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ABSTRACT

The late 1960's and early 1970's witnessed a political renaissance of conservatism in America and a resurgent interest in the conservative Senator from Arizona, Barry Morris Goldwater. This dissertation attempts to explain how the Arizonan made rhetorical choices in light of his political ideology. The investigation focuses on the question of whether Goldwater's conservatism or his view of himself limited his rhetorical flexibility and/or the ultimate acceptance or rejection of his messages. To facilitate this task, a comparison was made of how Goldwater approached two diverse audience types: (1) partisans and (2) neutral and hostile groups.

Barry Goldwater's rhetoric displayed the characteristics of the authoritarian personality. His method of information processing reflected the tendencies of isolating information, filtering incoming data through accepted authority figures, and a reluctance to process new and scientific information. The Senator also exhibited the characteristics of this personality type through the drawing of specific in-out group distinctions and a view of the world as a hostile and threatening place.

Barry Goldwater coached his arguments in terms of fundamental values and principles. To be free and to enjoy the individual liberties inherent in the democratic form of government demanded that man be strong, honor his commitments, and adhere to a system of societal laws and order. These were the fundamental premises on which Barry Goldwater's positions were based.
Between 1969 and 1974 the Senator assumed the mantle of a statesman-preacher. Assured that the public was ready to receive 'the truth' as represented by the Senator through the guidelines afforded to him by the conservative ideology, Goldwater proceeded with his mission to dispense these facts to the masses. The claims, evidence, analogies, and reasoning, as well as the argumentative and persuasive strategies the Senator used, support the feeling held by the Arizonan that his mission was to impart the gospel of conservatism to the American public in the hope that they would use its guidelines as a cornerstone for action.

Established as the spokesman of conservative audiences and convinced of the correctness of his position, the Senator saw his rhetorical purpose with these individuals as one of mobilizing strength for the cause they shared. Convinced also that the people listening to him would accept his position, the Senator capitalized on common premises and the means by which these individuals assimilated information rather than on offering formally valid arguments. Viewed as an authority figure for these groups, he based his arguments on premises they espoused, and constructed his arguments so that the listeners could easily accept them without causing dissonance with the other beliefs they held.

When Barry Goldwater spoke to neutral and hostile audiences, he was dealing with a segment of society that did not share his view of reality. The Senator did adapt to his audiences when he argued for change and when he used broad-based American values rather than conservative premises. However, primarily Goldwater based his rhetoric to neutral and hostile audiences on the belief he was now an accepted
leader and an authority figure in the political sphere. Essentially the
topics on which the Senator spoke and his stand on those issues were not
appreciably different from those espoused in 1964.

Goldwater's failure to present formally valid units of proof
hampered his effectiveness with non-conservative audiences. These
groups neither understood nor accepted the reasoning processes the
Senator advanced. Operating from a different frame of reference, the
information provided by the Senator failed to penetrate their belief-
attitude structure.
The end of a free society is served by the interplay of rival forces as long as they blend the diverse groups into a unified system.¹ This blending is exemplified by the liberal and conservative factions within the Republican and Democratic parties. Ralph Waldo Emerson stated of liberalism and conservatism, "each is a good half, but an impossible whole. . . In a true society, in a true man, both must combine."² In The Liberal Tradition William Orton indicates the function and interrelationship of the ideologies.

Without the centripetal check of Conservatism Liberalism flies off in tangents toward radicalism, academic utopianism of philosophical anarchy. Without the centrifugal urge, Conservatism becomes mere dead-centrism, ossification of class or caste structure, Colonel Blimp with his what-we-have-we hold.³

The political philosophies of liberalism and conservatism provide checks and balances as they operate in society. As a reaction to the liberalism of the early 1960's, the late '60's, and early 1970's witnessed a political renaissance of conservatism in America and a resurgent interest in the conservative Senator from Arizona, Barry Morris Goldwater. James Kilpatrick questioned "whether the growing

²Rossiter, pp. 55-6.
enthusiasm of conservatives has helped to focus attention on Barry Goldwater or whether the special attraction of this man has helped to focus attention on conservatism."

Statement of Purpose

According to John Hammerback, Barry Goldwater relied primarily on public speaking for his popularity and political ascendancy. The rhetoric of Barry Goldwater prior to his presidential defeat in 1964 has been subject to substantial inquiries. The earliest studies of the Arizonan's speaking centered on selected speeches from his 1958 campaign and his rhetorical effectiveness from 1960 through 1963. Six theses, concerned directly with the 1964 campaign, analyzed the invention and persuasive techniques employed in the preconvention campaign, changes in voting behavior of audiences listening to

---

political speeches by Johnson and Goldwater,\(^9\) two speeches delivered in Los Angeles,\(^10\) reporting by the press of speeches by the Senator,\(^11\) and Goldwater's use of violence as a campaign issue.\(^12\)

The present study concentrates on Barry Goldwater's speaking after his defeat for the presidency in 1964. While the Senator enjoyed a political renaissance between 1968 and 1974, corresponding studies have not been conducted on his speaking during this period. Yet between those years, the Arizonan faced the challenge of vindicating the conservative ideology against numerous liberal allegations including charges that the Watergate scandal was caused by adherence to conservative principles.

Goldwater, acknowledged as "the most conspicuous, peripatetic spokesman of conservatism today,"\(^13\) has mentioned on many occasions his desire to advance the conservative cause through his speaking. This work seeks to explore how the Arizona Senator made rhetorical

---

\(^9\) William D. Brooks, "Study of Selected Factors of Change in Voting Attitudes of Audiences Listening to Political Speeches by President Johnson and Senator Goldwater" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Ohio University, 1965.)

\(^10\) Verne Kennedy, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Two Speeches Delivered in Los Angeles During the 1964 Presidential Campaign by Lyndon Johnson and Barry Goldwater" (Unpublished Master's thesis, Louisiana State University, 1965).


choices in light of his philosophical orientation. In "The Plight of the Conservative in Public Discussion" James McBurney recognized that the thought patterns of conservatives affected their rhetorical effectiveness. This study focuses on the question of whether Goldwater's conservatism, and his view of himself, limited his rhetorical flexibility and the ultimate acceptance or rejection of his messages.

To facilitate this investigation, a comparison of how Goldwater approached two diverse audience types: (1) partisans and (2) neutral and hostile groups. Using this as a guide, selected addresses by Barry Goldwater between 1968 and 1974 have been divided.

Partisan Audiences


4. "Inflation and the Union" to Industrial College of the


Neutral and Hostile Audiences


8. "Facts on the SST" to the U.S. Senate, October 2, 1970,
Before accepting the speeches included in any study, rhetorical critics must consider the authenticity of the materials. Tony Smith, Barry Goldwater's Press Secretary, indicated that most of the Senator's speeches after 1964 were extemporaneous.\textsuperscript{15} For this reason, the addresses selected for inclusion in this work were chosen from speeches printed in the \textit{Congressional Record} or \textit{Vital Speeches of the Day}.

Thonssen, Baird and Braden warn

With an incomplete or imperfect copy, the critic must seriously qualify his judgments. When he does not have available a verbatim text, he can make inferences about invention; argument, evidence, analysis and adaptation. He may also study organization, but he must hold tenuous judgments about style or use of language.\textsuperscript{16}

Thus, the type of analysis encompassed in this investigation can be accomplished without a verbatim copy of the delivered text.

\textbf{Methodology}

The analysis of the rhetoric of Barry Goldwater after his return to the Senate in 1968 will include an evaluation of evidence, argumentation, and persuasion. Three characteristics of conservative discourse mandates the expansion of this traditional approach to include concepts alluded to in the rhetorical model advanced by Stephen Toulmin.

\textsuperscript{15} Based on personal correspondence between Tony Smith, Barry Goldwater's Press Secretary and the writer, March 28, 1977.

First, as a conservative, Goldwater's speaking is concerned predominately with discovering the best means of determining future action. To do this, the Senator sought to establish "conclusions about which we are not entirely confident by relating them back to other information about which we have greater assurance."\(^{17}\) Since the future is unknown and unforeseen circumstances can alter current forecasts, individuals concerned with such predictions can only be expected to deal in probabilities. Toulmin recognized that the failure of these predictive arguments to meet analytic standards is not a shortcoming of this argument type. Rather "were they successful in doing so they would cease to be predictive arguments and consequently would not be useful in dealing with predictive problems."\(^{18}\) Thus, the philosopher's approach to discourse did not mandate the rejection of argumentation that failed to establish the definitiveness demanded by the traditional analytic syllogism.

Second, as a conservative, Goldwater acknowledged the existence and endurance of constants in the world and utilized these principles in his argumentative structures. These premises serve several functions in a unit of proof. Since fundamental principles play an important role in conservative argument, a method which enables the critic to determine the exact function of these premises is needed. Toulmin explains

\begin{quote}
Particular premises commonly express our data; whereas
\end{quote}


\(^{18}\)Toulmin, p. 169.
universal premises may express either warrants or the backing for warranties, and when they are stated in the form 'All A's are B's' it will often be entirely obscure just which function they are to be understood as performing.\(^1\)

Toulmin aids our understanding of Senator Goldwater's rhetoric by providing the terminology to distinguish between the use of underlying premises in these two roles.

Finally, Toulmin recognized that various fields employ different procedures and techniques of argument. Using the term 'field' to refer to subject matter areas, the philosopher argued that in practical discourse the rhetor selects criteria appropriate to the specific subject under discussion rather than applying one set of universal criteria to all subject matter areas. Although agreeing with Toulmin's position that a universal criteria would not be acceptable for application to all disciplines, Charles Williard disagreed with the philosopher's definition of fields as subject matter areas. For Williard, fields consisted of "shared orientations toward ideas or events which are acted out and continually renewed or revised in the ongoing accomplishments of people who work from the shared view."\(^2\)

Williard contends that "the degree to which any argument directly takes data and claims from domains . . . always depends on the intentions of the arguer, which means that ordinary arguments must be understood from the psychological perspective of arguers."\(^2\)

\(^1\)Toulmin, p. 143.

must take into account the way in which the facts of the field are embedded within the actor's personal perspective. Williard argued that the relationship between claims and the evidence for them is always psychological. 'Leaps' from data to claim, after all are movements made by thinkers—which should mean that they obey the mandates of the thinker's cognitive system.

The field concept of Toulmin as reinterpreted by Williard provides another aid in understanding Barry Goldwater's speaking. As an avowed conservative, the Senator's rhetorical choices would be determined by his philosophical orientation. Recognition of the Arizonan's view of the world is a variable that must be considered in evaluating his rhetoric.

Two prerequisites are necessary before Senator Barry Goldwater's speaking can be subjected to analysis to determine its effectiveness. First, Chapter II undertakes a description of Goldwater's personal history since family background and life experiences are influential in shaping perceptions of the world. Second, of more general applicability in understanding the philosophical orientations of the speaker, Chapter III creates a profile of the conservative thought processes. Through examination of the fundamental principles of the ideology and the means by which adherents defend these premises, an understanding emerges of the typical conservative mind.

---

22 Williard, p. 15.
Chapter II

THE MAN: BARRY MORRIS GOLDFWATER

Although Barry Goldwater entered politics with little background or experience, in twelve years he achieved sufficient recognition to receive his party's nomination for the presidency. Richard Dudman attributed the Arizonan's ascendancy to the fact that "as a Senator, Goldwater . . . built his career on campaigning and speech-making, rather than on a legislative record. . . . With his speeches his popularity grew."2

Goldwater began his speaking career as a photographer and explorer. His best prints of Indians were collected in two books, Arizona Portraits (1946) and The Face of Arizona (1963).3 However, it was not until he began contributing photographs and articles to Arizona Highways and Desert, that Barry Goldwater began appearing regularly before PTA's and civic and business associations. Fireman indicated that "these talks were the beginning of his political career, though Barry didn't know it. He sincerely fell into it."4

4Ibid.
As a successful Phoenix businessman, Barry Goldwater served as vice president of the Chamber of Commerce, a member of the board and fund raiser for St. Luke's Hospital, and chairman of Community Chest drives. While he had always found politics fascinating, Barry had given no thought to a political career until he was in his forties. Stephen Shadegg, Goldwater's campaign manager for the 1952 Senate race, claimed that Barry's entrance into politics was unique since he was a businessman rather than a politician.

The argument could also be advanced that Goldwater's entrance into politics was inevitable because several Goldwaters, including Mike, Joe, and Morris, had been political candidates. Barry's Uncle Morris, a Jeffersonian Democrat, helped form the Democratic party in Arizona, served as a member of the territorial legislature, and had been mayor of Prescott for twenty-four years. Barry listened to his uncle's stories of legislative battles and political campaigns. In the summers Morris would take his young nephew with him on political trips around the state. An inclination for politics and Barry's political beliefs grew out of his association with his Uncle Morris. Interested in the science of politics, Goldwater read Thomas Jefferson, Edmund

---


7 Shadegg, pp. 21, 158-9.

Burke, and the Federalist Papers.  

Paul Healey stated that Goldwater's party affiliation was primarily a matter of good business practices. He related, "When Barry and his brother Bob, took over the family store after the death of his father in 1929, they decided that one of them should be a Republican for business reasons and Barry registered as such." Also, motivated by business interests, Goldwater volunteered to head the retailer's campaign to implement 'right to work' legislation.

When approached to run on the reform ticket for the Phoenix City Council in 1949, Goldwater acquiesced. In an explanation to his brother, Barry indicated his thoughts:

I have decided to run for councilman . . . I dont [sic] think a man can live with himself when he asks others to do his dirty work for him . . . if we win . . . Pheonix will have two years . . . that I hope will set a pattern for . . . coming generations.

There has always been Goldwaters damned fools enough to get into politics and they always did it with service in their minds, which is the way I approach this thing . . . doing what Americans should always be doing. Helping each other.

Dont [sic] cuss me too much. It ain't for life and it may be fun.

As the leading vote getter on the reform ticket, Barry Goldwater entered the political arena.

Arizona, a traditionally Democratic state, had elected only two Republican governors between the year of statehood, 1912, and 1950, thus, when party officials sought a campaign manager for Howard Pyle, the Republican Party candidate in 1950, they were looking for a person

---

9 Sheehan, p. 139.  
10 Healey, p. 38.  
11 Perry, p. 39.  
12 Perry, p. 42.  
13 Healey, p. 116; Sheehan, p. 251.  
14 Perry, pp. 43-4.
who could lift the campaign out of the usual lackadaisical effort. Feeling the old party members could provide the political experience the officials drafted Goldwater. Barry was chosen because he was "a Republican who enjoyed the love and respect of men and women in both parties. Barry had an enviable war record and was in great demand as a speaker throughout the state."  

The Pyle campaign was important for two reasons. First, in conversations with Pyle during flights between rallies and meetings, Barry began to spell out his political convictions. While the campaign manager knew he believed in the dignity of the individual and the wisdom of the Constitution, articulation of these views were difficult for the novice politician. Second, Pyle's successful election to the governorship left the 1952 Senate race open. Ironically Pyle, who had wanted to enter the Senate race, found this goal impossible for at least four years. Barry, who viewed the Arizona governorship as a culmination of the Goldwater heritage, had secretly desired that office. With Pyle's election, Goldwater's goal was also temporarily impossible.  

Goldwater's defeat of Democratic Senate incumbent, Ernest McFarland in 1952 was, according to Healey, "no small feat. . . . his margin of victory was less than 1 percent." The odds against Goldwater were five to one. McFarland, the Senate Majority Leader, had the backing of President Truman. Prior to this election, the

15 Shadegg, p. 136. 16 Shadegg, pp. 139-40.
17 Perry, p. 43; Shadegg, p. 145. 18 Healey, p. 116.
19 Sheehan, p. 251. 20 Ibid.
The state of Arizona had elected only one Republican to the Senate. Although Goldwater waged a vigorous campaign, he attributed his win in part to the popularity of the Republican presidential candidate, General Dwight Eisenhower. On his 44th birthday, Barry Goldwater arrived in Washington, D.C.

Goldwater's Senate colleagues elected him chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee in 1955. The chairman's responsibility was to supervise campaigns on behalf of Republican's running for the Senate. Reelected in 1959 and again in 1961, the Senator roamed the country delivering hundreds of speeches.

The first national attention Goldwater received resulted from his reelection to the Senate in 1958. The Arizona Senator had already indicated his conservative leanings by the position he had taken on a variety of issues. Yet while other conservative Republicans were losing elections, Goldwater won a decisive victory over an attempted comeback by McFarland. Prior to 1958, Goldwater, with over six years of political speaking experience, had received a moderate but

---


22 Perry, p. 47.


24 Perry, p. 67.


26 Perry, p. 64. 27 Novak, p. 27.
steady number of invitations to speak in various areas of the country. By defeating McFarland, the stream became a deluge and the invitations were not issued solely by organizations considered conservative.28

In 1960 Goldwater published Conscience of a Conservative which advocated that the conservative philosophy, based on the laws of God and of nature, was the answer to the problems confronting the nation. Taken from radio broadcasts, speeches, and notes collected over the years, Conscience of a Conservative represented Goldwater's philosophy.29 Not only Conscience of a Conservative but also Why Not Victory?, published three years later, became political bibles for conservatives.30

Conservatives were disappointed in the Nixon-Rockefeller platform in 1960. Believing they had found their standard-bearer, they nominated Goldwater for the presidency. An impressive demonstration by conservative forces followed Goldwater's nomination, although the Senator removed his name and voiced his support for Nixon.31

Tom Wicker stated that in the early 1960's embittered and discontented Americans were "as nearly united as they can be in idolatry and exploration of the most attractive 'conservative' since Herbert Hoover," Barry Goldwater.32 By offering "conservatives the first

28Shadegg, pp. 234-35.
31Cooper, p. 18.
completely acceptable candidate in over a decade," they "discarded the name of Taft Republicans and became Goldwater Republicans."33

The Arizona Senator had quickly established himself as the foremost conservative spokesman in the Upper House following Robert A. Taft's death.34 The support engendered for Goldwater, however, was far different than that given to Taft. Although Goldwater could not match Taft's popularity within the party, he achieved "fanatical support outside party ranks."35 Novak contends, "If Taft was Mr. Republican, Goldwater was Mr. Conservative."36

Between July 28 and November 8, 1960, the Arizona Senator traveled extensively for the Republican party.37 Senator Margaret Chase Smith of Maine stated, "He showed an ability and a determination to do everything he could to get every Republican senatorial nominee elected regardless of whether he agreed or disagreed with the views of the individual candidate."38 The G.O.P. Senate conference unanimously adopted a resolution in 1961 praising Goldwater for his "inspiring leadership, his tireless effort, and his dedicated devotion to the Republican party."39

The Senator's calendar showed 404 speeches in 1961. In March, three thousand young people listened to Goldwater at a New York rally sponsored by the conservative Young Americans for Freedom.40 At Harvard, in two appearances, Barry averaged one thousand three hundred

36Ibid. 37Shadegg, p. 273. 38Bell, p. 136.
39Bell, p. 173. 40Perry, p. 75.
Business Week observed that "The most sought-after man on Capitol Hill for speaking engagements around the country used to be a glamorous, liberal senator named John F. Kennedy. Today he is a glamorous, conservative senator named Barry Goldwater."  

Men who were previously uninterested or indifferent to politics began to solicit advice from the Senator from Arizona. By 1962, a deluge of mail was coming in and requests for personal appearances averaged more than one hundred a week. A significant personal achievement for Barry Goldwater occurred in the Spring of that year when he received an invitation to speak as a Chubb Fellow at Yale. The Goldwaters had withdrawn Barry from Phoenix High School when he failed two courses and enrolled him in Staunton Military Academy in Lexington, Virginia, where he graduated with full honors in 1928. One of his military commanders stated "Goldwater was one of the best candidates we ever turned out. But there were times when we thought we would never get him through school." The following Fall, Barry entered the University of Arizona. In assessing his university career, he stated, "My idea was to have a good time in college and then enter the family business. I had enough sense to know that I wasn't a particularly apt student." According to Perry, the Arizonan probably left college because he was disinterested, rather than because of his father's death. Whatever the reason for the decision to leave school,

---

41 Bell, p. 158. 42 Wicker, p. 34. 43 Shadegg, p. 274.
44 Sheehan, p. 246; Shadegg, p. 91. 45 Shadegg, p. 89.
46 Shadegg, pp. 90-1.
Goldwater, sensitive to his lack of academic credentials, stated "that is the worst mistake I ever made." The invitation that Goldwater received to speak at Yale University was important for the Senator because it indicated that he had survived his educational deficiencies and had arrived in the Ivy League.

During 1963 requests for personal appearances began to mount daily. Goldwater filled as many engagements as possible, sometimes taking only one hastily typed copy of his speech and not even a researcher for company. Often the Arizonan was on speaking tours when roll call votes came up in the Senate. While some decisions were of minor importance, the discussion of major issues also found him absent.

In mid-September of 1963, Goldwater was the 'star attraction' at the Republican Fiesta held in Dodger Stadium in Los Angeles. The Senator spoke to an audience of 40,000 on an evening when the Dodgers were playing in a locally televised out-of-state game that was crucial in their drive for the National League pennant. The audience for this rally represented the largest turnout for a Republican speaker since 1944.

Until 1963 the primary service that Goldwater performed for the Republican Party was as a speaker and fund-raiser. Party records indicate that he spoke in more places than any other Republican, even

---

47 Perry, pp. 26-7. 48 Bell, p. 158. 49 Novak, pp. 173, 236.
50 Bell, pp. 166-67.

the national chairman could not match Goldwater's travels nor equal his speaking engagements. 52 Victor Johnson, staff director of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee stated, "I've been on this committee for 18 years, and we've never had a chairman like Barry. He's by far the most active chairman we've ever had. If anybody would ask him to come and give a speech, he'd go." 53

In his three terms as chairman of the Senate Republican Campaign Committee, Goldwater traveled over 1,000,000 miles speaking at fund-raising dinners, college rallies, and business and civic group meetings. 54 Schultz mentions that Goldwater was "far and away the greatest fund-raiser the Republican party has known in years." 55 For example in 1962, Barry stumped Texas for the lone Republican candidate, John Tower. In one day, making three speeches, he raised $70,500. 56 Cole estimated that the Senator had given approximately 3,000 speeches and raised $6.5 million for the Republican Party. 57

Perry alleged that the Arizona Senator was "the most conservative leader in the Republican Party . . . [who] defeated the Eastern 'moderate' wing of his party in one of the most remarkable campaigns in the history of the Republican Party." 58 Goldwater's bid for his

53 Perry, p. 73. 54 Ibid. 55 Schultz, pp. 19-20.
56 Sheehan, p. 251.
58 Perry, p. 9.
party's presidential nomination and the ensuing campaign against Lyndon Johnson provided additional speaking opportunities for the Senator. As a long time veteran of the banquet circuit, Goldwater was accustomed to expressing his non-conformist stands in characteristically blunt language. According to Mayer, the Arizona Senator

had spoken so often and incautiously over the year that he would have been wise to avoid controversy while rounding up delegates . . . he would have been well advised to imitate McKinley, who had won the nomination in 1896 by being inconspicuous. At the outset, Goldwater contemplated something of the sort: a minimum of oratory and a concerted backstage effort to secure delegates.

However, after his formal declaration of candidacy, Goldwater was persuaded to enter several primaries and that required months of constant exposure. Kitchel, Burch, and Kleindienst, who controlled the Goldwater campaign, had faith in Barry's charismatic powers. The group failed to perceive two problems. First, these men believed that the format of informal speeches to small groups would work effectively everywhere. Second, they did not recognize "the difference between off-the-cuff remarks by a senatorial candidate that were likely to go unreported, and those by a Presidential candidate that were certain to be reported."

During the presidential race that followed, bitter attacks were leveled on Goldwater by Republicans and Democrats alike and the attacks "steadily mounted in ferocity until they had established what one

59 Novak, p. 238.
61 Ibid.
columnist called 'a new level of vituperation.' These comments compared the Senator's platform to a John Birch Society magazine, his policies to Russian Stalinism, and the man himself to Adolf Hitler. Thus, few individuals were surprised when Goldwater was defeated in a landslide victory by Lyndon Baines Johnson. Goldwater lost the election by a record 15,529,886 plurality with a vote of 41,727,846 to 26,197,960 or 61 percent to 31 percent.

No invitations came from the Republican National Committee for Goldwater to speak at party functions the first year after the Johnson landslide. In order to retain a national perspective, Goldwater asked a New York agency to book him for speaking engagements before any group who wished to hear him. The Arizonan stated, "Suddenly, I found myself with three times as many invitations as I could handle."

Goldwater's decisive loss appeared not only to signal the end of contemporary conservative dominance of the G.O.P. but also indicated that Barry Goldwater was "a politician who . . . seemed headed for the dustbins of history." While the enormous electoral defeat gave rise to intra-party conflict and ideological splinter groups of both right

---

66 Ibid.
67 Murphy, p. 133.
and left,"68 not only Republicans but conservative Republicans recovered following the 1964 defeat.

The congressional segment of the Republican party had been considered a conservative force for many years. The fact that delegates sent to the convention were usually conservative was especially true during the 1968 convention because the formula for delegates provided "a bonus for states carried by the presidential nominee in the previous election. . . . The only states to receive such a bonus . . . were . . . states in which the party apparatus was dominated by conservatives."69 Chances for Nixon's 1968 nomination were enhanced by these forces within the party. According to Buchanan, "Had Senators Goldwater, Tower, and Thurman broken to Ronald Reagan at that convention in Miami Beach, Richard Nixon would have been denied nomination on the first ballot."70 In that year, while Richard Nixon barely achieved sufficient votes to gain the office of the Presidency, Barry Goldwater won Carl Hayden's Arizona Senate seat by 70,000 votes.71 Six years later, in a tribute to the Arizona Senator, Walter Cronkite posed the question, "Is Goldwater catching up to changing times? Or asked more properly, are the times catching up to Barry Goldwater?"72

69 Bibby, p. 104.
71 Murphy, p. 134.
72 Buckley, p. 1265.
A retail merchant, Barry Goldwater entered politics on the local level by running for the city council. However, not until he served as campaign manager for Howard Pyle's gubernatorial race did the future Senator begin to firmly formulate and articulate his political philosophy. Elected to the United States Senate in 1952, Goldwater was chosen the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee Chairman in 1955 and was reelected in 1959 and 1961. In this capacity the Senator served his party as a fund-raiser and stumped the country on behalf of G.O.P. senatorial hopefuls.

Goldwater established himself as the leading conservative in the Senate following Robert Taft's death. Many of his actions were directed toward furthering the conservative ideology. In deciding to run for the nation's top office, Barry Goldwater's major consideration was the effect his campaign would have on conservatism. Talking to Newsweek reporters in 1963, he stated

I ask myself what's my responsibility to conservatism. Is the country really ready for it? If I am beaten at the convention, how much will conservatism be set back? . . . If I am nominated and soundly beaten by Kennedy, it could be the end of the conservative movement in this country, and I'd be through in politics. . . . But if I ran a reasonably close race--say within a 5% plurality--this would be bound to be a break on the New Frontier philosophy.

Insofar as a person's thoughts and feelings are mirrored in their rhetorical utterances, a study of a man's arguments can provide valuable assistance in understanding a speaker. The basic beliefs and attitudes that an individual holds form the framework for his view of

---

Cooper, p. 16.

the world. Because Barry Goldwater adheres to the conservative ideology, an attempt to understand the Senator must begin with an exploration of the characteristics of the conservative mind. The next chapter directs attention to this task.
Individuals have a countless number of beliefs, some of which can be verbalized and some of which cannot. When a person's beliefs are not verbalized, they must be inferred from what the individual says and does. In this context, Rokeach used the term belief and defined an individual's belief system as "an organization of verbal and non-verbal implicit and explicit beliefs, sets, or expectancies . . . that a person at a given time accepts as true of the world he lives in." 

An individual's belief system may be defined as having represented within it, in some organized psychological but not necessarily logical form, each and every one of a person's countless beliefs about physical and social reality." Of course these beliefs are not equally important to the individual. Rokeach indicates that beliefs vary along a central-peripheral continuum, and he delineated five kinds or types of beliefs.

Type A beliefs are primitive beliefs that have one hundred percent consensus. "A person's primitive beliefs represent his 'basic
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1Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960), pp. 32-3. References to The Open and Closed Mind will subsequently be referred to as OCM.

2Ibid.

3Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes and Values (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969), p. 2. References to Beliefs, Attitudes and Values will subsequently be referred to as BAV.
truths' about physical reality, social reality, and the nature of the self; they represent a subsystem within the total system in which the person has the heaviest of commitments."^4 Primitive beliefs of this type are learned by direct encounter with the object of belief, are taken for granted, and rarely become subjects of controversy. Because such primitive beliefs represent the innermost core of the belief system "any inexplicable disruption of these taken-for-granted consistencies, physical or social or self, would lead one to question the validity of one's own senses, one's competence as a person who can cope with reality, or even one's sanity."^5

A second type of primitive belief, Type B, is also incontrovertible and involves direct encounter with the object of belief. These beliefs involve the individual's existence and self-identity and consequently are impervious to either the argumentation or persuasion of others. They can be a subject of controversy, however the only person who can change such a belief is the self.^6

When a child finds out that a particular primitive belief is not shared by everyone he "is forced to work through a more selective conception of positive and negative authority; this point marks the beginning of the development of the non-primitive parts of the child's ever-expanding belief system."^7 The most important non-primitive beliefs are concerned with positive and negative authority or the individual's reference groups or people. The authorities relied upon

^4Rokeach, BAV, p. 6.  ^5Rokeach, BAV, p. 7.
^6Rokeach, BAV, p. 8.  ^7Rokeach, BAV, p. 9.
for information "differ from one person to the next and would depend on learning experiences within the context of the person's social structure--family, class, peer group, ethnic group, religious and political groups, and country."\(^8\) Controversy and differences of opinion are expected concerning Type C beliefs since the individual knows that not everyone shares his belief.

When ideological beliefs, such as those related to political and religious institutions, are derived through identification with the authority, they are classified as derived beliefs. "Believing in the credibility of a particular authority implies an acceptance of other beliefs perceived to emanate from such authority."\(^9\) Thus, matters of fact are accepted when the authoritative source is trusted. When it is known that a person believes in a particular authority, through deduction the beliefs derived from the authority can be delineated. Rokeach indicates that a "change of belief with respect to authority, or a direct communication from one's authority, should lead to many other changes in beliefs deriving from authority."\(^10\)

Type E beliefs represent arbitrary matters of taste and are therefore termed 'inconsequential beliefs'. Although matters of taste may be intensely held, they are considered inconsequential because they are usually not connected with other beliefs in the system. Thus, if changed, they have little effect on the maintenance or preservation of other beliefs in the rest of the system.\(^11\)

\(^8\)Rokeach, BAV, p. 10. \(^9\)Ibid.
\(^10\)Rokeach, BAV, p. 11. \(^11\)Ibid.
Rokeach states that "every system is asymmetrical rather than symmetrical, it includes on the one hand a system of beliefs that one accepts, and, on the other, a series of systems that one rejects." This latter system is the individual's disbelief system.

The disbelief system is composed of a series of subsystems rather than merely a single one, and contains all the disbeliefs, sets, expectancies, conscious and unconscious, that, to one degree or another, a person at a given time rejects as false.

The function of the individual's belief-disbelief system is twofold: "to understand the world insofar as possible and to defend against it insofar as necessary." Thus, to comprehend the rhetoric of a conservative spokesman, as well as conservative auditors, demands a discussion of the fundamental beliefs upon which these individuals base their perceptions of reality. The second section of this chapter expands our understanding of conservatives by considering the means that they employ to defend these beliefs from attack.

**Fundamental Principles**

The philosophical meaning of conservatism implies a group philosophy of life. In this sense the individual adherents want to (1) describe the nature of man, the state and society, (2) show that their view of the world is the only possible view, and (3) prescribe the behavior of man since this is necessary for the progress of civilization. An understanding of the conservative philosophy of
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12 Rokeach, OCM, p. 32. 13 Rokeach, OCM, p. 33.
14 Rokeach, OCM, p. 400.
15 Richard Joseph Dandeneau, "The Rhetorical Invention of Conservatism: An Analysis of the Assumptions of Contemporary
life emanates from the fundamental premises upon which the ideology is based.

**Divine Intent Rules Society and Man**

*Must be Obedient to an Eternal Law*  
*Derived from Divine Providence*

A conservative views man and the purposes of his life from a religious standpoint. The belief in a power greater than man who guides man's life and society is essential to the conservative ideology.

The first canon of conservative thought is a belief "that a divine intent rules society as well as conscience." Serving as a civilizing societal force, religion creates social cohesion by offering man eternal laws by which to live. Man, created in God's image, must be made aware of and be obedient to an eternal law. Eternal law and the principles derived from it are considered good, lasting, given and the source of these laws is divine Providence.

Man's nature consists of a mixture of good and evil. Conservatives believe in the doctrine of original sin. A fallen creature, man's nature is fixed and unchangeable and consists of a composite of

---


good and evil. Since man's evil is inherent, he can never overcome his innate qualities of laziness, irrationality, depravity, selfishness, cruelty, and corruptibility. Thus, part of the conservative mission is to point out man's frailty, depravity, imperfections, and weaknesses.

Man has a duty to cultivate virtue and self-restraint. Conservatives believe that individuals have a duty to God, themselves, and their fellowmen to bring their own impulses under control. In this regard they feel that man should shun vice and cultivate virtue. Desirable virtues to cultivate include "wisdom, justice, temperance, and courage; industry, frugality, piety, and honesty; contentment, obedience, compassion, and good manners." Additionally ingrained in the conservative spirit is the urge to be righteous, upright, self-reliant, duty conscious, and to live up to the limits of ability. The central virtue for the conservative seems to be prudence which consists of a "cluster of urges--toward caution, deliberation, and discretion, toward moderation and calculation, toward old ways and good form."

For conservatives, "self government is for moral men; those who would be free must be virtuous." Responsibility for oneself is the only way a free government can be secured and society made stable. Freedom demands self-discipline and restraint. According to Burke

Society cannot exist unless a controlling power of will and appetite be placed somewhere; and the less of it there is within, the more there must be without. It is ordained in the eternal constitution of things, that men of intemperate minds cannot be free.
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21 Rossiter, pp. 21-2. 22 Ibid. 23 Rossiter, pp. 25-6.
24 Ibid. 25 Ibid. 26 Ibid. 27 Rossiter, pp. 184-85.
28 Rossiter, p. 39.
Man Has a Right to Liberty; to do What he Can Without Trespassing on Others and to be Restrained Only When Necessary

Conservatives feel that man has a right to liberty. Accordingly, unless his actions trespass on others, man has a right to do anything for himself that he can do. Man also has the right to his fair share of what his government or society can do for him, as long as these things are done with his permission. Inherent in this position is the concept that man should be restrained by outside authorities only when that action is necessary for his own good.  

Liberty is thwarted when individuals are made subordinate to the state. Conservatives believe that throughout history, government has thwarted liberty by threatening individual freedom and initiative. A decrease of liberty occurs when ideologies subordinate individuals to the state.  

American conservatives think the real danger of liberty lies in the abuse of political authority; that regulation, even when plainly necessary, has a deadening effect on the initiative and energy of free men; that the burden of proof rests completely on those who advocate increased government activity.  

Collectives, which fail to take into account the dignity of the individual, should be rejected. The conservative thinks in terms of the individual regardless of whether he is discussing the freedom and rights or the duties and responsibilities of man. Since conservatives believe in the dignity and freedom of the individual, they reject the

29 Dandeneau, p. 69. 30 Dandeneau, p. 102. 31 Rossiter, p. 91.
concept of collective entities. For the conservative, the idea of human beings as faceless units to be directed and organized can only be held when men ignore the separate integrity of the person. Thinking that collectives are instruments of the manipulation and submergence of people who compose them, the conservative views the community as composed of personal relationships which are based on traditions confirmed by living generations.\textsuperscript{32}

Liberty is Superior to Equality

Although most conservatives no longer believe in a fixed aristocracy, they acknowledge the necessary existence of classes. Signs of inequality, should they exist, must be natural and functional ones. However, conservatives are more inclined than others to view artificial distinctions as natural.

Equity rather than equality is the mark of his society; the reconciliation of classes is his constant aim. When he is forced to choose between liberty and equality, he throws his support unhesitatingly to liberty. Indeed, the preference of liberty over equality lies at the root of the conservative tradition, and men who subscribe to this tradition never tire of warning against the 'rage for equality.'\textsuperscript{33}

\textbf{Classes are needed in society.} The conservative contends that "Men are grossly unequal—and, what is more, can never be made equal—in most qualities of mind, body, and spirit."\textsuperscript{34} Men are equal only in that they are spiritual and physical entities in the eyes of God.\textsuperscript{35}

This belief in the inequalities of man leads the conservative


\textsuperscript{33}Rossiter, p. 24.  \textsuperscript{34}Rossiter, pp. 23-4.  \textsuperscript{35}Ibid.
to contend that there are superior persons in society. Superior because of birth, talent, and manners, these individuals are trained for special service and should be granted special consideration. A superior person possesses inherited values, standards and positions and as such they should have more of an influence on public affairs than other members of society.\textsuperscript{36}

Equality of opportunity allows man to descend and climb in the class structure. For conservatives, equality of opportunity allows men to rise to their utmost ability\textsuperscript{37} and provides the means for descending or climbing in the class structure. The purpose of education "must be directed to shaping the child to integrate into society rather than toward reshaping society."\textsuperscript{38} As such, education should "emphasize guided development of the child along disciplined and well defined traditional lines."\textsuperscript{39}

Private Ownership and Freedom Are Inseparable

For the conservative, society must be economically competitive. A free-enterprise property-based economy is the best means of securing individual liberty and a free society. Man cannot be free as long as he is dependent either in whole or in part on others, especially government, for his material needs. Consequently, the conservative disagrees with all monopolies, whether they be union, corporate, or

\textsuperscript{36}Rossiter, pp. 24-5. \textsuperscript{37}Rossiter, p. 185.
\textsuperscript{38}Rossiter, pp. 26-7; Dandeneau, p. 83.
\textsuperscript{39}Dandeneau, p. 170.
government. As the only practical system for satisfying economic wants, private enterprise provides an incentive for productive work.

The cornerstone of man's freedom is his right to the fruits of his labor and the labors of his ancestors. The state has no authority to violate man's right to property. In line with this view, government should be entitled to only an equal percentage of each man's wealth for its support. Thus, conservatives oppose any tax that takes more of a percentage of one man's wealth than another. An unjust imposition of taxes makes people feel cheated and the result is a loss of incentive and productivity. Failing to equalize, such a policy only alters the hierarchy so a new group of untrained and incompetent wealthy emerge.

A Constitutional Republic Is the Only Workable Form of Government

Conservatives view the political choices of the world as between "a constitutional republic based on liberty and some form of collectivism based upon egalitarianism and upon rule by the masses through economic, social, political, and moral leveling." With its cumbersome system of checks and balances, conservatives feel a constitutional republic is the only workable form of government.

The sanctity of constitutional limits must be respected by both rulers and ruled. Constitutionalism forces "men to think, talk,
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42 Dandeneau, pp. 168-69. 43 Dandeneau, pp. 101, 139, 181.
44 Dandeneau, p. 159. 45 Rossiter, pp. 32-3.
46 Ibid.
and compromise before they act." The Constitution not only restrains the tendency of government to become absolute, but also provides a means by which society can be made more stable. Providing a system of fair-minded, abstract, law and justice, the Constitution should be literally interpreted.

The conservative recognizes the rights of man which he defines as "a sphere of personality and activity into which other men, whether private citizens or public officials, have no logical or moral claim to intrude." These hard-earned rights of man have developed by years of struggle until they have become enforced and recognized by law.

This law must sanction man's right to life, liberty, and property; civil rights must be spelled out and protected by specific laws; there are no other 'natural' rights of man, so the only way to add or subtract from man's civil rights is by legislation according to established and agreed-upon legal procedure.

Thus, man's rights are more than just social and natural, they are historical, constitutional, and legal.

The functions of government should be discharged virtuously, justly and with minimum interference in the lives of man. For conservatives, when properly conceived, government is a positive concept which serves purposes which cannot be filled by other means. Essential to man's security and liberty, the functions of government include

to defend the nation, symbolize national unity, establish and administer justice, arbitrate conflicts between individuals and groups, make secure the civil rights of man, promote public and private morality, protect organized religion, act as a welfare agency only in emergencies.
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47 Rossiter, pp. 32-3. 48 Dandeneau, pp. 171-72, 68.
49 Rossiter, p. 36. 50 Dandeneau, pp. 169-70.
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As a symbol of unity, government defends the community, protects men against violence, and establishes and administers an equitable system of justice enabling men to live and work together. Although the ultimate responsibility for unsolved problems rests with the government, there are many things that government by right or nature simply should not do.  

The conservative, realizing the inadequacies of government, believes that the more social ends man can accomplish without its intervention, the better. Government should neither substitute for other institutions nor assume obligations which could be discharged more effectively by other individuals or institutions. Since health, education, and welfare are not delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, they should be local matters.  

Governmental power must be balanced and diffused. The conservative respects governmental authority, but would indicate that this power should be directed to its historic tasks. A portion of the conservative mission is to support enough governmental authority to exercise control over human weaknesses, yet to guarantee that no one individual or group of individuals obtain too much political power. The conservative's paramount concern is not with the authority of government but with the size and scope of government. Expansion of federal authority, for conservatives, signals a decrease in individual

53 Rossiter, pp. 34-5, 263-64.  
54 Rossiter, pp. 41-2, 32.  
55 Dandeneau, p. 102.  
56 Evans, p. 76.
Diffusion of power limits the possibilities of wholesale reform and limits the abuses of authority. Because the conservative believes that the mark of a stable society is equilibrium, once power has been diffused, the institutions that have the power must be balanced.  

History Indicates the Precepts Upon Which the Present and Future Should Be Built

While the conservative does not accept history in its entirety, he feels the past indicates the precepts on which the present and future should be built.  

History is a mirror in which each nation can find an honest image, a book in which it can read the awesome truth. The nature and capacities of man, the purposes and dangers of government, the origins and limits—we learn these things best, the conservative insists, by studying the past.

The ends do not justify the means. With history as a guide, conservatives reject immorality, brutality and unrestrained state power as a means of accomplishing humane objectives. For the conservative, the ends never justify the means. Reforms must be accomplished through constitutional processes. Not condoning lawless violence, the conservative revolts against the "cruelty, unpredictability, and inadequacy of brute force as a solution to the problems of human

59 Dandeneau, p. 175. 60 Rossiter, p. 44.
Conservatives feel that objectives can be reached through moderation.

Inherited values, symbols, rituals, and institutions [especially the church and school] are important and should serve as guides for man's actions. While human reason is one of man's precious gifts, the conservative holds that not even the best brand of reason can provide a complete picture of reality. A comprehensive understanding of society can be gained only through tradition, the accumulated wisdom of our ancestors. This combined wisdom is superior to that which could be attained by any single individual. Consequently, the use of man's reason must be consistent with historical limitations, human nature, the inherited wisdom of the community, and the instincts of the virtuous man.

Change should be evolutionary, conserve existing values, be built on the best of the old, and occur in response to an undoubted social need. The conservative believes that there must inevitably be action and change: that "change is a rule of life." However, because a government which is in a constant state of flux is as dangerous as a government that is totally rigid, conservatives place
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conditions on when change should be effected.

Change should never be taken solely for the sake of change, but rather should have preservation for its central objective.\textsuperscript{69} Although the conservative cherishes tradition, he does not wish society to be a repetition and imitation of what has happened before.\textsuperscript{70} While the conservative can be found arguing briskly for change, his contention is that before something new can be created, values which have already been created must be conserved. The new should be "built on the best of the old; history, tradition, and past wisdom are the best guides for the study of society and for the determination of future action or change."\textsuperscript{71}

All political change and action must depend on the problem under consideration, the time, the place, and the needs of the people. Because the conservative understands the infinite variety of the circumstances which affect man, any change must take these variables into account.\textsuperscript{72} Thus, for the conservative, change should be limited in purpose and scope and must occur in response to an undoubted social need.\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{69} Rossiter, pp. 29, 176-77.


\textsuperscript{71} Kirk, p. 6; Dandeneau, p. 169.

\textsuperscript{72} Russell Kirk, The Conservative Mind from Burke to Santayana (Chicago: H. Regnery, 1953), p. 5.

\textsuperscript{73} Rossiter, pp. 176-77.
Defending Fundamental Premises

The empirical research of Milton Rokeach provided the rationale for the observation that conservatives defend the fundamental premises of their ideology by means associated with the 'authoritarian personality.' The term 'authoritarian personality' emanated from the works of Adorno and Christie and Jahoda. The studies of these researchers linked the concept with anti-Semitism and ethnocentrism. Rokeach extended this research by advancing the hypothesis that persons having strong commitment to religious or political groups will manifest more dogmatism and opinionation than persons having lesser commitments. In the case of strong commitments to right-of-center groups, we expect relatively high scores on dogmatism and opinionation, and at the same time relatively high scores on the F [Fascist] scale and, possibly but not necessarily on the E [ethnocentrism] scale.\(^{74}\)

Rokeach found that "those who score high on the F scale also tend to score high on measures of ethnocentrism, anti-Semitism, and anti-Negro feelings, and tend to be politically conservatives."\(^{75}\)

Additionally, the data indicated a more positive correlation between dogmatism and right opinionation than between dogmatism and left opinionation. In fact, dogmatism has a somewhat greater affinity to right-oriented than to left oriented ideologies. The correlations between dogmatism and conservatism . . . and between opinionation and conservatism, while small or negligible, are consistently positive; the correlations between dogmatism and right opinionation are consistently larger than those with left opinionation. . . . The

\(^{74}\)Milton Rokeach, "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative to the Authoritarian Personality," Psychological Monographs: General and Applied 70:18. References to "Political and Religious Dogmatism: An Alternative Approach to the Authoritarian Personality" will subsequently be referred to as "PRD."

\(^{75}\)Rokeach, OCM, p. 12.
correlations between dogmatism and ethnocentrism . . . and between opinionation and ethnocentrism . . . are even higher. 76

Thus, Rokeach concluded that since correlations between conservatism and dogmatism are consistently positive, "The chances are somewhat better than even that a close-minded person will be conservative rather than liberal in his politics." 77

This positive correlation between ethnocentrism, intolerance, dogmatism, and political-economic conservatism provide information necessary for postulating certain assumptions concerning the information processing characteristics and personality characteristics of conservatives.

Information Processing Characteristics

Individuals generally resist changing their beliefs since they "gain comfort in clinging to the familiar and because all our beliefs seem to serve highly important functions for us." 78 Dogmatism refers to an individual's propensity to change his belief system. 79 Rokeach defined the term as

(a) a relatively closed cognitive organization of beliefs and disbeliefs about reality, (b) organized around a central set of beliefs about absolute authority which, in turn, (c) provide a framework for the patterns of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward others. 80

Conservatives display dogmatic tendencies in processing information by isolating beliefs, filtering information through accepted authority figures, and reluctantly processing new data.
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78 Rokeach, BAV, p. 183. 79 Rokeach, OCM, pp. 54-70.
80 Rokeach, "PRD," p. 3-19.
Beliefs are isolated within the belief-disbelief system. "Isolation refers to the degree of segregation or lack of intercommunication between neighboring regions or subregions" of the belief-disbelief system. Securing change in the system is often dependent on the isolation or lack of isolation of the beliefs. "The greater the isolation, the less direct effect will a change in one part [belief] of the peripheral region have upon adjacent parts [beliefs]." Consequently, the greater the isolation the less will positive transfers occur in the belief-disbelief system.

The belief-disbelief system is closed to the extent that "there is a high magnitude of rejection of all disbelief systems, an isolation of beliefs, a high discrepancy in degree of differentiation between belief and disbelief systems and little differentiation within the belief system."

Information is filtered through accepted authority figures. Individuals evaluate the relevant and irrelevant information received in every situation. The more open the person's belief-disbelief system, the more will the individual evaluate and act on information because of its own merits. Stated simply, "the more open the person's belief system, the more strength should he have to resist externally imposed reinforcements, or rewards and punishments."

Reliance on authority is a key characteristic of the closed-minded individual. Authority refers to "any source to whom we look
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81 Rokeach, "PRD," p. 7.  82 Rokeach, OCM, p. 49.
83 Rokeach, OCM, p. 61.
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for information about the universe or to check information we already possess." When an individual's belief-disbelief system is closed, the power emanating from authorities does not depend on cognitive correctness or logical consistency. Rather, the more closed the system, the more will acceptance of a specific belief be determined by "irrelevant internal drives and/or arbitrary reinforcements from external authority." Rokeach explains

the more closed his system, the more sensitive he should be to communications, reinforcements, warnings, prohibitions, and promises issuing forth from his own group or authorities, and the more should he be dependent on such positive authorities for information he accumulates about a particular disbelief subsystem. Information about disbelief system, if received at all, should come secondhand, spoonfed by the person's positive authority.

Consequently, when a variety of information is gained from an external source, "the relatively closed person is forced to accept all or reject all in a package deal." The more closed the belief system, the more difficult should it be to distinguish between information received about the world and information received about the source. What the external source says is true about the world should become all mixed up with what the external source wants us to believe is true, and wants us to do about it. To the extent that a person cannot distinguish the two kinds of information received from the source, he should not be free to receive, evaluate and act on information in terms of inner rewards and punishments, meted out by the source designed to make him evaluate and act on the information in the way the source wants him to.

New and scientific information is reluctantly processed. As individuals seek consistency between various parts of their belief-disbelief systems, they screen out information that is not compatible.

---
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"For this reason, people often selectively avoid contact with stimuli, people, events, books, etc., that threaten the validity of their ideology or proselyte for competing ideologies."\(^90\)

Rokeach remarks

At the closed extreme, it is the new information that must be tampered with--by narrowing it out, altering it, or containing it within isolated bounds. In this way, the belief-disbelief system is left intact. At the open extreme, it is the other way around: New information is assimilated as is, . . . thereby producing 'genuine' changes in the whole belief-disbelief system.\(^91\)

Thus, the more closed minded the individual, the more resistant he will be to the integration of new beliefs. The person exhibits "greater reluctance to change their everyday belief system" as well as a resistance to formulating new belief systems.\(^92\) As Rokeach indicated

The closed mind, through fear of the new, is a passive mind. . . . When left to its own devices, like a fish out of water, it cannot integrate new beliefs into a new system because it cannot remember them because there is a dynamic unwillingness to 'play along', and to 'entertain' strange belief systems.\(^93\)

Personality Characteristics

The association of conservatism with dogmatism, intolerance, and ethnocentrism also provides insight into the personality of the typical conservative.

A sharp distinction is drawn between groups and individuals accepted and those not accepted. Dogmatism provides "a framework for organizing attitudes of intolerance and qualified tolerance toward people in general according to the beliefs they accept or reject."\(^94\)

\(^90\)Rokeach, OCM, p. 48.  \(^91\)Rokeach, OCM, p. 50.

\(^92\)Rokeach, OCM, pp. 216, 181.  \(^93\)Rokeach, OCM, p. 23.

\(^94\)Rokeach, "PRD," p. 10.
The more closed minded the individual, the more he would display the tendency to accept or reject others according to the degree that they agreed with his beliefs.\(^95\)

Consistent with ethnocentrism, the intolerant individual would display rigid ingroup-outgroup distinctions; . . . stereotyped negative imagery and hostile attitudes toward outgroups, stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups, and a hierarchical, authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups subordinate.\(^96\)

Consequently, when an individual's motivation causes him to form a closed belief-disbelief system, most likely he will embrace a blatantly anti-equalitarian ideology. Rokeach indicates that this "would account for the somewhat greater affinity we have observed between authoritarian belief structure and conservatism than between the same structure and liberalism."\(^97\)

The world is a threatening place. In discussing what the F scale actually measured, Christie and Jahoda concluded

The items themselves may be defined in terms of their content, i.e., they are phrased so that agreement implies a Wettanschauung which is characterized by dichotomization of complex issues, acceptance of authoritarian figures [traditional ones, at least] and a view of the world as hostile and threatening.\(^98\)
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\(^95\) Rokeach, OCM, p. 80.


\(^97\) Rokeach, OCM, p. 127.

When an individual is threatened or anxious in a situation, he is motivated to reduce the threat and allay the anxiety. This attempt "to cope with anxiety should involve a de-emphasis of the present and a preoccupation with the future."\(^{99}\) Because the distant or remote future "cannot by its very nature, be known" and consequently is impossible to refute, "one can safely be preoccupied with it."\(^{100}\)

Rokeach explains

the more closed the system, the more will . . . beliefs be to the effect that we live alone, isolated and helpless in a friendless world; that we live in a world wherein the future is uncertain; that the self is fundamentally unworthy and inadequate to cope alone with this friendless world; and that the way to overcome such feelings is by a self-aggrandizing and self-righteous identification with a cause, a concern with power and status, and by a compulsive self-proselytization about the justness of such a cause.\(^{101}\)

Thus, viewed in the extreme, a closed belief-disbelief system provides a network of psychoanalytic defense mechanisms which, when taken together, "form a cognitive system . . . designed to shield a vulnerable mind."\(^{102}\) Closed mindedness makes "it possible to ward off threatening aspects of reality and at the same time gives one the satisfaction of feeling that one understands it."\(^{103}\)

**Summary**

This chapter advanced the premise that an understanding of the conservative mind is an essential prerequisite for analyzing conservative rhetoric as well as comprehending conservative auditors. Conserva-

\(^{99}\) Rokeach, OCM, p. 367.  
\(^{100}\) Rokeach, OCM, p. 64.  
\(^{101}\) Rokeach, OCM, p. 75.  
\(^{102}\) Rokeach, OCM, p. 70.  
\(^{103}\) Rokeach, "PRD," p. 5.
tives, as all men, maintain belief and disbelief systems which assist them in understanding the world. The beliefs upon which conservatives base their perception of reality can be delineated by the basic premises of their ideology. These fundamental premises include:

I. Divine intent rules society and man must be obedient to an eternal law derived from divine Providence.
   A. Man's nature consists of a mixture of good and evil.
   B. Man has a duty to cultivate virtue and self-restraint.

II. Man has a right to liberty; to do what he can without trespassing on others and to be restrained only when necessary.
   A. Liberty is thwarted when individuals are made subordinate to the state.
   B. Collectives, which fail to take into account the dignity of the individual, should be rejected.

III. Liberty is superior to equality.
   A. Classes are needed in society.
   B. Equality of opportunity allows man to descend and climb in the class structure.

IV. Private ownership and freedom are inseparable.

V. A constitutional republic is the only workable form of government.
   A. The functions of government should be discharged virtuously, justly, and with minimum intervention in the lives of citizens.
   B. Government power must be balanced and diffused.
VI. History indicates the precepts upon which the present and future should be built.

A. The ends do not justify the means.

B. Inherited values, symbols, rituals, and institutions [especially the school and the church] are important and should serve as guides for man's actions.

C. Change should be evolutionary, conserve existing values, be built on the best of the old, and occur in response to an undoubted social need.

To maintain consistency within the belief system, conservatives defend these premises by utilizing means associated with the authoritarian personality. Empirical research indicates a positive correlation between the variables of the authoritarian personality [ethnocentrism, intolerance, dogmatism] and political-economic conservatism. As authoritarians, conservatives draw sharp distinctions between groups and individuals accepted and those not accepted. Also, the conservative would maintain a view of the world as a hostile, threatening, unfriendly place. To protect his belief-disbelief system, the conservative would display information processing characteristics including a reluctance to process new information, filtering incoming information through authority figures, and isolating beliefs within the belief-disbelief system.

If Barry Goldwater is indeed a conservative and if the foregoing empirical research is valid, the premises of the ideology and the personality and information processing characteristics of the authoritarian personality should be evident in his rhetoric. With this
observation in mind, Chapters IV and V will analyze the Senator's speaking between 1969 and 1974.
Chapter IV

FAVORABLY DISPOSED AUDIENCES

The time period encompassed in this study was determined on the belief that some force, perhaps even a change in Barry Goldwater himself, had been responsible for a resurgent interest in conservatism in general, and in Goldwater, in particular. When Lyndon Johnson had overwhelmingly defeated the Senator in 1964, political prognosticators had predicted the end of the conservative movement in America and the termination of the career of the former G.O.P. standard-bearer.

However, this forecast was premature, for neither the ex-Arizona Senator, nor the conservative cause he represented, were destined to die as a result of the 1964 Presidential election. Any attempt to understand Barry Goldwater's rhetoric must begin with an examination of how the Arizonan viewed himself, and how the American public perceived him during the period under consideration. An analysis of these influences and their effect on the Senator's rhetoric will be developed on two levels. First, those factors determined the Senator's rhetorical philosophy. Second, the influence those perceptions had on the Arizonan's method of argumentation become evident as his speeches are analyzed.

Barry Goldwater's Rhetorical Philosophy

Two factors influenced Barry Goldwater's rhetorical philosophy when he addressed favorably disposed audiences between 1969 and 1974.
The resiliency of the conservative factions of the Republican Party was one item that shaped the Senator's rhetorical philosophy. A second item which affected Goldwater's speaking was his public image as enhanced by media coverage.

In 1966, Congressman Stalbaum of Wisconsin commented that conservative forces were still a strong factor in the G.O.P. He stated:

We find the Goldwater element, that element which we believed had been so resoundingly defeated in 1964, is still dominant in the Republican Party and is continuing to control the party.¹

During that same year, Andrew Kopkind claimed that "Almost everywhere the 1964 results . . . have reinforced the claim of the right wing control of the party"² and one Republican spokesman said, "I don't know whether it was Goldwater who jolted them or the defeat of the candidates that jolted them. But we've come back. We now have 25 governors, we picked up 46 seats in the House, we picked up a Senate seat."³

Barry Goldwater indicated that he perceived himself and the 1964 race at least partially responsible for the continued strength of conservative forces.

I like to think, and I believe I am justified in this belief, that one of the direct results of my candidacy in 1964 was to attract new young leaders to the Republican banner. . . . I like to think that the events of the last decade turned our party, organizationally, into a national party again for the first time in many years. If my efforts . . . contributed to this cause and


furthered the awakening that we see today in the revolt of middle Americans, I am profoundly grateful.4

A second force which influenced the Arizonan's rhetorical philosophy and reinforced his perception of himself, was the publicity given to him during this period. These reports, for the most part, demonstrated a change of view on the part of Goldwater's colleagues and the media.

Before Goldwater's successful bid for the Senate seat vacated by Carl Hyden, an article entitled "Barry Rides Again" appeared in *Newsweek*. The staff writers proclaimed "last week, Barry Morris Goldwater, buoyantly happy at the controls of his twin turboprop Cessna 401, was barnstorming Arizona, a politician who survived catastrophe to fight another day."5 The same work dramatized how the former Senator was viewing himself during the campaign. "Goldwater is presenting himself to the voters as something of an Arizona national monument, a statesman entitled to the choice forum the Senate offers."6

Comments supporting the emerging view of Goldwater, 'the statesman,' continued after the Senator returned to Capitol Hill. James Naughton in a *New York Times* editorial published on January 9, 1974 wrote

Barry Goldwater, like a Republican cloth coat rediscovered at the end of a fashion era, is back in style. For a decade, Democrats gleefully scorned him; now they quote

5 "Barry Rides Again," *Newsweek*, October 14, 1968, p. 35.
6 Ibid.
him. Republicans tried to forget his political legacy; now they applaud him. . . .

Naughton continued

The blunt candor that devastated the Senator's campaign for the White House in 1964 appears to many to have become something of a national treasure in 1974, and, . . . each passing day seems to yield new evidence that the Arizona Republican is in the middle of a political renaissance.8

James Kilpatrick in the Washington Star-News summarized Goldwater's political renaissance when he stated, "Goldwater is 'Mr. Republican.' He has grown in the country's respect and affection. . . ."9

Charles Murphy concluded

There have been few events in our political experience to match this profound and appreciative reevaluation of a man's worth. . . . he [Goldwater] has now emerged, for many, as the conscience of Congress—a man who can be counted upon to stand up and speak the truth.10

Barry Morris Goldwater espoused a brand of conservatism that had survived his defeat at the polls. The undisputed practicing leader of this ideological philosophy, the Senator had spent his political career articulating its principles and had been responsible for marshalling recruits for the conservative cause. Thus, evidence of political success for conservatives and moderates in the Republican party could not help but effect Goldwater's perception of himself and

---

8 Ibid.
10 Charles Murphy, "Barry Goldwater's Second Wind," Reader's Digest, October, 1974, p. 134.
his role in the political system. Overwhelmingly returned to the United States Senate, the Arizonan's position as a foremost conservative spokesman was secure. History was even beginning to acknowledge the values of the Senator and his cause. Goldwater's feeling of worth was being further enhanced by the image perpetuated by the media. Without an apparent shift of position, the Senator was being lauded by both conservatives and liberals alike. These events were not unnoticed by the experienced politician and offer an explanation for his rhetorical philosophy.

For years acknowledged as 'Mr. Conservative,' the Senator now assumed the undisputed role as an authority figure for the conservative cause. The speeches discussed in this chapter were delivered to audiences sympathetic with this cause. When presenting an issue to these listeners, the Arizonan approached them with confidence. He felt comfortable with them. He was their spokesman. He articulated premises they espoused. As conservatives, the audiences shared the Senator's means of information processing as well as his view of the world.

Rhetorical Analysis

Analysis of the speaking of Senator Barry Goldwater will explore his use of evidence, argument, and persuasive techniques. Based upon the information gleaned from this critique, a final section will summarize the techniques the Arizona Senator used speaking to favorably disposed audiences.

Evidence

Goldwater's use of data reflects his view of himself as an
authority. Rather than an extensive use of direct quotations, the Senator paraphrased information, used vague references to identify sources, and relied on his own interpretation of events as support for his positions.

**Direct quotations.** A typical example of Goldwater's introduction of direct quotations was a comment made to the Young Americans for Freedom. Supporting the premise that adequate compensation would increase recruitment he said, "The Commission [Gates] . . . noted 'The evidence is overwhelming that if compensation is set at levels which satisfy army requirements, the other services will be able to attract enough qualified volunteers to meet their respective requirements.'"

Additionally Goldwater documented his evidence and used direct quotations when discussing the Soviet buildup and the Russian propensity for aggression. Examples illustrating this allegation can be found in the section on polarization.

**Paraphrased information.** Frequently, Goldwater paraphrased information taken from various sources. For example, when he referred to the conclusion of the Gates Commission, he said, "The opportunity for dismantling the draft is a real one. Now, all of you here I believe have heard of the findings of the Gates Commission. . . . Their conclusion--to put it briefly--is that a Voluntary system will

---

work." To give credence, Goldwater commented that the Gates Commission had been organized under the direction of the President to reach conclusions regarding the volunteer military.

Another example of the Senator's paraphrasing of information occurred when he countered the idea that the economy was beginning to become more stable. He referred to Dr. Arthur O. Dahlberg who allegedly points to the credit crunch of 1966 and says that tight credit then dampened business activities so effectively that the Federal Reserve index of industrial production dropped four points. Yet the rate of inflation did not recede.13

The Arizonan provided partial information for establishing the credibility of Dahlberg by introducing him as "the prominent economist and writer. . . ." Aside from this general statement, no other information was provided on the credentials or expertise of the source.

Vague referent sources. More extensively used than paraphrasing direct quotations, Goldwater generalized the sources of his data. The Senator made such comments as "The scientists told us . . ."14 "Financial writers say . . .",15 "many political commentators and alleged experts . . .",16 and "The newspapers tell us very

12Young Americans for Freedom Symposium, p. 29499.


15Industrial College of the Armed Forces, p. 402.

16Speech by Barry Goldwater (Subject: Nixon's Budget Proposal)
These illustrations demonstrate that Barry Goldwater often failed to provide adequate documentation of his evidence and on many occasions he completely omitted the sources of his data. Thus, Goldwater asked his audiences to accept his evidence without certifying the source.

**Goldwater as authority.** A complete analysis of the Senator's use of evidence reveals that often he relied on his own interpretation of events as evidence. This tendency is evident when the Arizonan presented statistical, historical, and opinionated data.

1. **Statistical data.** The most illustrative example of Goldwater's use of statistical data was presented to the American Iron and Steel Institute. In discussing the profits of big business, the Senator asserts

You may recall the results of the Harris Survey last year when only 10 percent of the people thought business was keeping profits at a 'reasonable level' . . . --whatever that means! This compares with 46 percent in 1966. And yet, after tax corporate profits on sales dropped from 5.6 percent in 1966 to about 4 percent last year. What's more, corporate profits as a share of national income dropped from about 13 percent in 1966 to around 9 percent last year, while employee compensation climbed from 70 to 76 percent.\(^1\)

In this statement the Arizonan cited statistical evidence and indicated the source of the information. However, the Senator did not directly


\(^1\)Speech by Barry Goldwater (Subject: Free Enterprise) to the American Iron and Steel Institute, February 5, 1974, U.S., Congressional Record, 93d Cong., 2d Sess. (1974), CXX, No. 4, 334.
quote the Harris Survey and thus the statistics and conclusions were open to Goldwater's interpretation.

The Senator also included numerical data in support of the premise that the cost of a volunteer military is overestimated. However, as will be noted, Goldwater failed to indicate where he secured his information. Goldwater stated that the cost of the voluntary military is not nearly as great as the money currently involved in retaining men for vacated positions. Passing this allegation off as fact, the Senator said,

I was astounded at the amount of money that it cost just the Air Force alone each year to retrain a man for a slot that had been vacated by another man. This training in a four year term can run as high as $250,000 in the case of enlisted men. In the case of officers it can be double that amount. More specifically the Senator cites, "In fact, you may not know it but in a B-52 first-term pilot we have invested about a million dollars in training."}

2. Historical data. While the above indicates that Goldwater presented statistical allegations as factual statements, further examination reveals that the Senator passed off his interpretation of history as factual utterances also. Postulating that inflation gained momentum during the Kennedy Administration and was accelerated while Johnson was in the White House, the Arizonan painted a picture of that period in our history.

This was the era when people who argued for balanced budgets or for payments on the national debt or for reduction at least of

---

19 Young Americans for Freedom Symposium, p. 29499.
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budget deficits were laughed at as old fashioned. . . . when balanced budgets were described as 'dangerous'. . . . when we were told by a new breed of economists that the running of consecutive Federal deficits was healthy in an expanding economy. . . . when the fallacy that 'a little inflation' is good for economic health of the nation got its powerful push.21

3. Opinionated data. Another aspect of Barry Goldwater's use of evidence was that he passed opinions and values off as fact. Worded in the form of declarative statements, these words portended truth. Initially, Goldwater presented his opinion as documented fact. For example, in offering proof for the position that congestion is a major problem facing the aviation industry, the Senator alleges

At Washington's National Airport. . . . congestion problems continue even though some of the jet traffic has been drawn away to Dulles International Airport. . . . today, strangely enough, Dulles Airport . . . does not have sufficient business to keep it operating. . . . within a very short time the facilities at Dulles will prove as inadequate as those at National Airport.22

In documenting the position that for our defense posture to be adequate we must utilize our financial resources more effectively, Goldwater claimed

economies in defense spending can only be realized . . . by optimizing military policies, strategy and tactics to . . . exploit all the products of technology. The . . . need to develop and maintain the most advanced systems possible in order to guard against the fact that an enemy could build and use these against us means that any reliance on older systems . . . will eventually add to the cost of defense.23

Not only did the Arizona Senator pass off his interpretations

21Industrial College of the Armed Forces, p. 402.


23American Fighter Pilots, p. 357.
and opinions as fact, he also, and in the same manner, incorporated his values, passed them off as facts, and expected his audience to process them as such. On occasion, Goldwater did indicate that the evidence presented was based on his beliefs and values. For example, when discussing the anti-war demonstrations, the Senator related

I do object if they have the effect of prolonging the war and of causing our fighting men even one moment of unhappiness. . . . I find it a little frightening to see how many people, . . . think they are doing a righteous and noble and daring thing when they join in protests against the announced policies of the United States Government.

At the very least, it is a sad commentary on the American attitude.24

However, on other occasions, Goldwater merely indicated the value and articulated it as fact. In one address, for example, the Arizona Senator discussed the desirability of retaining conservative principles since "threats to individual liberty in this country are growing very rapidly."25 In another instance, the Senator showed that the anti-demonstrations would not have the desired effect of assisting with the Paris Peace talks by saying

No amount of shouting, or banner-waving or street-clogging or mass assemblies is going to help the cause of peace in Paris or Hanoi. This kind of activity would only have a minimal effect, even if the demonstrators--through some unforeseen miracle of belated patriotism--should protest on behalf of the United States position in Asia.26

Argument

Analysis of Goldwater's use of argumentation will be subdivided

24California Federation of Republican Women, p. 30360.

25Speech by Barry Goldwater (Subject: Federal Government) to the 7th Annual Young Americans For Freedom Convention, August 16, 1973, press release.

26California Federation of Republican Women, p. 30359.
to include consideration of the conclusions or claims that he advanced, the reasoning processes he used to support those claims, and the refutational strategies he employed to counter his opposition's arguments. Allegations directed to the inability of conservative spokesmen to formulate and articulate specific policy necessitates consideration of those instances when the Senator advanced a specific plan of action. Finally, during the 1964 race, charges were leveled against the Arizona Senator indicating that he did not maintain consistent positions. Thus, the final segment of this section will consider the inconsistencies reflected in Goldwater's rhetoric.

Claims. While Barry Goldwater presented some positions which were based on fact or advocated a proposed action, these did not represent a majority of the claims he advanced. In reviewing what the Senator wished his audiences to accept and the subpropositions on which his stands were based, some observations can be postulated which support the Arizonan's affinity for the conservative mode of argumentation.

First, the majority of the points included in Goldwater's addresses were either totally evaluative, discussing the relative worth, merit, or desirability of an individual, idea, or action, or were factual in phrasing but evaluative in content. Examples include:

Watergate is being used by the liberals to try to discredit and destroy the mandate of 1972 and the conservative policies on which it was built.27

The Nixon Administration would not find itself in the situation it does today if it had been manned at the top by staff people

27Young Americans for Freedom Convention, press release.
strongly committed to the principles of conservatism.  

Inflation is a result of a deliberate but false national policy of fiscal management.  

The program outlined by President Nixon to correct long years of irresponsible economics in government was forced on him by the weight of circumstances.  

There would be little objection to the antiwar demonstrations as these actions neither prolonged the war nor caused the fighting men any unhappiness.  

The news media is using Vietnam to discredit the President.  

The Voluntary Military Proposal is sensible and morally justified.  

The draft violates a fundamental human right.  

The pendulum of the defense organization has moved too far in the direction of economy and too far away from defense readiness and force modernization.  

The competitive enterprise system is faltering under a series of poorly handled shortages and is under attack by demagogues who would like to nationalize all basic industries in this country.  

Opponents of the free enterprise system have misjudged the attitudes of the American people.  

Because many of the claims that Barry Goldwater advanced were either purely or partially evaluative, representing value interpret-

28 Young Americans For Freedom Convention, press release.  
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tions, no amount of proof would have been sufficient to establish them. The audiences would remain committed to either agreement of disagreement with the Senator's values. If the audience maintained a different belief or value than the Senator they would probably not have been in the predominately conservative audiences. However, the fact remains that it is possible that members of the audience might have disagreed with one or more of the precepts or values advanced. If this was the case, the value to which they deferred would have been embedded within their belief-attitude structure and no orator could realistically expect to change the listeners position through the demonstration of data on one occasion.

Agreement with the Arizonan would have negated the need for proof since the information necessary for establishing the claim would already exist in the hearts and the minds of the audience. Insofar as the groups under consideration shared the Senator's orientation and assumptions, they would have accepted the claims without support. Additionally, the listeners awarded the Senator credibility as the spokesman of the conservative cause in America. Thus, as conservatives, they would accept his thoughts as representative of the ideological positions to which they adhered.

A second observation concerning the claims that Barry Goldwater advanced is that many of them were based on future probability.

Future developments in transportation would be beyond the financial competence of private companies.38

Businessmen can increase their position by enacting a

3813th Annual Southwest Transportation Seminar.
three-fold plan.\textsuperscript{39}

The adoption of Nixon's proposed budget would not increase his popularity.\textsuperscript{40}

The anti-war demonstrations would not speed up the Paris Peace talks.\textsuperscript{41}

A voluntary system would work.\textsuperscript{42}

Adequate compensation would increase recruitment.\textsuperscript{43}

Even with the voluntary system, mechanisms would be available for handling national emergencies.\textsuperscript{44}

We are rapidly approaching a position where it is no longer possible to equate an adequate defense posture with a stated level of defense spending.\textsuperscript{45}

Pressure of world events might force the Nixon Administration to ask for an increase in defense spending.\textsuperscript{46}

No one can definitely foresee the future and, consequently, even with the assistance of past events to allude to a trend, these claims cannot be established with any degree of certainty. Even if the Senator did utilize all available documentation, he would still only be able to establish possibility or probability.

\textbf{Reasoning.} Senator Barry Goldwater utilized both the traditional inductive and deductive reasoning patterns. However, two characteristics of the Senator's rhetoric render the simple exploration
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of these two forms inadequate.

First, as the section on claims demonstrated, the Arizonan primarily advanced positions that were either based on future probability or which sought to establish the Senator's value orientation. Because valid analytic deductive forms cannot present anything in the conclusion that has not already been included in the data and warrant backing, a critic would not expect to find an extensive use of valid syllogistic arguments in conservative rhetoric. Claims that seek to prove future events deal with predictions and as such, the certainty required for formal validity is not possible. In a similar manner, an individual's values are difficult to change through logical argumentation. Milton Rokeach defined values as "abstract ideals, positive or negative, not tied to any specific attitude, object, or situation, representing a person's belief about ideal modes of conduct and ideal terminal goals." Because values "serve as a standard for what is good or bad," they are determined, maintained and retained on more of an emotional rather than logical basis. Thus, demanding that arguments predicated of value assumptions adhere to the proof requirements of analytic arguments is asking that they fulfill a function that they cannot by their nature carry out.

Second, in dealing with the future and with values, Goldwater


relied heavily on the use of conservative maxims. Previous attempts to analyze the Senator's rhetoric have attested to his use of the principles of the conservative ideology. Yet the analytic model employed by those critics has been unable to delineate the specific functions that these premises were playing in the reasoning process. This inability on the part of traditional models is, in part, responsible for the confusion regarding the effectiveness of Senator Goldwater's rhetoric and the perplexity critics experience in attempting to analyze the reasoning processes employed in conservative rhetoric.

A review of Barry Goldwater's speaking shows that the fundamental principles of conservatism served two roles. Initially, the premises served as a direct link between the evidence and the conclusion, thus adhering to the function normally associated with the enthymeme. Secondarily, conservative maxims provided the indirect support for other reasoning processes. Without a delineation of what roles the conservative premises serve at any time, the analysis of conservative rhetoric is incomplete and invalid.

Examination of the reasoning patterns of Senator Barry Goldwater provided the organizational structure for this section. Inductive reasoning, specifically the use of generalization, will be discussed first. Deductive reasoning, including cause, analogy, classification, and the use of the enthymeme, will then be considered. Finally,

attention will be directed to the use of conservative premises as backing for both the above processes.

1. **Inductive Reasoning.** One form of inductive reasoning predominated the Senator's rhetoric. Goldwater had a penchant for enumerating examples and asking his audience to reason from them to a general conclusion. These generalizations varied in their validity especially with respect to the number of the examples used and their representativeness.

Two examples demonstrate the Arizonan's use of induction. First, Goldwater used this reasoning process to lead the audience to the conclusion that the volunteer military is a normal way of life under our system of government. The Senator told the Young Americans for Freedom

> In fact, up to the time of the Civil War there had never been a compulsory system of military service, in the United States. . . . The involuntary draft first appeared in this nation in 1863 . . . it was dropped and didn't show up until 1917, when it was used . . . it was dropped after the war. In 1940, the draft came again; it was allowed to expire in 1947. But one year later the Congress passed a draft law and that one is still with us.51

The Senator concluded this argument with the statement "I think in the brief history you can see that the fact that the draft has continued since 1948 is contrary to the entire past history of the United States. This practice has no place in our system of freedom except as a temporary expedient."52

Second, speaking to the Norwich graduates, Goldwater discussed the attacks on the military. The Senator began by citing historical

51 Young Americans for Freedom Symposium, p. 29499. 52 Ibid.
examples of these assaults in the United States.

Between World War I and World War II many movements flourished in this country in the name of pacifism, in the name of disarmament, in the name of peace. . . . charges were publicized in the Senate hearings against the so-called munition makers . . . attempts were made to convince the American people that wars were the result of activities on the part of people who manufactured the sinews of war. A connection was drawn between deaths on the battlefields and profits made by the manufacturers of armaments. On many campuses in this country peace groups flourished and the ROTC was held in contempt.53

The Senator also demonstrated that attacks on the military were not limited to this country by using England as an example. He said

In Great Britain the movement was even more pronounced. At one time a majority of the undergraduates at Oxford University signed a document called the 'Oxford Oath' that pledged them never to take up arms in any war at anytime. And, of course, many of those young men a few years later participated valiantly in the Battle of Britain.54

After citing examples of where anti-military actions had been taken in both America and England, Goldwater concluded, "From the vantage point of age, I want to assure this graduating class today that what is taking place at the present time is not new, either in this nation or in other nations of the free world."55

2. Deductive reasoning. Goldwater employed four reasoning processes which fall under the category of deduction: classification, cause, analogy, and the enthymeme.

A typical example of the Arizona Senator's use of classification
was found in the address to the National Rifle Association. The Senator indicated early in the speech the general opinion that antimilitary forces were responsible for America's current isolationist policies. He stated

Thanks to the anti-military, economy clique in Congress, the United States is turning isolationist with a vengeance. It is withdrawing from the arena. It is refusing to face the reality of world power. It is busily engaged in taking on the mantle of a second or third or who knows what rate power.\textsuperscript{56}

Goldwater argued from this position to the specific instance of the SST and the effects that critics had on the subject of its development. Claiming that the coalition was effective in restricting the implementation of a needed technological advance, the Senator relates:

The latest step . . . was the refusal . . . to approve funds for the continuation of the SST Program. . . . the defeat of the SST was a surrender--. . . of our long-held predominance in the field of air transport production. . . . of the nearly $1,000,000,000 which we had already expended on the SST. . . . The SST represented an important advance in technology which of course is the lifeblood of the military-industrial complex. Therefore, those who would destroy all defensive weapons had to shoot down and kill the SST as part of their overall strategy of disarmament.\textsuperscript{57}

The ineffectiveness of Goldwater's argument did not emanate from the fact that he used classification per se. The Senator began with a broad statement claiming that because of the anti-military clique in Congress, the United States was turning isolationist. However, when he sought to support this statement with the SST example, the reasoning pattern went astray. While the Senator claimed that the SST represented a necessary technological advance, the data did not

\textsuperscript{56} National Rifle Association, p. 10371. \textsuperscript{57} Ibid.
support this premise. Rather the evidence indicated that defeat of
the SST would result in a financial loss and a reduction in our
superiority in aviation. The only need cited for the development was
that advances in technology were the lifeblood of the military industrial
complex. Goldwater asserted that those seeking to thwart the SST
proposal were trying to destroy all defensive weapons. However, not
only would the SST not be classified as a defensive weapon, but the
Senator did not link this allegation to the claim that rejection of
the SST would result in an isolationist policy or that this was the
intention of the group arguing against implementation.

More extensively used than reasoning from classification, the
Arizona Senator employed causal analysis. As will be demonstrated
more completely in the section on polarization, on many occasions
Goldwater cited individuals and groups as the causes of our current
problems. Most noteworthy in this regard were indictments leveled on
union leaders and liberals for causing inflation, and liberals,
McNamara, and the press for being responsible for the anti-military
sentiments in the country. The lack of a firm conservative ideological
commitment was also mentioned as the reason for the Watergate crimes.

The Arizonan relied on causation when saying that frustration
over Vietnam was responsible for the criticisms of the military
industrial complex and the decreased allocation in defense spending.
Goldwater opened this line of analysis with the statement:

Popular frustration over Vietnam gave . . . authority to the
arguments of our defense critics. . . . And an additional factor
was the prevalence of troublesome domestic problems. . . . [some
of] the critics of the MIC . . . made a business of contending
that withdrawal of American troops from Southeast Asia, coupled
with enormous cutbacks in defense expenditures, would solve our
problems on the domestic front. The Arizonan indicated the position this placed America in by claiming "The upshot of all this agitation and criticism has brought about heavy reductions in defense funds at a time when the Soviet Union is going all-out to build the mightiest military machine the world has ever known." The strength of this unit of proof depended primarily upon the common sense approach utilized. The Senator provided a motivation for the Congress of American Industry to be attentive to the material presented by identifying with their interests. The audience was the portion of the military-industrial complex that was going to be affected financially by the cutbacks in spending. By remarking that the Vietnam war was responsible for the decrease, Goldwater provided those assembled with an understandable reason for the decline in funding.

A second illustration of Goldwater's development of causation was found in his address to the Norwich graduates. In essence, by showing that military expenditures were not primarily responsible for inflation, the Arizonan argued alternate causality. The major analysis offered was that during at least three time periods, defense spending dropped while social-welfare spending and all other Federal spending reflected consistent increases. He opened with the statement,

... the government's official figures on Federal spending ... prove that defense spending at the Federal level dropped two percent between the years 1952-1960. And while it increased 75 percent in the period between 1960-1968, it dropped off by 10 percent in the period between 1968-1971.

---
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The Senator continued by mentioning other causes of inflation.

... to see what really is causing the price inflation of today, you have to take a look at Federal spending for such resources as health, education, labor, social security and other human resources. This spending increased 227 percent between 1952-1960. It increased another 165 percent in the period between 1960-1968 and an additional 41 percent in the period from 1968-1971.\textsuperscript{61}

Finally, Goldwater stated, "Federal spending on all other purposes in these three periods showed an increase of 49 percent between 1952 and 1960; an increase of 78 percent between 1960 and 1968; an increase of 14 percent between 1968 and 1971."\textsuperscript{62}

The Arizona Senator presented a relatively well-structured and well-documented argument that military spending was not responsible for inflation by demonstrating statistically that funding for other areas had increased more than those for defense. While the statistics presented did support the Arizonan's position, notation must be made of the fact that no documentation was offered for the source of the data. The Senator implied, through this argument, an indictment of the liberals. Since the liberal community was responsible for advocating social-welfare programs, Goldwater was providing a scapegoat for his pro-military audience. Through this means the Senator illustrated that the position of his audience could not be linked with undesirable consequences; the problem instead stemmed from the programs advocated by the opposition.

The third form of deduction evident in Goldwater's rhetoric was reasoning from analogy. Equating fiscal responsibility with government policy, Goldwater provided an analogy to the Young
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Republican Leadership Conference. Disagreeing with Nixon's budget proposal, the Senator compared it with the budget Eisenhower had presented in 1957. He related

Years ago, a Republican President, committed to the principles of fiscal responsibility, surprised us by unveiling a spending program which busted his former budget and went in rather heavily for deficit financing. The President was Dwight D. Eisenhower. . . . the . . . year 1957. . . . it was felt that a new direction in Federal budgeting was needed to increase the popularity of the President's party in off-year elections. It was a shift to the left which I referred to as a 'dime store New Deal' budget.

The figures in that earlier budget . . . were fractional when compared with today's spending program.63

Goldwater continued by linking the budget of 1957 and the one proposed in 1974.

Now if I felt Ike's budget was a 'dime store New Deal' you can imagine what I think of the budget recently sent to Capitol Hill. Like that earlier fiscal spending plan, this budget calls for a drastic change in direction. Or perhaps I should say it is a 'change of a change' in direction.64

The validity of this analogy is questionable since the conditions in the country had changed drastically between 1957 and 1974. Another problem with this comparison resides in the motivation that the two Presidents had regarding advocating an 'inflationary budget'. At a later point in the speech, Goldwater claimed that the Nixon budget was inspired as a conciliatory measure to keep the would-be impeachers at bay. Insofar as Eisenhower had been faced with different problems, the situations were not comparable.

Barry Goldwater also used an analogy when speaking about foreign policy. After mentioning that some officials felt that the Soviet Union was building up their weapon arsenals, the Senator
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dramatized what could happen unless we escalated our own weapon development. This was accomplished through a comparison of current situations with those in England many years before. The Arizonan remembers:

Some of us older students of history remember . . . days of the 'Oxford Oath' in which Mr. Churchill tried . . . to warn the British against disarmament in the teeth of the Hitler threat . . . Winston Churchill was denounced as an enemy of peace, as a . . . warmonger . . . trying to 'frighten' the British people.

. . . it is time to frighten the British people. The developments . . . actually occurred. And they occurred so long before the British people were willing to listen to sound advice that it almost caused the lights of freedom to be extinguished forever on the 'tight little island'.

Goldwater concluded with the statement that "Looking back on Mr. Churchill's experience, I think it behooves us today to listen to the voices of warning--even if they should prove 'frightening' to our comfortable form of existence."66

The Arizonan used this specific instance in an attempt to convince the audience that what happened in England was typical of what would happen if or when disarmament was undertaken. To accept this comparison would require the audience to concede that potentially the current Soviet threat was as great as the Hitler threat was in Churchill's day.

When previously held values serve as a link between the data presented and the conclusion that the speaker asks his audience to accept, they function as a form of reasoning. If the audiences accept the principles utilized, a rationale is provided for accepting the claim. Rhetorically such a process has been referred to as the enthymeme. The enthymeme is based on syllogistic reasoning.67 In
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clarifying the use of the enthymeme, Weaver contends

Such a syllogism can be used only when the audience is willing to supply the missing proposition. The message proposition will be 'in their hearts', as it were, it will be their agreement upon some fundamental aspect of the issue being discussed. It is there, the orator does not have to 'supply it' if it is not there, he may not be able to get it in anyway—at least not as orator... The orator was logical, but he could dispense with being a pure logician because that third proposition has been established for him.68

Barry Goldwater relied on two types of values as the unstated propositions for his enthymetic structures. First, the Senator referred to feelings shared by a majority of American citizens. Second, the Arizonan secured belief by depending on conservative ideals.

Goldwater tapped two emotions held by a majority of Americans and utilized them as the unstated positions for his enthymemes. These two feelings were the desire for security and pride in America.69

The Senator appealed to security in two addresses delivered to favorable audiences. Goldwater implied the necessity for American security when he supported the concept that a new breed of isolationist was springing up in Washington, intent on cutting defense spending. Attempting to enact fear of possible aggression from Russia or China, he stated,

... the new savers want the savings to be cut out of this nation's defenses or its ability to retaliate to a possible first strike attack from Communist nations. They also want to cut those savings out of the space program and other areas where U.S.


supremacy over the Soviet Union and Communist China are especially impressive and needed.70

The desire for security was more explicitly articulated in Goldwater's support for the idea that the argument against strategic weapons and defense expenditures had been promoted against the background of the unpopular war in Vietnam. In supporting this position the Senator claimed "this approach . . . impairs our nation's ability to defend itself and its 204,000,000 citizens."71

Pride in America was the most extensive emotion that the Arizona Senator used to move his audience from data to claim. Specifically this appeal was effective by tapping the desire of most of the people to consider the United States first in its dealings. The Senator employed variations of this theme on three occasions. Initially, he spoke to an audience of Republican women seeking to engender negative reactions to the anti-war demonstrations. To accomplish this goal he referred to the pride the audience should feel in America and in the job being done by American fighting men.

Goldwater relates, "The newspapers tell us . . . our fighting men in Vietnam believe in what they are doing. . . . they believe in their country, believe in its leaders, believe in its cause and will fight for them."72 The Senator further notes

Our fighting men in Vietnam . . . have every . . . reason to be proud of what they are doing and to understand that the vast majority of . . . people support them. . . . They are making great sacrifices for their country, . . . and it would be shameful

70 California Federation of Republican Women, p. 30359.
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... if they were to ... think for one minute that their sacrifices were not deeply appreciated by their fellow Americans. 73

Speaking to the National Rifle Association concerning the possible defeat of the SST proposal, Goldwater implied the desire of most people in the United States to consider their country first. The thought of America as a second or third rate world power, incapable of domination of the aviation industry, and unable to make important technological advances would be untenable. In capitalizing on this feeling the Arizonan began,

It has been suggested that the American people are losing their national pride. ... that the American people no longer care whether their country suffers a military defeat in Indochina, the loss of respect of the rest of the world, or the loss of leadership in the air transport industry. ... that American pride has shrunk to the point where the question of strategic superiority over the Soviet Union no longer interests the people of the United States.74

The Senator continues

I believe the pride of our people in our nation is running stronger than ever and ... anyone who assumes that a majority of Americans no longer take pride in their country is making a serious miscalculation.75

Talking with an audience of retail merchants who were concerned with producing and distributing American products, Goldwater used pride of American workmanship to discredit union leaders. The Senator epitomized this strategy with the statement, "I should like to ask Mr. Meany whether he believes it might be possible to get some old-time pride in craftsmanship from the workers whom we pay so dearly."76
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More specifically, Goldwater infers that Mr. Meany is not doing every­thing at his disposal to insure the increased quality of American workmanship. He dramatizes

I wonder if . . . Mr. Meany . . . has done anything lately [so] . . . the . . . homeowner can get some fair workmanship and speed from the plumber he calls to fix a leaky faucet. . . . whether he sees anytime . . . when a homeowner can hire a carpenter and get a decent job . . . done for the exorbitant price . . . if Mr. Meany's influence couldn't get the American people better mechanical work for . . . their automobiles. I wonder if the union leaders who are showing such an arrogant, demanding face to a President struggling with a problem they helped to create might help improve the quality of American workmanship.77

The link to the listeners is intensified when they remember that the speaker rose to prominence as a merchant. This association, along with the desire of those in business to promote their products, adds impact to the allusion. The Senator also derived force for the enthymeme by comparing American products with those produced by foreign competitors. The allegation that we were losing ground in our ability to produce quality goods enhanced the effectiveness of the argument. Goldwater concluded with the statement:

I no longer take the pride that my father and my uncle and my grandfather took in the quality of Yankee workmanship. I am not puzzled that we are encountering more and more competition from abroad. . . . foreign producers are making better products than their competitors in this country. . . . Better steel is made abroad. Better and cheaper automobiles are made abroad. Better radios, televisions, recorders, and other electronic items are made abroad.78

Three conservative principles were isolated in the enthymemes
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of the Arizona Senator: (1) dislike of government intervention, (2) the need for caution before changing policy, and (3) the distrust in human nature.

Initially, on two occasions the Senator displayed the conservative dislike for excessive government interference in the lives of citizens. Speaking to the American Iron and Steel Institute, the Senator advanced the position that business faced a determined drive for more nationalization. Relying solely on his opinion and suppositions, Goldwater based his argument on conservative premises. The free enterprise system is prized by conservatives and any attempt to limit or curtail that system would be viewed with contempt. The businessmen the Senator addressed were integrally a part of the free enterprise system, and, of course wished to see it retained. Coupling preservation with another conservative premise to maximize the effectiveness of the linkage, the Senator implied that government interference in the lives of American citizens should be limited. Thus, for conservatives and businessmen, nationalization of businesses would be undesirable.

Increased government intervention provided a reason for Goldwater to oppose the draft in favor of the all volunteer military. Equating the draft with the loss of individual freedom and a fundamental human right through increased government control, the volunteer military became an attractive alternative. Goldwater further indicated that his strong belief in and emotional commitment for the all volunteer military stemmed from his conservative leanings.79
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Secondarily, Goldwater reverted to the conservative principle that societal change should only be accomplished in response to a demonstrated need in two speeches. The most specific articulation of this view was presented in an address to an all volunteer military. The Senator supported the position that the voluntary service would not be a drastic change from the system we have currently in force by asserting

The truth is that our current military forces are made up predominately of Volunteers. This is something that many people don't realize. We have in my State of Arizona for example such a large number of Volunteers that our draft call in many months has practically been non-existent.80

The Senator further supports the position by citing the statistical findings of the Gates Commission

According to the Gates Commission the great majority of servicemen are either individuals who have reenlisted after their original obligations had ended, or first-term enlistees who say they would have enlisted even had there been no threat of the draft looming over their heads. The existing base of volunteers is so large that the Gates Commission found, and I quote, 'A fully Volunteer Force of 2.5 million men can be achieved by improving pay and conditions to service sufficiently to induce approximately 75,000 additional men to enlist each year'. . . . And I feel this can be achieved.81

The Arizonan also asked for caution before accepting Nixon's 304 billion dollar budget proposal. Coupled with an emotional appeal, he told the audience

I am asking in the name of reason, in the name of sanity, of justice and enlightenment, in the name of the great God above for a moment of quiet thought and reflection.

If we can have such a moment to quiet the hysteria that grips us we may be able to proceed to the task ahead, to put in order our house of government, to eliminate the incompetent, punish the
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guilty and to make sure that what has happened may not happen again. But all this in an orderly deliberate fashion.82

Continuing on a more national level, Goldwater urged reflection for all areas of government "To the Congress, to the White House, to the Administration, to the press and the news media, to each and every one of us, I plead for restraint in this crisis. For to stay on this road to unreason means stark tragedy."83

Finally, Goldwater used the principle that man's nature was a mixture of good and evil to assist in securing belief. The discussion of human imperfections was epitomized in the Senator's addresses on war. In speaking to the Norwich graduates, the Arizonan addressed the argument of military opponents that the way to promote world peace is to object to anything or anyone used in waging war. Disproof for this claim rested with the audience acceptance of the belief that man is not by nature a noble creature. The baser tendencies of man's nature--selfishness, hatred, greed, and avarice--makes it impossible to assume that peace is possible in the world. With this idea in mind, Barry Goldwater told the Norwich graduates

It may be entirely reasonable to acknowledge that war is wasteful and brutal and non-productive. But unless all men bow to that acknowledgement and bind their ambitions and their endeavors to it, it just won't work. There is no way to pass a law which could make men forever noble, thereby eliminating his human tendencies toward avarice and greed and selfishness and hatred.84

This same view of human nature was found when the Senator spoke to the American Fighter Pilots. Goldwater began his analysis by
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saying that opponents of the military base their arguments on wishful thinking, they would have us believe that if the United States only stopped building military weapons that would be the answer to peace throughout the world. They would have us believe that . . . we could shame our enemies into following suit.  

The rigidity with which Goldwater held this idea and the inability of the Senator to accept any compromise in his assessment of human nature was demonstrated in the statement:

But, unfortunately, man's nature is not susceptible to quick change of this sort. He will, despite all the education that the academic community can cram into his skull, still have traces of greed, hatred and avarice in his nature. He will still be susceptible to the temptations and impulses which today lead men to fights and nations to war. This is no mystery. It's a fact of life. Any reasonable individual will understand and accept the premise because he knows that it is true and that it is not subject to questioning.  

3. **Backing.** The confusion of attempts to analyze conservative rhetoric in general, and Senator Barry Goldwater's oratory in particular, has resulted from an over reliance on the traditional analytic paradigm as a model for rhetorical criticism. Detection and analysis of reasoning processes using this tool has blurred the distinction between the use of a repressed warrant as the primary link between the evidence and the conclusion and when that maxim has been used to support another reasoning pattern. In the second instance the premise serves as backing for the primary warrant. Backing refers to support for the acceptability of the assumption implied in the reasoning process. As such it certifies the claim only indirectly.  

---
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when conservative postulates are used as backing, they perform a specialized function that has heretofore gone unnoticed by critics. The implied premises serve to further substantiate or provide a motivation for accepting the analysis provided by the more traditional reasoning processes. Weaver implied the value that such backing can provide when he stated, "The mere demonstration of logical connections is not enough to persuade the commonality, who instead have to be approached through certain 'places' or common perceptions of reality." Thus, the interweaving of logic with the shared beliefs of the audience enhance the possibility of establishing the desired conclusion. Barry Goldwater used conservative principles as backing for both inductive and deductive reasoning patterns.

In addressing the American Fighter Pilots Association Goldwater used inductive backing in expressing displeasure that the government had relied on civilians for shaping defense policy. To stress the error of policy he offered one item of proof, alleging that scientists had warned against development of the H bomb. He cited:

The scientists told us that the H bomb would be inordinately expensive, that it probably would not work and that its development would alter the world balance of power. . . . Not only did the H bomb work but it proved to be less expensive. . . . the Russians developed one of their own. If President Truman had listened to the advice of scientists like Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer the balance of power would have been drastically altered—but in favor of the Soviet Union.

While this unit of proof bespoke the use of the substantive warrant of generalization, an implied conservative premise served as

---
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backing for the warrant. The conservative distrust for new and scientific information provided the catalyst for accepting the reasoning.

On many occasions, Senator Goldwater relied on historical data to support his premises. The evidence itself normally provided documentation for the claim and usually entailed the use of generalization. However, this form of information also served to enact a conservative premise which served as backing. As conservatives, the audience would revere the lessons of history and use them as guides for future actions. Thus by using instances from history, the Senator forged a stronger link between the data presented and the claim. Goldwater used this means to establish that the voluntary military was the normal way of life under our system of government, that attacks on the military in this country were not new, that communists should not be trusted, and that higher wage hikes by unions were the reason why inflation was still not being controlled.

When Goldwater postulated that the voluntary military system was not a drastic change from the system we have right now, he activated both American values and conservative premises to back his generalization. After presenting two pieces of evidence indicating the number of volunteers we currently have, the Senator enacted the desire of all Americans for freedom. He said

I'm just old fashioned enough to believe that there are still a great many Americans among us who think enough of their freedom that they are willing to fight for it. Furthermore, I think the rest of the Americans are willing to pay those who serve in the military a good and ample wage, with fringe benefits, for shouldering the task.90

90Young Americans for Freedom Symposium, p. 29499.
Additionally, the proposition itself implied a conservative premise that change is undesirable. Thus, by retaining the system that required the least change, conservatives would accept the all volunteer military.

The most extensive use of conservative premises to back a deductive reasoning pattern was delivered to the Young Republican Leadership Conference. Contending that the Republican Party should pause and reflect before rushing headlong into acceptance of Nixon's budget proposal, Goldwater presented the following argument based on reasoning from analogy. The Senator began by dramatizing what could happen if man failed to proceed in a logical manner.

The . . . voice[s] of history and . . . of common sense tells us that nothing is more terrible than the torrential passions of human beings in the mass. It is like a forest fire. It surges on . . . far beyond the underbrush which is its first victim—on until it consumes the monarchs of the forest and the humble habitats of man. On and on until everything lies stricken in a desert of charred remains.

Such a storm . . . if those who fuel the fire continue at their frenzied pace, can go far beyond the ruin of individuals. It can destroy vital institutions.91

Relying on history as a guide, Goldwater projected what could happen to our society if this hysteria is not controlled. He stated, "For hysteria leads to panic. Panic leads to chaos. And chaos means national disaster." 92 He continued

The great past scourges that have swept nations and civilizations before them have recognized [sic] no distinctions. Nor will this one. Disaster will fall not only upon the President and people who defend him . . . it will hit the innocent as well as the guilty. It will sweep us all in its great vortex of tragedy.93
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Drawing the argument to a close, the Senator utilized another analogy to emphasize that the time is one of potential crisis. He states:

Forty years ago, in the great banking crisis, President Roosevelt told the American people that they had nothing to fear but fear. . . . it happened to be far from the truth. For there was plenty for people to fear at that time. I am not telling you there is nothing to fear but fear. For there is much room for fear.94

While the analogies might secure audience acceptance of the conclusion, the backing provided greatly enhanced that possibility. The Senator urged a time for reflection and careful deliberation before action. This orientation reflected the conservative attitude of change—that change should be accomplished slowly, deliberately, in response to an undoubted social need and have the preservation of the community and of the institutions of society as prime considerations. These are desirable goals for conservatives and the possible loss or destruction of them would act as a strong motivation for the audience not to rush carelessly into action. By adding a reference to the lessons of history, Goldwater further enhanced his position. As conservative Republicans, the audience would rely on historical precedents as guides for future actions. If history warned of undesirable consequences stemming from actions based on emotion, the audience would probably heed the warning.

Refutation. While frequently Goldwater presented a position and attempted to support it, on other occasions he would mention the premise advocated by his opposition and counter it. These refutational strategies were most noticeable on discussions of military matters. In
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discussing the point that the military were opponents of war, Goldwater utilized a three-fold tactic. Initially, he postulated that it would be nice if all men desired peace but such a dream failed to take into account man's perverse nature. Secondarily, the Senator advanced the contention that the military men are the strongest proponents for freedom, security, and safety, and coupled these feelings with the work done by the military.

A different strategy, more often employed by Goldwater, was direct refutation of the argument. For example, through the use of undocumented statistics, the Senator sought to refute the argument that Vietnam was not the primary cause of inflation. The same tactic of directly countering the arguments was found in Goldwater's discussion of the all volunteer military. Specifically, Goldwater directly countered his opposition by supporting the positions that the voluntary system was not a drastic change from the one we have now, that the volunteer system would work, and that the cost of instituting such a system is overestimated.

A specific illustration of Goldwater's refutational strategies can be found as he countered the claim that the volunteer system would be incapable of handling national emergencies. First the Senator utilized direct support for the premise that manpower would be available should such emergencies arise. He began by indicating, "we can have a sufficient existing Reserve to meet any National Emergency. Thus it will be the Reserve forces which will provide immediate support for the active forces. Like the active duty forces, the reserve forces
will be recruited on a voluntary basis."  

When asserting that there was sufficient manpower in the active forces and the Reserve to handle emergencies, the Senator mentioned that heretofore these men had not been effectively utilized.

I have to say in a rather critical way that both of these sources of manpower have not been completely used in the Vietnam situation. Some Air National Guard groups have served in Vietnam, and some Reserve Air Lift Forces have helped, but there are literally hundreds of thousands of people who could have been used, who wanted to be used, but were not called up.  

While the Reserves would also entail voluntary enlistment, Goldwater indicated that this would pose no problem by saying,

The legislation which we have sponsored will automatically increase the drill pay for Reserve participation, at the same time that it provides pay increases for the active component. In my view, this increase will be sufficient to encourage reserve enlistments adequate to maintain a voluntary reserve force which is large enough to support a voluntary active duty force.

In addition to directly countering the idea that sufficient manpower did not exist for a successful volunteer military to handle national emergencies, Goldwater demonstrated initially that the proposal being considered would take a

common sense approach of providing for a stand-by draft, in case of an emergency. Conscription could be re instituted by an act of Congress, almost immediately, because our plan provides for the continued registration of all young men in the United States even though the draft itself will be done away with.

The Senator from Arizona continued by showing that the draft does not provide forces for handling national emergencies anyway. "In the event of a national emergency, of course, we can always go back to the draft system. It takes just an act of Congress to set it in motion.

---
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But conscription cannot provide emergency forces, it never has, and I see no way, after 37 years of Reserve service that it can. 99

**Action step.** In every speech that Barry Goldwater delivered to favorable audiences he was seeking adherence to his view. However, in very few instances did the Arizonan provide a specific plan of action for his listeners. Since the allegation has been leveled against conservatives saying their philosophy inhibits their ability to formulate specific policy, attention must be given to Goldwater's attempts to move his audiences to action. The Senator used a modified plan of action to retain the Young Americans for Freedom leaders in governmental service. In seeking justification for his position, the Arizona Senator relied on polarization and references to basic conservative premises. Through a discussion of the accomplishments of the Nixon Administration as opposed to those of the previous Democratic regimes, Goldwater polarized the position of the two ideologies. Because the Arizonan's audience was comprised of conservative Republicans, both the references to the conservative beliefs and the indictments of the liberal principles would have activated a response of strengthening political commitments. Goldwater stated that voting for the Nixon Administration was an endorsement for

- decentralization of government authority and a vast reduction in government expenditures.
- ... an [end] to the longest war in our history on honorable terms.
- ... the release of American prisoners of war.
- ... a policy of opposition to appeals for amnesty for
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The Senator continued his argument with the statement that "we will be called upon in the future to make some very hard decisions involving the national welfare on one hand and individual liberties on the other. Because conservation of individual liberty is an important precept of conservatism, Goldwater provided a motivation for the audience to remain active in government work by saying

It is my fervent hope that all of you who are concerned with the question of freedom will recognize the threats as they arise and rush to the barricades to do battle and to oppose any move that could take us even one small step closer to regimentation and the totalitarian concepts which have destroyed so many governments and so many civilizations in the past.

When talking about unions causing inflation, the Senator also provided his listeners with a guideline for future behavior. Speaking to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Goldwater contended that we will not be able to control inflation as long as unions wield such power. He stated, "Not until Congress takes action to cut down on the powers, the liberties, the immunities and the privileges of our large labor unions will we make the kind of progress which is needed."

Goldwater supported this premise by citing the example of Judge Clemet Haynesworth

And I can only cite to you the great power exercised by the union bosses in the Senate action in rejecting the nomination of Judge Clemet Haynesworth for appointment to the Supreme Court as an example of their continuing influence. Many knowledgeable

---
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observers chalked up this administration defeat as a direct victory for union pressure.\textsuperscript{104}

After presenting an example to illustrate union influence, Goldwater postulated that the only means of limiting this power was by actions of an informed public. Initially, the Senator mentioned the importance of securing correct information. He stated "We need more and more spokesmen who know the root cause of inflation . . . . The public must be made to understand that liberal spokesmen who blame the entire inflation problem on increased corporate profits are playing the role of the demagogue."\textsuperscript{105}

Next the Arizonan presented the effect of the public's being informed on union pressure. He stated, "Now . . . is the time to develop a public so well informed that it will overpower the influence of the union bosses in the halls of Congress . . . ."\textsuperscript{106}

As is demonstrated through the development of this unit of proof, the Senator was asking his audience to become informed on the issue of inflation. In this regard Goldwater indicted unions and the liberals for perpetuating the problem. However, while the Arizonan alleged that having articulate spokesmen would overpower the influence of union leaders in Congress, he failed to provide the analysis for how this would be accomplished. Thus, while the action desired is within the capabilities of the audience, a question remains as to whether the mere securing of the information would be sufficient to counter union influence.
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A more realistic course of action was advanced to the American Iron and Steel Institute. The problem that the Arizonan cites is that business is failing to adequately present its position to Congress and to the American people. The Senator contends that "Unless you [businessmen] plan ahead you will... be wondering why you couldn't get your message across to the people and their elected representatives."\(^{107}\)

The Senator from Arizona presented a three-fold plan of action for business leaders to consider. First, the Senator presented the position that business should build its own 'personalized' communication network. He contends that these spokesmen should "go into the community rooms of the schools, the union clubs and rotary clubs—... they should appear on local TV and radio to confront the critics and debate the issues."\(^{108}\)

Second, the Arizonan felt that businessmen must compete effectively in the crucial market place of ideas. He specified, "I'm referring to the intellectual market place—the deep-water mainstream of idea formulation which has the most pervasive impact on public attitudes and public policies."\(^{109}\) In citing the failure of business to fulfill this responsibility, Goldwater continues

Business has not only abdicated the intellectual arena to the liberal left but they have also been pouring salt on their own wounds by giving millions of dollars each year to academic institutions who regard free enterprise with contempt.\(^{110}\)

Finally, Goldwater advanced the position that the business community should become actively involved in political activities at
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the local and national levels. The Senator began by indicating that "recent legislation has not been in the public interest." In dramatizing what the business community needed to do, the Arizonan stated that they should first support candidates who represent their interests.

You should employ all the legitimate means at your disposal to support candidates

--Who want to improve the competitive enterprise system instead of tearing it down.

--Who are convinced that our system works best with less government interference in the market place rather than more.112

Additionally, the Senator advised

Business must play an active role in putting together a strong team in Congress who can break up the disaster lobby, scatter the prophets of doom and dismantle the interventionist bureaucracy. I'm talking about those people who preach about the 'evils of capitalism' instead of its strengths . . . who support more and more federal agencies to regulate business in order to protect 'the people' from 'the big bad guys'--the FTC, EPC, EPA and all the others.113

The three-fold plan of action that Barry Goldwater presented to the business leaders was a workable one. Although such a plan would not guarantee the desired result, such action appears to be a step in the right direction for the business community.

Although often seeking adherence for the issues advanced, the Arizona Senator rarely provided a specific plan of action that he wanted his audience to follow. A review of the topics chosen by Goldwater provides a reason for this lack. In most instances, the Arizonan sought to provide information for his listeners. His themes, specifically regarding the military and most economic issues, were
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unsuitable for realistic action on the part of the audiences. These groups could do little to defeat Nixon's budget proposal, to increase defense spending while cutting social-welfare spending, to halt the current Soviet buildup, to stop the anti-war demonstrations, or to enact the all volunteer military. However, because Goldwater felt that his listeners should be aware of these events, these became the topics on which he spoke.

Inconsistencies. Adherence to conservative premises permeated the rhetoric of the Arizona Senator. For the most part, Goldwater represented these principles in a coherent and consistent manner. However, when discussing human rights, government interference in the lives of citizens, and Richard Nixon, inconsistencies were noted. The first two areas mentioned involved a philosophical inconsistency on the part of Goldwater. The change of the Senator's view of the President emanated from the belief that Nixon had abdicated the ideological commitments of Republicanism and conservatism.

1. Human rights. Barry Goldwater, as all conservatives, believed in fundamental human rights. The Senator adhered to this premise when speaking to the Young Americans for Freedom regarding the volunteer military. In fact, he used the premise as the basis for his stand on the issue by stating

Now when the law is used to tell a young man how he shall spend several years of his life, this causes an invasion of the most precious and fundamental of human rights, the right of each citizen to live his own life. . . . And to do this as you may choose. This is why as a conservative I am so strongly and emotionally committed to the voluntary military approach.114

114Young Americans for Freedom Symposium, p. 29499.
While through this statement Goldwater demonstrated support for the precept that men should have the right to do what they can without trespassing on others, and should be restrained only when necessary, this same principle underwent a subtle change in another address. In discussing the Moratorium demonstrations, the Senator told his audience of Republican women:

I don't care whether you call the agitations an expression of the American will to end the bloodshed. I don't care whether you call them proper exercises in the right of protest or the right of assembly or the right of free speech. . . .

. . . the fact remains that these demonstrations are playing into the hands of the people whose business it is to kill American fighting men.\(^{115}\)

From this statement the conclusion can be reached that for Goldwater the importance of human rights varied according to the issue being discussed. When the principle could be used to support the Arizonan's position, individual human rights became a paramount concern. However, when considering a topic about which Goldwater disagreed, these same human rights must be discounted. In all fairness to the Senator, securing support for the thesis of the speeches in which these positions were articulated could have been more important than remaining consistent to an ideological precept. Thus, both support for the volunteer military and the discrediting of the anti-war demonstrations could have assumed precedence over the specific issue of human rights.

2. **Government intervention.** According to conservative dictates, the functions of government should be balanced and diffused and should be discharged virtuously, justly, and with minimum interference.

\(^{115}\) California Federation of Republican Women, p. 30359.
in the lives of citizens. Closely linked to this concept is the feeling of conservatives that liberty is thwarted when individuals become subordinate to the state. Adherence to this principle was responsible for Goldwater's dislike and consequent attacks on the liberal philosophy, nationalization, socialism, and communism. The Senator from Arizona alluded to this idea when speaking to the Young Americans for Freedom regarding the accomplishments of the Nixon Administration. He made such statements as a vote for Nixon "was an endorsement of moves promised by the President aimed at decentralization of government authority and a vast reduction of government expenditures," and "the constriction of individual freedom by government fiat is shrouded in idealism and alleged crises." ^116 In a more extensive reference Goldwater remarked,

> We have recently been through the whole negative, counter-productive business of government-ordered price and wage controls and we are seeing new threats of government interference in the lives of American citizens arising in other areas. ^117

Especially in light of the indictments found in Goldwater's addresses concerning his fear of nationalization of industry, the address to the 13th Annual Southwest Transportation Seminar is puzzling. The major contention advanced in the speech was that future developments in transportation would be beyond the financial competence of private companies. With the Arizonan's predisposition for the free enterprise system, surprisingly he stated that

> we have reached a stage in our transportation development whereby the vehicles of the future will be so tremendous that they

---
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will be beyond the financial competence of private companies to develop and manufacture. Government help will be an absolute necessity. Consequently, the development of an overall national policy on transportation becomes more imperative every day.  

He continued by discussing the problems in commercial aviation, "They [problems] are many and varied and exceedingly complicated. They literally cry out for the development of a sound national policy at the federal level." The Senator concluded the address by saying, "I am confident that our private aviation industry with the help of a modernized government policy will be able to remedy our problems and clear the way for an amazing, hard-to-believe era of faster and easier travel in all areas of transportation."

3. Richard Nixon. The inconsistencies that were evident in Senator Goldwater's rhetoric concerning Richard Nixon were understandable in light of the time period encompassed in this study. The impetus for the Senator's change of allegiance was Watergate. For Goldwater, justification for these changes of opinion was necessary because the President had abdicated on ideological commitments. Additionally, and probably more germane, Nixon had, by these shifts, discredited the G.O.P. and conservatism. To Goldwater the only course of action possible under those circumstances was to reject his former colleague.

Barry Goldwater's support for President Nixon had been demonstrated on both a personal and political level. In dramatizing that Nixon was a man who placed his country's needs above political

---
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considerations, Goldwater had remarked that the President's use of wage and price controls were necessary. He said, "I can only say that when this time for decision was reached, they had in the White House a President who was unafraid to take steps that were indicated regardless of the consequences of his own political future or that of his party."\textsuperscript{121} On other occasions the Senator reminded his audience that Nixon was a Republican. He contended "I am not suggesting ... any slavish adherence to each and every policy that comes from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue merely because its present resident is a card-carrying member of the G.O.P. in good standing."\textsuperscript{122} The Senator continued, "But I believe the President of the United States, as Commander-in-Chief of the nation's Armed Forces and as the man designated by the Constitution to carry out the strategic policy of this country, deserves a lot better from his fellow Republicans."\textsuperscript{123}

In a similar line of development, the Arizonan asked for support of Richard Nixon because

whether you believe that some Administration moves ran counter to our basic conservative tenets, the fact remains that when the voters went to the polls in 1972, the choice was between all-out capitulation to the New Left or support for the nearest thing this country has seen in 40 years to a conservative administration.\textsuperscript{124}

Through this statement Goldwater established that Nixon was politically conservative. Additionally, he planted in the audience's mind the idea that the American public had endorsed the President for
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that reason. In emphasizing this point, Goldwater set up the line of analysis that was to serve as a starting point for his vindication of the Watergate crimes. For the liberals to regain political control they had to locate an issue through which they could attack the Nixon Administration. Goldwater claimed that "the Watergate situation is being used by the liberals to try and discredit and destroy the mandate of 1972 and the conservative policies upon which it was built." The Arizonan stresses "I would certainly hope that Young Americans for Freedom and young people everywhere would insist on the retention of the constructive accomplishments of the Nixon Administration no matter how strenuously they might object to the Watergate affair."

The first irregularity that is noted in the Senator's treatment of Richard Nixon is closely associated with the allegation that the President and his Administration were considered politically conservative. In the same address in which he spoke of the conservative mandate that elected the President in 1972, the Arizonan contended

It was not the existence of conservative ideology in the White House or in the Committee to Reelect the President which brought on the stupidities and irregularities of the Watergate. Rather—and let me emphasize and underline this assertion—it was the lack of ideology and the lack of a deeply rooted philosophy of life which brought on the unfortunate and unforgivable activity that has been uncovered in the Watergate investigation.

Goldwater justified his disassociation with the President on the issue of Watergate on the basis of the violation of a specific concept. The Senator articulated his position specifically by stating, "I am in no way condoning or justifying or excusing the crimes committed

---
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in the Watergate break in and related activities. I see these activities as directly opposed to the principles which I believe conservatism incorporates." He stated, "No sincere conservative that I know would ever adopt the idea that the end justifies the means as seems to have been the case in the Watergate fiasco." Goldwater's strategy became clear when he stated that the liberals, not the conservatives, believed that the end justified the means. To support this position, the Senator cited Mr. Ellsberg's theft of confidential and classified material, and the "virtual enshrining by the liberals of Angela Davis, the Berrigan Brothers, the peace rioters, and the war dissenters..." Watergate was also partially responsible for the Senator's change of opinion on Nixon's economic policy. In two addresses Goldwater sought support for the President in this area. The Arizonan remarked that Nixon's inspired attempts to solve inflation were "heroic efforts of the administration" and he referred to "the President's courageous tax recommendation." Speaking to the National Retail Merchants Association, the Arizona Senator supported the President's wage and price control program by saying, "I do not believe that the President of the United States had any choice. I believe the course he took was made inevitable by the inattention to sound financial policy which has characterized the Federal Government through much of the last
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30 years." On both of these occasions the Senator praised the efforts of the Nixon Administration in attempting to control inflation while subtly implying that the liberals and/or the Democrats, were responsible for present economic conditions.

However, when Goldwater spoke to the Young Republican Leadership Conference early in 1974, the thesis of his address was that the Republican was in trouble because of Nixon's proposed 304 billion dollar budget proposal. In opposing the budget, Goldwater alluded to the fact that Nixon had abdicated the conservative position and had sold out to the liberals in an attempt to pacify his enemies. The Arizonan claimed

Now, ladies and gentlemen, if the President's advisors believe that any progress can be made toward appeasing Mr. Nixon's would-be impeachers by compromising economic policy, they are badly mistaken. If they believe the President's position with his liberal critics can be improved through a splurge of extravagance with the taxpayer's money, they do not understand the thinking of today's liberal-to-radical leaders.134

In shifting from support of Richard Nixon's economic incentives to condemning his 304 billion dollar budget request, Goldwater attempted to prove that the President had forsaken the principles of his party for the sake of political expediency.

Persuasive Devices

Barry Goldwater relied heavily on non-argumentative tactics for securing audience acceptance of his messages. While influential with the listeners, these strategies were not concerned with the logical
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establishment of claims or with the issues under consideration. Rather
the devices are utilized to enhance feelings of consubstantiality
between speaker and listener. The Senator utilized three persuasive
devices in his rhetoric to favorably disposed audiences: identification,
adulation, and polarization. In polarizing groups, the Arizonan
employed fear appeals which were developed around the loss of precious
values. A review of the manner in which the Arizona Senator employed
these devices not only underscores Goldwater's rhetorical philosophy,
but assists in understanding the man and his view of the world.

Identification. A common means used by persuaders to gain a
hearing from an audience is identification. The Senator made frequent
use of this technique with favorably disposed audiences. Specifically,
Goldwater approached identification on three levels. First, he estab­
lished a link with the audience. Second, he mentioned his affiliation
with the issue. Finally, he equated the message with his listeners'
interests.

1. Speaker-Audience. Goldwater used identification when he
associated himself with the members of his audience. The Senator per­
ceived himself as an authority and as a prophet of truth. Thus,
identification between the audience and speaker served the function of
validating the positions held by the hearers. In essence, through
such a linkage, Goldwater was saying 'I am right and because you share
the same orientation I do, you are correct also'.

The establishment of a common group through speaker-audience
identification can be demonstrated when Goldwater related self and
audience through political party affiliation or ideology. In numerous
speeches Goldwater sought allegiance from his listeners because they were Republicans. Illustrative of this strategy, the Senator said that many political commentators and alleged experts would like to believe that the Republican party is planning to roll over and play dead in the 1974 elections because of Watergate and other problems which show our party to be down in the public opinion polls.\(^\text{135}\)

Using an analogy to tell that this would not happen, the Senator stated

> I can only tell you that the people who are writing off the Republican Party and bemoaning the possible fate of the two party system today, are the same ones that told us after my defeat in 1964 that the GOP was breathing its last. And who told us after McGovern's historic defeat in 1972 that the Democrats were about to gasp their last political breath.\(^\text{136}\)

On other occasions the Arizonan established a common bond with his audience on the basis of their conservatism. For example, Goldwater reminded the Young Americans for Freedom that

> At one of your very first rallies in Madison Square Garden, I remember voicing the opinion that conservatism was 'the wave of the future' in American politics. Needless to say, that comment drew resounding approval from the members of the Young Americans for Freedom, but it was largely discounted as 'wishful thinking' in the media and in many segments of the political community. But you know and I know and America knows that long ago prediction was an accurate one and one which we were destined to see fulfilled.\(^\text{137}\)

The Senator capitalized on this relationship by stating that the organization had "come a long way and your progress has kept pace with and helped lead the advance made by the conservative movement in this country over the past decade."\(^\text{138}\)

Another means of identifying with the audience is found when, in talking to the Young Americans for Freedom, Goldwater indicated his
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long years of working with young people. He said

Throughout my political life, I have always urged young people to become active in politics and to aspire to public office and government service. And I am proud of the fact that many young people who sought my advice ten or more years ago are today holding positions of trust and responsibility in the political parties of their choosing and in various branches of government.\textsuperscript{139}

The Senator's distrust of intellectuals is evident in a variance of speaker-audience identification. Goldwater was speaking to the American Iron and Steel Institute concerning the need for business to send spokesmen into communities to represent their position. Implicit in his statement was the view that academicians are not necessarily in a position to impart true knowledge. The underlying assumption is that there are individuals, however, that are in such a position. Goldwater and the members of his audience were members of this elite. He delineated:

Members of these teams should be foremen as well as executives. Above all, they must be articulate salesmen of the true facts. In fact, respected blue collar workers may be more convincing than the board chairman. They might not have college degrees—Hell, I don't have one!—but they know best how to communicate with their peers. The only equipment and training they need are unvarnished pro and con fact sheets on the major issues - plus an incentive.\textsuperscript{140}

2. Speaker-Issue. In dramatizing his personal concern with the issues, Goldwater indirectly alluded to his expertise on the topics. Although these statements did not in actuality establish or enhance the Senator's credibility, the Arizonan perceived that the audiences would interpret them as ethos-strengthening. For example, when speaking to the 13th Annual Southwest Transportation Seminar concerning the need
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for development of the SST, Goldwater said

I am perhaps more acutely aware of these developments because of my great interest in and love for the United States Air Force and its relationship to flying in general. At the present time my Senate assignments include the Committees on Armed Services and on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.\textsuperscript{141}

On two different occasions Goldwater also dramatized his knowledge regarding inflation. When speaking to the National Retail Merchants Association, the Senator presented the premise that he had been aware of the nation's economic problems for a long time by indicating

For I was an eye witness to much of the extravagance and waste and irresponsibility [sic] which plied one Federal deficit on top of another during the Kennedy and Johnson years. I was one of those who raised my feeble voice in the cause of sound government financial policies and in warning about the run-away inflation which would follow the continual deficit financing by the Federal Government.\textsuperscript{142}

Strengthening the linkage between himself and his advocated position, Goldwater mentioned that the premise he is advancing is inconsistent with his normal predisposition. He mentions, "I'm sure you realize that I am perhaps one of the last people on Capital [sic] Hill who could be expected to sanction wage and price controls."\textsuperscript{143}

A similar developmental pattern of identifying speaker and issue was found when Goldwater addressed the Industrial College of the Armed Forces alleging that labor unions were major causes of inflation.

I have been one of those who has been arguing . . . against the special privileges which we have granted the large labor unions through Federal law. I have . . . warned that we would someday reach a time of reckoning. I argued that in our great zeal to equalize the forces of capital and labor in the early 30's we
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allowed the pendulum [sic] to swing too far, that we have invested union leaders with unjustified power over the economic well-being of the nation, that management and the public were not equal partners with labor before the law in this equation.\textsuperscript{144}

The Arizonan continued by remembering "As early as 1961, I wrote a paper which was titled 'The Forgotten American' in which I pointed to the squeeze that was being put on the average American taxpayer and consumer because of special preferences granted the union bosses."\textsuperscript{145}

A final example of Goldwater's personal identification with the issue is demonstrated when he spoke on the military. In discussing the all volunteer force, the Senator reminded the audience that "the reason I was originally deeply interested . . . was as a result of my annual tours of duty with the Air Force in Personnel at the Pentagon."\textsuperscript{146}

Further, Goldwater states

this is not a new cause to me. . . . I came to the conclusion to support this position during the last five years of my military service of 37 years as a Reserve Officer. . . . As I watched the inefficiency of maintaining the draft I became convinced that we had to institute a different system. In acting on this belief I helped to draft the Republican National platform in '64, which pledged to end the draft altogether and as soon as possible. Also, I remember the very first speech of that . . . campaign . . . when I strongly endorsed the Voluntary system.\textsuperscript{147}

3. \textbf{Issue-Audience}. Realizing that even a favorably disposed audience would be more likely to act on a proposition when their interests would be served best by doing so, Goldwater employed a final means of identification. Through the establishment of a bond between the audiences' interest and the intent of the message, the Senator
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sought acceptance of the entire speech as a package. Speaking to the Norwich graduates, the Senator posited that a vast majority of Americans are proponents of peace. He cited the military as adherents to this attitude. Linking this premise to his audience, the Senator said

"Most of you will be part of that system only briefly. Your education at Norwich has been, for the most part, a preparation for careers in civilian life. But you have also been trained to take your place beside men who are devoting their lives to service in our Armed Forces."148

The Arizonan also utilized this technique when speaking to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces regarding inflation. He stated the purpose of the speech by saying:

"I should like to discuss . . . a problem which I believe could be the most troublesome that our nation is likely to confront in the decade of the 70's . . . a problem which affects all areas of our lives . . . and which contains more seeds of disruption than anything . . . on either the domestic or the foreign horizon . . . . It is the problem of the disappearing dollar . . . the problem of skyrocketing prices . . . the problem which can lead us to insolvency on one hand or outright depression on the other."149

Goldwater further linked the issue of inflation to the military with the comment

"This [inflation] is a question, among other things, which is perhaps the greatest problem confronting the military of this nation and those leaders among us who are charged with the responsibility of national defense, the security of our 204 million people, the maintenance of our obligations throughout the world and the honoring of our just commitments in the community of nations."150

Audience adulation. Individuals like to hear favorable comments concerning their importance or which praise desirable personality
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characteristics. Barry Goldwater, realizing this, employed flattery in this rhetoric. While the audiences that the Senator addressed were favorably disposed toward both the speaker and the topics, Goldwater used adulation to insure the reinforcing of audience attitudes. To do this the Senator told various audiences how sophisticated, trustworthy, courageous, and well trained they were, and that the hope for the future rested with them.

The Arizonan, speaking to the 13th Annual Southwest Transportation Seminar, linked himself with the issue of transportation development by indicating that his Senate assignments included the Committee on Armed Services and on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. Employing flattery to increase his credibility and enhance himself in the eyes of the audience, Goldwater mentioned, "I'm sure that I don't have to stress to this sophisticated audience the fact that transportation plays a vital role in virtually all considerations of these two committees." The same technique was used when the Senator spoke to the Young Republican Leadership Conference. He said, "Although this is a Young Republican group, I am sure it possesses much more sophistication than is necessary to realize how fast polls can change in the politics of today."

The Senator flattered the Directors of the American Iron and Steel Institute by insinuating that they were honest, dependable, and trustworthy, and that the general public would find them believable. He stated:

---
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Most people in this country work for you and you work for them. You are part of their community. Most important, they want to listen and they believe in you. They sense that they are not getting 'the truth and nothing but the truth' from the octopus TV screen in their living room.153

On two occasion, Goldwater appealed to the courage of his hearers. Indicating that man is not a noble being, the Arizonan told the graduates of Norwich that "if this were true, there would be no need for defense expenditure of any kind and there would be no need for courageous, well-trained young men like yourselves."154 In using a similar strategy, the Senator told the Young Americans for Freedom that they had a responsibility of not only perpetuating conservative ideals but also of opposing any programs or politics with the intent of infringing on individual freedom. Impact was added to this appeal with the statement "To avoid responsibility in this fashion is the coward's way. It is unworthy of consideration by young people like yourselves who hold firm opinions and deep convictions about the way our country should be run."155

Speaking to the same audience, Goldwater used another technique of audience flattery. Indicating that the future of America could be shaped by the dedicated efforts of young people like those in his audience, the Senator claimed:

I feel very strongly that the young people of today are America's hope for the future. But it would be a vain hope indeed if young people in large numbers became disillusioned over Watergate and similar developments and decided to forego politics and government service as activities unworthy of their best efforts. If anything, Watergate is no reason for young people to avoid
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political activity in government service. It is instead an over­
riding reason why they should.156

Finally, Goldwater used a variation of audience flattery when
he expressed to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces his confi­
dence in the intelligence of the American people. Notation must be
made of the fact that the Arizonan's statement qualified confidence on
the premise that the population must have the true facts and implied
that Goldwater and his audience were in the best position to provide
them with this truth. He stated

I have a great confidence in the ability of the majority of
the American people to reach the right conclusion once the facts
are presented to them. Our current trouble is that we have not
been diligent enough or determined enough to explain the economic
facts of life in a fashion which can be readily understood.157

Polarization. Perhaps the most distinctive persuasive strategy
that is evident in Barry Goldwater's rhetoric is polarization. Remem­
bering that the Senator views his positions as the only correct ones,
one can understand why this particular technique is so extensively
used by Goldwater. The Arizonan labels various groups in accordance
with their acceptance or unacceptance of his view of reality. Those
groups which share Goldwater's orientation are commended and offer the
hope for correcting the problems of society. Three of these groups are
alluded to in the Senator's rhetoric to favorable audiences—business
leaders, the military, and the President and his Administration. An
interesting point to note here is that the audiences to whom Goldwater
was speaking were either members of these groups or shared the political
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Not all groups, however, shared the Senator's perception of reality. These groups were labeled as enemies and were blamed for societal ills and unless checked would cause the destruction of the American way of life. Indicted by Goldwater as undesirable were communists, Democrats, liberals, the press, intellectuals, and union leaders. Aside from specific union leaders, the only individual singled out as an enemy was ex-Secretary of Defense, McNamara. By indicating that the interests and work of business leaders and the military were being thwarted by 'the enemies' the Senator insured an attentive audience.

While the polarization attempts employed by Goldwater were interwoven on the levels of friend, issue, and enemy, some common developmental patterns can be noted. In all instances, the Senator identified the favored group, equated their position on the issue with praiseworthy aims, isolated the group or groups thwarting those aims, and further indicated the results that could be expected if those negative forces were not controlled. For clarity of analysis, Goldwater's use of polarization has been divided into attempts dealing with foreign policy, and those concerned with economic policies.

1. Foreign policy. In five of the Arizonan's speeches he discussed the necessity for a strengthening of America's military establishment. In essence, Goldwater's major premise in these rhetorical situations was that the United States needed to be strong defensively. This need emanated from the desire to preserve the American way of life. Based on a genuine distrust for any system of government that subordinated
individuals to the state, the Senator saw socialists, communists, and totalitarian governments as a threat to the freedoms and liberties United States citizens enjoy. History had demonstrated that governments committed to these ends should not be trusted. Because such forces have to be contained, the Senator argued against any program or group that placed domestic issues above foreign policy. Although generally opposed to government intervention, the area of foreign policy was one area where government action was justified. In fact, the power of the Federal government to act in the area of foreign affairs was granted by the Constitution. Not only did the Senator seek government responsibility for defense, but he argued that the best means for guaranteeing the security of the nation was through support, psychologically and financially, for the military.

Specifically, Barry Goldwater's discussion of foreign policy focused on the issue of the Vietnam war. Public frustration over the conflict had resulted in attacks on both official government policy and on the military industrial complex. Addressing the National Rifle Association he relates,

the argument against strategic weapons and defense expenditures has been promoted against the backdrop of the unpopular War in Indochina.

The campaign against our defense system and the military-industrial complex has been building steadily for the past three years.158

The Senator's rhetorical strategy sought to establish the concept that unless America remained committed to a strong defense capability, we would jeopardize our freedom and security.
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Goldwater identified two groups whose ideas should be supported in the area of foreign policy. Initially, the Senator claimed that the foreign policy mandates of President Nixon and his advisors should be followed. He also sought support for the military to have more of a say in foreign policy decisions.

Goldwater's support for the President was articulated in an address entitled "Vietnam and the Protests" in which he stated

I do believe that we must close ranks and give him [the President] the support he needs on big, fundamental, strategic decisions that affect not only the future of the United States and the Republican party but the future of the entire free world. His policy on Vietnam is just such a fundamental matter.\textsuperscript{159}

The Senator specified that the goals of the Nixon Administration were the same as his and the majority of Americans—peace. The Senator stated

I want an honorable peace. The American people... want an end to the killing. . . . When any member of Congress makes a public demand for American withdrawals from Southeast Asia, he is not out ahead of concerned Republicans like myself in his desire for peace. He is not out ahead of the American people. He is not out ahead of Richard M. Nixon. In fact, he isn't even with the President and his advisors when it comes to time spent in attempts to end this unfortunate and unhappy conflict we inherited from the Democrats.\textsuperscript{160}

In this manner he emphasized the praiseworthiness of the aims of those he was urging his audience to support. Implicit in his statement was also a vindication of the current administration through an indication that they had not created the problem.

The second group that Goldwater sought support for was the military. The Senator indicated the necessity for the military to have
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a say in vital foreign policy matters by relating:

I do not recommend a general for the office of the Secretary of Defense. I do not necessarily insist that civilian experts be replaced in the Defense establishment. . . . I do, however, argue strenuously and persistently [sic] that military experience and military men be given their proper voice in the determination of policies upon which our safety and the protection of our millions of citizens must ultimately depend.161

The Senator forwarded two lines of analysis to support the premise that the aims of the military were praiseworthy. First, Goldwater told his audiences that the men of the military were proponents of peace. Second, he stressed that the military were fighting to preserve the freedoms and security of the country.

In presenting the position that the military desires peace, Goldwater stated:

It does no good to say you are for peace and against war. . . . The vast majority of people all over the world subscribe to it, and of those, the most sincere, I have no doubt, are the members of the American military establishment.162

The most direct statement that Goldwater used to show that the military are proponents of peace was by saying that the

strongest, best qualified opponents of war in any nation are the men who have seen it at first hand, who have experienced the suffering and the heartbreak and the inconvenience of armed conflict.163

Second, Goldwater notes that the military are fighting to preserve the societal values of our country. The Senator epitomized this technique when he told the Norwich graduates that

I want to emphasize . . . that theirs [military] is one of the most honorable professions which our society has to offer at a time
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of crucial importance to our Nation's security and the cause of human freedom throughout the world.164

In the same address, Goldwater told his audience

if we had no military, Communist aggressors in all parts of the world would feel justified in reaching for additional territory and more power over the lives of innocent people. This is what happened in Korea. It's what almost happened in the Chinese off-shore islands of Quemoy and Matsu. . . . in Lebanon, in Berlin and in Cuba.165

Barry Goldwater polarized the groups that were opposed to the President and the military on matters of foreign policy. He attacked the news media for their reporting on Nixon's efforts to end the war and on perpetuating anti-military attitudes. Goldwater also charged that the emphasis on cost effectiveness was the hallmark of the McNamara era in the Department of Defense and charged that this time period had resulted in an overemphasis on civilian decision-making in military matters. However, the majority of the Senator's efforts were devoted to establishing the premise that the liberals and the leftists were using social-welfare issues to effectuate a reduction in defense allocations.

Goldwater leveled two charges against the news media. First, the Senator claimed that the news media was using Vietnam to discredit the President. The Arizonan was speaking to an audience of Republicans seeking support for a G.O.P. President's policies when he stated,

Where Vietnam is concerned, I am convinced that the nation's news media has a lot to answer for. . . . the easiest way to get plenty of attention in the newspapers, on radio and television is to oppose the President of the United States.166
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The Senator explained

In Washington at least one newspaper has a name for it. . . . The Washington Post . . . calls the process 'the breaking of a President'.

The whole idea is that certain liberal critics learned how to 'break' Lyndon B. Johnson and force his retirement using the Vietnam issue as a club. These same forces, convinced that President Nixon is following much the same course, believed the process can be repeated.167

Goldwater also mentioned that the press was helping perpetuate anti-military attitudes. Speaking to the American Fighter Pilots, a pro-military audience, he stressed

It's getting as though the liberal press treats any recommendations by the Joint Chiefs of Staff as a form of evil, per se. To this element of our national media, anything connected with the military is dangerous. They would have the American public believe that every man that ever wore an officer's uniform is interested personally in unleashing nuclear war.168

The Senator from Arizona traced anti-military sentiment to the reliance on civilian policy-making and 'cost effectiveness' that characterized the Department of Defense during the McNamara era. This premise was specifically articulated to the American Fighter Pilots.

This suspicion of the military; this deliberate attempt to minimize the voice in the development of defense policies, was a hallmark of the McNamara regime in the Pentagon . . . The battle cry became 'cost effectiveness to the end'. The voices of experienced military men, trained in service academies and tested in combat, were drowned out by the whirring and beeping of the computers. Sound advice on hard military matters gave way to chalk talks and glib televised press conferences wherein anyone holding a pointer to a chart passed as an expert.169

Linking this policy with our inability to maintain a defense readiness posture, the Senator cited

The bomb shortage of the early 1960's; the efforts to save

---
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money through the concept of 'commonality' in the TFX, now F-11B program with no alternative available when it failed; and the low risk procurement policies typified by the current requirement that services have all technology 'in hand' before a contract is let—all these are examples of this trend.170

He continued

To rely solely on missiles in order to save the cost of the backup bomber force is an example of what I mean. Others involved are building of only conventional ships to save the cost of nuclear engines and to economize by not developing, testing, and stockpiling certain military space systems, or not to develop new and better tactical nuclear weapons.171

Through his attacks on the Department of Defense, Goldwater implied that total reliance on civilian, scientific advice had been detrimental to the security of the nation. Specifying the problem, the Senator stated that "mistakes stemming from overemphasis on civilian decision making in the Defense Department are too numerous to mention. . .".172 On another occasion, the Arizonan concluded by saying that this

is what we get for putting up with a Secretary of Defense so inept and so naive that he attempted to view a world in the most serious condition through the eyes of 'intellectuals' and other Defense Department neophytes who couldn't even remember the lessons this nation was taught during World War II.173

To Goldwater, the leftist/liberals/Democrats were the principle enemy to the military industrial complex and anyone who supported it. The fact that the Senator groups these three factions together and treats them as one entity is a clear example of Goldwater's thought processes. The following statement is illustrative of this facet of the Arizonan's method of polarization.

Understand me well, I want peace in Vietnam as much as anyone who calls himself a member of the October 15th Moratorium Committee, as much as any Democratic member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, as much as any recently appointed member of the Senate from New York and as much, if not more than, any of the professional slogan-mouthing, leftist-oriented pacifist groups in this country.\textsuperscript{174}

The Arizona Senator attempted to convince his audience that the Democrats, not the Republicans, were responsible for the Vietnam conflict. Additionally, the 'anti-military' liberal press was responsible for influencing the public that military men were proponents of war.

The thrust of Goldwater's attack on the liberals involved the allegation that they were the ones responsible for advocating inflationary social-welfare programs. The Senator from Arizona claimed

\begin{quote}
It almost seems that to these groups the words 'defense' or 'military' are synonymous with evil and are legitimate prey for any kind of legislative reform or financial pruning, but that programs which have a high-sounding purpose . . . like 'welfare' or 'education' or anti-poverty' or 'housing' are automatically so noble in their intent that they are above scrutiny.\textsuperscript{175}
\end{quote}

Goldwater links the individuals desirous of social welfare with those opposed to military spending with the words,

\begin{quote}
Much of the talk about government economy we hear today comes from the liberals. . . . from people who yell like stuck pigs when an overcost is found in the Defense Department but who never raise a peep about the billions of dollars that have gone down the drain through waste and inefficiency and duplication and favoritism in the administration of domestic education and welfare programs.\textsuperscript{176}
\end{quote}

A summary of the Arizonan's indictment against the liberal affinity for social welfare programs above defense is shown by the statement:

\begin{quote}
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They [new apostles of thrift] aren't worried about fiscal responsibility. They could care less about inflation, balanced Federal budgets, payments on the national debt and similar facets of sound economy.

No, these 'savers' have a couple of pet areas in mind. Naturally, they are areas that conform with the liberal philosophy. . . .177

Goldwater indicates that the position this anti-military attitude places America in by saying "The upshot of all this agitation and criticism has brought about heavy reductions in defense funds at a time when the Soviet Union is going all-out to build the mightiest military machine the world has ever known."178 Through this means, the Senator paved the way for a series of arguments leading the audience to the conclusion that our current defense policy was inadequate to counter the Communist threat.

The Senator from Arizona believed that Communism, which seeks to destroy democracy and freedom, threatens our security. As his first strategy, Goldwater sought to demonstrate that the Soviet Union was gaining superiority over the United States. A typical developmental strategy is found in his speech to the National Rifle Association. Arguing from examples, Goldwater told his audience first that the Russians were superior to America in the area of weaponry. He began by citing

"Earlier this year the chief of the Communist Warsaw Pact forces boasted that the Soviet Union now has anti-aircraft defenses which could 'hit virtually all air targets of the enemy' and a Navy capable of action on any ocean in the World. Among other things the Russian General said that Soviet rockets are capable of delivering nuclear warheads to any spot on the globe."179

---
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He continued

If there is any one field where the U. S. remains superior to the Soviet Union, it would be in the field of heavy bombing. But even in this area there is reason for doubt... since our Soviet adversary... has acquired a nuclear strategic superiority not only in megatonnage yield but also in ICBM's.180

Next the Arizonan remarked

General Andrew J. Goodpasture, Supreme NATO Commander, has warned us that the Warsaw Pact Nations in Communist East Europe have amassed, as he put it, 'a concentration of military power that exceeds anything the world has ever seen'.181

Showing how this increase was putting Russia in a position of superiority, Goldwater said

The Russians are moving ahead in every area of military preparation. They are building the greatest Navy Russia has ever possessed. They are challenging us for Naval supremacy in the Mediterranean and the Caribbean, in the Indian Ocean and the Suez Canal, and on every other strategic waterway throughout the world... 182

The Senator concluded with the use of a second mild fear appeal indicating that the possibility existed that Soviet-American relationship might be altered as a result. He told his audience

Deterrence was our one total defense philosophy during our era of superiority... we must assume and expect that the Russians will take greater and greater international risks at our expense during the remainder of the 1970's. I believe they might even reverse the concept of massive retaliation.

For the first time we find serious students of Soviet relationships beginning to speculate on the probable Russian course if that country's strategic nuclear and conventional superiority became unchallengeable.183

The same developmental pattern was evident when the Senator spoke to the Congress of American Industry. Initially, Goldwater
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advanced the claim that the Soviet Union was moving ahead of America in all areas of military development. The evidence that the Arizonan employed in this speech must be noted since, uncharacteristically, Goldwater not only identified the sources of his information, but, additionally, he used direct quotations. In providing numerous examples to support his position, the Senator turned first to Melvin Laird. He relates that "Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird told the NATO defense ministers in Ottawa, Canada, that the Russians now have 1,400 land-based ICBM's either ready for use or now under construction. This puts the Russians about 350 ICBM's ahead of the U. S. force of deep-striking land-based missiles."\(^\text{184}\)

According to Goldwater,

Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, father of the nuclear-powered submarine, told a Congressional Committee: 'Our defense posture is dangerously growing worse. The Soviets are capable of starting tomorrow the biggest war there has ever been, and I am not confident that the outcome of such a war would be in our favor'.\(^\text{185}\)

Citing another example, the Senator said

Admiral T. H. Moore, Chairman of the U. S. Joint Chiefs of Staff, said that the United States has been making 'bare bones' cuts in its military power while the Soviet Union has launched one of its largest and most comprehensive build-ups in all areas of its armed forces.\(^\text{186}\)

Finally, the Arizonan related that

Norman Polar, Editor of the U. S. section of the annual publication, Jane's Fighting Ships, says the Soviet navy is now the world's largest in terms of ocean-going ships and will equal the nuclear submarine strength of the U. S. Navy before 1970 has expired.\(^\text{187}\)

Again the Senator effectuates an appeal to fear as he

\(^{184}\) 75th Congress of American Industry, p. 231.

\(^{185}\) Ibid.  \(^{186}\) Ibid.  \(^{187}\) Ibid.
demonstrates that the Soviet Union will use the weapons they possess.

Arguing from examples, Goldwater began by saying

hardly a day goes by that we don't learn of a new movement the Soviets are making to extend their military power around the globe. . . . it required a specially negotiated 'understanding' by the State Department to stop the Soviets from building a powerful submarine base in Cienfuegos, Cuba.\(^{188}\)

Presenting another illustration, the Senator relates

We learn that the Soviet Union is developing a deep water naval port on the Egyptian coast between Alexandria and the Libyan border. . . . which will greatly strengthen the Soviet naval position in the strategic Mediterranean. . . . It is already capable of handling ships as large as destroyers and is being deepened so that it can eventually supply service to guided missile cruisers.\(^{189}\)

Impact to the data was provided by the statement:

The Soviet Union is hell-bent on establishing a superiority over the United States in every phase of military development. . . . the Soviet Union is testing this nation of ours in almost every section of the world. . . . in Indochina. In the Middle East. . . . In the Mediterranean. . . . Our forces in every waterway in the world are being challenged by a. . . . growing Soviet navy.\(^{190}\)

On a third occasion Goldwater abbreviated the appeal by telling the Norwich graduates that the Pentagon was becoming more alarmed each week at evidence of a Soviet weapons buildup. First, he stated

 Officials such as Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird, Chief of Naval Operations Admiral H. Moorer, and Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., head of Defense Research and Engineering, informed the Senate Armed Services Committee . . . that the Russian arms buildup is 'a matter of great and growing concern'.\(^{191}\)

The Arizonan continued by stating that "high ranking naval officials reported that the U. S. is facing a serious challenge from the progressive buildup of Russian naval forces in strategic areas of the world."\(^{192}\)
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Finally, the Senator told the American Fighter Pilots that maintenance of a strong national defense was based on utilization of the latest technological developments, specifically the ABM. He contended that "the Soviets are already way ahead of us... The very least that we must do is to develop a system to protect our deterrent to war." The crux of the Communist fear appeal was articulated in that address when Goldwater quoted former President Dwight Eisenhower as saying:

We face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration... with liberty at stake.

A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty... so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction.

2. Economic policies. Barry Goldwater's discussion of economic issues, in four of the addresses studied, advanced the major premise that preservation of capitalism and the free enterprise system is essential because economic freedom is inseparable with all other freedoms and liberties Americans enjoy. The profits of business are the keys to fueling the economy. Thus, businesses should be encouraged and supported. The only way to guarantee the capitalistic economic system is through fiscal responsibility. Consequently any impediment to fiscal responsibility, including inflationary programs and union wage increases, must be contained. All segments of the population must join in the efforts to halt inflation, a detriment to the free enterprise system. Action such as wage-price controls, although undesirable, should be
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enacted if necessary.

In the area of economic policies, Goldwater again isolated two groups to whom the American public should defer. In supporting the efforts of the President and the business community, the Senator indicated that the enemies to a sound fiscal policy were the media and labor union leaders. The dire consequence, that the Arizonan predicted would result from the business-union conflict, was nationalization of basic industries—a move supported by the liberal segment of society.

The Senator from Arizona intertwined his support for the President's efforts to halt inflation with references to the fact that the Democrats were exacerbating the problem. Enumerating some of the attempts the Nixon Administration had made, he stated:

> It was felt in the beginning that heroic efforts . . . in turning an estimated $25 billion deficit into a budgetary surplus and a reduction of some $7 billion in expenditures estimated by outgoing President Johnson would slow things down. It is apparent now that these steps, while they are important and have helped to an extent, are not enough.\(^\text{195}\)

In providing another example, Goldwater indicated "It is apparent also that the President's courageous tax recommendations and his threat to veto the extravagant Health, Education and Welfare package which the Democratic Congress laid on his desk also will not be sufficient to the task."\(^\text{196}\)

In demonstrating that a majority of the population support business, Goldwater told the Directors of the American Iron and Steel Institute that:

> Most of the citizens of America are capitalists themselves. They are stockholders in our largest corporations either directly
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... or indirectly. ... They 'own a piece of the rock' and they don't want to see it chipped away into small pieces and pass into oblivion. But too many still do not realize that what helps business provides better opportunities at higher pay for them.\textsuperscript{197}

Speaking to the National Retail Merchants Association, the Senator indicated one manner in which business was benefiting society. The speech centered around allegations that unions were not cooperating with the wage-price controls urged by the President to curb inflation. Goldwater stated that "The retail merchants in this country are cooperating by adhering to the President's price-wage freeze. The blue collar workers are cooperating by acquiescing to the freeze on wages."\textsuperscript{198} On another occasion Goldwater mentioned

I find it ironic that the American competitive enterprise system, which has produced greater good for more people than any other system in history is so little understood and appreciated by the vast majority of its beneficiaries. ... few ... citizens have a clear concept of the key role of profits in fueling economic growth and improving human welfare.\textsuperscript{199}

The Senator from Arizona alluded to two groups that were anti-business. The major force espousing the 'anti-business attitude' was the liberal community, specifically the press. However, union leaders were singled out by the Senator as both unsupportive of the President and polarized as an enemy of big business.

Goldwater claimed that the media was responsible for attacking the profit margin of business. The Senator stated, "Today the prime target of the disaster lobby is profits, the very life blood of our competitive enterprise system. The word has almost become obscene in
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our lexicom." Noting that media was distorting the figures on which the profit margin was based, the Arizonan noted

Most corporations prepare profit statements to appeal to security analysts and potential investors. They put emphasis on the percentage profit increase this year versus last year - or this quarter versus last quarter. So even if earnings on sales have only risen from 3 to 4 percent, the year end statement will highlight the fact that profits are up 33 percent. This in turn is translated into banner headlines that the XYZ Corporation is reaping 'unconscionable' excess profits.201

Goldwater mentioned the possible results that this could have by saying, "Without adequate profits there would be a crippling lack of the capital formation needed to increase projection to meet increased demands."202 In this manner he introduced the problem that restrictions of profits would entail.

If profits are held down by price controls, proposed changes in business tax provisions, unrealistic environmental and consumer regulations, and a host of other disincentives for undertaking large capital investment programs to increase productive capacity, then it follows as night the day that shortages and unemployment will spiral upward and we will enter a period of economic stagnation--which is still the worst form of pollution in an industrial society.203

Goldwater devoted a significant amount of time to formulating an assault on large labor unions and their leaders. The analysis centered around two similar but separate issues. First, the Arizonan cited union leaders for not supporting the President's wage-price controls. Second, the Senator mentioned that the actions taken by union leaders were the root cause of inflation.

Goldwater began his unit of proof concerning the President's wage-price controls with the statement that support for Nixon's
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proposal was generally widespread. However, Goldwater noted exceptions to cooperation with the President. He first stated, "Almost everyone in the country is cooperating with the exception of Mr. Meany and that special category of union leader who has so long felt he was above the rest of us."

In the same address, Barry Goldwater repeated this idea with the statement:

At a time when an overwhelming number of the American people and an overwhelming number of rank and file labor union members are supporting the Administration and doing their best to cooperate, the union leaders who over the past years have played an important role in creating the mess, are withholding offers to help.

Goldwater provided the overview that higher and higher wage hikes by unions were the reason why inflation was still not being controlled.

It [inflation] is the problem of wrestling with unions so powerful that they can demand and obtain from management wage increases which have no relation to increased productivity. It is the problem of union privileges distorting a nation's economy. It is the problem of unions becoming so powerful that they can force management and employers to disregard all the lessons of the past and all the historic applications of economic principles and grant wage increases far in excess of what is justified by the amount of labor performed.

The Senator predicts that instead of wage decreases, financial writers say that 1970 will be a year of whopping wage increases. Their estimate is based on the fact that some 5 million workers in heavily organized American industry, including workers in the trucking, auto, rubber, meat packing, clothing and construction industries, will present management with new record-breaking demands in the next 12 months.

Moving from a generalized statement, the Arizonan told his
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listeners precisely what they might expect from unions during the coming months. He said, "To give you some idea of what we are facing, let me point out that one big union—the Teamsters—whose contracts expire in March, is demanding benefits which will approximate a 62 percent increase over a three-year period." 208

For Goldwater, the crux of the analysis came from the disparity that was beginning to be evident between wage increases and worker productivity. To support this premise, the Senator first mentioned

Historically, wage increases are supposed to bear at least some comparison to an increased rate of worker productivity. However, favoritism and special privileges granted to big unions in this country have effectively destroyed this historical ratio. 209

The Senator continued by stating that since the 1940's, "wage costs in industry have risen more rapidly than efficiency." 210 Goldwater remembered that in 1960 the disparity between increased wages and increased productivity set a record. He stated, "Government figures show that productivity increased approximately 3 percent during the year, but the union wage increases ran between 7 percent and 9 percent for the year." 211 Demonstrating the result of this event, Goldwater mentioned

The result has been that employers have had no productivity cushion left after paying for wage increases. This means they have been unable to cut prices. Instead they have had to raise prices steadily in order to obtain a margin for profit. 212

Inflation needed to be controlled and Goldwater contended that one means suggested to restore fiscal balance, the nationalization of industry, would destroy the capitalistic, free enterprise system.

In order to preserve the free enterprise system, the Arizonan
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told the American Iron and Steel Institute that the business community must be prepared to combat attempts to nationalize and socialize industry. He claimed

the competitive enterprise system is now face to face with one of the greatest threats in this country's 200 year history. The system is faltering under a series of poorly handled shortages, and it is under attack by demagogues who would like to nationalize all basic enterprise in this country.213

Goldwater cited that this drive for more nationalism of businesses was a major problem facing businesses. He said,

During the past decade there has been a determined effort--conceived by patriotic, well intentioned idealists--to replace the 'evils of capitalism' and 'big, bad' business corporations, with government controlled corporations operated 'by and for the people'.214

The Senator further detailed the strategy and identified the means by which these idealists hoped to accomplish their goals.

Their strategy is not a frontal attack at the center, but rather a series of nibbling piecemeal tactics--what our old nemesis Nikita Khrushchev called salami slicing tactics. Their weapons are the national electronic media networks and the well coordinated regiments of liberal politicians, intellectuals, journalists, and educators.215

A primary tactic used by the opponents is to attack profit. He states, "If the opposition can change the word 'profit' into a four letter word then they may have a clear field for their drive to nationalize the basic industries. Then profits can be replaced by deficits."216 To support this position, Goldwater claimed

We have ample evidence from nations who have already nationalized. The British Railway deficit is more than $200 million a year . . . the German Railway's about $750 million, and the Japanese National Railway has a deficit in the vicinity of $900 million a year . . . in your industry I am told that the British steel is losing more than 150 million dollars a year.217
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After dramatizing what would happen to the profit margin of the industry in which his audience worked, the Senator enhanced the fear appeal by citing how the change to nationalism will be accomplished. Using the energy crisis as an example, the Arizonan contends "that today's energy crisis is tomorrow's steel crisis and the next day's crisis of the enterprise system itself."\textsuperscript{218} Goldwater projects what will happen to the steel industry:

I predict that very shortly you gentlemen may find yourselves on the witness stand accused of conspiring to cause a steel shortage, bring about inflation and increased unemployment. . . . reaping windfall profits at the expense of helpless consumers and taxpayers. And I predict that Congress will be considering . . . bills to nationalize your industry or to impose price controls and taxes on your domestic and foreign earnings.\textsuperscript{219}

Goldwater continued by linking nationalism and socialism, "Now you can ignore the fact, or you can pretend that nationalism is something other than what it really is . . . but it turns out to be socialism and that is the system that has never done anything for any people."\textsuperscript{220} The Senator from Arizona postulated that once the nation becomes socialized, that our freedoms and liberties will be lost. "If . . . we . . . [junk] what's left of our competitive enterprise system in favor of one that is centrally directed under government control, then all our freedoms will soon go by the board."\textsuperscript{221}

Finally, the Senator echoes conservative premises by stating

Economic freedom is inseparable from all the other freedoms and liberties we enjoy. It is, in fact, the essential freedom, without which the rest perish. What good is the right to life if
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In America, the hope of economic and personal freedom rests in the hands of enlightened citizens and their elected representatives who are convinced that the competitive enterprise system is the best system available in this imperfect world of ours.\textsuperscript{222}

The Senator completes the line of analysis by quoting Supreme Court Justice Lewis Powell who warned that "private business and freedom are in danger and . . . 'the hour is late!'\textsuperscript{223}

\textbf{Summary}

Barry Goldwater's use of evidence attests to his acknowledgement of his position as an authority figure. The Senator rarely presented direct quotations. Rather, he displayed the tendency to either paraphrase information or pass off his opinions and beliefs as facts. When the Arizonan did paraphrase data from other sources, he was normally vague, rather than specific, in his documentation. These strategies give credence to Goldwater's view of himself as an authority and his belief that his audiences would perceive him in that light.

Two types of claims predominated the Senator's rhetoric. Many of the conclusions advanced sought agreement with his evaluation concerning the desirability, worth or merit of an idea, action, or individual. Because these positions were rooted in value assumptions, the acceptance or denial of the premises rested, at least in part, with the audiences' predisposition toward the subject. The second category of claims utilized extensively by the Senator dealt with future predictions. Because of the inability of either speaker or audience to determine definitively the course of unknown events, these conclusions
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could only be established as possibilities or probabilities.

The reasoning patterns that Goldwater employed in moving the audience from data to the conclusion included use of the traditional patterns of induction and deduction. Inductively the Senator relied heavily on generalization, asking his audience to accept the examples cited and move from them to the conclusion desired. In selecting the illustrations, Goldwater demonstrated a reliance on historical events. Deductively, the Arizonan reasoned from classification, cause, and analogy. The Senator also made extensive use of the enthymeme with the unstated warrant consisting of either commonly held American or conservative values. Another characteristic of Barry Goldwater's reasoning was using conservative principles to enhance the effectiveness of other reasoning patterns.

In countering the arguments of his opposition, the Arizona Senator relied primarily on direct refutational strategies. Often, however, Goldwater would sidestep the issue by diverting attention from the problem to a scapegoat, an individual or group, that could be blamed for current conditions.

Goldwater did not extensively seek adherence for specific courses of action. On one occasion he merely sought a continued dedication for the work the audience was already engaged in. To a second group he outlined what was needed, but supplied no practical steps that could be taken to secure the desired result. A third audience, comprised of businessmen, received a practical three-fold plan that, if implemented, could possibly correct the problem.

A review of the speeches to favorable audiences indicates that Goldwater was inconsistent when discussing three topics. The Senator
argued for human rights as a justification for the all volunteer military, then when discussing the anti-war demonstrations, condemned the participants for exercising their rights. Secondly, throughout the addresses the Arizonan expressed dislike for government interference in the lives of citizens, then argued for an increase in Federal policies for the aviation industry. Finally, and most extensively developed in the rhetoric of the Senator, was a shift in allegiance regarding President Nixon. Initially, Goldwater had personally and politically supported Nixon. However, the inflationary budget proposal, coupled with the Watergate break-in, convinced the Senator that Nixon had forsaken the Republican ideals, as well as conservative principles, for the sake of political expediency.

The Arizona Senator used three persuasive strategies in his addresses to favorable audiences. These tactics included identification, flattery, and polarization.

Goldwater employed identification initially by forging a link between himself and his audience. This process was accomplished through references to party affiliation, ideological commitments, past work done for similar groups, and through an association with the common man. In a second identification strategy, Goldwater associated himself with the issue. By dramatizing his background and previous work concerning aviation, inflation, and the military, the Senator implied his ability to speak knowledgeably on these subjects. Finally, Goldwater employed identification when he explored the relationship between the audience and the issue. Through utilization of this tactic, the Arizonan provided a justification for the audience to attend the message.
The Senator reinforced the audiences' perception of themselves and enhanced his position with them through the use of flattery. By alluding to the fact that the listeners were trustworthy, courageous, sophisticated, and well-trained, the Arizona Senator inferred that these qualities would enable them to perceive the truth of his messages.

The most extensively used persuasive strategy located in Barry Goldwater's addresses was polarization. In polarizing foreign policy issues, the choice was between American or Soviet superiority, freedom or slavery, defense or social-welfare programs, the military and the administration advice or the utterances of the media, the Department of Defense, and/or the liberals. A similar tactic was evident in the discussion of economic issues. Here, through polarization, the choices became free enterprise or nationalization/socialism, unions or inflation, freedom and liberty or totalitarianism and regimentation.
Chapter V

NEUTRAL AND HOSTILE AUDIENCES

While Barry Goldwater enhanced his credibility with favorably disposed audiences through his work with and the increased visibility of conservative politicians at the polls, one issue gave credence to the Senator with neutral and hostile audiences: Nixon's involvement in the Watergate break-in. As the previous chapter established, Goldwater initially was supportive of the President and his policies, alleging that the Administration was the closest to a conservative government that America had in forty years. However, when information became increasingly evident that this administration had abdicated the conservative doctrine by adopting the position that the end justified the means, the Senator from Arizona could no longer back President Nixon.

The break between Goldwater and Nixon was duly noted by the press and the resultant acclaim it provided the Senator had ramifications for his rhetorical philosophy when speaking to neutral and hostile audiences. Before examining the implications of media coverage on the speaking of the Arizona Senator, the general tenor of the remarks printed must be reviewed.

James Naughton mentioned that the Democrats who had scorned the Senator and the Republicans who had tried to forget his political legacy now quoted and applauded him. Naughton continued, "The reason is Watergate--and Senator Goldwater's outspoken criticism of President
Nixon and what he plainly believes is Mr. Nixon's failure to deal effectively with the scandal."¹

Norm Brewer expressed a similar sentiment when he commented on the Goldwater renaissance by saying

What has brought a lot of this about, of course, is Senator Goldwater's blunt candor about Watergate and his open, unrelenting pressure on Richard Nixon to make a full public disclosure on the issue. The same kind of blunt candor which made Goldwater the target of so much undeserved criticism in the 1964 campaign. I, for one, am delighted to see his sudden rise in popularity.²

An even stronger endorsement of Barry Goldwater was published in Newsweek. Implied that the Senator was the individual who most closely approximated being a statesman, the staff writer mentioned

The Nixonian crisis has yet to produce its first statesman, its first detached but responsible over-viewer. Congressional Democrats by definition have too great a partisan interest to fill the role, the GOP liberals have not been able to figure out what stance to take. But in the vacuum, the tough, long-viewed and carefully balanced judgments of conservative Sen. Barry Goldwater have taken on increasing weight through the long months—and an increasingly outspoken series of recent interviews and newspaper articles have only augmented Goldwater's reputation as perhaps Capitol Hill's most conscientious voice in the whole wretched affair.³

Explaining the reason why Goldwater was being perceived in such a favorable fashion, Walter Cronkite said on his CBS broadcast

If Goldwater now sounds like the voice of moderation and reason . . ., perhaps it's because on Watergate he seems to be one of the few outspoken individuals who belong to no faction. . . . he seems to plead no special cause . . ., except for frankness and honesty. No wonder he seems like such a loner in Washington these days. Once, his many critics told us Goldwater's


approach to government was overly simplistic. He was ridiculed as an anachronism. But now, without fundamental change, he seems to strike a responsive cord in wider circles than those right-wing groups that have always venerated his name.4

Goldwater's Rhetorical Philosophy

The favorable view that was emerging of the Arizona Senator affected his perception of himself and his role in the political arena. While Goldwater rarely specifically addressed the issue of Watergate when he spoke to neutral and hostile audiences, the effect that the press coverage had on the Senator pervaded his rhetoric during the period being studied.

Any study on the Senator attests to his commitment to the conservative cause.5 In fact, Goldwater expressed this view and provided the cornerstone of his rhetorical stance when he told the

Magazine Publisher's Association

I am among those conservatives who welcome rather than avoid exchange of ideas. Long ago I learned that very little could be accomplished by talking over matters of serious public concern with people who were in total agreement with your views.6

Barry Goldwater felt that the conservative premises that had


6Speech by Barry Goldwater ("America's Right to Know") to the Magazine Publishers Association, New York City, September 18, 1975, press release.
guided him and his political philosophy provided the only workable guidelines for society as a whole. The Senator had staked his career in government on articulating these premises. Although his belief that a majority of the American public supported his views might have been shaken as the result of the 1964 election, the current press reports were beginning to demonstrate extensive support for the Senator and his position with non-conservatives.

Goldwater took these press reports literally. Rather than viewing his new acclaim as stemming solely from his disagreement with Nixon on Watergate, the Arizonan saw the reports as an indication of increased acceptance of his entire political philosophy. Thus, he acknowledged his new position as a statesman and approached his audiences from that perspective.

**Rhetorical Analysis**

An analysis of the speeches that Barry Goldwater delivered between 1969 and 1974 to audiences who did not share his perception of reality includes consideration of the evidence, argument, and means of persuasion employed. A final section of the chapter will draw upon the findings of this exploration in an attempt to understand Goldwater's reasons for approaching these audiences in the manner he did.

**Evidence**

Critics have rendered arguments of the Senator suspect because of the apparent lack of 'acceptable' data. The concern expressed regarding the Arizonan's use of evidence, mandates careful consideration of the types of information Goldwater presented in support of
his positions. A review of the Arizona Senator's speeches before neutral and hostile audiences reveals that the evidence he used included common knowledge, direct quotations, semi-direct quotations, paraphrased information, and Goldwater's opinions or interpretations passed off as documentation.

**Common knowledge.** On occasion Goldwater employed evidence that the audience would accept on the basis of the fact that it was common knowledge with the majority of the population. Advancing the claim that the anti-war demonstrations are not representative of the way policy is made in a Republic, for example, the Senator alleged

Democratic processes provide other legitimate means for changing any official policy with which Americans might disagree. This is what our free election system is all about. That is why American citizens are provided with the right to vote. The ballot box is provided to serve those who would continue existing policies and officials or replace them with others who hold a different view.\(^7\)

The use of a statement that is common knowledge with members of the audience would be accepted immediately. As informed American citizens, Goldwater's listeners would be aware of the recourse of grievances that are available to them under the democratic system of government. The Senator referred to these traditional means by which policy changes are made. This data would lead to acknowledgement of the claim that the Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations are not representative of the way policy is made in a Republic.

**Direct quotations.** In discussing the growth and the danger

inherent in the bureaucratic structure, the Senator referred to Mr. Lee Loevinger, a Washington attorney who was a former member of the Federal Communication Commission. In an article written for *The Business Lawyer*, Loevinger warned that

the most pervasive social institution . . . the most characteristic social problem of the . . . growth of recent years is bureaucracy. . . . bureaucracy is not an answer to our problems but it is itself one of the principle problems.  

The Senator from Arizona also used direct quotations when he discussed how the Soviets would view U. S. development of the ABM.

Goldwater said

we are told that if we go ahead with a skeleton, rudimentary type missile defense system that the Russians will regard it as provocative. . . . Actually, the Russians wouldn't. Kocygin has said time and time again when asked about the ABM, 'Oh, that's a defensive system. That's not provocative; that doesn't mean anything'.

Still arguing for the development of an ABM system, the Senator quoted Mr. Rathjens. The gentleman said:

While we have almost no confidence in an ABM system working, an adversary can have almost no confidence that it will not work. Thus, we must expect the Soviet Union to react to even a 'light' or 'thin' deployment . . . not because an ABM system will be effective and not because it will be expanded but simply as a conservative hedge against those possibilities.

Goldwater gave limited credibility to the information provided.

While Rathjens, a scientist, might be able to speak competently on the

---


10Ibid.
chances of the ABM working, his assessment of the Russian reaction is dubious.

A final example of the Arizonan's use of direct quotations was offered to support the position that development of the SST would not be environmentally dangerous. William Margruder stated

There is no evidence of any kind to verify that the temperature of the atmosphere will rise because of water vapor in it. It is true that it's increasing, and we should know more about why it is increasing. We do have large research and development programs looking into the problem but not just because of the SST. There is just as much evidence to say that this is a good development as there is to say that it is a bad development. But if you've made up your mind to shoot at the SST, you can turn all your 'ifs' against it.\(^1\)

Goldwater provided the necessary qualifications to give some credibility to the source he used. Specifically, he identified William Margruder as the Director of the SST developmental program in the Department of Defense. As this identification indicates, Margruder would definitely be biased in favor of SST development.

Semi-quotations. On two occasions Barry Goldwater used a type of data that could be classified as neither purely direct quotation nor totally paraphrased. One example was delivered to a De Molay audience concerning the proposition that the United States no longer dominated the world's waterways. While the text of the address indicated that the following was a direct quotation, no specific information was provided regarding where the information came from. Goldwater stated

In other words, with our present naval strength—which has been described as 'the obsolescence, rust and decay of what is basically still a World War II fleet'--we are well on the way to

\(^1\)Speech by Barry Goldwater ("Facts on the SST") to the U.S. Senate, October 2, 1970, Vital Speeches of the Day, November 1, 1970, p. 41.
becoming a second rate military power in the world.\textsuperscript{12}

More frequently, the Arizonan used the type of data found in an address to the Association of Old Crows. Weaving together a direct quotation by Clark Clifford, Goldwater's interpretation of Clifford's remarks and motive appeals, the Senator sought to support the claim that immediate withdrawal of forces from Vietnam would constitute a default on a commitment. He opened by mentioning that Clifford described a proposal to withdraw American troops from South Vietnam by December, 1970, as 'unrealistic and impractical' and an action which would result in—and I use his precise words—'a bloodbath'.\textsuperscript{13}

Goldwater provided Clark Clifford's expertise by introducing him as the former Defense Secretary. The Senator next presented his interpretation of Clifford's remarks.

Mr. Clifford, like anyone else who has any knowledge at all of military operations and strategy, realizes that such a withdrawal would cause the collapse of the military and the collapse of the government in South Vietnam. It would lay South Vietnam and all of Southeast Asia wide open to Communist conquest and terrorism.\textsuperscript{14}

The Arizonan continued

It is not enough . . . to . . . [proclaim] peace and then demand impossible military actions such as complete and immediate withdrawal of troops. . . . it carries with it not one ounce of responsibility for what might happen to American lives and to our own national strategic interests if such action were to be taken by the person in authority.\textsuperscript{15}

Through the interpretation of Clifford's remarks, the Senator implied various motivational warrants. First, Goldwater referred to
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the fact that our immediate withdrawal would open the area to Communist takeover. Most audience members would accept the position since they probably believed that protecting others from Communism was our reason for entering the war in the first place. Second, specific reference was also made to the effects immediate withdrawal would have on American lives and our national strategic interests. As patriotic citizens, if the members of the audience thought that immediate withdrawal from Vietnam would harm American lives or interests, they would be less likely to support such withdrawal.

Paraphrased evidence. Goldwater's use of evidence included paraphrasing information from other sources. When the Senator spoke to the De Molay about contemporary Russia, he stated

Every bit of evidence which is coming out of the Soviet Union today—even that reported by such liberal newspapers as the Washington Post—tells the story of a different kind of Russia than the one that the ABM opponents and the Senate 'doves' would like us to believe exists.16

Supporting the position that the SST was not environmentally offensive, the Senator paraphrased the position articulated by Senator Tower of Texas. Goldwater stated that Tower felt that

in the case of the SST, we are not risking damage to the environment for the simple reason that our program, as presently drawn, calls only for the development of a prototype aircraft. . . . And we can not possibly know . . . what, if any, lasting effects SST operations might have until after full testing of the prototype plane.17

Goldwater as authority. Barry Goldwater was convinced of the truth of his utterances as well as the positions he took on various

16 Order of De Molay, p. 18431. 17 U. S. Senate, SST, p. 42.
issues. Manifested in his use of evidence, the Senator often passed his ideas and assessments off as factual utterances. This strategy was evident when the Arizonan interpreted statistics and historical examples. Goldwater also asked his audience to accept statements based solely on his opinions and values.

1. **Statistical data.** Goldwater offered numerical data as proof for the claim that there was no financial barrier to the development of the SST. The Arizonan told the Senate that the program under debate was "a joint venture designed to meet the enormous cost of providing this type of transportation."\(^{18}\) To support this position he mentioned

> The program calls for a total Government commitment of $1.3 billion. In addition to this, the SST contractors will put up about $3.2 billion, $54 million of it in facilities. And finally the airlines themselves are putting money on the line. They have already invested $60 million in risk capital and $22 million more in reservation deposits.\(^{19}\)

Next, Goldwater indicated the procedure through which government would be repaid for the initial outlay. "Royalties will be paid to the Government on every SST sold and the rate of payment will assure full reimbursement of the Government's investment when 300 American SST's are sold."\(^{20}\) The information provided appears to be germane, however, only if and when a fleet of American SST's are developed—a contingency outside the scope of the Senate debate which called only for an SST prototype.

Goldwater also used statistical data when he discussed the ability of Congress to appropriate funds. Contending that most of

\(^{18}\)U. S. Senate, SST, p. 43. \(^{19}\)Ibid. \(^{20}\)Ibid.
As of January 1, 1969, the U. S. Government was authorized under law to maintain 812 trust funds; 139 revolving funds, 86 special accounts, 381 no-year accounts, and 510 deposit accounts, none of which are subject to normal year-by-year scrutiny of the appropriation process.21

Offering further data, the Senator said

Three-quarters of the $11.6 billion non-defense budget increase between 1969-1970 reflected, in the words of former President Johnson, 'relatively uncontrollable charges which must be met under present laws'. They included $2.0 billion for automatic increases in Social Security, Medicare, and Social Insurance programs financed through trust funds; $2.8 billion for automatic pay raises; $1.6 billion for automatic increases in Veterans Benefits, Medicaid, and interest on the national debt; and $1.3 billion for increases arising out of prior year contracts then reaching the payment stage. . . .22

However, perhaps the most compelling data Goldwater employed was that

last year President Nixon proposed a fiscal 1970 budget of $193.3 billion. . . . relatively uncontrollable civilian outlays under existing law amounted to $98.8 billion. When you subtract spending for military defense. . . . $81.5 billion, make bookkeeping adjustments, the Congressional appropriation committees ended up having actual jurisdiction over only about $20 billion.23

However, the financial information which Goldwater presented failed to achieve as much impact as it could have because the sources of the data were missing.

2. Historical data. Goldwater presented his interpretation of the historical examples he offered as support when he spoke to the University Club. Using the Czechoslovakian situation as an illustration, he related

---

21 U. S. Senate, Federal Government, p. 646.
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While part of the Warsaw Pact troops might have been removed from Czech soil . . . they still left behind several divisions stationed near the West German frontier . . . the Warsaw Pact nations are capable of mobilizing, deploying, and reinforcing several hundred thousand troops in a very short period of time. Thus the transfer of Soviet forces to other locations in Central Europe is meaningless and certainly should not be considered as a sign that the Russians are ready to permit the modest hope of freedom to revive in Czechoslovakia.24

Expanding the example, the Arizonan stated

Moscow continues to justify the Czech adventure on the grounds that the Kremlin has the right to intervene in the affairs of other Socialist countries by any means, whenever it feels that the survival of Socialism is at stake. Also the Soviets have not yet withdrawn the claim . . . that they have the right to intervene in West Germany under certain postwar agreements and the United Nations Charter.25

Again, without providing the necessary source of the information, the impact of the data was lost. Goldwater was interpreting the events he related without thought to the fact that his audience might not accept this data solely on his word.

3. Opinionated data. More often than any other type of evidence, Barry Goldwater passed his values and opinions off as factual data. On occasion the Senator merely stated his ideas. This was evident when he discussed the effect that ratification of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty would have on our allies. He stated

I believe the ratification of this treaty could easily undermine the confidence with which we are held by our European allies, especially West Germany. . . . I could feel better about this treaty if it incorporated provisions for an inspection system which I felt were adequate to prevent possible cheating. But so far I have seen no indication on the part of the administration to insist upon any such machinery.26

25Ibid. 26Ibid.
Goldwater also used his ideas as data when demonstrating that a new and different Russia was emerging. The Senator related that news tells

the story of a nation reaching strenuously for world domination in all areas. It tells the story of a nation which has now extended its naval might into every ocean and strategic waterway in the world. It tells the story of a nation rushing expanded production of ICBM's and SS-9 missile at a capacity rate. It tells the story of a nation which has moved into the power vacuum in the Middle East. It tells the story of a nation which is . . . preparing to move forcibly into any vacuum which may occur throughout the Western world. . . .

On other occasions, the Arizona Senator presented his opinions in a more authoritarian manner. Initially, referring to the cost argument of ABM critics, the Arizona Senator stated

Those people who argue against the ABM by stating that its rejection would make additional billions available for sorely needed projects in our intercity areas are neglecting to consider the alternative. For if we don't have a missile defense, we must have an overpowering missile offense.

When supporting the claim that the Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations are not representative of the policy-making of a Republic, Goldwater contended "We have all heard a great deal about the recent Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations. . . . I am here to tell you that this is not the way policy is made or can be made in a Republic."

A final example of the definitiveness with which the Senator approached an issue was in a statement made to the U. S. Senate showing that the American people had demonstrated their desire for the curbing of inflation. Goldwater commented

There can be no question that the American people who have gone

---

27 Order of De Molay, p. 18431. 28 Ibid. 29 Association of Old Crows, p. 31293.
to the polls in recent years have voted their dissatisfaction over the steadily rising cost of living and steadily increasing prices in all consumer areas. This dissatisfaction is one of the principle reasons for the election of President Nixon in 1968 and, to his credit, he is striving mightily with this problem.30

**Argumentation**

An examination of the means of argument that Barry Goldwater used in speaking to neutral and hostile audiences reflect the Senator's frame of mind when he approached the rostrum between 1969 and 1974. Initially, attention will be directed to the claims that the Arizonan was asking his audiences to accept. The second segment will be concerned with the various types of reasoning and backing that the Senator used in providing the bridge between the evidence presented and the claim advanced. A final area of investigation will explore specific argumentative strategies used in the addresses including arguments for change, tactics of refutation, either/or alternatives, and the presentation of positions counter to the predisposition of the audience.

**Claims.** Analysis of Barry Goldwater's addresses to neutral and hostile audiences reveals the same predominance of evaluative claims and future predictions that permeated the Senator's rhetoric to favorable audiences. However, in these speeches, Goldwater also sought adherence for conclusions based on fact. As will be evident in the discussion that follows, the proof requirements for designative or factual claims is different than for the other claims utilized.

The Arizonan based a majority of his arguments on his evaluation of events. The use of the Senator's opinion can be illustrated through

---

30 U. S. Senate, Federal Government, p. 646.
the following statements:

The proposal on the SST contains no elements of danger. 31

There is no financial barrier to the development of the SST. 32

There are times when the public's right to know is not valid in terms of national defense and public safety. 33

Anything that causes American military men unhappiness or discouragement in his assignment in Vietnam is indefensible. 34

The ABM is not being sufficiently and adequately explained to the American people. 35

The Federal bureaucracy is so large and loosely administered that it invites abuse by its very nature. 36

Not nearly enough attention is being given to the technical and practical weaknesses of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, to say nothing of its dangerous psychological implications. 37

The Arizona Senator also presented premises that were based on future predictions. Examples of these statements include:

Development of the SST is necessary for continued U. S. dominance of aviation. 38

Without the MIC this nation would be a third rate nation. 39

As the Soviet Union becomes dominant on the world's waterways, the U. S. will become dominated. 40

The proposed nuclear non-proliferation treaty will affect foreign affairs. 41


The necessary proof structure for establishing evaluative claims or those based on future events pose some unique problems. As discussed in the preceding chapter, acceptance of an emotion or value resides more often in the minds of audience members than in the units of evidence presented within a given address. Individuals listening to Barry Goldwater would either adhere to the values he supported or disavow them, based on the congruity of that feeling to their attitude-belief system. If Goldwater's belief was the same as theirs or could easily be assimilated into the listeners' attitude systems, the premise would be accepted regardless of the evidence presented. On the other hand, if the value articulated was counter to those values held by the listeners, the possibility was remote that mere documentation would change the audiences' minds, regardless of the strength of that data.

Another problem exists in providing adequate evidence for establishing conclusions based on future probability. Because the future is unknown, any amount of documentation could, at most, establish the claim only possibly or probably. Regardless of the completeness of the data provided, the claim could not be established with certainty.

The Senator also presented factual conclusions. Illustrative of this type of position are such statements as:

Other countries are developing the SST.\textsuperscript{42}

The Vietnam Moratorium demonstrations are not representative of the way policy is made in a Republic.\textsuperscript{43}

The aggressive nature of Soviet activity outside its border is being matched by recent developments in the Soviet Union itself.\textsuperscript{44}

\textsuperscript{42}U. S. Senate, SST. \textsuperscript{43}Association of Old Crows. \textsuperscript{44}University Club.
Opponents of the ABM System are using a variety of arguments to discredit its implementation.\textsuperscript{45}

The President is the representative of the nation in conducting foreign relations.\textsuperscript{46}

The Constitution does not deposit with Congress the primary power over the conduct of American military actions.\textsuperscript{47}

The documents of government uphold the fundamental role of the President to plan and conduct the military and foreign affairs of the United States.\textsuperscript{48}

The proof requirements for factual claims are more exact than those based on emotion or prediction. These postulates can be adequately supported so as to demonstrate their certainty. A failure to provide the information needed to establish these claims would constitute a valid reason for rejecting the conclusion.

An example of the method by which Barry Goldwater sought to establish a factual claim was presented to the U. S. Senate. In supporting the position that other countries developing the SST were unconcerned about the environmental effects, Goldwater began by implying a comparison between America and Europe. First he asserted that the SST was being developed in Europe.

It [development of the SST] will come as quickly as it is feasible. In Europe it already is feasible. Not only the Soviets but the French and British are busy testing SST prototypes which will shortly be moved into production and placed in operation on regularly scheduled world airlines.\textsuperscript{49}

The Senator indicates that while

\textsuperscript{45} New Jersey Banker's Association.
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Versions of it [the SST] are now being test flown in Europe . . . the foreign producers do not seem to be testing the effects of their planes on the environment . . . the environment covers all nations [yet] the authority of this Congress to speed up or stop the development of supersonic transports does not extend beyond our own borders.\footnote{50}

Finally, Goldwater contends that "if we do not test our own SST prototype, we will not know what effects the Russians or the French/British supersonic transports are likely to have on the environment."\footnote{51} Assuming that the environmental arguments being used to defeat SST development in this country are true, the Senator contends that these same effects would be operative in developing any SST models. Since the SST is being developed abroad, if this argument is accepted, the only alternative would be the creation and environmental testing of an SST prototype. Having presented this unit of proof, Goldwater provided the conclusion "Nothing we do either in this Chamber or in the House, is likely to slow down the development of the British/French Concorde or Soviet TU-144."\footnote{52}

This unit of proof illustrates the difficulties inherent in Goldwater's proof structure when supporting factual claims. More specific information regarding the fact that countries were indeed developing the SST, that they were unconcerned about the environmental effects, and that the U.S. was powerless to do anything to alter the consequences of such development, would have provided more of a reason for accepting the premise. Additionally, the evidence provided consisted solely of the assertions and opinions of the Arizonan. With neutral and hostile audiences, support emanating from other sources

\footnote{50}{U. S. Senate, SST, p. 42.} \footnote{51}{Ibid.} \footnote{52}{Ibid.}
would have enhanced the credibility of the data.

Reasoning. A variety of reasoning patterns were used in Goldwater's addresses. While the inductive approach was the predominant single means employed to move the listeners from data to claim, deductive reasoning was also prominent in the Senator's rhetoric. Specifically, Goldwater relied on deductive arguments from sign, cause, analogy, and the enthymeme to secure his position. In providing the motivation on which the enthymemes were based, and in specifying backing for other reasoning processes, the Senator based his positions on general American values. Finally, in some instances, the Senator offered neither reasoning nor motivational appeals in assisting his audience in making the transition from data to claim. In these cases, acceptance of the premises rested totally on Goldwater's credibility.

1. Inductive reasoning. Barry Goldwater utilized the substantive warrant of generalization when he spoke to the West Point Society. Claiming that there were technical and practical problems with the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, Goldwater contended that if the treaty were ratified, some non-nuclear nations would construe it as a commitment on behalf of the United States to provide military support for them in the event of the threat of nuclear attack. He alleged "that President Johnson and Secretary McNamara declared in 1966 that nations not seeking nuclear weapons can be sure of our strong support against nuclear blackmail."53 The Senator continued

53West Point Society, p. 2641.
During 1968 the United States, the United Kingdom and Russia each issued similar declarations of intent to act immediately through the Security Council of the United Nations to assist any non-nuclear party to the treaty that becomes a victim of nuclear aggression or threat.\textsuperscript{54}

Goldwater's examples did illustrate that commitments had been made which would indicate support for non-nuclear nations. The problem was that the Arizonan did not cite the source of the material. The Senator, in trying to represent these allegations as facts, weakened the proof structure.

Supporting the position that the Federal bureaucracy is so large that no one in or out of government can accurately define its power and scope, the Senator began

The government is so large that institutions doing business with it... are forced to hire trained experts just to show them around through the labyrinthine maze made up of hundreds of departments, bureaus, commissions, offices and agencies.\textsuperscript{55}

Goldwater continued by illustrating specifically what happened to one individual who tried to determine the extent of the existing bureaucracy.

A young member of the House of Representatives several years ago set out to determine how many assistance programs were available and maintained in the Federal Government. It took him... years to find out that there were over 1,300 such programs, many of which were unknown to each other and unknown to the people they were established to help... no one in the Federal Government had any idea how many assistance programs existed, where they were located and how they were designed to help American citizens.\textsuperscript{56}

Additionally, in showing the immense size of the bureaucracy, the Arizonan related

Then we have the spectacle of the House of Representatives

\textsuperscript{54}West Point Society, p. 2641.

\textsuperscript{55}U. S. Senate, Federal Government, p. 652.  \textsuperscript{56}Ibid.
engaging in a tense, prolonged battle over the appropriation of funds for rat control in our major cities. After all the shouting had died down, it was discovered that there existed already eight programs in various governmental departments to do the same thing.57

By citing specific instances, the Senator argued that they were representative and thus other examples would also support the same conclusion.

2. Deductive reasoning. Barry Goldwater used four types of deductive reasoning when speaking to neutral and hostile audiences. Although the Senator argued from sign and used the enthymeme, reasoning from cause and analogy were more extensively used.

Throughout Goldwater's argumentation concerning the increase in Soviet fleets on major oceans and sea lanes, the Senator asked his audience to accept the fact that this was a sign of their future domination of the waterways. However, while this connection was suggested, it was never adequately demonstrated.

In discussing the Russian military buildup, Goldwater wanted his audience to conclude that such action was a sign of Soviet aggression toward peaceful nations. Advancing the position that the aggressive nature of Soviet activity outside its border was being matched by recent developments in the Soviet Union itself, the Senator related

I am referring now to the resurrection of Joseph Stalin. Any effort at this date in history to resurrect Stalin can only point to a return to the hard-nosed, rigid, police state which characterized Russia in the early years of the Cold War between East and West.58

58 University Club, p. 4490.
Goldwater asked the audience to accept that a resurrection of Stalin indicated a return to the policies of that era. However, more documentation was necessary to establish that a return to the practices of that era was eminent.

The effectiveness of the Arizona Senator's use of reasoning from cause varied with the documentation provided. Initially, Goldwater offered one item of data to support the claim that the anti-Vietnam war demonstrations were the cause of the loss of morale in our Asian troops. He stated:

Already our troops and our fighting men in Vietnam have had their morale severely shaken by the spectacle of thousands of people running through the streets and shouting their disapproval with what our fighting men are trying to accomplish. 59

The Senator could have enhanced the claim by supplying more evidence. However, common sense would indicate that anti-war demonstrations would, at least, not strengthen the morale of our troops.

In speaking to the U. S. Senate, Goldwater stated that the President needed to maintain some kind of administrative control over the sprawling Federal bureaucracy or it would control his administration. The Senator indicated that the President should direct his attention to the problem.

The magazine Business Week, back on August 3, 1968, reported on the aspect of the civilian work force in government and commented 'to get these hundreds of thousands of accountants, plumbers, lawyers, clerks, and engineers swinging the way he wants them to, the new president will be at the mercy of his middle managers'. 60

The Arizonan continued saying that this matter has not received

59 Association of Old Crows, p. 31292.
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as much attention as it should have from the President. Goldwater stated:

The point I raise today is whether the Nixon administration has actually understood the problem and come to grips with the need for controlling the so-called 'middle management level' of the Federal Government. I seriously doubt it, or we would not see the freedom with which government employees come together in mass meetings designed to oppose a major policy of the new administration. 61

Goldwater's next statement was based on the possibility that members of the Nixon Administration were unaware of the necessity of placing individuals in middle management positions who adhered to the administration's "philosophy of government and its attitudes toward the burning public issues of the day." 62

It is negative motion for the administration to place in positions of middle management responsibility individuals who either oppose the President's programs outright or who are lukewarm in their support of administration policies generally. . . . 63

Demonstrating the difficulty of staffing governmental positions, Goldwater cites:

A mere presidential appointment does not make an administration expert. For example, some members of President Nixon's cabinet come up very short in this department--through no lack of intelligence--through a complete lack of experience in political bureaucratic administration. 63

This illustration indicates how competence is often confused with political consideration. The Senator added that "a man can be a lousy administrator, but if he happens to be a liberal who doesn't see eye to eye with everything the national administration stands for, his dismissal is always attributed in the public press to philosophical differences." 65 He continued with the example of:

63 Ibid. 64 Ibid. 65 U.S. Senate, Federal Government, p. 645.
the former head of the U. S. Office of Education, Dr. James Allen, who was dismissed recently; many administration critics claimed the action resulted from differences with the White House over segregation policies. . . . While this difference of opinion may have had some bearing on the situation, the fact remains that Dr. Allen was discharged primarily because he did not possess the administrative ability to handle the job.66

Using argument from cause, the Arizonan said that the problem with the Federal bureaucracy stemmed from the inattention given to it by the administration, the selection of individuals for key governmental positions that were at variance with the administration's proposals, and the reports in the press that confused competence and philosophical differences. Additional strength could have been provided for the reasoning process if the Senator had provided an indication of where he had secured the information. This was done, however, only with the use of the Business Week quotation.

Barry Goldwater relied heavily on the use of analogies. While often these analogies were backed by American values, in a simply developed comparison regarding what would happen if the Russians attained a position of dominance on the world waterways, the Senator said:

By controlling the waterways of the world, Russia could establish a supremacy comparable to that enjoyed by the English during the period known in history as 'Pax Britannica'. That era was one in which Britain held undisputed world supremacy through the mere maintenance of the most powerful navy ever seen. No nations in that period dared to challenge any policy or extend their own interests if either ran counter to British concerns.67

Through the use of this comparison, the Arizonan equated Russian rule with that enjoyed at one time by the English. Thus, he

67 Order of De Molay, p. 18432.
advanced the conclusion that the same conditions would be operative—that no country would challenge the power of any nation controlling the waterways.

Barry Goldwater did not use appeals to commonly held audience values extensively in the speeches delivered to neutral and hostile audiences. When found in the Senator's addresses, the values were those that reflected general American feelings, rather than those held by any one segment of the population. The appeals to freedom and pride in America were representative of those the Arizonan used.

Concerning the SST proposal, Goldwater contended that the people who are spearheading the drive against the SST are many of the same people who have been attempting, through every possible device, to bring about a reduction in American arms.68

The Senator further specified that efforts to halt American involvement in the SST development were occurring at the same time that the Russians were building up arms. In assisting the audience in moving from the information advanced to the conclusion desired, Goldwater relied on motivating the audience through commonly held beliefs and feelings. The Senator from Arizona first appealed to the fear of communism. Specifically, this line of thought was that the growth of communism would result in future attacks on the United States and other free countries. To forestall these attacks, America must be at least equal if not superior to the Soviet Union. Closely connected with, and used in conjunction with the distaste for communism, Goldwater concurrently suggested that by nature, communism limits and destroys freedom. To the Senator, freedom must be preserved and any

68 U. S. Senate, SST, p. 43.
attempt to limit this freedom must be thwarted.

Motivational appeals were also used by Barry Goldwater to establish the claim that the United States should participate more fully in the development of the SST program for economic reasons. The Arizonan indicated his position with the following statement.

The foreign producers are not going to wait for . . . Congress to decide this matter on the basis of possible environmental effects or domestic spending priorities. They are competitors who have come in second best too often and too long in the history of commercial affairs to pass up the opportunity they have right now to assume leadership over the United States in the matter of air superiority.  

The Senator continued by showing what would happen if the United States did not enter into the SST development.

When the airlines reach the point that they have to have supersonic transportation to meet competition from overseas, they will buy that airplane. They will buy it from the Soviets, or the French, or the British if we are not able to provide it.  

Implicitly, this warrant also applied to the more general argument that American superiority should be retained. Explicitly, Goldwater activated the appeal to United States ingenuity and tapped the American sense of pride. The Senator articulated this link specifically by saying "I do not believe, Mr. President, that American technology and know-how is so deficient that it must bow to the Russian and the French and the British in this area of air supremacy." In a more extended form later in the speech, Goldwater commented,

I . . . wonder what happened to that fine old boast about Yankee knowhow. . . . for many years our nation was able to overcome competition . . . by the simple expedient of being able to build a 'better mousetrap'. And in the 'mousetrap' business we

---
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were unchallenged... we always came up with the better product. ... our 'mousetrap' is one that was capable of landing men on the moon before any other nation or collection of nations. ... we have Members of this body telling us that in the SST development we not only cannot build a better mousetrap, we cannot even build one. 72

3. **Backing.** Barry Goldwater used motivational appeals to provide the support for both inductive and deductive reasoning patterns. Most prevalent in the Senator's speeches were fear of communism, the necessity for freedom and security for all Americans, and the use of examples taken from historical instances.

In an example of backing for inductive reasoning patterns, Goldwater advanced the position that the documents of government uphold the fundamental role of the President to plan and conduct the military and foreign affairs of the United States. First, the Arizonan presented comments from John Jay and Chief Justice Marshall. Credibility for these individuals was provided by the Senator in the data. He said

John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, who observed in the *Federalist* that the executive possesses greater inherent strengths in his direction of matters affecting our international affairs. These include the unity of the office, the capacity for secrecy and speed, and superior sources of information. 73

He continued by indicating that

Chief Justice Marshall... when he was still a member of the House of Representatives, ... said that 'the President is the sole organ of the Nation in its external relations and its sole representative with foreign powers'. 74

Goldwater additionally related that the President's role in

---

72 U. S. Senate, SST, p. 43.
73 New Hampshire Chamber of Commerce, p. 14328.
74 New Hampshire Chamber of Commerce, p. 14327.
foreign relations was reaffirmed by the Supreme Court in both the Curtiss Wright decision and in Cunningham v. Neagle. The Senator provided added support for the premise by referring directly to the Constitution. He stated that the President's function and action in Cambodia was supported by the authority of

the first sentence of Article II of the Constitution. This provision declares that 'the executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America'.

The meaning of this clause is that the Constitution has vested in the President all the executive powers of a sovereign nation, including the capacity to form important policy independent of direction by Congress.\(^7^6\)

Finally, documentation was gained from section 3 of Article II "which places upon the President, and the President alone, the duty to 'take care that the laws be faithfully executed'. . . . the laws of the land include treaty law and international law.\(^7^7\)

The Arizona Senator cited Justices of the Supreme Court, the Court's decisions, and the Constitution to establish the claim that the President had authority to govern in foreign policy matters. The Senator enhanced the acceptability of the claim by using examples based on historical precedent. However, Goldwater took the liberty of interpreting not only the examples but also the Constitution itself, and in some cases his conclusions regarding what the evidence actually said is suspect. The Senator from Arizona blended the conservative desire to base action on historical examples with the necessity for protecting American citizens and interests when he stated

\(^7^5\)New Hampshire Chamber of Commerce, p. 14327.

\(^7^6\)Ibid.

\(^7^7\)Ibid.
The verdict of history which stands as the best proof. . . . since the Constitution was adopted there have been nearly 140 armed incidents in which the President, without any prior Congressional authorization, and without any prior declaration of war, has ordered the Armed Forces of the United States to take action or maintain a military stance abroad.

While many of these actions involved the protection of American property or American citizens in foreign lands, a great many of these incidents have been concerned with the general defense of the United States or the protection of some national security interest.\(^{78}\)

Another example of backing of an inductive reasoning pattern was presented when, in opposing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, Barry Goldwater contended that the proposed treaty would affect foreign affairs.

There is reason to believe that ratification of this treaty at this time would in effect place the U. S. stamp of approval on the aggressive and militant move made by Russia to stamp out human freedom. Members of the Senate I believe will have to ask themselves. . . . Do we, in ratifying this treaty, announce to the world that we are ready to forget that the Soviet Union has a long, dishonorable history of broken treaties?\(^{79}\)

Specifically, the Senator remembered that since ratification of the Test Ban Treaty, "the Soviet Union has repeatedly demonstrated that, far from reducing or being interested in a reduction of world tensions, it has actively and aggressively promoted such tensions on a worldwide basis."\(^{80}\)

The Senator used examples to further support his position.

The Viet Cong and Hanoi couldn't have kept up the pace at which they are killing American soldiers for six months without the supplies and support sent to them by our partner in the Test Ban Treaty. The Middle East would not today be the tinder box threatening the peace of three continents if it were not for an aggressive policy of Soviet arming of Arab nations. The Mediterranean would not today be bristling with Soviet naval power.

\(^{78}\) New Hampshire Chamber of Commerce, p. 14328.

\(^{79}\) West Point Society, p. 2640. \(^{80}\) Ibid.
Czechoslovakia would not have been invaded, nor would Rumania and West Germany be threatened.  

Drawing this line of analysis to a conclusion, Goldwater related

These are serious questions which bear directly on the security of this nation. . . . there can be no accommodation, there can be no true detente, so long as the Soviet Union continues to ferment aggression and stir up war. A thousand non-proliferation treaties with the Soviet Union will not wipe out actions such as the invasion of Czechoslovakia.  

Employing specific examples, the Senator wished his audience to conclude that if America signed the treaty it would indicate approval of Russian aggressive behavior. These acts of aggression would be viewed as undesirable by many Americans. The Arizona Senator added credence to his argument by saying

the Soviet Union violated the treaty by its invasion of Czechoslovakia while the document was awaiting action in the U.S. Senate. The preamble of the treaty declares that 'states must refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state'.  

As typically found in the Arizonan's addresses on foreign policy, the mention of aggression activated a fear of communism as well as the necessity to maintain the security of the country. While the communists would not be halted by opposing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, the Senator was asking his audience to accept the premise that United States support for such a treaty would not only indicate our support for Russian actions, but that it would affect foreign policy generally.

The only backing that was located for a deductive reasoning

---
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pattern was found when the Senator employed reasoning from analogy. The use of analogous reasoning with motivational backing provided Goldwater's counter to the attack that the SST would "put out enough water in the atmosphere to change the temperature . . . and result in a melting of the polar ice cap and the consequent flooding of large areas of the civilized world." The Arizona Senator provided three examples, or analogies, to support the premise that this would not occur. The Senator related

in 1883, when the Pacific Island of Krakatoa, blew up, it put a cubic mile of sea water into the upper atmosphere . . . without changing the atmospheric temperature of the world . . . . But even this development—certainly one more tremendous than could be produced by any kind of an enormous SST fleet. . . . --did not melt the polar ice cap.

Second, the Senator compared the SST environmental effects with the plane raids in Germany during World War II.

Those raids over Germany, with the long trails produced by the superchargers emitting warm air, which produced molecules of water which froze and made long wide trails, plus the compression of the air at the wing tips of the aircraft. . . . did not change the weather in Europe one bit, during the raids or after them.

Finally, Goldwater equated the possible environmental effects of the SST with the Bikini A-bomb tests in 1946 in the Pacific. After citing the predictions of scientists regarding the experiments, the Senator related

no tidal waves occurred and the earth's crust remained undamaged, and about all that came out of the predictions of catastrophe was a vast supply of sorely needed scientific information that we never would have gotten had we turned all the 'ifs' in that situation against Operation Crossroads, as the Bikini tests were known.

---
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Through these three historical analogies, Barry Goldwater equated the effects of the SST with Krakatoa, German plane raids, and the Bikini A-bomb tests. In each case, water had been ejected into the atmosphere without resulting in the dire consequence predicted. Implicit in the comparisons was the use of historical incidents and events to determine the future course of action.

Analogous reasoning was also used when speaking to the University Club when Goldwater discussed the need to maintain an adequate defense posture. The Senator referred to a comment made by Dwight Eisenhower that

we face a hostile ideology—global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose and insidious in method. Unhappily the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. . . . A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment.®

The Arizonan concluded:

Those words were spoken by Dwight Eisenhower on January 17, 1961, just a little over eight years ago. They hold just as true this minute as they did in 1961. We are faced with a hostile ideology, and liberty is the stake. It can only be protected through the maintenance of American strength.®

While Goldwater equated the conditions that the United States faced with those faced in 1961, some audience members might not have accepted the comparison. However, in summarizing the unit of proof, Goldwater referred to the fact that liberty was at stake. Because American citizens prize freedom and liberty, and wish to see these values preserved, they would tend to agree with the Senator's desire to protect them. To capitalize on this link, Goldwater stressed that the only way liberty could be secured was through American strength.

---
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4. **No reasoning pattern.** In some instances Barry Goldwater failed to establish any link between the data presented and the claim. In discussing the nuclear non-proliferation treaty, the Senator provided a reason for its rejection. He stated

> it would provide no safeguard which would go into effect simultaneously with the application of the treaty. The safeguards for verification of compliance would not be negotiated nor established until after the treaty enters into force and need not be concluded for two years thereafter. \(^{90}\)

He continued

> The inspection phase of the treaty would be entrusted to the International Atomic Energy Agency which has no proven inspection skill. Even if adequate safeguards could be developed, the agency is limited under the treaty to declare nuclear facilities. There is no provision for searching out clandestine facilities. Nor does the treaty impose any penalty or sanction of any nation that violates the treaty. \(^{91}\)

No reasoning pattern was advanced to link evidence to conclusion. Since Goldwater was presenting these allegations as fact, his ethos would have to be high to have secured acceptance of the claim. However, while a large portion of the strength of the argument depended on the Senator's credibility, this was never established.

**Argumentative strategies.** Four specific strategies were utilized by Senator Goldwater when speaking to neutral and hostile audiences. First, contrary to the normal conservative position, Goldwater argued for changes in current policies. Second, the Arizonan made extensive use of refutation to counter the positions of his opponents. Third, the Senator's simplistic analysis is evident in his use of either/or alternatives. Finally, the Arizona Senator advocated

---
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positions which deviated from those espoused by his audience.

1. **Change.** Chapter III documented that one of the primary factors distinguishing the liberal from the conservative ideologies involved the issue of social change. Conservatives allegedly resist progress. However, writers for the philosophy state that change is necessary but that when it is being contemplated it should be in response to a societal need, retain valued institutions and goals, and be accomplished in a evolutionary manner.

In two addresses Goldwater argued that change was needed. Arguing for implementation of the ABM system, Barry Goldwater advanced the position that the choice was either to move ahead and keep abreast of the times, or hearken back to that period in the 1920's and 1930's when isolationism, disarmament, and the downgrading of the military and the ROTC were being promoted. This line of analysis offered not only an example of the Senator's use of either/or alternatives for complex problems, but also supported the position that the ABM system was necessary for national security. The Arizonan began by comparing conditions today with those of the 20's and 30's. He said, "People are tired of war. Many yearn for the comforting isolated days of an earlier era. Many want to risk again the dangers of unilateral disarmament in the face of rising armed strength in the potential enemy camps." Furthermore, he mentioned

We are today hearing the same kind of arguments that were used twenty years ago in a futile attempt to get this nation to forego the development of a hydrogen bomb while our Russian adversaries in the Cold War pushed ahead with their own H bomb.\(^{93}\)

---
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In further supporting the position that the United States must move ahead and keep abreast of the times, the Senator cites

It took Secretary McNamara . . . years even to concede. . . . that the Russians had begun to erect a system for defending Leningrad, Moscow, and other areas of Russian territory from the possibility of an attack. . . . It wasn't until last year, when the Russians began an advanced phase of their ABM deployment that Mr. McNamara saw fit to recommend that maybe it would not be a bad idea to explore the idea of a little protection for the United States. 94

A more specific example of change is reflected in Goldwater's discussion of the Federal bureaucracy. Contending that change is essential to democratic processes, the Senator stated, "Governments change, new administrations take office, political complexions of Presidents change to reflect the will of the qualified voters of the United States." 95 Referring to the system he said, "When the people of this country become dissatisfied with the kind of government they are receiving, they go to the polls and vote to oust the officials responsible." 96

The Senator placed this problem in perspective by indicating that

the question is whether this will of the people, whether this officially stamped request for a change in direction can ever be completely realized under the present system of bureaucratic management. I do not think that the will of the people and the intent of Congress goes deep enough into the places where the policies are made. . . . The officials oriented to the philosophies promoted by the Democratic Party have been in control too long, their numbers are too great and their influence too strong to quickly bring about any substantial change in the things that cause concern among the people. 97

94 New Jersey Bankers's Association, p. 14511.
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Implicit in Goldwater's argument for change was an indictment of the Democrats and their policies. Because the Senate was composed of as many Democrats as Republicans, at least a portion of the listeners could be offended by the Senator's negative remarks about their party. Thus, even if they agreed with the position that change was desirable, they might not have accepted Goldwater's claim since the speaker challenged the values of a portion of the audience.

2. Refutation. An interesting aspect of Barry Goldwater's speeches to neutral and/or hostile audiences was the reliance on refutational strategies. In some speeches, Goldwater cited the position of his opponents, and then disagreed. When demonstrating the necessity to proceed with necessary defense projects, for example, the Senator states that "we are told, . . . that the way to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union on arms limitations is to refuse President Nixon's request for the Safeguard missile defense system."98 His countering of the position consisted of the statement:

The argument overlooks the fact that the Russians already have an ABM system which is now in the third phase of deployment. It also ignores the fact that if the Safeguard system is defeated in Congress, the United States will be forced to escalate drastically the international arms race and begin erecting a gigantic nuclear capacity.99

A similar argument was advanced to the New Jersey Banker's Association. In refuting the allegation that opponents felt that the development of the ABM system would signal the start of a new arms race, the Arizonan stated

98 Order of De Molay, p. 18431.
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The plain fact is that our delayed decision to go ahead with an ABM was not the start of a new arms race; rather it was a decision not to lose a race already in progress, and one in which the Soviets threaten to leave us far behind.\textsuperscript{100}

On other occasions, rather than simply stating the opinions of his opposition and advancing a direct counter through either specific data or his opinion, the Senator offered analysis replete with lines of reasoning and motivational appeals. Barry Goldwater used this type of refutational strategy in conjunction with the argument that opponents of the ABM system viewed it as too costly. Rather than directly refuting the argument, the Senator began by mentioning that a portion of the costliness of the program stemmed from our not implementing it earlier. He stated

The Russians have been building a missile defense for five years, and we have known about it for five years. Suppose we had started, even a year after the Russians. Think of what it would have meant in dollars and cents, when you count inflation and what inflation has done to defense costs in the last four years. . . . it may be costly to go ahead with the Safeguard today, but at our present rate of increase and inflation, think of what it would be if we had to start one, five, or ten years from now.\textsuperscript{101}

While it was desirable to live in a world where war was impossible, the Senator did not believe this was feasible. In giving credence to this idea, Goldwater related

Soviet Russia is getting tougher and stronger by the minute. Czechoslovakia is a case in point. The Soviets' increased armaments, their growing Navy in the Mediterranean, their arming of the Arab nations, their emphasis on more and heavier explosives, megatonnage, ICBM's—all of those things point to an adversary of ours who is arming to the teeth and deploying a defense against any possible missile attack from outside its borders.\textsuperscript{102}

Goldwater proceeded by equating the cost of the system with
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the human lives involved

You cannot estimate a cost on millions of lives and the possibility of their being wiped out in an enemy attack on this country. You cannot estimate the cost of millions of lives or even one life in dollars and cents that might, if they didn't go to an ABM system, be channeled into American ghettos.103

Qualifying his argument, the Senator mentioned that he was not suggesting that all our nation's resources should be spent on defense.

Now understand me well. I am not for expending this nation's entire substance in military hardware to the exclusion of welfare, to the exclusion of rebuilding our cities, to the exclusion of increasing the level of health and welfare for our many underprivileged people... But I say to you that the welfare of these people will mean nothing at all unless they are safe.104

Although Goldwater did not specifically delineate the cost of instituting an ABM system, the analysis employed was that regardless of the financial resources necessary, the lives and security of the country mandated the proposal. For this claim to be accepted, the bankers would have to agree that the buildup of an ABM system and armaments in Russia was a sign of an eminent threat to this country.

Barry Goldwater also used rhetorical questions as a refutational strategy. Using the tactic as a means of directly refuting the claim that our enemy's intentions and attitudes were improving, the Senator asked

If the Russians are mellowing, if they want to ease world tensions... why... don't they act like it? Why are the Russians intent on disrupting the whole of Europe? Why are they... taking sides with the Arabs in the Middle East, why do they encourage trouble in Berlin, why do they move troops to the Finnish border, why do they feed the military machine of the Viet Cong in Southeast Asia? Are these really the acts of a world super-power interested in maintaining a reasonable, intelligent balance of
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affairs that will prevent the development of World War III?  

Before offering another series of questions, the Senator indicated that the acts represented were not those of a mellowing nation. He said

No. They are not the acts of a nation bent on peace and harmony in a dangerously complex world. They are the acts of a nation dedicated to the concept of world conquest and, consequently, to the use of every situation that comes to hand in the international sphere to implement an overall design.

Goldwater summarized the argument with the observation

How can anyone look at the chain of events which has been put together by the Soviet Union since the August invasion—a chain which runs from the northern-most part of Europe through the central continent and into the Middle East—and still believe the Russians are pursuing a new course of reasonableness in world affairs?

3. Either/or alternatives. On occasion, Goldwater reverted to the use of either/or alternatives in his addresses. In using this technique, the Senator asked his audience to not only accept that there were only two choices, but that the one he advocated was the only logical one to accept. The first example of this strategy appeared when Goldwater attempted to convince his audience that either they proceed with ABM development or be left defenseless. He began his argument by saying

We are . . . debating . . . the most important question to come before this Congress in many years. . . . because, despite its many technical aspects and its possible non-workability, we are speaking here about an ultimate system to protect this nation's deterrent capabilities and to defend 200 million American lives against the possibility of an enemy attack. I am not convinced that Safeguard is the final answer, nor that the Safeguard is the
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most effective ABM device we could proceed with at this time. It may well be that Safeguard will not be the system ultimately deployed.\(^{108}\)

In extending this line of argument the Senator indicated that

What this issue boils down to is whether this country is to have even a rudimentary counterpart to the elaborate, three-stage, Soviet defense system known as Galosh. The argument is over whether we have something to match against Soviet defenses or nothing at all. And let's make it very clear we are not here talking about an offensive weapon system.\(^{109}\)

Certain weaknesses are evident in the proof structure. The Senator related that he was skeptical of whether the proposed Safeguard system would even work. Yet he continued by contending that either the present proposal was adopted or we would be left defenseless. The Senator neglected to prove that there were no other systems feasible or that any other proposals would be less desirable than the one under consideration.

Discussing the same topic, Goldwater told the Fraternal Order of De Molay that the choice for America was either to adopt the ABM defensive system or build a first rate offensive system. He said

If the Congress of the United States refuses to provide a defense for its deterrent capability, the only course left is to build an offensive force of ICBM's and multiple warheads so powerful that it will be able to overcome any type of first strike attack.\(^{110}\)

The Senator extends the argument with the statement that

The 'doves' in the U. S. Senate . . . cannot force the rejection of a missile defense such as Safeguard unless they are willing to accept the concept of an expanded offense based on multiple warheads. If the American people are to enjoy a measure of military security, they must have one system or the other. To reject both Safeguard and MIRV would be an act of unilateral disarmament so
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stark that any potential enemy would regard it as an open invitation to move against us.111

4. Counter positions. In telling the truth as he saw it, the Senator often expressed opinions that ran counter to those of his audience. For example, almost the entire address to the Magazine Publisher's Association ran counter to the audience's beliefs. Discussing the difference between America's need to know as opposed to America's right to know, the Senator explained that part of the responsibility of the press was to identify and insure the accuracy of the sources and the information used. He stated

I do, however, have doubts about the wisdom of publishers and commentators who broadcast information obtained unofficially from non-identified sources which has the effect of destroying the reputations of public officials. I find myself wondering seriously about the right to know when some hidden source levels charges at responsible public officials or any other American citizen.112

Goldwater articulated his position with the statement, "We need to know . . . the exact identity of the people who are the sources of these stories."113 The Senator stated

It is fine to talk about the right to know but let me tell you that right includes a lot more than just the right of an editor or publisher to decide what the American people should know. When you get into the business of leveling charges against men in public life, you'd better be very sure of your facts—you'd better be very sure of your facts that is if America's need to know and the people's right to know is to mean anything in our representative form of government.114

The Senator claimed that the public's right to know was not valid on some occasions because of national defense and public safety.
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He said

I am not about to concede that just because a newspaper is on the track of a hot story that it has an absolute, unquestionable right to whatever information the government may possess on that particular story. I believe there are times when a government, even a democratic form of government, must deny the right to know to the general public. 115

The Senator from Arizona was speaking to an audience of publishers. These individuals were convinced that they should have the authority to report the news without any restrictions. Because the Arizonan was qualifying the rights that these people had in executing their jobs and responsibilities, his position would not be viewed favorably by the audience.

On other occasions, Goldwater criticized members of the audience. Specifically, when speaking to the U. S. Senate, the Arizonan cast discredit on the liberal community who were trying to destroy chances for the SST program.

It strikes me that the liberal community is bound and determined that a Republican Nixon administration should never be credited with having advocated and developed a major move in the direction of progress. Perhaps if a liberal Democrat were in the White House, the opponents of the SST would be less fearful of melting ice caps and Socialists' threats and more confident of American technological ability. 116

The Senator mentioned next that

We seem to number among the opponents of this measure of progress those liberals who have staked their entire political lives on demands for change and progress in our society. It seems to me when we have one liberal charging socialism and another alleging McCarthyism, the whole thrust of this opposition is a matter of sponsorship. 117

The two liberals to which Goldwater was referring were John

115 Magazine Publisher's Association, press release.
116 U. S. Senate, SST, p. 43. 117 Ibid.
Galbraith and Senator Proxmire. Galbraith, the former Chairman of Americans for Democratic Action "told . . . the National Press Club that Government sponsorship of the SST is a manifestation of what he calls the Socialist drive."\textsuperscript{118} In discrediting Galbraith, Goldwater remembered that within the last year, the professor "suggested that Government take over the whole business of constructing military weapons and equipment."\textsuperscript{119} By pointing out this contradiction of position, Goldwater cast doubt on the credibility of the Harvard professor.

The further contradiction in the liberal position was illustrated by reference to a statement made before the Senate by Proxmire of Wisconsin. The Arizonan indicated that Proxmire "charged . . . that the Department of Transportation is engaging in something he calls SST McCarthyism."\textsuperscript{120}

Presenting the position that not only were the liberals opposed to the SST but that they were guilty of contradicting themselves and their philosophy, Goldwater sought to establish the premise that the fate of the SST proposal rested on its sponsorship. In this regard the Senator attempted to generalize from the statements of Galbraith and Proxmire to all liberals. If the audience agreed with the Arizona Senator that these men were typical liberals and acknowledged the contradiction of the remarks cited, some discredit would be associated with the liberal stance on the issue. However, because the Senate is composed of liberals, moderates, and conservatives, at least a portion of the audience would be unreceptive to the Arizonan's indictment of their political position.

\textsuperscript{118}U. S. Senate, SST, p. 43. \textsuperscript{119}Ibid. \textsuperscript{120}Ibid.
Persuasive Strategies

Realizing that individuals rarely reach conviction solely on the basis of logical argumentation, Barry Goldwater used motivational appeals when creating his enthymemes as well as when formulating the backing for the reasoning patterns used. Two specific strategies outside the realm of argumentation further enhanced the Arizona Senator's positions with neutral and hostile audiences. Initially, Goldwater identified himself with the topics of the addresses in an attempt to establish his credibility to speak on the issue. Secondarily, the Senator polarized issues and groups according to whether or not they agreed with his perception of reality.

Identification. Senator Goldwater's rhetoric reveals an interesting finding with respect to the means of identification employed. While the Arizonan could have enhanced his position with his audience if he had established a correspondence between himself and his listeners or if he had demonstrated the relevance of the topic to his listeners' interests, he did neither. The only strategy which the Senator used was to illustrate his association with the issue under discussion. Thus, his means of identification consisted of supplying knowledge concerning his ability to speak competently on the topic. Since many of Goldwater's arguments were based primarily on his credibility, a careful examination is required of his use of speaker-issue identification. The Arizona Senator employed this strategy when he spoke on both domestic issues and foreign policy issues.

1. Domestic issues. The Arizonan identified himself with the topic of America's need to know when he addressed the Magazine
Publisher's Association. Initially, Goldwater expressed his opinion that truthful information was needed concerning Watergate by saying, "There has never been any doubt in my mind that there was an extreme need for Americans to know about Watergate but at the same time there is a need to know the whole story." He continued, "I argued for and voted for public hearings by the Senate select committee in the sincere and honest belief that the American people had a right to know the entire truth about this sordid affair."

In the same address Goldwater stated

If my credentials need proving, let me merely point out that I joined with Senator Kennedy in sponsoring legislation to give magazines a better break on postal rates for the sole reason that the action would facilitate America's ability to know.

Providing another example, Goldwater related, "A couple of years ago there was a celebrated incident which I claim as further proof of my belief that the American people need to know and have a right to know facts which affect their present or their future."

He continued

I asked Henry Kissinger, ... then President Nixon's foreign policy advisor, for some information regarding Indo-China. He obliged by sending me a copy of a confidential press briefing. ... I read the material over and felt that it could be very helpful to other Members of the Senate so I immediately placed it in the Congressional Record. ... some people were inclined to think this was a blunder on my part and that I did not know about confidential press briefings. I can assure you that this was not the case.

In articulating his credibility to speak on the topic of America's need to know, Goldwater mentioned that he had voted for

\(^{121}\) Magazine Publisher's Association, press release.
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complete disclosure on Watergate and breaks on postal rates. Additionally, the Senator provided an example of where he had been responsible for the publication of classified material solely on the principle that the public needed to be aware of the information. While the Senator indicated that, by his actions, he believed in his position, he did not provide specific documentation as to why his ideas should be followed. Nowhere in the information did Goldwater establish that he had studied the problem or had the expertise to speak with authority on it.

The Senator also identified himself with the issue of controlling the Federal bureaucracy. Initially, he claimed, "The tremendous size of the Federal Government was a major concern of mine when I first was elected to the Senate over 18 years ago." The Senator next referred to the fact that

any man who finds himself running for the top office in this nation on a major party ticket is forced to give some thought and some study to the whole question of how you go about staffing the national government.

This whole problem is so vast that no man with even an outside chance of becoming President can do any less than to devote long hours of very concentrated study to the structuring and functioning of the Federal Government.

Goldwater also mentioned the fact that he was aware of the public concern over governmental policies. The Senator demonstrated that mail from his constituents reflected this increased concern.

My office mail was extremely light when I first came to the Senate in 1953. . . . Of course, it increased tremendously prior to 1964 and much of this had to do with my nomination as the Republican Presidential candidate. But even allowing for the

---

increased population of Arizona and allowing for my questionable status as a one-time candidate for President, my office mail today reflects a greatly increased concern on the part of the people in my state.\textsuperscript{128}

In this attempt to enhance his credibility, the Arizona Senator offered one of the only examples of audience-issue identifi- cation in any of the addresses studied. He stated "I believe this [public concern] can be attested to by any member of this chamber who keeps an accurate count of the mail he receives from his constituents from week to week."\textsuperscript{129}

Finally, Goldwater showed that while his state was some 2,500 miles from Washington, he was
enormously impressed at the number of people from Arizona who now visit my Washington office to clear up problems that have to do with the Federal Government and its relation to the communities, the land, the schools and the hospitals in my state.\textsuperscript{130}

Barry Goldwater's issue-identification regarding the Federal bureaucracy was both stronger and weaker than other such attempts. By showing that he had been concerned with the problem for eighteen years and that he had been in a position to think about staffing the major positions of that bureaucracy, the Senator established that he had given considerable deliberation to the problem. Additionally, in documenting the position that Americans were concerned about government, the Arizonan not only established his personal experiences but linked them to those of his audience. Goldwater's years and experience in Washington would have given credence to the information he provided. However, he was speaking to the U. S. Senate, and the members of this
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audience would have had knowledge of the bureaucracy and would know the concern of the American people regarding that government entity. Their impressions might or might not have agreed with the Arizona Senator's assessment.

The Senator also linked himself with the issue of the SST. Initially, Goldwater provided the following in regard to the sonic boom argument.

I happen to live in a part of the United States over which three times a day are flown aircraft capable of mach 3.1, or three times the speed of sound and it is very difficult to hear or feel that shock wave which is generated at about 80,000 feet. I have flown that aircraft myself, and a passenger would experience no feeling at all as the sonic barriers are met.\(^{131}\)

On a more general nature, the Senator expressed his concern over the environment should the SST be developed.

I should like to point out that I yield to no Member of the Senate in my concern over the problem of pollution. I have a new book coming out which devotes many thousand of words to the great need for maintaining a healthy atmosphere regardless of what it costs. Consequently, I say here that I am absolutely convinced that far from endangering the atmosphere, the SST will generate less pollutants per passenger mile than most other transportation alternatives.\(^{132}\)

In arguing for the adoption of the SST, Goldwater referred first to his knowledge of aviation generally, and to supersonic transportation specifically. The Senators, who would have been aware of the Arizonan's interest in air transportation, would have given some authority to Goldwater on this issue. However, when discussing his concern regarding the pollution problem, the Arizona Senator merely mentioned that his new book devoted attention to the necessity for a

\[^{131}\text{U. S. Senate, SST, p. 42.}\]
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healthy environment. This attempt to identify with the issue fell short since Goldwater failed to demonstrate any specific expertise to speak on the issue of environmental safeguards.

2. Foreign policy. Goldwater also used speaker-issue identification when he spoke to audiences on foreign policy. For example, the Senator told the Association of Old Crows that Richard Nixon should direct our Vietnam policy. The Arizonan identified with the President through the statement "I know Richard Nixon, and I think he's right." In further supporting this position, Goldwater related

We are fortunate to have in the White House a man of sound judgment and high courage who has had the honesty and directness to inform the emotional crowds with their banners and their signs that policy is not made in the streets. In attempting to document agreement with Nixon's position concerning Vietnam, the Arizona Senator asserted that the President's judgment was sound. However, he failed to provide examples of where President Nixon's past record had lead to this conclusion. Additionally, and more importantly, Goldwater skirted the issue that Richard Nixon should direct our foreign policy. While Goldwater thought Nixon was right, had sound judgment, and maintained courage enough to inform the populus that policy was not made in the streets, these comments in no way documented his ability to direct Vietnam policy.

In attempting to establish his expertise on the ABM, Goldwater said

I have sat through many hours of testimony in the Senate Armed Services Committee on the question of . . . the Safeguard ABM. . . . I have read a great many thousands of words on this subject and a

---
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large percentage of what I have heard and read has been arguments against the Nixon Administration's first major defense project.  

He continued

And I am struck by the similarity of the arguments . . . in opposition to this proposal. Boiled down, they all come around in various degrees of directness to an expressed fear that something we do in the field of defense may upset or irritate the Soviet Union. We are told . . . that approval of the Safeguard ABM system will destroy the possibility of our engaging in arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union. This had no basis in truth. The fact of the matter actually is that the Russians didn't even entertain the idea of such negotiations until we announced our determination to build a missile defense.

By indicating that familiarity with the topic had been afforded through assignment of the Senate Armed Services Committee, as well as the fact that he was well read on the subject, Goldwater alluded to more than a layman's knowledge of the ABM controversy. The Congressmen would also possess some information on the ABM, however, because of the Arizonan's committee assignments and interests, the assembly would probably acknowledge that the Senator possessed sufficient information to give credence to his argument.

This same knowledge was used when the Arizona Senator spoke to the De Molay. Concluding his argument on the ABM, the Arizonan remarked on the financial ramifications of the implementation of the ABM as opposed to the offensive missile system. He contended, "And I can tell you from my experience on the Armed Services Committee, that the cost of a defensive system would be far cheaper in the long run than the other alternative." Because this lay audience would not

---
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be privy to the extensive information that the U. S. Senate had at their disposal, Goldwater's allusion to his expertise in this instance would have probably been effective.

Finally, in speaking to the West Point Society, the Senator compared the nuclear non-proliferation treaty to the 1963 Test Ban Treaty. He recalls

It was promoted . . . as a 'great forward step' in the never ceasing struggle for world peace. In that instance, all technical and factual consideration were swept aside in a wave of optimism. . . . I would remind you that I, along with most other members of the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee, voted against that treaty.\textsuperscript{138}

The Senator used that analogy as the basis for identifying with the issue.

I was told that if I opposed the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, I would automatically forfeit any chance of receiving the Republican presidential nomination. . . . I still felt the treaty had to be opposed in the best interests of the country. I hope I shall never at any time be tempted to place political consideration ahead of what I feel is right and proper for this nation and its security. . . .\textsuperscript{139}

Both this analogy and the attempt to establish the correctness of his position could have enhanced the Senator's stance. However, while the analogy did attempt to make a comparison of two treaties between the United States and the U.S.S.R., the similarities of these two instances are not advanced. Additionally, the Arizonan did not indicate that any negative consequences resulted from implementation of the former treaty. The Senator might have increased his credibility had he specified who the military experts and scientists were that had provided the information upon which he had based his objections to the earlier treaty. Goldwater was, in essence, asking his audience to

\textsuperscript{138} West Point Society, p. 2641. \textsuperscript{139} Ibid.
accept that the treaty under consideration and the world conditions were the same as in 1963. The audience that the Senator was speaking with were military men. As such they would be aware of military matters and world conditions. Because of this, any omissions or misinformation by the Senator would have probably been noted.

**Polarization.** On a few occasions, Senator Barry Goldwater polarized groups and ideas according to whether or not they agreed with his perception of reality. Four instances of this strategy were particularly noticeable in his rhetoric. Goldwater condemned Secretary General U Thant, the scientific/academic community, and the Federal bureaucracy. He supported the military and the concommitent implementation of technological advances in defense. These advances were necessary for American security, while other programs designed to thwart American military strength were condemned.

1. **Secretary General U Thant.** Barry Goldwater utilized the substantive warrant of generalization when he attempted to support the premise that American Vietnam policy should continue to be made in the White House, in the State Department, and in the Department of Defense. The thrust of his argument concerned a general condemnation of U.N. Secretary General U Thant. Illustrating why U Thant should not direct this policy, Goldwater contended

I, for one, remember Mr. Thant's efforts in connection with the Cuban missile crisis. I also remember the part he played in the Middle Eastern situation just prior to the war of June, 1967. Neither situation convinced me that he was a man whose judgment is superior and whose political concerns are entirely objective.\textsuperscript{140}

\textsuperscript{140} Association of Old Crows, p. 31203.
The Arizonan concluded his argument with the statement, "Mr. Thant does not strike me as the kind of man whose record is such that he can be counted upon to serve in the pose of 'broker' to work out a viable, political situation in South Vietnam."\textsuperscript{141}

In discrediting U Thant, Goldwater referred to two examples of where the Secretary General's actions cast doubt on his ability to direct foreign policy. While Goldwater mentioned specific instances, he did not expand the discussion to include exactly what Mr. Thant's actions had been and why they were undesirable. Additionally, the Senator failed to establish the role that the State Department and the Department of Defense should play in policy determination. He only stated, without providing reasons, that such policy should be made in the White House instead of in the office of U Thant.

2. The Scientific/academic community. The inherent distrust of conservatives for new and scientific information was manifested throughout the Senator's rhetoric to neutral and hostile audiences. For example, when discussing the position that the best foreign policy option that the U. S. has regarding Russia would be to enter into a non-aggressive pact, the Arizonan mentions scientists such as George W. Rathjens and W.K.H. Panofsky, . . . spoke of the possibility of agreement as though it might be just around the corner. Indeed Rathjens saw a Soviet-American agreement to curtail the strategic arms race as 'the least costly, highest confidence measure of all'. Panofsky told the committee that agreed limitations or reduction of armaments 'appears at last to be in sight'.\textsuperscript{142}
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Goldwater stated that rather than an isolated argument, reliance on the possibility of reaching a mutual agreement is "the basic theme running through each and every argument presented to Senate Armed Services Committee for rejection of the Nixon Administration's safe-guard ABM program." The Senator alleged, however, that this premise had no basis in fact. The Senator advanced the position that even if an agreement was imminent, "the lack of an American counterpart to the Soviet's Galosh missile defense would have the United States entering into such an agreement from a position of comparative weakness." Referring to the opposition argument on this point, the Arizonan related that Abram Chayes, Harvard Law Professor, said

'I conclude that from the standpoint of achieving strategic arms limitations agreements, we are much better off in the position we are now in--with no ABM on our side and an obsolete one, difficult [sic] to upgrade, on theirs--than if each side were engaged in competitive deployment.'

Yet Goldwater indicated

If we are to accept this conclusion, we must accept a Harvard Law Professor's estimation that the Soviet ABM system, now in its third stage of advanced deployment, is obsolete. I, for one, am not willing to accept any such conclusion. It calls for a gamble that can be counted in millions of lives.

In citing statements from two scientists, George W. Rathjens and W. K. H. Panofsky, and from Abram Chayes, a Harvard Law Professor, Goldwater questioned the ability of the scientists to pass judgment on the possibility of such a non-aggression agreement becoming a reality. He also questioned a law professor's expertise to discuss whether or not it would be more or less effective to have an ABM system when
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entering into such an agreement.

Another example of the distrust of scientific information was evident when Goldwater compared the development of the H-bomb with the current debates over military weaponry. He explained

You have only to ask yourselves where we would stand 'vis-a-vis' the Soviet Union and Red China if President Truman had accepted the advice of the scientific Left Wing in this country and refused to develop the H bomb. It is easy also to understand what a subservient role we could be cast in today if our leaders had failed to go ahead with the development of the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, ICBM. 147

3. The Federal bureaucracy. Reflecting the conservative dislike for excessive government, Barry Goldwater attacked the abusive nature of the Federal bureaucracy in an address delivered to the U.S. Senate. Demonstrating that some bureaucrats had held their jobs so long that they felt they should have a say in policy, the Senator dramatized the effect this has on Congress' ability to effectively execute its role. He states, "I want to emphasize how this bureaucracy problem thwarts the work that we here in the Senate and the members of the House are engaging in."148 Indicating what happens to the legislation passed in Congress, he began

It shouldn't, but probably would, astound most members of the Senate to find out what actually happens to the intent which we write into major legislation when it gets into the hands of the bureaucrats in the Federal Government. Much of our purpose in enacting laws has been either contradicted, overruled, diluted or denied in many instances by quasi-political rulings by government regulation by the courts.149

Adding impact to this statement, Goldwater says,
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We seem almost complacent in our belief that the people who handle the provisions of the laws we pass will understand the motivation and the intent of the Congress which passed them. Further we seem almost secure in the belief that where this intent is shown that it will be followed without question. I think we all have seen enough examples to realize how far from the actual intent of Congress government bureaucrats have been known to stray in the administration of the laws—either by intention, design or mistake.\textsuperscript{150}

By linking the present situation to the audience's inability to execute the role for which they were elected, Goldwater provided a strong motivational appeal to engage in some action to correct the problem.

4. The military. One theme permeated the rhetoric of Senator Goldwater when he spoke to neutral and hostile audiences: American capability for defense in time of increased international tensions. Through the development of this topic, the Arizonan articulated positive feelings concerning the military-industrial complex while establishing distrust for any program or groups that opposed their goals.

The Senator's position on the military is epitomized by the role that he feels the military-industrial complex executes for this country. He says

\textit{The MIC is the only thing that enable [sic] this nation to maintain a level of strength sufficient to defend western Europe while it rehabilitated itself after World War II. It is the only thing, of course, that enables this nation to maintain its position of leadership in the free world.}\textsuperscript{151}

The necessity for supporting the MIC is dramatized by Goldwater's claim that the Soviet Union is becoming dominant over the
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United States. He contends

The Soviet fleet is now moving to challenge U. S. supremacy in all major oceans and sea lanes. . . . the North Atlantic, the North Sea, the Baltic Sea, the Sea of Japan, the South China Sea, and all major sea routes in the Western Pacific have become regular cruising areas for Soviet warships.152

The Senator from Arizona delineated the concern this has caused the country. First, Goldwater indicated, "The Joint Atomic Energy Committee has warned President Nixon that unless the Administration speeds up its nuclear ship-building program, the Soviet Union will soon dominate the seas of the world."153

The Senator continued by reminding the audience that U. S. Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, warned "that Soviet ocean operations are becoming 'unmistakably more aggressive, more varied, and are being conducted at ever increasing distances from their home base.'"154 Additionally, the Arizonan related "Admiral George W. Anderson, Jr. [Ret.], former Chief of Naval Operations, warned that the meaning of increased Soviet sea power is an attempt at world domination."155 Finally, the Senator depicted what could happen if the Russians do attain such a position of dominance. He cited that "they are reaching for a level of military and naval supremacy which will have the effect of making other nations accede to their strategic interests without having to resort to force."156

For Goldwater, the MIC was necessary for the United States to continue in a position of leadership in the world. By demonstrating
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this and by showing that the Soviets were seeking to usurp our position of superiority, the Senator provided a reason for believing in the need for the military. A common approach that Barry Goldwater took in dramatizing the necessity for a strong military was to engender in his audience a fear of the consequences of the Russian buildup. Essentially, the Senator equated such a move on the part of our adversaries as a threat to the safety and security of the United States citizens. Combining the reactions of the opponents of the MIC and specifically, those fighting against implementation of the ABM, with these feelings the Senator stated,

In this whole discussion of the ABM only one consideration can possibly be paramount and it is this: That the safety of 200 million Americans is non-negotiable. Whether the ABM opponents and the critics of the MIC like it or not, this government—no matter what the political persuasion of its President may be—is entirely committed to defending the security of its population and the protection of its national strategic interests. 157

Following documentation of a massive Soviet buildup, Goldwater told the University Club that it is dangerous, in the light of these developments, to make an assault on defense spending generally. The Senator said

The need to rebuild our military strength comes at a bad time. Our people are understandably tired of the Vietnam War. Many of them are inclined to think that our own military system is at fault. Others are convinced that the way to attack our domestic problems is through the expenditure of billions of dollars and that these billions can only be made available if the nation cuts down on its defense spending. 158

The Senator continued
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The cost of the Vietnam war is depriving domestic social plans of the kind of funding they require would have you believe that anyone who thinks the Vietnam war should be carried to an honorable conclusion is, per se, an enemy of the poor. These people in their oversimplification would have you believe that a public official favors hunger and poverty at home.159

Opponents of the military, according to Goldwater, would also like to divert the power over the conduct of American military actions from the President to Congress. In supporting this the Senator states, "The new isolationists are telling us ... they should have the pre-eminent role under the Constitution for the determination of our military and foreign policies."160 Goldwater reiterated

Under their concept of the Constitution, the conduct of American military operations would be turned over to them for decision. When they decide that too many American troops are engaged, or that the geography is not to their liking, or that our action might offend Red China, or of all things, Russia, then their determination is supposed to prevail.161

He continued with the statement that "the President's detractors would have us substitute their judgment for his. They would take over the reins of determining where and when each new military action by the United States should take place."162 The Senator indicated that "Of course, this would mean that the United States would steer a course of closing its eyes whenever and wherever the forces of Communism intervened in a new country or area of the world."163 Basing his position on past example, the Arizonan stated that "no howls of regret poured out when Hanoi moved 40,000 men into Cambodia in progressively more violent attacks against a neutral people."164
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He continued

Yet when President Nixon takes the honorable and sensible step of trying to protect the 435,000 American troops . . . by disrupting the Communist staging ground and supply bases . . . the full fury of the liberal forces was unleashed.

No matter that the President's actions will likely set back Hanoi's schemes of conquest in a major way. No matter that the drive against Communist supply areas will . . . assist the Administration's announced goal of withdrawing 150,000 American men during the next 12 months since it will enable the South Vietnamese to be in a better position to defend themselves.\textsuperscript{165}

Summary

The data Senator Barry Goldwater presented to support his claims when speaking to neutral and hostile audiences was often inadequate. Rarely did the Arizonan present material originating either from common perceptions of reality or from authorities in the fields under discussion. Even when Goldwater directly quoted another individual, the citations were either biased sources or were used to discredit the position that the source himself was advocating.

The most extensive form of support Goldwater used stemmed from his unshakable feeling that he was an authority. When the Senator employed semi-quotations, paraphrased evidence, and presented data based on authority, he demonstrated his penchant to believe that he was correct in his position. In this frame of mind, the Arizona Senator offered his interpretations of statistical data, historical examples, and his ideas and opinions as fact.

Of the three types of claims that Barry Goldwater used, two were incapable of being established by traditional means. Thus, the
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over-reliance on evaluative claims and future predictions, by their very nature, necessitate non-definitive proof units. Additionally, the factual premises that the Senator presented often lacked sufficient documentation to be proven with any degree of certainty.

Inadequate evidence also hampered the effectiveness of Goldwater's reasoning processes. This lack was primarily evident when the Arizona Senator argued inductively from generalization. Based only on a few examples, the data the Senator presented generally consisted of his interpretation of items and events. Exceptions to this were found when Goldwater established the President's power in the area of foreign affairs and when he discussed the Soviet buildup.

Four types of deductive reasoning were present in the addresses studied. Two of the weaker patterns used were sign and analogy. While analogies were extensively evident, they were primarily used as the only transition from evidence to conclusion and did not singly provide a strong enough rationale for accepting the claim advanced. The effectiveness of Goldwater's use of argument from cause directly correlated with the thoroughness of the information provided. Again hampered by the idea that his words protended truth, the Senator's analysis of cause consisted of from one brief statement to fully formed and delineated arguments.

The use of enthymemes and backing in the Arizonan rhetoric reflected audience analysis. Rather than articulating conservative premises, the Arizona Senator relied primarily on the general American values of freedom/security and pride/ingenuity. An additional tendency evident in Goldwater's argumentation, coupled primarily with the use of inductive reasoning, was the reliance on historical examples.
On many occasions the Senator failed to present any reasoning pattern to assist the audience in making the transition from data to claim. The assertion can be advanced here that the Arizona Senator expected his audience to award him sufficient credibility to establish his position.

Although the conservative ideology has been linked with retention of the status quo, Goldwater, on two occasions, argued that change was necessary. In both instances, the arguments were presented to the Senate. By condoning the ABM system, the Senator was indicating that a specific action was needed. Discussing the Federal bureaucracy, the Arizonan supported the position that change was a general characteristic of government and society.

Refutational strategies were used extensively in Barry Goldwater's speeches to neutral and hostile audiences. The attempts to counter arguments of his opponents varied in their effectiveness. In places, the Senator merely stated the argument and used his opinion to dispute it. On these occasions, the strength of the unit rested on the credibility the Arizonan possessed. However, the Senator also developed lines of analysis to refute some arguments of his opponents. The observable problem in these units of proof was that Goldwater, instead of providing documentation that would counter the position, would leave out elements necessary for audience acceptance. For example, in supporting the position that the ABM was not too costly, the Senator failed to include the actual cost of the system. Instead, he compared quantitative and qualitative values by contending that nothing is too costly if it saves American lives and provides for United States' security. The final refutational strategy the Arizona
Senator used consisted of rhetorical questions. By asking a series of questions designed to have the audience think about the claim, Goldwater placed his audience in the proper frame of mind to be receptive to the answer he later provided.

In using either/or alternatives, Goldwater reduced complicated issues to simplicity. The Senator examined a problem and would contend that only two courses of action were available. Leaving out the other possibilities, the Arizona Senator would then proceed to explore only the positions delineated. The conclusion advanced invariably supported Goldwater's position as the only logical one.

Barry Goldwater's desire for complete honesty in presenting the truth of his position served, at times, as a detriment in securing audience acceptance. By telling it like he saw it, the Senator presented positions and criticized the political philosophies of his listeners. Consequently, portions of the Arizonan's comments probably alienated his audience rather than assisting in bringing them to the position Goldwater sought.

The Senator did not take advantage of the various means of identification available for strengthening the bond between speaker-issue-audience. He failed to establish a commonality with the audience, and on only two occasions did he provide a link between the audience and the topic. The Senator's use of identification was designed to establish his expertise to speak on the topic. On most occasions, Goldwater indicated his past interest in and association with the issue under discussion. Rarely, however, did he provide concrete examples of where his background and experience had placed him in a position to speak with authority.
Polarizing on the basis of opposition to his position, Goldwater cited one individual and two groups for their potential negative effects on society. First, the Arizonan condemned U.N. Secretary General U Thant and his policies. In this instance, the Senator was contending that U Thant should not be trusted to handle the Vietnam controversy. Reflecting the distrust for both new information and the enlarged governmental structure, the Senator from Arizona indicted the scientific/academic community and the Federal bureaucracy. To discredit the academic community, Goldwater questioned the validity of statements made by these groups and mentioned that, on the basis of advice from these individuals, needed technological advances were being thwarted. The Senator's attack on the Federal bureaucracy consisted of establishing the claim that they had sufficient power to change the legislative intent of the bills passed by Congress.

The military and those associated with it were praised by Goldwater. According to the Senator, the military-industrial complex was necessary for the defense of the country and the security of American lives and property in a time of international tension with the Soviet Union. Because freedom was a paramount concern, Goldwater condemned any group or programs that were designed to limit American ability to maintain a strong defense posture. Specifically, the Senator cited opponents of the military who were intent on cutting defense spending and stripping the President of his power to control foreign policy. For Goldwater, acceptance of either of these positions would weaken the United States' position in the eyes of the world.
Chapter VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Considering Barry Goldwater's effect on America's political scene, Ernest Wrage commented

Admittedly, we are groping as we try to fathom the depth of the Senator's impact on our times. We can point with confidence to him, however, as the most conspicuous, peripatetic spokesman of conservatism today, and we may safely credit him with being its foremost mood-maker by intensifying popular nostalgia for a world of yesteryear.¹

The final task of this investigation is to determine the influence of the Arizona Senator on our times. According to Richard Weaver, "The honest rhetorician has two things in mind: a vision of how matters should go ideally and ethically and a consideration of the special circumstances of his auditors. Toward both of these he has a responsibility."² Thus, initially this chapter will seek an understanding of Barry Goldwater as an individual and as a conservative spokesman. Secondarily, the chapter will consider the Senator's effectiveness before favorable, neutral, and hostile audiences between 1969 and 1974.


Understanding the Speaker

To understand Barry Morris Goldwater, three aspects of the man as reflected in his rhetoric must be considered. The first area explores the effect of the Senator's background in creating the image projected to his audiences. Secondarily, the information processing and personality characteristics of the Arizonan, as reflected in his speaking, will be delineated. This section will postulate the position that the Senator from Arizona displayed the characteristics associated with the authoritarian personality. Finally, Goldwater's rhetorical intentions with his audience will be discussed.

Who is Barry Goldwater?

To simply say that Goldwater is a conservative Republican Senator from Arizona offers little in providing an insight into the man's thought processes. Yet that description offers a framework for attaining a more complete picture of the Senator. A partial understanding of Goldwater emerges through a reexamination of his life and speaking.

Barry Goldwater is a Senator from Arizona. When he returned to the Senate in 1968, he was a seasoned politician and a familiar figure on the Washington scene. His past experience in governmental service and his mode of living reflected two things. First, Goldwater displayed a fanatical love of Arizona. Goldwater's avowed love for his home state was reflected in the opening line of his announcement for the Republican presidential nomination in 1964. He began by saying, "Today here at our home in a state that I love. . . ."

Goldwater's hobbies of

---

photography and his interest in the Indians of Arizona had served as his first speaking forum. The historical background of the Goldwater family and the family business was integrally interwoven with the growth and development of the state. Additionally, many of Barry Goldwater's ancestors had been actively involved in the political working of Arizona and his own entrance into politics had been on a local level.

Second, Barry Goldwater was an old-fashioned flag-waving patriot. Bell stated, "Goldwater finds no country on earth that can match the United States in anything. For the Arizona Senator, America is pre-eminent in military power, scientific knowledge, cultural attainments, and just about anything else desirable." This love was reinforced by a strong belief in the precepts of the country's founding fathers and the documents on which the country was based. The Senator's love of country was pervasive in his rhetoric. Fear of the loss of the freedoms and liberties reflected by the American way of life, as well as his pride in the workmanship and superiority of American products, are reflected throughout his speeches.

Goldwater was also a dedicated Republican. While possibly his affiliation with the Republican party was instigated for business reasons, his years of work for the party demonstrated his loyalty. Having served as the chairman of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, Goldwater had been an extensive campaigner and chief fund-raiser for party candidates. While unsuccessful in his bid for the
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presidency in 1964, he had, nonetheless, secured the nomination of his party for the highest office in the nation.

Perhaps more than any other single characteristic affecting the Senator was the conservative ideology. Considered a conservative by the majority of the American public, his life and manner are the antithesis of the negative and traditional conservative image. Russell Kirk summarized the negative image that the word conservatism engenders when he said:

Liberal and radical journalists and politicians have contrived to establish what social psychologists are fond of calling a 'stereotype' image of the conservative as a dull, boorish, bigoted, and avaricious being, the enemy of imagination and youth, powerful through his present unjust tenure of property, but otherwise a craven and contemptible creature doomed to extinction.  

Rather than portraying the image of a passive individual, Goldwater's life was based on action. His activities, including athletics, exploring, jet piloting, and sports car driving, attests to his affinity for physical activity. These characteristics caused Hammerback to describe his as a rugged individualist. While the term individualist also alluded to Goldwater's belief in the worth of the individual, the description further depicts the essential element that distinguished the Senator from the previous images of conservative politicians. Goldwater's charisma was based on the image of a man's man, an outdoorsman. Consequently, McDonnell concluded that Goldwater "has demonstrated that conservatism is not synonymous with high-button
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shoes, model T's and the starched collar."^7

In considering the events that shaped the Arizona Senator and his view of the world, some basic observations must be forwarded. First, Goldwater was a seasoned politician, comfortable in his role as a United States Senator. Second, he was intensely devoted to America and his home state of Arizona. Third, he was acknowledged as a dedicated Republican—a leading speaker and fund-raiser, who had been selected by his party as their nominee for the presidency in 1964. Finally, Goldwater was a conservative in principle although the nature of his life and interests dispelled the typical negative conservative image. With these preliminary observations in mind, attention must next be directed toward an attempt to understand Barry Goldwater's thought processes.

How Did Goldwater Think?

Two specific inferences can be drawn from Barry Morris Goldwater's rhetoric which illuminate his method of thinking. First, Goldwater displayed the information processing traits and the personality characteristics associated with the authoritarian personality. Second, the Senator thought in terms of universal principles.

Goldwater as an authoritarian personality. Chapter III isolated three information processing characteristics that were indicative of the authoritarian personality: (1) the isolation of beliefs within the attitude-belief system; (2) the filtering of information through

accepted authority figures; and (3) the reluctance to process new and scientific information. Two personality characteristics are also associated with authoritarianism. These traits are the drawing of sharp distinctions between individuals and groups accepted and those not accepted, and the view of the world as a hostile and threatening place. The analysis of Goldwater's rhetoric indicates that he displayed these characteristics.

The isolation of beliefs within the belief-attitude structure serves a function for closed minded individuals. Compartmentalization enables the processing of incoming information without allowing new ideas to disrupt those already held. The Senator displayed the tendency to isolate beliefs through the use of polarization and either/or alternatives. The basic premise behind both of these strategies is the same: the distinguishing of a favored position or person from an unfavored idea or individual. In the instance of polarization, Goldwater discerned between individuals and groups that agreed with his position and those who did not. When utilizing either/or alternatives, the Senator was characterizing acceptable ideas from unacceptable ones. By isolating the approved from the unapproved, Goldwater segregated positions and people so that they could either be easily assimilated into the attitude-belief structure or be easily rejected.

Empirical research indicates that the authoritarian personality fails to differentiate between various beliefs. The Senator displayed this quality when discussing collective societies. For example, when speaking to the American Iron and Steel Institute, the Arizona Senator mentioned that nationalism was the same as socialism. The implication that socialism leads to communism also demonstrated the lack of
differentiation between disbeliefs.

Barry Goldwater also filtered the information he used through accepted authority figures. A review of the direct and paraphrased data that the Senator presented, bespeaks the fact that he considered the Founding Fathers and the military to be experts in the nation as acceptable authorities. Additionally, the conservative belief, that history provides the guidelines for future action, explains the Arizonan's use of this type of information as an authority. Most of the data presented in the addresses studied were filtered through these sources which served as authorities for the Senator.

Goldwater also demonstrated a reluctance to process new information, especially when that information emanated from the scientific and academic communities. A portion of this hesitancy was probably derived from Goldwater's own academic background. Although he had never been an apt student himself, the Senator was still convinced that he possessed superior qualities of leadership, and had mentioned to business leaders that a college degree was not a necessity and could perhaps be a detriment for communicating ideas. On numerous occasions, the Senator lashed out at both the scientific and academic communities by focusing on where the following of the advice of these individuals had led, or would lead, to disastrous consequences. Thus, Goldwater rejected information stemming from the scientific and academic communities because these were not accepted authority figures for him. Additionally, acceptance of data from these sources might be detrimental to the beliefs that the Senator already possessed. If the new information was not compatible with already accepted and maintained beliefs, the data could cause reverberations throughout the attitude-
belief system.

The use of in-out group distinctions was epitomized by the Arizonan's use of polarization. In employing this strategy, Goldwater identified the groups that he accepted with desirable goals and the ones not acceptable with undesirable goals. The interesting item to notice about the favored groups was that Goldwater's past indicated which groups would be acceptable. When the Arizonan had experienced difficulties in schooling, his parents had enrolled him in a military academy. The Senator's allegiance to the military was additionally strengthened through his active duty service and his military reserve status. Perhaps the seeking of Senate assignments dealing with the military stemmed from this background. However, it can also be postulated that the Arizonan's love for country and his desire to see it remain safe and secure might also have affected his favorable predisposition toward the military.

Another group that the Senator favored was the business community. Again, the association between the Arizonan and this group is evident. Goldwater's family had risen to prominence as merchants. In fact, the Senator had every expectation of going into the family business and remaining thus employed. The orientation provided by the family vocation would have created in the Arizonan not only an understanding of the business community, but also would have strengthened his bond with the free enterprise system.

As a Republican, Goldwater had invested his time in raising funds and speaking extensively for party candidates. His allegiance to the G.O.P. and the conservative cause was responsible for his defense of Richard Nixon and his policies. Specific support for the
President was found on the issues of foreign policy and inflation. Because the tenets of Republicanism and conservatism demanded a strong foreign policy abroad, and a strong policy of fiscal responsibility at home, the positions favoring Nixon are understandable. Additionally, Goldwater's firm conviction that our governmental system was the best available included an abiding faith in the President to execute his role in the governmental structure as articulated by the Constitution.

For the Arizona Senator, his faith in America and the American way of life entailed unwavering support for the President, the military, and the free enterprise system. The out-groups, in the Senator's estimation, were those groups or individuals who were advocating ideas and/or programs that would undermine or weaken the American system of government. In this regard, Goldwater cited the liberal community for promoting anti-Nixon and anti-military sentiment and for expanding governmental interference in the lives of American citizens. Unions and their leaders were blamed for failure to support measures designed to curb inflation.

Support for the position that Barry Goldwater saw the world as a hostile and threatening place was evident through an extension of his analysis concerning favored and unfavored groups. The military-industrial complex was needed if Americans hoped to ward off the threats to freedom stemming from communist countries, especially Russia. That the Soviets were intent on aggressive behavior for the purpose of dominating other countries was never established, nor was it needed, as far as the Senator was concerned. This premise was derived from the Arizonan's view that communists were hostile in their attitudes
toward free countries and presupposing that this hostility was a direct threat to American security.

A similar view was reflected by the Senator's discussion of free enterprise. The basis of the capitalistic system, free enterprise had to be preserved. Yet, Goldwater saw a threat to retention of this economic policy that stemmed from a misunderstanding on the part of the American public of the role of business and profits in fueling the economy. Unless the situation was corrected and the hostility toward the business community reduced, a drive toward nationalization of basic industries would result. Nationalization would strip the American people of free enterprise and place the economic power in the hands of the government. Thus, the threat that Goldwater saw was not only the possibility of the destruction of the free enterprise system, but also of increasing the power of the Federal government over citizens.

Barry Goldwater's rhetoric displayed the characteristics of the authoritarian personality. His method of information processing reflected the tendencies of isolating information, filtering incoming data through accepted authority figures, and a reluctance to process new and scientific information. The Senator also exhibited the characteristics of this personality type through the drawing of specific in-out group distinctions and a view of the world as a hostile and threatening place.

Goldwater as a man of principles. Describing the speaking style of Barry Goldwater, Tom Wicker of the New York Times stated, "The mild mannered Senator with his horn-rimmed glasses and his homely
way of speaking creates the impression of a simple, honest, natural
man of principle . . . who always says what he thinks and stands up
for what he believes."

Previous theses attempting to analyze the rhetoric of the
Arizona Senator have also alluded to the fact that Goldwater argued
from these universal premises. For example, Schultz mentioned that
"Goldwater is interested in the principle of issues, preferring to
deal with maxims rather than the practicality of programs." Providing
an example, she explained

While in the Senate, Goldwater has earned recognition as a
man of principle. His voting record had provided much of the
basis for this reputation. He has often aligned himself with
the minority, voting against such controversial issues as the
test ban treaty of September, 1963 and the Civil Rights Bill of
June, 1964. In 1959 he felt so strongly that weakness in the
Kennedy-Erwin Bill would provide no improvement in labor-manage-
ment legislation that he voted against it to be the only dissenting
vote; the final vote was ninety to one.

Focht echoed this idea when she commented, "His [Goldwater's]
position is one of returning to certain fundamental principles which
he states are 'derived from the nature of man and from the truths
that God has revealed about his creation.'" While Wicker, Schultz,
and Focht each alluded to the fact that Barry Goldwater argued from
principle, neither explored the ramifications that this type of
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argument had on his rhetoric. Likewise thus far, this investigation has only posited that Goldwater used the underlying premises of conservatism for the basis of his conclusion, evidence, and reasoning, without considering the effect of this tactic on his speaking.

Richard Weaver stated that "the function of rhetoric was to make men both feel and believe and to perceive order, first principles and fundamental values." Throughout his rhetoric between 1969 and 1974, Barry Goldwater coached his arguments in terms of fundamental values and principles. According to Richard Walen

Nothing in recent U.S. history quite compares with this stunning change of fortunes, with the spontaneous verve and sweep of the Goldwater tide. Beneath this still lies a state of mind—that of a body of aggressive, self-confident Americans who call themselves conservatives.13

Rather than dealing with present realities, the Senator searched for the root causes for the events—feeling that at the origin of all problems was a force that served as both cause and effect simultaneously. In Conscience of a Conservative he explained

Circumstances do change. So do the problems that are shaped by circumstances. But the principles that govern the solutions of the problem do not. . . .

The Conservative approach is nothing more or less than an attempt to supply the wisdom of experience of the revealed truths of the past to the problems of today.14

When asked what he considered to be the fundamental concept of his brand of conservatism, Goldwater stated

In my judgment it is that we look to the past for the answers

12 Weaver, p. 20.
14 Perry, pp. 49-50.
of today and tomorrow, that human nature has never changed, that
history repeats itself over and over again, and that, until human
nature changes, the answers to the problems we have today will
be the same as the answers to the problems that were exactly
like we had yesterday.\footnote{Bell, p. 223.}

As this quotation indicates, because the nature of man is a
constant, a study of history provided the only firm foundation on
which to guide action. Essentially the Senator felt that the danger
to society resulted "from men who departed from traditional values and
accepted principles, things that had worked in the past."\footnote{Barry Goldwater, The Conscience of a Majority (Englewood
Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), pp. 19-20.} To the
Senator, these fundamental premises were unshakable and unmistakably
clear.

In foreign policy, freedom and honor were Goldwater's para-
mount concerns. For Goldwater the issue of freedom was the corner-
stone on which the Founding Fathers had built the American system of
government. The restriction of freedoms enjoyed by United States
citizens either at home or abroad must be guarded against. The
gradual loss of freedom would signal an erosion of the principles on
which the country was founded and could easily result in the loss of
the American way of life. Freedom can only be preserved, in Goldwater's
view, through a dedicated effort to remain strong defensively. For
this reason Goldwater argued extensively for programs and policies
that would insure America's strategic capability to retain their
freedoms from the threat of collective government structures.

America must also appear honorable in its foreign policy
dealings. History dictated that self-government was possible only if man sought virtue and shunned vice. While not suggesting that the United States should police the world and enter into any skirmish, the Senator felt that it was important to meet the commitments honorably that we had made with our allies. With this premise in mind, the Arizonan urged that the failure to support the President's Vietnam policy would result in not only a default on our commitment to the Vietnamese government, but also to the American men who were fighting and dying in that conflict.

The maintenance of law and order and individual liberty were the principles from which Barry Goldwater derived his guidance for domestic policies. History indicated that man must adhere to a system of law and order. Specific laws were being broken by the anti-war demonstrators and by those involved in the Watergate break-in. Abuses in power that could result in a changing of societal order and balance were being attempted by union leaders, the Federal bureaucracy, and the media. Barry Goldwater felt law and order was essential for preserving the democratic form of government. Consequently, the Senator argued against individuals and groups that were not adhering to the dictates of the laws of the land and not proceeding with the goals of perpetuating societal order and harmony.

The firm belief in the value of the individual underscored many of Goldwater's arguments. Drawing on historical precedent, the Senator cited the development and creativity of the free enterprise system as the reason for the superiority of this country. This pride in the achievements of Americans was based on the principle of individual choice and initiative without excessive governmental inter-
ference. For Goldwater, history further indicated that these individual qualities were diminished as the state assumed more power. Consequently, the Senator viewed collective government entities as a means of stripping individuals of their liberties.

To be free and to enjoy the individual liberties inherent in the democratic form of government demanded that man be strong, honor his commitments, and adhere to a system of societal laws and orders. These were the fundamental premises on which Barry Goldwater's positions were based.

What Were Goldwater's Rhetorical Intentions?

When Barry Goldwater approached the audiences between 1969 and 1974 he considered himself successful. He had survived the electoral defeat of 1964 and had been returned to the Senate. His blunt candor on Watergate had resulted in adulation from the press. This increased credibility affected the Senator's rhetoric by attracting support in wider political circles and by enhancing the Arizonan's belief that his messages would now be accepted based solely on his authority. However, before an attempt can be made to analyze the extent of Goldwater's effectiveness before various audience types, the Senator's rhetorical goals must be examined. A lack of comprehension of what Barry Goldwater desired from his audiences at the conclusion of the rhetorical situation would render any evaluation of his speaking questionable.

Because Goldwater was a politician, a critic analyzing his rhetoric might look first to the courses of action that the Senator was advocating. As noticed in evaluating the Senator's rhetoric,
these specific strategies were rarely delineated. The critic might also look for the extensive use of expert testimony and valid deductive reasoning patterns. These ethos-strengthening tactics were also noticeably absent. Rather, the Senator from Arizona argued for his audience to follow general principles that he often articulated based solely on this interpretation of history and deeply rooted in the values he espoused. His formal use of reasoning often failed to achieve the force and cognizance necessary for validity. Thus, the question must be posited: What did Barry Goldwater hope to achieve when he spoke to audiences between 1969 and 1974?

Insight into this question is obtained primarily through the Senator's own statements. As early as 1964 when the Senator announced his candidacy for the G.O.P. nomination, he said

I want to tell you that I will seek the Republican Presidential nomination. And I have decided to do this because of the principles in which I believe and because I'm convinced that millions of Americans share my belief in those principles. ¹⁷

This statement implies that Barry Goldwater was interested in more than political power. Hess comments that Senator Goldwater had no desire to be President because personal power depressed rather than excited him. ¹⁸ Schultz claims

Because Goldwater is exceptionally frank in speaking his personal thoughts to his audiences, he creates a feeling in his listeners that he is less concerned with personal gain than with forwarding the cause of conservatism. ¹⁹

¹⁷ Perry, p. 87.


¹⁹ Schultz, p. 83.
As the above analysis and information indicates, Senator Goldwater was motivated primarily by a desire to advance the conservative movement in America. This goal was evident throughout Goldwater's career and appears to be the force that dominated his speaking during the period under consideration.

As a result of the media reports of the Arizonan during the late 1960's and early 1970's, his image before the American public changed from one of being a politician to being a statesman. The American Heritage Dictionary defines the term as "(1) One who is a leader in public affairs; (2) A political leader regarded as a promoter of the public good." The Arizona Senator perceived himself in this light as he approached his audiences.

Richard Weaver argued that

Because man is 'drawn forward by some conception of what he should be', a proper order of values is the 'ultimate sanction of rhetoric'. Rhetoric involves the making and presenting of choices among 'goods' and a striving toward some ultimate Good. By its very nature, he emphasized, 'language is sermonic'; it reflects choices and urges a particular 'ought.' He continued, "As rhetoric confronts us with choices involving values, the rhetorician is a preacher to us. . . . Since all utterances influence us in one or the other of these directions, it is important that the direction be the right one. . . ." When discussing conservatives, Rossiter contended that

The world being what it is today, the Conservative spends a good deal of his time in the pulpit exhorting his fellow men to live godly, righteous, and sober lives. He does not do this

---

21 Weaver, p. 18.
22 Weaver, p. 225.
gladly, for he is not by nature a Puritan, but the times seem
to have made him our leading 'moral athlete.'

As a leader intent on promoting the public ideas of societal
good, Goldwater fulfilled the role alluded to by many who have viewed
his rhetoric. In considering what was special about the Arizonan's
form of conservatism, Perry claimed that what "he preached at all
those dinners and rallies was his own brand of Republicanism." Wrage mentioned

Still more recently, we have the Goldwater prescription—a
dramatic, quasi-religious crusade with a broad-based ideological
appeal highlighting ancient verities and immutable principles of
the kind that are intended to send hearts soaring—in both
parties.

However, Novak provided the clearest articulation of Goldwater's
purpose and dramatized the implications for judging the Senator's
rhetoric when he said

Goldwater was not really a politician at all, but a preacher.
And as a preacher of the new conservative doctrine, he has sought
not to moderate and blunt his views, but to sharpen them to the
point where their impact would be felt hardest. In his interview
with Alsop, Goldwater was acting like a preacher and being treated
like a politician.

The American Heritage Dictionary defined to preach as "(1) To
deliver [a sermon]. (2) To advocate earnestly. (3) To give moral
advice, especially in a tiresome manner." Viewed from the perspec-
tive of a statesman-preacher, Goldwater's rhetoric displayed
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characteristics designed to promote public good through the giving of moral advice.

In preaching morality as dictated by the conservative ideology, Goldwater "did not say what people wanted to hear. He said what he thought people should hear."\(^{28}\) The Arizonan stated "I am convinced that the American people want the truth about their government and about the challenges which face us as a nation. If the truth is frightening, if it gives us cause for concern, I am convinced that the American people will be able to cope."\(^{29}\)

For Barry Goldwater, the imperfections inherent in man's nature were responsible for the negative happenings and problems of the world. Goldwater saw as a part of his 'ministry' the pointing out of these weaknesses. For example, the actions of men were responsible for extending governmental influence into the lives of citizens, for awarding some groups special privileges, for stripping the country of superiority, and for failing to take the actions necessary to insure American peace and security from outside threats.

However, the time was not too late to reverse the trends. The Arizona Senator counseled his audiences to be cautious before promoting change, not to trust in the goodwill of their adversaries, to curb the baser tendencies toward avarice and greed inherent in all men, and to rise to their utmost potential. To insure that his listeners would be able to determine the principles that should guide them, the Arizonan reduced his discussion and his analysis to simplistic terms. In most cases the choices facing the audiences were clear. Goldwater presented

\(^{28}\) Hess, p. 2. \(^{29}\) Goldwater, p. 110.
the alternatives as between superiority or subservience, freedom or slavery, liberty or government dominance. But redemption was possible. Subservience to other countries could be avoided through American ingenuity and the free enterprise system. Freedom would be insured if we used all our resources to resist the Communist threat. Liberty could be guaranteed if we would reduce governmental interference in the lives of American citizens. Through these means, Goldwater offered his audiences a means of redemption.

Seeing his new authority as a mandate for conservatism in America, Goldwater assumed the mantle of a statesman-preacher. Assured that the public was ready to receive 'the truth' as represented by the Senator through the guidelines afforded to him by the conservative ideology, Goldwater proceeded with his mission to dispense these facts to the masses.

The Senator's firm conviction that he was a messenger of truth is evident throughout his addresses. The claims, evidence, analysis, reasoning, as well as the argumentative and persuasive strategies the Senator used, support the feeling held by the Arizonan that his mission was to impart the gospel of conservatism to the American public in the hope that they would use its guidelines as a cornerstone for action. Consequently, regardless of whether the listeners wanted to receive his advice, Barry Goldwater presented his version of the world to his audiences.

**Effectiveness With Audiences**

Finally this study seeks to determine whether or not Barry Goldwater gave special consideration to the circumstances of his
auditors. Specifically the question to be answered is whether the rhetorical strategies that Goldwater used were dependent on the thought patterns of his audiences for their effectiveness?

An individual who enters into a rhetorical situation already possesses a number of beliefs, attitudes, and values. Based on previous knowledge and experience, these items comprise a thought system for that person and aid him in understanding and being able to function in the world in which he lives. When discussing fields of argument, Charles Williard claimed that these belief systems consisted of "schools of thoughts, orientations and background assumptions which affect a person's thinking."\(^\text{30}\) Thus, a field was defined as "shared orientations toward ideas or events which are acted out and continually renewed or revised in the ongoing accomplishments of people who work from the shared view."\(^\text{31}\)

The preceding investigation has focused on audiences from two distinct fields: those individuals adhering to the conservative ideology and those who did not. For rational discourse to have occurred or for Barry Goldwater to have been effective with individuals in either field, depended on his ability to use the established attitudes or the appropriate inference-warrants in that particular field.\(^\text{32}\)

The Conservative Field

Two principal strategies that Senator Goldwater used were related to the characteristic conservative method of viewing the
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world. First, the Arizonan knew that the audiences shared with him common basic precepts and underlying assumptions which guided their actions. Second, the Senator know that he and the members of the audiences shared a common means of information processing and the personality characteristics associated with the authoritarian personality. Goldwater capitalized on these similarities in his rhetoric to favorable audiences.

Basic precepts. The principles of conservatism provided a view of reality for their followers. In essence, those adhering to this world view felt that because man's nature was a mixture of good and evil, a Divine Law should govern society. A study of history was the best means possible on which to base future action and conservatives relied heavily on its guidelines. Thus, for conservatives, any changes contemplated should be undertaken in an evolutionary manner and should seek retention of valued social goals and institutions. A firm belief in individual liberties led conservatives to the belief that man should be restrained only when his actions trespassed on others. This respect for individual liberty was also responsible for the dislike of members of the ideology for any form of government that subordinated individuals to the state. Consequently, they felt that governments should be balanced, diffused, and should rarely intervene in the lives of the citizens.

Goldwater believed conservatism provided the philosophy which should guide society. Support for the contention was found in his overreliance on these principles throughout his speeches. The themes that the Arizonan used in his addresses to favorable audiences bespoke
the conservative distrust for those governments which subordinated individuals to the state. In foreign policy this premise was reflected by the fear that the freedoms and liberties Americans enjoy were being threatened by communism. In economic policy this same idea was manifested in the possibility of increased government intervention through the nationalization of basic industries.

Additionally, not only did the claims that the Senator advanced often imply these premises, but his evidence, reasoning, and backing rested on the precepts of the conservative ideology. The claims advanced were supported primarily through the use of historical data and urged caution before adopting any course of action. The use of American values and conservative premises often provided the transition between data and claim. Additionally, the use of these same principles as backing for more traditional reasoning patterns was noticeably present. Thus, conservative premises provided the underlying principles on which Goldwater based his positions.

Thought patterns. Barry Goldwater also based his messages on methods of argumentation that were compatible with and validated the attitude-belief system of his audience. Initially, Goldwater realized that most individuals did not reach conviction or belief through logic alone. This conclusion, in addition to the types of claims the Senator advanced, explains why few analytic deductive reasoning patterns were located in his speeches. Rather, as indicated earlier, the Arizonan based his claims, reasoning, and evidence on the commonly shared precepts of the conservative ideology. Since the members of the audience shared these principles with the speaker, the articulation
or allusion to them provided a validation of the beliefs of the audience and led to the natural acceptance of the sought after conclusion.

Basic agreement with the Senator's position caused no disruption in the individual's belief-disbelief system since the positions were based on already held beliefs. To capitalize on this agreement, Goldwater used both identification and audience flattery as a means of reinforcement.

Chapter III delineated not only the principles on which conservatives based their view of reality, but also provided an understanding of the means by which conservatives processed information. The empirical evidence on the information processing means of a conservative attests to the fact that Goldwater understood the thought processing of his audience and coached his arguments in a manner consistent with their information processing characteristics.

Specifically, the Senator's rhetoric indicated a sharp distinction between groups and individuals accepted and those not accepted, a perception of the world as a threatening and hostile place, a distrust of new scientific information, and the filtering of information through an accepted authority figure.

The drawing of sharp distinctions between the groups and individuals accepted and those not accepted, is evident throughout the Arizonan's rhetoric. Specifically, this strategy is evident in the Senator's use of argument from cause and polarization. Feeling confident that audience and speaker would consider the same groups undesirable, Goldwater expressed no reluctance in isolating specific individuals and groups and using them as scapegoats for current problems. These groups--the liberals, the media, the unions--were
compared unfavorably with the acceptable groups consisting of business leaders, the military, and the President and his advisors. By linking those groups with the violation of conservative principles, Goldwater enhanced the polarization attempts. Such linkages made the agreement with the Senator's premises easier to accept since he compartmentalized and isolated the groups and issues so that they were consistent with and could be easily assimilated within the individual's belief-disbelief system.

The characteristic of the conservative mind to perceive the world as a hostile and threatening place also received attention in Goldwater's rhetoric. Expressed predominantly in premises concerned with the evil of man's nature, the distrust of man's reasoning/decision making, and the general distrust of governments, the view resulted in doomsday predictions. Knowing that the audiences viewed the world in a paranoid manner, the Senator depicted those opposed to his position as evil and stressed that the worst possible consequences would result should their counsel be followed. However, Goldwater offered redemption for society. By heeding the warnings and following the dictates he espoused, these dire predictions could be averted.

Another characteristic of the conservative mind is a distrust of new information. The Senator's rhetoric capitalized on this distrust through explicit statement and through implication. On occasion, Goldwater openly articulated reluctance to accept new and scientific data by stating that previous actions based on such evidence had led to disastrous consequences. Much more frequently employed, however, and consistent with a conservative premise, was the reliance on history as a guide for present and future action. Historical incidents
and examples provided the most extensively used supports for the Senator's position. Because this information was not new and corresponded with the conservative ideology, it could be easily assimilated in the attitude-belief system of his listeners.

Finally, conservatives filter information through accepted authority figures. Goldwater served in this capacity for the audiences of this field and he was aware of his position. Acknowledged as the leader of conservative forces, the Senator's political renaissance established the Arizonan in this role. Rokeach indicated that when a person's belief system is more closed than open, they display the tendency to accept or reject all information emanating from authority figures regardless of correctness or logical consistency. Because Goldwater knew that he fulfilled an authoritarian role with these audiences, he knew that rather than critically evaluating his utterances, the listeners would accept his speeches in their entirety.

Goldwater was aware that his messages would be accepted by favorably disposed audiences. Established as their spokesman and convinced of the correctness of his position, the Senator saw his rhetorical purpose with these individuals as one of mobilizing strength for the cause they shared. The Senator capitalized on the common premises and the means by which these individuals assimilated information rather than on offering formally valid arguments. Because he was viewed as an authority figure for these groups, based his arguments on premises they espoused, and constructed his arguments so that the listeners could easily accept them without causing dissonance with the other beliefs they held, his ideas would have been accepted.
The Non-Conservative Field

The non-conservative audience field consisted of individuals who did not share the underlying assumptions upon which Goldwater based his perception of reality and who displayed information processing techniques at variance with those of the Senator. Effectiveness with these groups would necessitate the Arizonan's use of more rigorous standards regarding the validity and consistency of his argumentation. To determine whether Barry Goldwater's rhetoric was equal to these demands requires a brief critique of the units of proof the Senator advanced. Specifically, this section will evaluate the Arizonan's use of evidence, argument, and persuasive strategies.

Data. In adopting the Toulmin model of rhetorical criticism, James McCroskey indicated that three forms of support were available to the rhetor. Viewing them in a pyramidal order according to their effectiveness, these forms of data include: (1) audience opinion and audience knowledge; (2) asserted information and opinion of the speaker; and (3) facts and opinions attested to by others.33

All three forms of data are evident in Goldwater's rhetoric to neutral and hostile audiences. However, audience opinion and knowledge and the testimony of others were rarely found. Only when discussing the means by which policy alterations could be effectuated in our society did the Senator refer to the audience's awareness of the democratic process for effectuating change.

Goldwater did not rely extensively on the words of others to give credence to his positions. Except in discussing the Soviet buildup, when the opinions of others were advanced, the impact of the data was weakened since the quotations either emanated from biased sources or the information was used to discredit the position that the source himself was advocating. An additional problem was evident in the Arizonan's use of 'expert' testimony. According to McCroskey, when the facts and opinions of others are presented, the speaker must establish both the credibility of the source of the data and the speaker's own expertise.34 While the Arizona Senator did provide the credentials to establish the expertise of the source, he failed to establish his own credibility. The failure of Goldwater to establish his ability to speak with authority pervades the Senator's use of both evidence and reasoning and shall be discussed in more depth when considering the identification strategies employed in the speeches.

McCroskey claimed that the asserted information and opinions of the speaker were preferable to evidence from other individuals.35 Goldwater relied heavily on this form of support. Not only did the Senator ask that his audience accept his paraphrased interpretations of the comments of others, but he filtered historical examples and statistics through his perception of reality. However, as McCroskey points out, this form of data is available only to individuals who enjoy moderate to high credibility with the audiences.36 Thus, while Goldwater's opinions and the information he presented would have been

34 McCroskey, pp. 104-5.
35 McCroskey, p. 103. 36 Ibid.
effective with conservative audiences, the Senator probably did not have sufficient credibility to give credence to the data given to neutral and hostile audiences. This statement is not meant to imply that the Arizona Senator was devoid of credibility with members of these audiences. Except when speaking to the Senate, Goldwater had been asked to address these groups and thus the audiences would have awarded him some degree of status. This status could have been increased by press reports concerning Goldwater's candor and frankness in reporting the facts of a situation honestly. However, Goldwater was not an authority figure for these groups. Consequently, through the over-reliance on his own opinions and interpretations, he probably was demanding more of a position for himself than his audience would have been able to provide.

Argumentation. Barry Goldwater probably experienced difficulty in securing the acceptance of his positions with non-conservative audiences. Primarily the problems that the Senator experienced stemmed from the lack of a commonly shared basis on which to predicate argument. A consideration of the conclusions that the Arizonan asked his audiences to accept, the reasoning patterns that he employed, and the Senator's candor in presenting his positions, illuminate the handicaps he experienced in advancing his arguments.

1. Claims. Only three types of conclusions were evident in the Arizonan's rhetoric before neutral and hostile audiences. Initially, Goldwater presented factual conclusions. While these positions could be established definitively through the use of data and reasoning, often the units of proof that the Senator advanced were ineffective.
Primarily, the Arizona Senator either failed to provide sufficient documentation or relied on data based on his opinions to secure his position. When Goldwater used his attitudes and interpretations for data, the acceptance of the conclusion rested on the credibility the listeners would have afforded him.

More serious difficulties are evident when the Senator from Arizona attempted to establish the remaining two types of claims. By its nature, an evaluation entails a judgment and judgment entails "the ability to perceive and distinguish relationships or alternatives; discernment." The basic conservative principles which guided the Senator's life and actions were instrumental in formulating his estimation of the merit or worth of an idea or individual. The probability exists that conservatives would formulate the same evaluations as the Arizonan because the background assumptions and the means of acting on incoming information were similar. Yet when individuals operate from different interpretations of reality, the chance that they would reach agreement on an evaluative judgment is questionable. Because non-conservative audiences did not share the same assumptions as the speaker, an essential element for accepting Goldwater's evaluative positions was missing.

The initial judgment that an individual holds concerning the merit or value of an idea or person can be established either through direct contact with the object or from information filtered through an accepted authority figure. In the first instance, Rokeach claims that the only person who can change a belief formed through direct encounter

---

37 Davies, p. 386.
These beliefs are impervious to argumentation. If the value was established by association with an acceptance of an authority figure, argumentation would do little to change the belief unless the rhetor either could discredit the source or disassociate the source from the value. Authority figures vary with the individual. Consequently, the means possible for refuting values emanating from these sources would place an unrealistic burden on the speaker. Inability to refute these judgments prevents change of attitude.

Finally, the Arizona Senator attempted to establish claims based on future probability. The conservative view of the world as a hostile and threatening place would have created for these individuals a concern with the future. Non-conservatives, however, would not share this preoccupation. Moved more by expediency, non-conservatives would be seeking answers to immediate problems. While not totally oblivious to the results of current actions on future world events, these individuals were not predominantly concerned with these issues. This lack of a shared perception of reality was Goldwater's greatest problem in attempting to establish claims based on future probabilities.

A second problem is also evident in Goldwater's use of future claims. Even if the Senator had employed the most exacting forms of evidence available, which he failed to do, the conclusions could not have been established with certainty. The future, as an unknown, can only be established with probability. The forms of data used by the Arizonan mandated acceptance of the premises based on the Senator's

credibility. Unless the audience accepted Goldwater's expertise, they would not have acknowledged even the possibility of the future conditions he forecast.

2. Reasoning. A consideration of the validity of the reasoning patterns that Senator Goldwater used must also encompass evidence and claims that he advanced. Unless the data employed was accepted by the audience, the claim could not have been established. According to Ehninger and Brockriede, "No unit of proof is possible without some sort of informative data, for without data, there is no accepted ground to which a claim may be inferred."\(^{39}\) Thus, if the audience failed to admit the Senator's authority to issue accurate data and consequently refused to accept the factual foundation for the unit of proof, the conclusion would automatically be rejected.

The types of claims that Goldwater advanced also affected the reasoning patterns. Conclusions based on future probability could not be established with certainty regardless of the amount or quality of evidence used. Thus, while any valid form of inductive and/or deductive reasoning could establish designative claims,\(^{40}\) in the case of evaluative premises, the inductive process of generalization and the deductive patterns of analogy and classification, are the only ones that can prove the contention.\(^{41}\) However, the establishment of both of these conclusions could only be effectuated if the reasoning processes fulfilled the criteria necessary for their validity. Thus,


\(^{40}\)Ehninger and Brockriede, p. 155.  
\(^{41}\)Ibid.
a consideration of the forms of reasoning that Senator Goldwater used must be reviewed to determine if they provided a sufficient rationale for adaptation of the claim. Barry Goldwater employed generalization and the patterns of sign, analogy, and causation.

When Goldwater employed generalization, some problems were apparent. In discussing the Soviet weapons buildup and the President's power to direct foreign affairs, the Senator used reasoning from generalization effectively. Normally, however, he failed to provide sufficient examples to justify the assumptions in the warrant. Additionally, the samples on which the Senator based his reasoning predominantly consisted of his interpretations and opinions. The acceptance of positions based on either unacceptable data or insufficient examples is doubtful.

As stated earlier, reasoning from sign can be used only to establish factual conclusions. However, to be successful, even in this limited role, demands adherence to certain standards for validity. On the only occasion that Goldwater used reasoning from sign, he failed to fulfill the necessary requirements. Ehninger and Brockriede state that "the corroboration of several signs is generally required to establish the existence of a certain state of affairs."

However, the Senator advanced only one indication that Russia was returning to the police state associated with Stalin's reign—the resurrection of interest in the former Russian leader. As Ehninger and Brockriede contend, "only when a sign is infallible may the claim of a proof by sign be made without qualification."

Yet, while Goldwater did

42 Ehninger and Brockriede, pp. 133-4. 43 Ibid.
not provide his audience with an infallible example of reasoning from sign, neither did he qualify his position.

While reasoning from analogy can establish all types of claims, in discussing this form of reasoning, Brockriede and Ehninger postulate

... an analogy has less probative force than any other proof pattern. Claims supported by an analogy should probably be supplemented by other proofs. Perhaps the primary function of an analogy is to clarify a claim and state it more vividly. The claim in an analogy, therefore, must have a qualifier. Because the warrant itself is more indirect, open to more questions and subject to more reservations, the strongly qualifying 'possibly' is usually appropriate.44

By comparing the standards of these writers to the rhetoric of Senator Goldwater, the inadequacy of his use of this reasoning pattern can be demonstrated. The Arizonan relied extensively on the use of analogy to non-conservative audiences. Although the Senator, on occasion, used examples from history to further substantiate the analogies presented, often the comparisons were not reinforced by other means. A final weakness in Goldwater's use of analogy is noted by his failure to qualify his analogies. Not only does the Senator pass off the comparisons as absolutes, but he documents them by offering his interpretation of the events he cites.

Finally, the Arizona Senator used reasoning from cause which can only be used to document designative claims. In cause-effect reasoning

the effect expressed in the claim may be predicted with relatively greater assurance if (a) the evidence reports events or conditions accurately, (b) the warrant states a dependable causal relationship, and (c) intervening and counteracting causes

44Ehninger and Brockriede, p. 144.
are not present. To the extent that a unit of proof lacks these conditions, the claims must be qualified.\textsuperscript{45}

Concommitantly "the determination of causes is so difficult in most debatable questions, the claims of effect-to-cause proof almost always require a qualifier."\textsuperscript{46}

Barry Goldwater's causal analysis was ineffective for three reasons. First, Goldwater failed to take into consideration the fact that alternate causes could have been operative. If the audience was aware of the intervening or alternate reasons for the effect, the proof unit would have been rejected. Second, the Arizonan qualified none of the arguments from cause. By narrowing his focus, the Senator definitively postulated that one group of people or set of circumstances were the reason for the conditions with which he was concerned. Finally, Goldwater's effectiveness in using causal analysis was diminished insofar as the audience might not have accepted the fact that the data presented was accurate since it stemmed from the Senator's beliefs and opinions.

Barry Goldwater could have been assured that conservative audiences would have accepted his reasoning patterns and thus his conclusions without subjecting them to tests for logical consistency and validity. However, the Senator could not make this assumption with non-conservatives. Because Goldwater was not an authority figure for these groups, they would not be expected to process the proof unit advanced as a totality. Non-conservatives would expect logically

\textsuperscript{45}Ehninger and Brockriede, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{46}Ehninger and Brockriede, p. 131.
sound and formally valid reasoning patterns before accepting the premises advanced, and Barry Goldwater did not provide the necessary elements to fulfill these requirements.

The final method of argumentation that hampered the Arizonan's effectiveness with neutral and hostile audiences emanated from the frankness and candor that characterized the Senator's rhetoric throughout his political life. Convinced of the correctness of his position, Goldwater did not moderate his utterances to fit his audience. Thus, when the Arizona Senator had a message that he felt needed to be articulated, he expressed his opinion even when doing so necessitated alienating a portion of the audience. This strategy was primarily evident when Goldwater discussed needed restrictions on the media to the Magazine Publisher's Association and also when he condemned liberals and Democrats when he spoke to the United States Senate.

**Persuasive strategies.** Senator Barry Goldwater used two persuasive strategies when speaking to non-conservative audiences. A problem existed, however, with both the identification and the polarization attempts that the Arizonan presented.

Initially, the Senator sought to enhance his credibility through the use of identification. While Goldwater demonstrated his association with and interest in the topics on which he spoke, he failed to establish how his background and experience had provided sufficient exposure to qualify him as an expert on the topics under consideration. This absence would have been duly noted by audiences already skeptical of the Arizonan's credibility. The lack of definitive references to establish his authority had extensive ramifications
regarding the acceptability of Goldwater's arguments. Goldwater relied extensively on data that consisted of his interpretations and opinions. Thus, audience failure to perceive the Arizona Senator as an individual who could be counted on to interpret information accurately would have rendered his units of proof unacceptable.

Additionally, when considering Barry Goldwater's use of identification, the observation must be advanced that the Senator failed to take advantage of other means which could have strengthened his positions with his audiences. Specifically, the Arizonan might have established a personal linkage with the members of his audiences. He did not do so. Also, on only two occasions did Goldwater equate the interests of his audiences with the topics being discussed. The use of both speaker-audience and audience-topic identification might have enhanced the acceptability of the Arizonan's positions.

The strength of the strategies of polarization that the Arizona Senator used rested with audience acceptance of conservative premises. The members of his audiences who already had a distrust of scientific information, unions, big government, and the Soviet Union, would automatically accept the premises advanced solely by Goldwater's mention of the issue. However, for those who did not share this distrust, the Senator did little to persuade them of the truth of his accusations. As was evident throughout his speeches, Barry Goldwater, convinced of the correctness of his stand, supported his position with his opinions and values. Without providing either further documentation or justifying and establishing his credibility, audiences sharing a different world perspective would, in all probability, reject the Senator's analysis.
When Barry Goldwater spoke to neutral and hostile audiences, he was dealing with a segment of society that did not share the same view of reality that he did. Although the Senator realized this, he was deluded by the reevaluation of his worth provided by the media. The Senator did adapt to his audience on occasions when he argued for change, and when he used broad-based American values rather than conservative premises as his motive appeals. However, primarily Goldwater based his rhetoric to neutral and hostile audiences on the belief that he was now an accepted leader and an authority figure in the political sphere. The Arizonan's firm conviction that all in the country would be responsive to his ideology received credence by statements such as James Naughton's. Providing insight into the motivation for the increased support for Goldwater outside his usual political sphere, Naughton stated

There is more than mere irony in the transformation of the goat of the 1964 Republican disaster into hero of the 1974 Republican trauma. It may be both a cause and a symptom of the President's troubles.

Asked to explain the reversal, an official in the Nixon Administration said that Mr. Goldwater 'is not talking about nuke-ing the enemy anymore, he's talking about nike-ing Nixon'.

Essentially the topics on which Barry Goldwater spoke and his stand on those issues were not appreciably different from those he espoused in 1964. The Senator's speeches to neutral and hostile audiences attest to the fact that he was still 'nuke-ing the enemy'—the Communists, the liberals, the unions, the academic/scientific community, the Federal bureaucracy—and was supportive of Nixon—especially in the area of foreign policy. Goldwater's failure to

---

understand the reason for his increased support hampered his effectiveness with non-conservative audiences.

**A Concluding Comment**

In discussing the Arizona Senator's political renaissance, Norm Brewer mentioned, "I have long felt that Barry Goldwater has been one of the most misunderstood men of our times." This study has focused on one reason why Senator Goldwater has been misunderstood by many Americans. An avowed conservative, the Arizonan would be appreciated by those who share the basic thought patterns associated with the ideology. To conservatives Goldwater articulated truth, and they knew that the premises he espoused were 'right' and could provide workable guidelines for contemporary societal problems.

However, non-conservatives neither understood nor accepted the reasoning processes the Senator advanced. These individuals operated from a different frame of reference and consequently, the information provided by the Arizonan failed to penetrate their belief-attitude structure. Aside from vague allusions to American values, Goldwater failed to establish a common reference point with these audiences.

Perhaps Ernest Wrage said it best:

The full measure of Goldwater's impact on the public mind lurks in the lower levels of consciousness where we cannot probe. In what ways and to what extent has he enlarged the anxieties and guilt of those who, though not enrolled in the camp of the self-conscious conservatives, fear we are plugging down history's highway toward catastrophe?"}

---


49. Wrage, p. 119.
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