (2) unlike the themes discussed previously, two of the latter themes are characterized by a predominance of logical proofs over ethical or logical supports; (3) the five final major themes generally lack consistency, depth of analysis, or clarity of argument, but must be considered as major themes because of their frequency; (4) these five themes provided a conveniently flexible vehicle for traditional Republican appeals to the sanctity of private enterprise, the marvelous works of the American businessman, the need for a balanced budget, for the abolition of artificial controls on the economy, and for efficiency and economy in government.

These ten themes were the major arguments advanced for over one hundred years by twenty-eight keynote speakers. Although five themes were stimulative and five themes were persuasive or convincing, the stimulative themes were more significant and characteristic of the genre than were the convincing or persuasive themes.
Although all three modes of proof were used to support these major arguments, only four logical forms of support could be labeled as characteristic of the genre: (1) assertion and generalization; (2) rhetorical questions and subsequent audience response; (3) emotive language; and (4) sarcasm, ridicule, and humor. Although causal reasoning was frequently employed, this mode of proof was used much less often than the four characteristic supports.

Most of the ethical proofs employed by the keynoters were designed to enhance the reputation of the party. These forms of ethos were most often lists of beneficial legislation, or the association of Republican leaders with traits of honesty, morality, and integrity. In addition to these characteristics of the keynote genre, organizational techniques utilized by the keynoters reveal several inherent qualities.

The multipurpose nature of the observable convention seems to dictate the multiple functions of the keynote speeches. Seldom does a keynote speech have a clearly stated central thought or proposition. It is of little value to suggest that each speech does indeed have an implied proposition that "our candidates are splendid and will win the election." Such implied propositions are inherent in the nature of the convention system—each party in each convention employs this type argument. Admittedly, some of the keynote speeches did have concise, clearly stated themes. As a characteristic of the entire genre, however, clearly stated
central thoughts must be omitted.

The earlier examination of themes and supporting materials seems to indicate that most of the speeches were designed to stimulate rather than to inform, convince or persuade.

The Republican keynote speeches have been characterized by brief introductions, few transitions or previews, topical organization, and rather lengthy emotionalized conclusions.

Introductions to the keynote speeches fall into two categories: (1) the speeches delivered prior to 1900, and (2) the speeches given from 1900 to the present. Every introduction from 1856 to 1900 was characterized by the keynoters' attempts to gain good will through expressions of appreciation, humility, or unworthiness. All of the later speeches lack this particular characteristic. In contemporary keynote speeches, therefore, the introductions lack significant inherent qualities.

One of the most notable characteristics of the Republican keynote speeches are the conclusions. Seldom do Republican keynoters summarize or restate arguments; rather, the conclusions are consistently centered around an appeal. These appeals are usually a combination of patriotism and religion, with the speakers attempting to associate their party with Moses and Lincoln, God and Grant, and the Constitution and the Bible. Daniel J. Boorstin labels this mingling of politics and religion as the search for the
"common denominator." Boorstin states:

Whether all this talk is capable of producing agree­ment is really not too important, if, as I have suggested, the agreement is there all the time. Much of what passes for public debate in the United States is, then, less an attempt to tell people what to think than to state what everybody already thinks. One of the reasons why we are willing—or even eager—to com­mit our social philosophy to a search for the lowest common denominator is simply that we are so sure that the agreement is already there, that the common denominator really exists.

... in a curious and altogether characteristic way the currents of our religious and our political feelings mix. ... Here each of the two areas of thought, the political and the religious, seeks to compensate for the vagueness and inadequacy of the other by being still more explicit, without neces­sarily becoming more precise. Thus we expect ... that a political speech should have 'uplift' or some personally inspiring drift to it. ... 9

These combinations of religious and patriotic appeals were consistently employed in the conclusions of the Republican keynote speeches.

In addition to the role of the speaker and the nature of the speeches, the keynoter's function in the observable convention is supplemented by a number of extrinsic means of persuasion, including (1) the common audience responses; (2) other events on the agenda; (3) physical effects; and (4) prestige personalities. All these devices contribute to the convention's campaign-rally function, unity function, and common ground function.

The keynote speech is significant for a number of

---

reasons, primarily (1) for its attempts to heighten the enthusiasm of the delegates; (2) for its role in attracting public attention to the proceedings of the convention; (3) for its contribution to the ritualistic function of the convention; and (4) for its attempts to provide common ground among the laity and party professionals.

MAJOR CHANGES IN THE KEYNOTE SPEECH DURING THE PERIOD FROM 1856 TO 1964

Several changes in the genre occurred in the period covered in this study. These major changes are:

1. Criticism of the Democrats was most frequent and vitriolic following wars, and during the administration of Franklin Roosevelt.

2. Republican attitudes toward regulation of the economy have evolved from hostility to toleration.

3. Although all of the keynote speeches contain assertion, this form of support began increasing in frequency when Franklin Roosevelt came to power in 1932. The employment of assertion has increased to the extent that in Mark Hatfield's 1964 keynote speech, assertion outnumbered any other form of support by a ratio of over ten to one. (The single exception to this trend was Judd's 1960 keynote address.)

4. Contemporary keynoters use fewer statistics than did their predecessors, but the recent speakers have presented these statistics more clearly and effectively.
5. Although Republican keynoters frequently stressed the importance of individual freedom and a fear of centralized power, these two ideas received particular emphasis following wars and during the New Deal era.

6. Even though many keynoters after 1928 relied on history and heroes, later speakers used fewer such symbols and used them with more restraint than their predecessors. Although keynoters in recent years occasionally refer to the Constitution, the great party leaders, or the American heritage, seldom do they delve into such matters with the gusto of the early keynoters. In recent years, references to history or heroes usually occur in stimulative rather than argumentative contexts.

7. Since 1900, the Republican keynoters have not begun their speeches with expressions of unworthiness, humility, or appreciation.
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