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ABSTRACT

National nominating conventions serve a number of purposes for their respective parties. Most notably, the convention officially bestows the party nomination on the candidate for president. Recent political conventions have been carefully orchestrated to create an air of party unity and solidarity behind the respective candidate.

Beginning with the 1980 Democratic National Convention, there has been a new occurrence at these conventions. Contenders who were not going to receive the party nomination nor were they going to be the running mate for the party nominee have been granted podium time (usually during prime time of the convention) ostensibly for the purpose of addressing their supporters as well as the whole party to call for and encourage party unity.

This dissertation examined six of these speeches in order to determine whether or not a new form or genre of political convention discourse has emerged. The speeches included in this analysis were Edward Kennedy's speech to the 1980 DNC, Jesse Jackson and Gary Hart's speeches to the 1984 DNC, Jesse Jackson's 1988 speech to the DNC, Jerry Brown's speech to the 1992 DNC, and Pat Buchanan's speech to the 1992 RNC. The speeches were analyzed by looking at the context under which they were presented, the actual content of the speeches -- i.e., the structure and style of each -- and the general reaction to the speeches.
Final analysis of the six speeches to determine whether a new form or genre is emerging was inconclusive. The six speeches were not similar enough in form and content to draw a definitive conclusion. The one strong conclusion which emerged from the analysis was that the speeches, typically, were not designed to unite the party; they were designed to promote the contender in possible future elections.
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The marriage of the study of rhetoric and politics dates back over 2000 years to the writings of Aristotle. Aristotle recognized the natural relationship between these two essential parts of human nature when, in his Politics he wrote that people are "political beings" who "alone of the animals [are] furnished with the faculty of language"1 and in his Rhetoric established his systematic analysis of discourse and argued that "rhetorical study in its strict sense, is concerned with the modes of persuasion"2 thus cementing the importance of each discipline to the other. Centuries later, Harold Lasswell defined the study of politics and communication as necessarily interdependent when he wrote, "the political question 'Who gets what, when, and how' implicitly demands consideration of 'Who says what in which channel to whom with what effect?'"3

In the early 1980's, Dan Nimmo and Keith Sanders heralded political communication as a rapidly emerging field of study.4 They argued that although its origins date back to Aristotle, a "self-consciously cross-disciplinary" focus of study began in the late 1950's, when such diverse departments as communication, mass communication, journalism, political science, and sociology began offering a variety of courses on both the undergraduate and graduate level.5 In their early assessment of the field, Nimmo and Sanders claimed that the "key areas of inquiry" included rhetorical
analysis, propaganda analysis, attitude change studies, voting studies, government and the news media, functional and systems analyses, technological changes, media technologies, campaign techniques, and research techniques. A later assessment with Lynda Kaid found additional and more specific areas of concern including the presidency, political polls, public opinion, debates, and advertising to name a few. Finally, Kathleen Jamieson has focused study on the impact of electronic media on politics. This dissertation seeks to join the ever expanding study of political communication by focusing on political convention discourse.

The Importance of Studying Political Conventions

General/Historical Importance of Political Conventions

The national nominating convention is a unique American institution which is never mentioned in the Constitution, nor was it intended by the founding fathers of this country. The writers of the Constitution created the electoral college as the mechanism for selecting the President. They believed this system would allow the politically astute members of society to act as representatives of the general populace since the general population was deemed politically uninformed.

What the founding fathers never envisioned was the rapid rise and growth of political parties. By the early 19th century it was evident that some formal system was needed to accommodate the ever expanding and increasingly complicated political parties. Party leaders began to use congressional
caucuses as a method of nominating presidential candidates, but this soon proved unsatisfactory as the desire for increased democracy and direct participation by citizens swept the nation.

In September, 1831, the Anti-Masonic Party held the first national party convention and nominated William Wirt for the presidency. Despite Wirt's failure in the general election, and the subsequent failure of the Anti-Masonic Party, the nominating convention survived. In 1832, the Jacksonian Democrats held their first convention at which time Jackson was nominated for a second term. Jackson's re-election occurred at the same time party organizations in the states were experiencing tremendous growth, and as a result, conventions increasingly replaced caucuses as the means of nominating candidates for national, state and local offices.

Although there have been numerous internal or structural changes within the convention system since 1832, the primary functions of the convention have remained fairly constant. The national nominating convention serves four basic functions for the party. First, the convention writes the platform for the party in which party positions on campaign issues are clearly articulated. Second, the convention nominates the party candidates for president and vice-president. Third, the convention, through the national committee, serves as a governing body for the party. Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the convention has
recently become a public relations extravaganza in which the party attempts to create a national image, not only for the presidential candidate, but also for congressional, state and local candidates as well, and seeks to create a unified party voice behind the candidates to help ensure success in the upcoming election.

The forging of a unified voice from diverse constituencies and points of view is perhaps the most crucial function:

The nominee is the star and focus of attention. The entire convention serves as center stage for the nominee and can provide a good beginning for the official campaign. Thus, a deadlocked convention may be a spectator's dream, but it is a candidate's nightmare. Division, debate, and controversy may provide excitement but contribute little to unity, loyalty, and the reinforcement of candidate image.12

Judith Parris also notes the centrality of the unifying function: "When the convention works well, it is, as its name would imply, a 'coming together.' . . . When a party is bitterly divided, however, . . . the convention works less well in achieving consensus and legitimation."13 More recently, William Crotty and John Jackson have affirmed the importance of a unitary party voice:

The party is well positioned for the race if the convention has been successful in creating enthusiasm for the candidate and in creating or ratifying a consensus; if the party has adopted positions that promise to be attractive to the voters; and if the party has successfully avoided alienating its activists and voters. If problems remain evident after the convention, or if the problems are actually exacerbated by the events of the
convention itself, then the nominee and his party are likely to be in trouble in November.\textsuperscript{14}

Despite the criticism that modern political conventions no longer serve the important function of nominating the candidate,\textsuperscript{15} political scientists continue to view the quadrennial events as important for at least three reasons: the need for generating a unified party, the use of the convention to create a "bandwagon" effect of support from nonpartisan or uncommitted voters, and the "convention bump" of popularity the candidates receive in the polls after their respective conventions. Priscilla Southwell,\textsuperscript{16} Walter Stone,\textsuperscript{17} and Patrick Kenny and Tom Rice\textsuperscript{18} have repeatedly emphasized the importance of party unity. These researchers conclude that when partisan voters supported candidates who did not receive the party's nomination, they often found it difficult to give their support to a candidate they were just opposing. As a result, partisan voters often refuse to unite and vote for the party candidate in the general election. However, when the party convention is successful in unifying the party, these partisan voters are often able to relieve the dissonance they may feel about a candidate. Larry Bartles\textsuperscript{19} suggests that although candidates benefit from the bandwagon effect throughout the primary process, candidates can anticipate more support from the less attentive nonprimary voters who reach their decision about voting in the general election based, in part, on what they see during and immediately after the conventions. Indeed, according to
polls, at least 18% of the voters, and sometimes as many as 31% of the voters make their voting decision at the time of the national conventions. Finally, there is evidence to suggest that conventions provide candidates with a "bump" or spurt in popularity in the polls. This "bump" may propel a nominee to victory in the general election.

The Rhetorical Importance of Political Conventions

Although the functions of the convention have remained fairly constant, there have been numerous internal or structural changes. One of the most notable changes for the rhetorical scholar is the direct involvement of the nominee during the convention process. Early conventions were attended only by party elites and delegates. After the convention delegates had arrived at their decision, the presidential nominee was notified of his selection by letter, and responded with his official acceptance at a special ceremony several weeks later. In 1932 -- eight years before limited television coverage of the conventions began -- Franklin D. Roosevelt broke tradition by delivering his acceptance speech in person at the conclusion of the Democratic convention. Twelve years later Thomas Dewey became the first Republican nominee to deliver his acceptance speech to the national convention. These precedent setting appearances were the final ingredients in the birth of the modern convention.

Today, the national convention is a showcase designed to project a party image which is not only the epitome of
democracy, but is also the image of efficiency and harmony. The schedule of convention events is designed to showcase the party's strengths -- for example, the highly partisan keynote speech, the casting of ballots for the nominee, and the acceptance speeches of the candidates are all presented during prime time. Likewise, in an effort to project this harmonious and unified image, party leaders generally attempt to keep any evidence of party factionalism or bitterness such as credentials and platform fights out of the peak viewing period of prime time.

The national nominating conventions provide the rhetorical scholar with a number of fascinating opportunities for study. The conventions are perhaps best described as highly rhetorical events since the average convention may have 150 speeches or more over the course of four days. Indeed, as Robert Bostrom argued, "Probably no other assembly in American public life can quite match a political convention in the number of speeches presented in a comparable length of time." Thus, the sheer volume of speeches suggests that conventions are events worthy of study.

In addition to the sheer number of speeches, the rhetorical scholar should find convention speeches worthy of study because of the purposeful nature of the speeches. The general consensus is that convention speakers, particularly those chosen to speak during prime time, are carefully chosen for either one of two reasons: to give national exposure to
an up and coming party member; or, to appeal to and create party salience.

The first reason a speaker may be chosen is that the party sees the person as an up and coming member who can benefit from the national exposure of addressing the convention — as in the case of Bill Clinton when he was given the opportunity to address the 1984 and 1988 Democratic National Conventions. Harry Kerr asserted that "an able speaker can vault into consideration for the vice-presidential nomination and other important party positions." Although Kerr acknowledged the probability of receiving the vice-presidential nomination is slim, he argued that "the probability of advancement to more responsible roles in the party is entirely real. An invitation to deliver the keynote speech is both a reward for past accomplishments and a test of future performance." 

A paradigmatic example of this was the 1968 Republican convention keynote speaker Daniel J. Evans. Evans was selected as the keynote speaker for several reasons. First, Evans was running for re-election as Governor of Washington, and his state party organization was sharply divided. Republican leaders felt the recognition accorded Evans might unite the state party and secure the state's support in the upcoming Presidential election. Second, Evans met the approval of the three major candidates — Nixon, Reagan, and Rockefeller. Finally, Evans was both attractive and articulate, and would thus project a very positive image for the party.
A second reason a speaker may be chosen is constituency salience. Candidates for president and vice-president carefully select the speakers who will place their names in nomination and give seconding speeches based on the speakers' ability to appeal to a specific constituency. For example, in 1984 Geraldine Ferraro chose Barbara Kennelly to place her name in nomination because Ferraro felt Kennelly would appeal to women. Ferraro also chose Barbara Roberts Mason, a black educator as one of her seconders along with Hispanic Tony Anaya, Governor of New Mexico, in order to appeal to specific groups. (Ferraro had asked Congressman Peter Rodino, dean of the Italian-American caucus in the House to speak for her nomination, but since he was not planning to attend the convention, he could not speak on her behalf.)

Despite the rhetorical nature of conventions, they have received little study when compared to other aspects of political communication. For most rhetorical scholars conventions are studied as repositories of speeches. Their most characteristic research act is the classification of convention speeches as one of four types — the keynote address, the nominating speeches, and the acceptance speech of the vice-presidential candidate, and the acceptance speech of the presidential candidate which serves as a capstone speech for the convention. Speeches outside the purview of these categories are generally deemed of minor importance, and thus receive little or no attention. However, since the 1980 Democratic National Convention, it seems that a new form
of convention speech has emerged -- a speech whose function, according to the media, is to bring unity to the party.

The 1980 Democratic National Convention is remembered as one of the most divisive conventions in recent history. Not since the Chicago convention of 1968 have the Democrats entered a national convention as divided as the one in Madison Square Garden. The controversy and divisiveness were engendered by the perception that President Carter was falling so far behind in the polls that the Democrats were destined to lose the White House.\(^4\) The perceived lack of support for Carter provided Senator Edward Kennedy with hope that he could win a controversial rules fight concerning the binding of delegates to the candidates on the first ballot. If Kennedy could win the delegate rule fight, he felt he could recruit enough Carter delegates to seize the nomination on the convention floor.

The rules fight was billed by the media as a showdown between the moderate Democrats who supported Carter and the more liberal constituency of the party who supported Kennedy. On the opening night of the convention, Carter and his supporters won the delegate rule fight by almost 600 votes,\(^5\) thus ensuring Carter's victory at the convention. After losing the rules vote, Kennedy notified Carter that he would withdraw his name from the nomination. Kennedy requested, and was given permission to address the convention delegates and the general public, ostensibly on matters of the party platform and to urge support for the Democratic ticket.
On Tuesday, August 12, 1980, Edward Kennedy became the first major contender for the Democratic Presidential nomination since William Jennings Bryan's 1896 "Cross of Gold" speech to address the Democratic National Convention. In an electrifying speech which was heralded as the high point of Kennedy's campaign, as well as the high point of the 1980 convention, Kennedy established the precedent for a new form of political convention discourse for the Democratic party -- a form of speech identified by the media as the unity speech.

Broadly defined, the unity speech is a ceremonial speech given by the major political contender(s) who failed to win enough delegates during the primaries and caucuses to secure the party nomination. Despite their lack of delegates to secure the nomination, the major contenders often have a sufficient number of delegates and/or a large enough constituency of supporters to force the party nominee to include them in negotiating the party platform or risk having the contenders bolt from the convention and encourage their supporters to abstain in voting. The unity speech (if such a thing exists) provides an opportunity for the major contenders to address the convention delegates -- and often their constituents at home via the media -- to endorse the party nominee and to encourage the delegates and general voters to do the same.

Since Kennedy's 1980 speech, the Democrats have continued to allow the major political contenders to address the
convention and the general public. In 1984, both Jesse Jackson and Gary Hart were afforded prime time to address their constituents in the name of party unity. In 1988, Jesse Jackson was again allowed to address the convention to call for party unity behind nominee Michael Dukakis. Even Jerry Brown was allowed to address the Democratic convention in 1992, although he was restricted to addressing the convention during the day rather than during prime time when his speech would have been carried by the three networks. Additionally, the unity speech was adopted in 1992 by the Republicans when Patrick Buchanan was afforded an opportunity to address the Republican convention.

Political humorist Molly Ivins claims that in politics nothing can be considered a trend until it has happened at least twice.34 Certainly four Democratic and one Republican National Conventions suggest the emergence of a trend in convention discourse. This dissertation focuses on this emerging trend in convention discourse in an attempt to answer the following research questions:

(1) To what extent do these speeches actually represent a new type or genre of political convention discourse?
(2) Rhetorical Potential: What are the constraints, rhetorical choices, and formal features of the genre?
(3) What functions do these speeches perform other than unity?
(4) Intertextuality: What earlier genre do these forms draw upon and how do they make use of earlier forms? What does the emergence and development of this genre tell us about contemporary American political culture?

(5) What has been the critical evaluation of these speeches and do they contribute to our understanding of generic discourse?

Only after examining the speeches of Kennedy, Jackson, Hart, Brown and Buchanan in light of these five research questions can we determine if a new type of convention discourse has emerged.
Notes to Chapter I


5 Nimmo and Sanders, 15.

6 Nimmo and Sanders, 17-27.


One of the major criticisms against the nominating convention is that because states have already voted in primaries and caucuses, the actual nominee for president is usually known well in advance of the convention. Additionally, it has become the norm for the party nominee to choose his own running mate, usually just prior to the convention. Thus, the convention no longer serves to really nominate the candidates, instead it merely provides the formal endorsement of the candidate and his running mate.


For a more thorough explanation of this phenomena, see such works as Byron E. Shafer, Bifurcated Politics: Evolution and Reform in the National Party Convention (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard UP, 1988); Stephen J. Wayne, The

22 This number is an approximation based on Larry David Smith's research of conventions as institutional discourse. Smith explained that he reviewed over 300 speeches from the 1984 Democratic and Republican conventions, and approximately the same number from the 1988 conventions. Larry David Smith, "Convention Oratory as Institutional Discourse: A Narrative Synthesis of the Democrats and Republicans of 1988," Communication Studies 41, (Spring 1990): 19-34.


25 Kerr, 405.


Although Kennedy’s speech marked the first time in almost one hundred years that a Democratic candidate addressed his convention, this was not the first time a contender had spoken before his convention. In 1964, Republican Nelson Rockefeller was given fifteen minutes to defend the first of three draft minority resolutions which had been prepared by the Eastern constituency of the party as a challenge to the text of the majority of the Platform Committee and Barry Goldwater. In 1976, incumbent Gerald Ford and challenger Ronald Reagan went into the Republican convention in almost a dead heat, with neither candidate having enough delegates to guarantee securing the nomination on the first ballot. At the convention, Ford was able to pull just ahead of Reagan and win the nomination on the first ballot by a total of 1187 to 1070. Because of the uncertainty of the nomination, both candidates had addressed the convention in an attempt to win delegates.


CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Political communication emerged as a recognized field of study in the late 1950s. Since that time a vast body of literature has developed, especially in the past decade. Rhetoricians have studied the speeches and writings of individual political figures, political campaigning and advertising, the impact of the media on politics, and the overall importance of rhetoric and communication in politics. Despite this abundance of research covering various aspects of political communication, relatively little has been written about the national conventions.

Communication research focusing on the national conventions has been limited to two basic perspectives. The first, and the older of the two, isolates a particular speech from the convention and analyzes it for overall style or effect. The second perspective looks at conventions holistically to understand their rhetorical nature. Both perspectives have merit and provide a theoretical foundation for this study.

Analyses of Convention Speeches

Edwin A. Miles wrote the definitive essay on keynote speeches in 1960. In his analysis of convention keynote speeches dating back to the 1896 Democratic convention, Miles identified the keynote speech as serving two functions: "to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates to a high pitch and to rally the voters of the nation to the party's standard." Going beyond the mere identification of the functions of the
keynote speech, Miles traced the history and evolution of the keynote address until he was able to identify the common form or pattern in the speech, thus establishing the standards by which keynote speeches must be measured:

... each orator will remind the delegates of the solemnity of the hour and the importance of their decisions; he will recount in detail the principles and accomplishments of his party; he will hold up his opponents to ridicule and scorn; and he will make a plea for a united effort by his party to achieve victory in November.7

Bostrom8 explored the ritualistic functions of the nominating speech and concluded that nominating speeches continue and succeed despite the circumstances under which they are given. Because of the ritualistic nature of the nominating speech, the speakers have little opportunity for individuality or originality in their speeches and instead are forced to conform to a speech whose form and use of language are awkward at best and extremely stylized at worst. Additionally, just as Miles identified the formal structures of keynote speeches, Bostrom identified the formal structures of nominating speeches. According to Bostrom, the nominating speech is characterized by highly ritualized organization, language, and content.

Custom specifies a climatic order, especially because of the demonstration that usually follows the speech. The language of the speeches tends to be extravagant principally because of the "two-valuedness" of American political speaking -- "our side" is always the best. . . . Organization and language are strongly affected, but the speech's content shows tradition even more strongly.9
While Miles and Bostrom established the forms of keynote and nomination speeches and then applied these forms to specific examples, others have been concerned with studying the evolution or development of one particular speech. For example, Newell and King traced the evolution of Reubin Askew's keynote address at the 1972 Democratic National Convention in Miami Beach to better understand the constraints which affected the final speech. Likewise, Smith examined Daniel Evans' 1968 keynote speech as an example of compromise in which Evans was able to develop a speech with balanced appeals to three different audiences: the conservative audience of convention delegates, the general American audience who were more conservative than Evans, and the voters in Washington who were more liberal than the general American audience.

Although there has been sporadic interest in analyzing convention speeches, it has always been done within the context of one convention or one election campaign in an attempt to understand the importance of the convention and the convention speeches in that particular campaign. For example, Paul Rosenthal explored how, in 1964, a "militant minority faction" of the Republican party was able to use rhetoric to "seize control" of the party and the convention.

Campbell and Jamieson used Barbara Jordan's 1976 keynote address to the Democratic convention as an example of the reflexive form of "enactment" to analyze not only that speech but other examples of rhetorical enactment. They concluded
that although Jordan used enactment in her speech, she did not take full advantage of the strategy. According to Campbell and Jamieson, if Jordan had used enactment to her full advantage, the speech would have been more effective and memorable for its content and structure, not just because Barbara Jordan delivered it.

One weakness of this type of analysis is that the researcher must guard against the universalism and conservatism that have characterized functionalist analysis. Functionalists like Campbell and Jamieson routinely assume that the weakness of a given event lies within the speaker's understanding and skill in exploiting the generic form. The bias of this functionalist position is that it deflects attention away from the genre, the audience, accidental propitiation, or the role of local constraints.

More recently Lesley DiMare applied conflict theory to Jesse Jackson's 1984 Democratic National Convention speech to analyze Jackson's attempt at resolving the conflict which his candidacy had created in the 1984 campaign. DiMare argued that Jackson chose to "functionalize" conflict rather than trying to reduce or eliminate it outright. She concluded that because Jackson was able to demonstrate to the Democrats that inter-party conflict does not have to be viewed as the antithesis of party unity, Jackson was able to appeal to the party as a whole without abandoning his constituency.

Finally, Stephen Depoe explored Edward Kennedy's rhetorical use of nostalgia in his address to the 1980 Democratic
Depoe hypothesized that Kennedy tried to use nostalgic appeals both for the deliberative function of casting himself as a leader of the Democratic party and for the therapeutic function of trying to unify the party. Unfortunately, the deliberative and therapeutic functions of the speech were contradictory to each other, and the speech failed to achieve both.

While DiMare and Depoe's works are most directly related to this dissertation, they still only explore the speeches as isolated examples rather than looking at them as an emerging pattern or genre of convention discourse. This dissertation will take a more macroscopic perspective by looking at several examples of these speeches -- Kennedy in 1980, Hart and Jackson in 1984, Jackson in 1988, and Brown in 1992 for the Democrats and Buchanan in 1992 for the Republicans. Only by looking at these six texts as part of a larger text or type will it be possible to determine whether or not a new genre or type of political convention speech has emerged, to evaluate the efforts of its practitioners, and to speculate about its rhetorical potential and future utility.

**Holistic Analysis of Political Conventions**

Although rhetorical scholars have demonstrated at least limited interest in studying convention speeches, there has been little emphasis on studying the conventions as a whole. Farrell examined the 1976 conventions of both the Republicans and Democrats to see how the conventions used ritual forms to legitimate the party and the respective candidates.
Farrell explored the way both parties used consensus and conflict rituals to cast themselves and the opposing party. Both parties constructed themes which were carried throughout the various convention speeches, both developed character schemes for the different party members in an effort to show different role relationships in the party, both attempted to enact these rituals they were creating through their chosen candidates, and both parties cast judgment on the other.

Farrell concluded that, in 1976, neither party was overly successful in creating this sense of legitimation. The Democrats were "modestly successful," but the Republicans were unable to fulfill the ritual, in part because of the lingering presence of Watergate.17 For the purpose of this dissertation, the most important contribution by Farrell was his use of conventions as events to study a rhetorical strategy. In analyzing the conventions as events, Farrell demonstrated the legitimacy of viewing the convention events -- speeches, platforms, films, etc. -- as interconnected and purposefully orchestrated.

Likewise, Larry David Smith has argued extensively for studying conventions holistically as extended party narratives in which both parties attempt to create political realities for themselves and the voters. Smith uses Fisher's narrative paradigm to examine the party platforms,18 the conventions themselves,19 and even the network coverage of the conventions20 to show how the parties carefully construct
and attempt to enact "stories" which are designed to create a particular reality for the voter.

Smith's contributions to studying conventions are two-fold. First, he, like Farrell, offers an excellent rationale for examining the conventions as events rather than just opportunities for examining particular speeches. Second, Smith's use of the narrative paradigm clearly demonstrates the length to which the parties will go to create an image or sense of reality, not only about themselves, but also about the other party. The careful construction and execution of these party narratives once again underscores the importance of party unity and cohesion.

Two general conclusions can be drawn from the existing research. First, a significant rhetorical purpose for convention speeches is to create a sense of party unity; to rally the spirits and support of party members behind the party nominee. The convention speakers, both the major and minor speakers, must attempt to create speeches which will appeal to and reinforce the heightened emotions the convention delegates feel as well as appeal to the massive television audience watching the convention but is not directly experiencing the emotional fervor of the moment. As both Miles and Bostrom have argued, this appeal to party unification and support is created by the form or structure of the speeches. Second, the research by Farrell and Smith clearly indicates that the party conventions are carefully orchestrated events designed to create a meta-narrative, which,
again, is designed to evoke a coherent political story complete with dramatic forms: characters, heroes, villains, victims, spectacle, thought, action, conflict, and resolution.

The Importance of Party Unity

The importance of party unity has been repeatedly argued by rhetorical scholars, and it has also been studied empirically by political scientists. The general conclusion is that the more unified the party is in the convention, or the more the convention is able to heal the wounds of a divided party, the better the chance for the nominee to do well in the general election. This is perhaps best explained by Denis Sullivan:

The long pre-convention campaign can only serve to increase the psychological investment each delegate has in his/her candidate. These facts, we think, make it even more difficult for losers to accept the convention outcome and recommit their energies to the winner.\textsuperscript{21}

Research by Southwell, Stone, and Kenney and Rice\textsuperscript{22} has supported this hypothesis. In particular, Kenny and Rice concluded that prenomination preferences are a vital determinant of the general election vote choice.\textsuperscript{23} In fact, the prenomination preferences are sometimes so strong that the partisan voters are likely to switch their votes to the opposite party rather than vote for the nominee who beat their preferred candidate.

Specifically, the results revealed that the higher a respondent scored Kennedy compared to Carter on the feeling thermometer scales,
the more likely he or she was to rank Reagan near or above Carter on the general election thermometers. Likewise, the higher a respondent ranked Bush relative to Reagan, the more likely he or she was to rate Carter high compared to Reagan.  

The importance of party unity is also acknowledged in the popular press. Newspapers and magazines prior to, during, and immediately after the conventions are filled with headlines announcing the efforts of the candidates and convention organizers to appeal to and create unity among both the delegates and the party members at large.

Given the popular consensus of opinion that party unity is important, and the fact that this is supported empirically, the question arises, why have recent conventions allowed the major party contenders to address the conventions? Are these speeches supposed to heal wounds that have been inflicted on the nominee during the pre-convention campaign? Are these speeches supposed to create a sense of unity and party identification for the supporters of the non-winning candidate? According to the popular press, the answers are yes. The rhetorical critic, however, must look beyond the surface of these speeches and what they supposedly represent.

Methodology

This study examines six speeches -- Edward Kennedy’s 1980 address to the Democratic National Convention; Jesse Jackson and Gary Hart’s 1984 speeches to the Democratic National Convention; Jesse Jackson’s 1988 address to the Democratic National Convention; Jerry Brown’s 1992 address to
the Democratic National Convention; and, Patrick Buchanan’s 1992 address to the Republican National Convention -- to determine whether a new form of convention discourse is emerging. To make this determination, these speeches are analyzed from a form and genre methodology.

In his seminal work, *Anatomy of Criticism*, Northrop Frye wrote that "The study of genres is based on analogies in form." Frye referred to these forms as "typical recurring images," "associative clusters," and "complex variables" and compared them to rhetorical commonplaces or *topoi*. According to Frye, genres are the forms through which experiences and feelings can be made intelligible to others. As Campbell and Jamieson extend on this:

> . . . formal similarities establish genres, and the forms relevant to genres are complex forms present in all discourse. If the forms from which genres are constituted have the characteristics indicated by Frye, they will be the kinds of forms that rhetoricians ordinarily call "strategies" -- substantive and stylistic forms chosen to respond to situational requirements.

When analyzing the speeches by the Democratic and Republican contenders, these three elements -- substance, style, and situation must be carefully examined to see whether a similar form is being used by the speakers. Examples of substantive forms are the various modes of proof, canons of logic, use of 'topoi,' and the use of emotional or motivational appeals. Likewise, examples of stylistic forms include structural elements, patterns of personal display, and the use of various figures of speech such as metaphor and
antithesis. If the speeches reflect a similar form, it is possible to argue that a new genre of political discourse may be emerging.

The use of form and genre analysis for political speeches is a commonly accepted practice. Indeed, as Simons and Aghazarian pointed out, "generic concepts and methods may prove more useful in the study of political rhetoric than they have in the study of literature" in part because "rhetorical works are more amenable to generic analysis than are literary works, owing to the very nature of rhetoric as a practical, situational art."39

In order to accurately apply form and genre analysis to these speeches, a sense of purpose or general set of expectations surrounding these speeches must be established. However, before identifying the purpose or goal of these speeches it is necessary to examine the situations surrounding the speeches. Thus, the first step in this process is to explore the situations in which these speeches have arisen, both individually and collectively. This will be accomplished by reviewing the factors in each convention which contributed to increased or decreased unity for the party. Once the situation is clearly understood, it will be possible to explore the goal(s) or purpose(s) of these speeches.30 Once the goal(s) or purpose(s) of the speeches has been established it will be possible to apply form and genre analysis to the sample speeches to determine (1) are there recurrent themes, styles, or constructions to these speeches,
thus suggesting a new genre of convention discourse; (2) what form or structure these speeches take; and (3) whether these forms, both substantive and stylistic, are appropriate to the situation.

In the analysis of each convention, two aspects of the convention and speech will be explored: first, the context of each speech -- the individual situation for each speaker and his respective convention, and second, the text of each speech.

When using formal criticism to evaluate a speech, the temptation is to create a form and impose it on the speech to see how well the form fits. To approach the criticism from this manner risks artificially limiting or structuring the speech. This is not to say that some basic assumptions of form -- particularly the substantive aspect -- cannot be made before examining the speeches. In the case of the unity speech, there are a number of assumptions which merit exploration.

The first assumption is centered around the purpose of the speech. Conventional wisdom says that the major speeches of the convention have unique and specific purposes. The keynote speech has the dual functions of raising the enthusiasm of the delegates to a high pitch by setting a tone for the convention and to rally the voters of the nation to the party's standard. The nominating speech, despite the criticism that this form of speech is useless, bombastic, and meaningless, serves the function of building enthusiasm for
the nominee and the party's ticket. The acceptance speech by the nominee serves a capstone function by issuing forth a cry of challenge to the opposition and rallying the party supporters to recommit their efforts on behalf of the party's ticket. Thus, it is logical to argue that the unity speech (as its name implies) would serve the function of unifying the party.

In Chapter I, the "Unity Speech" was defined as a ceremonial speech given by the major political contender(s) who failed to win enough delegates during the primaries and caucuses to secure the party nomination. Despite the lack of delegates to secure the nomination, the major contenders often have a sufficient number of delegates and/or a large enough constituency of supporters to force the party nominee to include them in negotiating the party platform or risk having the contenders bolt from the convention and encourage their supporters to abstain in voting. Thus, the unity speech (if such a thing exists) provides an opportunity for the major contenders to address the convention delegates -- and often their constituents at home via the media -- to endorse the official party nominee and to encourage their supporters to do the same.

A second assumption surrounding the unity speech is that this speech would accomplish the goal of creating unity through the careful construction of arguments in which the contender's supporters would find commonality with the party nominee. Popular political pundits and academicians both
have recognized the importance of prenomination preferences in influencing the likelihood of a person to vote for the party nominee in November. As Kenny and Rice\(^3\) have noted, prenomination preferences influence a voter's perceptions of their party identification, policy evaluations as articulated in the party platform, the comparative personal qualities of the candidates, the comparative evaluation of the candidates, and ultimately their vote choice. Thus, the assumption is that the contender would construct arguments in the unity speech to enable his supporters to more positively identify with the party nominee, thus increasing the likelihood they will actually join ranks with the party and support the nominee.

If this second assumption is true, and the contender tries to create this sense of commonality to provide unity for the party, a third assumption emerges concerning the actual construction of the speech. This third assumption is that the contender would construct the speech around three major lines of argument. First, the contender would reaffirm the ideals and issues on which his candidacy had been based, thus acknowledging the importance of these issues for his supporters. Second, the contender would show how the party and the nominee have moved toward (or even embraced) these issues and ideals both through the formal structure of the party platform and the more informal structure of the nominee's acceptance of these issues. Third, after reaffirming his supporters and reconfirming the legitimacy of their
concerns, and after demonstrating that the party as a whole is ready to embrace these concerns, the contender would argue for the unconditional support of the party nominee to insure the success of the party in the November election.

A fourth and final assumption about the unity speech is drawn from the work of Farrell and Smith who both have argued that national conventions are carefully orchestrated meta-narratives, and the successful convention is one in which the participants draw upon, reinforce, and extend the party narrative. Thus, the assumption would be that the successful unity speech would incorporate the convention and party narrative as a subtle reinforcement of the contender’s support of the party and the nominee.

These four general assumptions provide the preliminary basis for criteria of a unity speech. As mentioned above, it is dangerous to construct a new form which is then imposed over the speeches to determine whether or not a new genre is emerging. On the other hand, it is helpful to have some general assumptions or guidelines to look for when analyzing the speeches to better determine if there are similarities to the structure of these speeches.

Now that the unity speech has been defined and some basic assumptions surrounding its form have been offered, it is time to begin the analysis of the six speeches. The analysis of each speech will follow a similar pattern; first the situation or context of the speech will be examined, then the actual speech will be analyzed both structurally and
stylistically. Rhetorical scholars such as Kenneth Burke\textsuperscript{14} and Lloyd Bitzer\textsuperscript{15} have argued that rhetoric springs forth in response to a need or an exigence, either real or potential, and so when analyzing texts it is important for the critic to examine the situation surrounding the rhetorical act. Thus, when examining these convention speeches it is necessary to briefly review the campaigns and the issues which constructed these rhetorical situations.
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CHAPTER III
EDWARD KENNEDY AND THE 1980
DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

The 1980 Democratic National Convention will be remembered as one of the most divisive conventions in recent history. Not since the 1968 Convention in Chicago which was marred with protests and riots had the Democrats entered a national convention with such controversy and open hostility between candidate supporters. The Madison Square Garden Convention was the culmination of a campaign which had often degenerated to what Kathleen Jamieson called an "I'm qualified to be president and you're not" level of campaigning between Massachusetts Senator Edward Kennedy and President Jimmy Carter.¹

When Kennedy entered the race in 1979, he entered assuming the Democratic nomination was his for the taking. The press had proposed Kennedy as a potential candidate and practically crowned Kennedy 'heir apparent' for the presidency since the death of Robert Kennedy in 1968, and in 1979, polls indicated that President Jimmy Carter was falling in popularity.

... in early October 1979, when party regulars were asking themselves the key question about the upcoming election -- can this candidate win? -- Gallup polls showed that Jimmy Carter's approval rating had reached an all-time low of 29%. Gallup also reported that polled Democrats favored Teddy two to one as the party's nominee.²

On November 7, 1979, Kennedy announced his candidacy, and according to Patrick Devlin, fully expected to win the
party nomination. Kennedy's candidacy suffered almost from the beginning, both because of Kennedy's lack of preparation and because of Carter's increased popularity for his handling of the Iranian hostage situation. In fact, by May of 1980, three months prior to the Democratic National Convention, Kennedy was mathematically out of the race. By the August convention, Carter had won 24 of 34 Democratic primaries and 60 per cent of the 3,331 convention delegates needed to secure the party nomination. New York Times correspondent Drummond Ayres summarized the situation:

But in the end, because he was perceived as flawed in character, because foreign crises in Iran and Afghanistan overshadowed and submerged his campaign at crucial points, because political ideology and style had changed in the years since the deaths of his brothers, because luck and the breaks were not with him, and because he was not as good at campaigning as the public had thought and the President was better -- because of all this, the applause and clamor and yearning for Edward Kennedy faded.

Although he had no real chance to clinch the party nomination, Kennedy stayed in the race to continue to argue for the ideas and issues he deemed important. Kennedy speechwriter Robert Schrum explained Kennedy's reasoning.

His [Kennedy's] attitude was 'I'm going to be for what I'm going to be for. I mean, if I'm going to win this thing, I'm going to do it on my terms. If I'm going to lose it, I'm going to lose it on my terms. And when it is over, I'm going to feel good about it, I'm going to be for what I'm for.'

What Kennedy was 'for' was the resurrection of the old style, liberal Democratic party that had existed during the
political reign of his brothers. Kennedy had vowed from the beginning of his candidacy to "sail against the winds" of the growing conservatism he saw sweeping the country and the Democratic party.⁸

By the time the Democrats convened in Madison Square Garden, Kennedy's only hope for securing the party nomination was to win a controversial rules fight to be voted on the first day of the convention. The proposed rule, F(3)(c), was a 77-word resolution which would require delegates at the convention to vote on the first ballot for the Presidential candidate they represented during their home state primaries and caucuses. Kennedy and his supporters opposed the rule and argued that delegates should be free to change their minds as political circumstances change; that delegates should not be bound to a candidate on the first ballot. Kennedy believed that if he could win the rules fight and release the delegates, he could then stampede the convention either through debate over his Old Deal Democratic economic proposals in the party platform or through a catalytic platform speech, thereby recruiting enough delegates to capture the nomination on the first ballot.⁹

The rules fight, which was billed by the media as the opening day showdown for the convention, was won by Carter by almost 600 votes. This assured the President of victory on the nominating roll-call vote. Upon losing the rules fight, Kennedy "quickly bowed to that reality with a telephone call
to President Carter, and a public statement saying that ‘my name will not be placed in nomination.’”

Despite losing the rules vote and withdrawing his name from nomination, Kennedy still insisted on leading the debate on the economic planks of the party platform. According to Carter’s chief political advisor, Hamilton Jordan, Kennedy was granted permission to address the convention delegates and the voters at large on the economic planks of the platform because his support was deemed important. "It will be easier with him. We could do it without him, but it will be easier with him. He doesn’t matter so much himself, but his people do.” (emphasis mine) Adam Clymer of the New York Times put the situation into perspective:

At a time when only 23% of Mr. Kennedy’s Democratic followers say they plan to vote for Mr. Carter, according to the latest New York Times/CBS News poll, the Senator’s personal participation in the campaign would be immensely helpful. . . . Moreover, there were differences of considerable substance between Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Carter, and if Mr. Kennedy drops them, his supporters are not compelled to follow his lead.

On Tuesday, August 12, 1980, Edward Kennedy became the first major contender for the Democratic Presidential nomination since William Jennings Bryan’s 1896 "Cross of Gold" speech to address the Democratic National Convention.

Kennedy’s speech to the Democrats was both the high point of the convention and the high point of his campaign. According to Devlin, Kennedy used this speech to give his campaign meaning -- to legitimize his candidacy;
according to some convention analysts, Kennedy used his speech to call for unity among the Democratic party;\textsuperscript{15} but according to Kennedy, the purpose of the speech was not "to argue for a candidacy, but to affirm a cause."\textsuperscript{16}

\textbf{Kennedy's Speech: Structure}

The first aspect of Kennedy's speech to be examined is the structure or form since the structure of a speech is a primary focal point of form and genre analysis. Kennedy used the structure of an acceptance speech when he constructed his address to the Democrats. Robert Nordvold identified three functions the acceptance speech is supposed to fulfill:

First, the acceptance address represents the public assumption by the nominee of the leadership of the party. Second, it elicits from the assembled delegates concerted, vocal response, indicating their support for the nominee and loyalty to the party. Third, it presents to the wider audience, the viewing, listening, and reading public a demonstration of political solidarity and ideological unity.\textsuperscript{17}

In his own way, Kennedy tried to meet all three of these goals. First, Kennedy used his speech to assume a role of leadership in the Democratic party by attempting to redefine the party, by forcing Carter to accept a more liberal economic platform, and by casting himself as a viable candidate for the presidency in 1984. Second, Kennedy successfully created enthusiasm for himself, though not necessarily for the party ticket. Finally, Kennedy called for party unity and solidarity, though not around a candidate, but around the cause of "economic justice."
Kennedy's Assumption of Leadership

Kennedy used his speech to the convention to try to redefine the Democratic party. As mentioned earlier, Kennedy had entered the 1980 race in part to challenge and counter the growing trend of conservatism he saw not only among the Democrats, but throughout the country. In direct response to this conservatism, Kennedy argued that the Democrats must recommit themselves to being, "the party of the New Freedom, the New Deal, and the New Frontier." The way to achieve this recommitment, according to Kennedy, was through the adoption of the controversial economic plank of the party platform.

The economic plank of this platform on its face concerns only material things; but it is also a moral issue that I raise tonight. It has taken many forms over many years. In this campaign, and in this country that we seek to lead, the challenge in 1980 is to give our voice and our vote for these fundamental Democratic principles.

Kennedy also tried to redefine the party by invoking the names of traditional Democratic icons Thomas Jefferson, whose cause was the common man (and, Kennedy added, the common woman), and Andrew Jackson, whose cause was the humble members of society -- the farmers, mechanics, and laborers. "On this foundation, we have defined our values, refined our policies, and refreshed our faith." Later in the speech, Kennedy called upon Democrats to "restate and reaffirm the timeless truth of our party" and issued the hope that "May it be said of our party in 1980 we found our faith again."
A second way in which Kennedy asserted his leadership was by forcing Carter to accept Kennedy's liberal economic platform. As Peter Goldman observed, Carter needed Kennedy's 'blessing' badly, and Kennedy exacted a heavy price. "He forced a liberal platform on the President, some of it repudiating the Carter record." By forcing this liberal economic platform on the party, Kennedy demonstrated that he held a level of control over the party which even the party nominee had to respect.

Finally, Kennedy used his speech to establish his role as a visionary leader for the party in 1984.

By wisely refusing to bolt the party and by stirring the convention with anti-Reagan and standard liberal themes, Mr. Kennedy both maintained party regularity and asserted his leadership of the liberal wing. His speech may also have persuaded some Democrats that the Kennedy "magic" is not dead after all.

Thus, by redefining the Democratic Party along traditional liberal lines, by forcing a liberal economic platform on the party, and by presenting himself as the undisputed leader of the liberal wing of the party, Kennedy assumed a role of leadership over the Democrats.

**Kennedy's Creation of Enthusiasm**

Kennedy also used his speech to the convention to create enthusiasm and excitement which, until his speech, had been missing from the convention. As Peter Goldman wrote, "He did a stem-winding hymn to the old-time tax-and-spend religion and ignited a dancing, whooping, weeping demonstration that
Carter could not hope to match." The excitement Kennedy created resulted in his speech being interrupted fifty-one times by applause. Five times during the speech there was sustained applause coupled with chants of "We want Kennedy."24

Although Kennedy clearly did create an air of excitement and enthusiasm at the convention, the excitement was for him, not for President Carter or even the party as a whole. Because of this, the excitement and enthusiasm he generated was more counterproductive than it was beneficial. Kennedy supporters were reminded why they were backing Kennedy and not Carter, and Carter supporters were confronted with the realization that their chosen candidate lacked Kennedy's charisma and vitality. Anthony Lewis described the emotional reaction to Kennedy's speech.

The speech was a personal triumph for Senator Kennedy, and in cheering him the delegates were also really expressing their disappointment with President Carter. Kennedy put some passion into a convention that had seemed almost detached. He made the delegates care. He aroused the old Democratic political emotions, not only in Madison Square Garden, but surely around the country.26

So vivid were these realizations that by Wednesday morning a number of Kennedy delegates, including delegates from the states of Connecticut, Maryland, and Wisconsin, and delegates from the International Association of Machinists and the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, were publicly announcing their intentions to
either support independent candidate John Anderson or just not vote at all in November.  

Kennedy's Call for Unity and Solidarity

The third important function of the acceptance speech, according to Nordvold, is the candidate's call for unity and solidarity. Kennedy did issue forth a call for party unity and solidarity in his speech, though his call focused on a cause rather than a candidacy. Kennedy began his speech with this call for unity and solidarity.

My fellow Democrats and my fellow Americans: I have come here tonight not to argue for a candidacy, but to affirm a cause. I am asking you to renew the commitment of the Democratic Party to economic justice. I am asking you to renew our commitment to a fair and lasting prosperity that can put America back to work.

Kennedy then proceeded to tell the convention that, "This is the cause that brought me into the campaign and that sustained me for nine months . . . ." and that, "The serious issue before us tonight is the cause for which the Democratic Party has stood in its finest hours -- the cause that keeps our party young -- and makes it . . . the largest political party on the Planet."

Kennedy ended his speech by telling the stories of some of the people he had met during his campaign, all of whom were struggling financially. As he told their stories, he again emphasized his concern for and commitment to the cause of economic justice, and called on the Democratic party to embrace the cause.
Tonight, in their name, I have come here to speak for them. For their sake, I ask you to stand with them. On their behalf, I ask you to restate and reaffirm the timeless truth of our party.

I congratulate President Carter on his victory here. I am confident that the Democratic Party will reunite on the basis of Democratic principles -- and that together we will march toward a Democratic victory in 1980.30

Interestingly, this was the only passage in the speech in which Kennedy mentioned Carter. The significance of this is that in one sentence Kennedy congratulated Carter, and in the very next sentence he called for the Democrats to unite, not around Carter, but around Democratic party principles as defined by Kennedy.

This tactic did not go unnoticed by the press.

Those who watched the convention on television both nights probably got the impression of a bitterly divided Democratic Party that may only grudgingly fall in place behind Mr. Carter. . . . In fact, Mr. Kennedy, while urging party unity, fell considerably short of full-fledged support for President Carter.31

Kennedy's speech clearly followed the form of an acceptance speech. Kennedy used his speech to assert his leadership over the Democratic party, to create enthusiasm for his campaign (and perhaps for his future candidacy), and he used the speech to call for party unity and solidarity around the issue of economic justice. It was no accident that this speech so closely followed the form of an acceptance speech, because according to Kennedy speechwriter Robert Schrum, "Fundamentally that speech was the acceptance speech," and,
had Kennedy received the nomination, "basically, the same speech would have been delivered."32

**Kennedy's Speech: Style**

The second aspect of Kennedy's speech to be examined is his style — his use of language, his use of rhythm, and his use of various appeals (particularly his use of ethos and pathos).

**Kennedy's Use of Language**

When examining a speaker's use of language, the critic typically focuses on stylistic devices such as the use of metaphors and similes, the use of synecdoche and metonymy, and the use of antithesis. When applying these stylistic devices to Kennedy's speech, it is quickly apparent that Kennedy rarely used them when he addressed the Democratic Convention.

Kennedy did not rely on the use of metaphors or similes to create images in the minds of his audience. He used only one metaphor toward the end of his speech, and that was the same maritime metaphor he had used throughout his campaign to describe his candidacy and campaign. As mentioned earlier, Kennedy had defined himself as "sailing against the wind" because he was running in opposition to the growing conservatism he saw across the country as well as in the Democratic party. Toward the end of his speech, he invoked this maritime metaphor when he told his audience, "There were hard hours on our journey. Often we sailed against the wind, but always we kept our rudder true."33 The metaphor was not
developed, and the only purpose it served was as a reminder that Kennedy and his supporters had remained true to what they had defined as their mission -- to reintroduce liberal policies (particularly liberal economic policies) to the Democratic party.

Kennedy did use an element similar to metonymy in his speech. Metonymy is a figure of speech which uses the name of one thing for that of another of which the first thing is an attribute or with which it is associated. Kennedy used metonymy in the same way many politicians do -- he cast himself as the Democratic party. However, unlike most politicians, Kennedy was also able to use metonymy to cast himself as the contemporary standard bearer of the Kennedy political dynasty. By using such pronouns as "our," "us," and "we" Kennedy assumed and asserted a dual personae of the Democratic party and the Kennedy tradition. This is particularly evident in a number of passages in the first part of his speech:

*Our cause has been,* since the days of Thomas Jefferson, the cause of the common man -- and the common woman. *Our commitment has been,* since the days of Andrew Jackson, to all those he called "the humble members of society -- the farmers, mechanics, and laborers." On this foundation we have defined our values, refined our policies, and refreshed our faith (emphasis mine)."  

A few paragraphs later, after identifying a number of pledges to which he wanted the party to commit itself to, Kennedy admonished his audience to be mindful of the importance of these pledges.
These are not simplistic pledges. Simply put, they are the heart of our tradition; they have been the soul of our party across the generations. It is the glory and the greatness of our tradition to speak for those who have no voice, to remember those who are forgotten, to respond to the frustrations and fulfill the aspirations of all Americans seeking a better life in a better land (emphasis mine).35

Through the constant reference to "our," Kennedy was able to shift the reference from what was at first clearly the Democratic party, to a connotation which was much more ambiguous. When Kennedy argued that the cause of economic justice is "the heart of our tradition" and "the soul of our party," he could have meant either the Democratic party, or he could have meant the Kennedy political dynasty.

This ambiguity was advantageous to Kennedy because it allowed him to appeal to the more conservative element of the Democratic party by implying that the cause of economic justice is inherent within the party and needs only to be resurrected. On the other hand, Kennedy was also able to appeal to the liberal element of the party by implying that the cause of economic justice is the cause which the Kennedy family has always championed. In this way, Kennedy was able to most effectively use metonymy because to his supporters, he became the Democratic party.

Kennedy’s Use of Rhythm

One of the most stirring and effective elements of Kennedy’s speech was his use of repetition to create rhythm. Repetition is the rhetorical device which allows the speaker to use a particular phrase over and over either at the
beginning or the end of a sentence or paragraph for the purpose of emphasizing a thought or idea. When used effectively, repetition creates a rhythm which casts an almost hypnotic spell over an audience. Kennedy used this device throughout his speech.

Early in his speech, Kennedy used repetition to explain the rationale for his speaking:

*I speak out of a deep sense* of urgency about the anguish and anxiety I have seen across America. *I speak out of a deep belief* in the ideals of the Democratic Party, and in the potential of that party and of a president to make a difference. *I speak out of a deep trust* in our capacity to proceed with boldness and a common vision that will feel and heal the suffering of our time ... (emphasis mine)

Moments later, when he asked the Democratic party to pledge itself to the cause of economic justice, Kennedy used repetition again.

*Let us pledge that* we will never misuse unemployment, high interest rates, and human misery as false weapons against inflation. *Let us pledge that* employment will be the first priority of our economic policy. *Let us pledge that* there will be security for all who are now at work. *Let us pledge that* there will be jobs for all who are out of work -- and we will not compromise on the issue of jobs. (emphasis mine)

Kennedy's most effective use of repetition occurred when he cast the Republican party and their nominee, Ronald Reagan, as political villains. In a passage which generated nearly three minutes of applause and cries of support for Kennedy, he utilized various quotations by Reagan and a
repetitive structure to create an image of Reagan as the common enemy of all Democrats.

The same Republicans who are talking about the crisis of unemployment have nominated a man who once said -- and I quote: "Unemployment is a prepaid vacation plan for freeloaders." And that nominee is no friend of labor.

The same Republicans who are talking about the problems of the inner cities have nominated a man who said -- and I quote: "I have included in my morning and evening prayers every day the prayer that the federal government not bail out New York." And that nominee is no friend of this city and of our great urban centers.

The same Republicans who are talking about security for the elderly have nominated a man who said just four years ago that participation in Social Security "should be made voluntary." And that nominee is no friend of the senior citizen.

The same Republicans who are talking about preserving the environment have nominated a man who last year made the preposterous statement, and I quote: "Eighty percent of air pollution comes from plants and trees." And that nominee is no friend of the environment.

And the same Republicans who are invoking Franklin Roosevelt have nominated a man who said in 1976 -- and these are his exact words: "Fascism was really the basis of the New Deal." And that nominee, whose name is Ronald Reagan, has no right to quote Franklin Delano Roosevelt. (emphasis mine)

In direct contrast to the image of the villainous Republicans, Kennedy cast the Democrats as the heroes when he defined the Democratic party as the "party of new hope." Once again he used repetition to reinforce this image.

To all those who are idle in the cities and industries of the America, let us provide new hope for the dignity of useful work. . . .
To all those who doubt the future of our economy, let us provide new hope for the reindustrialization of America. . . .
To all those who work hard for a living wage, let us provide new hope that the price of their employment shall not be an unsafe workplace and death at an earlier age.

To all those who inhabit our land, from California to the New York Island, from the Redwood Forest to the Gulfstream waters, let us provide new hope that prosperity shall not be purchased by poisoning the air, the rivers and the natural resources that are the greatest gift of this continent.

To all those who see the worth of their work and their savings taken by inflation, let us offer new hope for a stable economy.

And to all those overburdened by an unfair tax structure, let us provide new hope for real tax reform.

The irony of this passage is that Kennedy offered what he saw as the direction the Democrats should go, just as if the Republicans were the party in power rather than the Democrats. By defining the Democratic party as the "party of new hope," he was implicitly criticizing the priorities and directions as emphasized by the Carter administration. At the very least this criticism of the party nominee did nothing to encourage feelings of unity among the delegates and party supporters.

The final example of repetition in Kennedy’s speech was when he praised the party for being "different."

Democrats can be proud that we choose a different course, and a different platform.

We can be proud that our party stands for investment in safe energy instead of a nuclear future that may threaten the future itself.

We can be proud that our party stands for a fair housing law to unlock the doors of discrimination once and for all.

And we can be proud that our party stands
plainly, publicly, and persistently for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.40

Kennedy used these repetitive passages to build a momentum which helped ignite his audience. The rhythm he created was further augmented by the strong emotional appeals he used.

Kennedy's Use of Appeals

Kennedy primarily relied on pathos and ethos as types of appeals in his speech. Because some might see Kennedy's ethos as suspect, he began his speech with emotional appeals which were designed to help establish his credibility in the minds of doubters, and reinforce his credibility in the minds of his supporters. Again, only by presenting himself as a legitimate candidate could Kennedy assert his role of leader for the party in the future.

Stephen Depoe41 argued that Kennedy constructed his speech almost entirely around one emotional appeal -- the appeal to nostalgia. According to Depoe, Kennedy used a series of nostalgic appeals which were designed to "invite the convention and national television audience to participate in a time of selective remembrance of liberal policies and heroic liberal leaders of the past."42 The use of nostalgic appeals could be highly effective because, as Fred Davis has argued, nostalgia serves as a type of emotional coping mechanism because it provides people with a therapeutic sense of order and stability during times of stressful change or uncertainty.43
Kennedy took advantage of the dissatisfaction many Democrats, particularly the liberal wing of the party, felt with Carter, as well as the general desire of many Americans to recapture the feeling of better times by resurrecting traditional Democratic liberalism. Kennedy began his speech with appeals to the history of the Democratic party by reminding them they were "the largest political party in this Republic and the longest lasting political party on this planet." Unfortunately, this "history" was in real danger and required a recommitment on the part of the Democrats. "We cannot let the great purposes of the Democratic Party become the bygone passages of history." The way to prevent this tragedy, according to Kennedy, was for the Democratic party to redefine itself along the traditional liberal lines of the party. As discussed earlier, by redefining the party, Kennedy was asserting his leadership over the party and was trying to dictate the direction the party should go in the future -- perhaps with Kennedy at the helm.

Other appeals to nostalgia included references to the Democratic party as "the party of the New Freedom, the New Deal, and the New Frontier" as well as references to great Democratic leaders such as Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and John Kennedy. Roosevelt was mentioned five times during the speech -- not just as one of the great party leaders, but also as a means of directly refuting claims made by the Republicans and Ronald Reagan during the Republican convention. Finally, Kennedy ended his
speech with an explicit reference to his slain brothers John and Robert when he quoted a passage from Tennyson’s *Ulysses*. "May it be said of us, . . . in the words of Tennyson that my brothers quoted and loved -- and that have a special meaning for me now . . . ."  

Although the emotional appeal of nostalgia was carefully woven throughout his speech, it was not the only type of emotional appeal Kennedy used. He also used short stories about some of the ordinary people he had met during his months of campaigning -- stories with which his audience could identify. Kennedy spoke of having listened to the forgotten, common voter such as "Kenny Dubois, a glassblower in Charleston, West Virginia" and to "the Trachta family, who farm in Iowa" and to "a grandmother in East Oakland, who no longer has a phone to call her grandchildren, because she gave it up to pay the rent on her small apartment."  

The use of these emotional appeals -- both the appeals to nostalgia and the stories of the common voter (the voter at the core of the party since the days of Jefferson) -- allowed Kennedy to create an atmosphere in which the Democrats could openly and vehemently support and endorse their chosen candidate, Edward Kennedy.  

Kennedy also used carefully constructed arguments to create and reinforce his credibility so he could utilize personal appeals in the speech. Kennedy told his audience at the beginning of his speech that it was not personal desire that had led him to declare his candidacy, but "the cause" of
economic justice. To further demonstrate his commitment to the cause, Kennedy informed his audience that even though he was no longer in contention for the nomination, he had taken the "unusual step of carrying the cause and the commitment of my campaign personally to our national convention." Kennedy cast himself as a concerned and caring candidate when he talked of the "anguish and anxiety I have seen across America" and his "deep belief in the ideals of the Democratic Party, and in the potential of that party . . . to make a difference."

After establishing the selflessness of his candidacy, Kennedy began to construct arguments in which he presented himself as not only credible, but as the only viable leader for the Democrats. By invoking the names of past leaders such as Jefferson, Jackson, Roosevelt, and (through vague implication) his brother John, Kennedy was able to suggest that these were the types of leaders the Democrats needed again. Kennedy implied that Carter did not fit the mold of these past great leaders. According to Kennedy, "The task of leadership in 1980 is not to parade scapegoats or to seek refuge in reaction but to match our power to the possibilities of progress." Later in the speech he told his audience that "a President and the people can make a difference" if they are willing to "reject the counsel of retreat and the call to reaction" because it is important to remember that history "only helps those who help themselves."
Kennedy was able to offer himself as a viable alternative, at least for the future, because he represented a commitment to the aggressive, forward looking concerns of the Democratic party.

While others talked of free enterprise, it was the Democratic Party that acted — and we ended excessive regulation in the airline and trucking industry. We restored competition to the marketplace. And I take some satisfaction that this deregulation was legislation that I sponsored and passed in the Congress of the United States.34

Conclusion

Kennedy’s address to the Democrats at the 1980 convention was allowed because the Carter administration saw this as an opportunity to bring the party back together after a hard fought and bitter primary race. Carter and his aides tried to use Kennedy’s speech as a springboard for appealing to the party to unite. James Reston of the New York Times summed up the situation well:

President Carter is now calling for the "unity" of the Democratic Party, but there is really no unity. He has defeated Senator Kennedy and the other liberal elements of his party, but he has not persuaded them. . . . While most people have forgotten the difference, the Kennedy people have not and therefore are reluctant to respond to Carter’s appeals for "unity" and for "generosity."

The failure of this speech to act in a unifying capacity stems primarily from the fact that Kennedy did not use this speech to appeal to party unity around Carter. Instead, Kennedy used this speech for his own interests -- to justify his candidacy during the 1980 race, and to firmly establish
his role as the leader for the liberal constituency of the party in the 1984 election.
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CHAPTER IV
JESSE JACKSON AND GARY HART AND THE 1984 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

After the hotly contested and divided 1980 convention in Madison Square Garden, the Democrats were determined to present a unified image of the party when they assembled at San Francisco's Moscone Center in 1984. However, despite their intention, desire, and need to present this unified party image, the Democrats were once again plagued with intra-party divisions as a result of months of heated campaigning for the party nomination.

The spring campaign had been a civil war among the three separate and seemingly irreconcilable tribes, Mondale's, Hart's, and Jackson's; each had its own agenda and its own core constituency, and each claimed title to the future of the party.¹

Walter Mondale had entered the race for the presidency after carefully analyzing the political sentiment of the country and the list of probable Democratic contenders. He chose to run in 1984 because, as he told supporters gathered at the Minnesota state capitol when he announced his candidacy, "I am ready. I am ready to be president of the United States."² According to Goldman & Fuller, Mondale also chose to run because he did not feel the other probable Democratic contenders posed a real threat to his candidacy.³ Needless to say, the race for the nomination as the Democrats entered San Francisco was not what Mondale had expected.

Mondale's nomination by the Democrats was challenged from two directions. First, and perhaps more symbolically
than numerically, he was challenged by Jesse Jackson and his Rainbow Coalition who wanted, among other things, changes made within the party primary system to abolish the use of runoff primaries which were, according to Jackson, discriminatory. Second, Mondale was challenged by Colorado Senator Gary Hart who had gained tremendous momentum toward the end of the primaries with his 'new leadership' candidacy, and who, as Kathleen Jamieson stated, "battled Walter Mondale to the finish line."

The first, and perhaps the most vocal challenge Mondale faced came from Jesse Jackson. Jackson had entered the race for the presidency to draw attention to the fact that the black electorate had been growing explosively since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 had become law -- from six million to ten million registered black voters -- and it had still not reached its limits. According to Jackson's figures, there were approximately seven million blacks waiting to be registered and included in the political process. Jackson decided to be the vehicle which would empower America's black voters, and thus was born the Rainbow Coalition.

Jackson's campaign was plagued by two problems. First, early in his campaign Jackson effectively alienated Jewish voters when he referred to Jews as "Hymies" and to New York as "Hymietown." The damage of the use of these terms was further compounded when Jackson claimed he did not remember if those were terms he had used, and he refused to apologize. This caused old strains between blacks and Jews
to resurface, and suddenly brought the credibility of the whole Rainbow Coalition into question.

The second problem which Jackson faced was the Democratic party's use of the runoff primary. Because nine states (all of them in the South or bordering a southern state) used the runoff primary, Jackson was never able to win enough delegates to be a serious contender for the party nomination. The issue of the runoff primary became one of the major themes for Jackson as he continued his campaign throughout the primary season and into the national convention in San Francisco. Even though he had been awarded fewer than 500 delegates, Jackson remained in the race for the party nomination in order to draw attention to a system which he claimed was discriminatory, and to prove that a minority candidate could not only be a legitimate contender for the nomination, but could be a force to be reckoned with in the writing of the party platform.

The second challenge Mondale faced was the strong showing Gary Hart had made toward the end of the primary season. Hart (and other Democratic contenders) had managed to effectively cast Mondale as the candidate of the old-style political machine, supported heavily by special interest groups. At the same time, Hart had found the constituency he had been looking for -- younger America. This was a constituency for whom the labor movement was an anachronism, and civil rights a closed chapter in history.
Hart was able to capitalize on a campaign strategy Pat Caddell had designed for the purpose of tempting Joe Bidon to run in 1984. When Bidon refused to run, Caddell eventually made his way to the Hart campaign camp, and ignited Hart’s candidacy. Caddell’s preliminary analysis of voters for the 1984 race indicated that the baby boom generation of voters felt somewhat alienated and unrepresented by the traditional political candidates. Furthermore, his analysis revealed that this younger voter would respond favorably to a young candidate with whom they identified, both ideologically and as a representative of an age of new leadership.

Hart sought to mold himself to this constituency. His campaign might best be described as a roller-coaster campaign in which he started somewhat slowly, gained tremendous popularity and support quickly, then lost a great deal of momentum, and finally reemerged as a serious threat to Mondale during the last few weeks of campaigning.

By the time the Democrats gathered in San Francisco, Mondale held a tenuous numerical claim to the party nomination. Mondale entered the convention with a reserve of fewer than 100 votes above the 1,967 required for nomination. Although neither Jackson nor Hart commanded enough delegates to be able to claim title to the nomination outright, they did pose a threat if they succeeded in convincing delegates to abandon Mondale. Both Hart and Jackson tried to motivate black delegates to switch their allegiance to Jackson in honor and recognition of his historic candidacy. Hart’s
strategists told reporters they had a "10 to 15 percent chance" of creating enough defections among Mondale's black and Hispanic delegates to force the convention to at least a second ballot. This was exactly what Mondale and his strategists did not want.

Mondale was able to prove his political leadership by making compromise agreements with his minority delegates, thus binding their support to him on the first ballot and insuring his nomination.

Interestingly, Mondale and his strategists were more concerned with Jackson than they were with Hart, despite the fact that Jackson commanded fewer delegates. Even though Jackson was not viewed as a viable contender for the nomination, he was considered a principal figure in the upcoming campaign against the Republicans. Jackson was seen as the representative of the powerless, having amassed over three million popular votes in the primaries largely as a result of blacks who turned out and voted in record numbers. The support he had received in the primaries placed Jackson only nineteen percentage points behind Mondale in the popular vote total.

Mondale and his strategists knew that if he were to have any hope of defeating Ronald Reagan, Mondale needed Jackson's support to attract the black vote. As Solomon and Stewart argued, if Jackson left the convention to run as an independent or gave Mondale anything less than his full support, the Democrats' efforts would have been seriously handicapped.
The platform committee rejected all of the proposals submitted by Jackson on behalf of the Rainbow Coalition, primarily because many of the proposals would have alienated moderate voters. To compensate for this, Mondale and the leaders of the Democratic party sought to appease Jackson and his followers by extending an invitation for Jackson to address the convention on the second evening, during prime time.

On the other hand, Mondale and the platform committee had accepted a number of Hart's platform proposals, and had even incorporated much of Hart's 'new-wave' language when writing the platform. When, at the last minute, Hart had insisted on a last minority plank limiting the use of force in Central America and the Persian Gulf, Mondale "grudgingly swallowed it, too." Once Hart "gave up the ghost" and admitted that he had no chance of winning the nomination, Mondale granted him permission to address the convention. According to Goldman and Fuller, the Mondale command granted Hart an hour of podium time along with a slide show and heroic music; only the ballon drop traditionally reserved for the winners had been vetoed.

Both speeches were hailed, before the fact and after, as unity speeches for the Democrats. Both speeches will be analyzed as unity speeches based on their structure and style.

**Jesse Jackson's Speech**

Allowing Jackson to address the convention was a risky venture since no one knew what he might say. It was possible
that he would be bitter, hostile, and antagonistic, and
equally possible that he would be reflective and supportive.
On the opening day of the convention, Jackson had told
Mondale strategist Bob Beckel that, "One of three things is
going to happen . . . you're either going to become a chump,
a chimp, or a champ, and you'll find out tomorrow night."\textsuperscript{19}

Although Jackson himself had made gestures toward peace
between the two camps, it was widely known that the more
militant of his followers -- his wife and his friends from
PUSH among them -- did not share his impulse toward peace.
As Gerald Boyd noted, "some of Mr. Jackson's supporters are
worried that he has been too conciliatory without tangible
concessions from the probable nominee, Walter F. Mondale."\textsuperscript{20}

Just as Kennedy's address had been the highpoint of the
1980 Democratic convention, so too was Jackson's speech in
1984. Jackson's speech was hailed as "one of the greatest
speeches of our time,"\textsuperscript{21} and, coupled with Mario Cuomo's
keynote speech from the previous night, helped signal "the
re-emergence of the political speech as something to be proud
of."\textsuperscript{22}

**Jackson's Speech: Structure**

Jackson's speech can best be described as something more
than the traditional political speech. Jackson's speech did
not follow any traditional order or pattern associated with
political discourse. Instead, Jackson blended religious
appeals, self-promotional images, attacks on the Republican
administration, compliments to the Democratic party, appeals
to the disaffected, and an apology for his own past statements and actions into "an intoxicating brew spiked with rhymed slogans and vivid images." Jackson "preached a political sermon that ended in a dream of national redemption."

Despite the fact that Jackson's speech did not follow any traditional organizational structure associated with political discourse, his speech did have a sense of order to it. The speech can be broken into four main sections, each of which was designed to satisfy a particular need or perform a specific political function. The first section of the speech was designed to defuse the tensions within the Democratic party which Jackson's campaign had created. The second section of the speech was used to introduce the national audience to the rainbow metaphor, to describe the members of this coalition, and to present their agenda. The third section of the speech, the longest, was used as a scathing indictment of the Reagan administration for its failure to address the needs of both the average person and the economically depressed. The fourth and final section of Jackson's speech is his conclusion in which he invited his audience -- particularly the disenfranchised members of his Rainbow Coalition -- to dream of a future America which lives up to its promise of justice for all.

**Jackson's Diffusion of Tensions**

Jackson used the first several minutes of his speech to try to diffuse worries and tensions which he had created
during the course of the campaign. This was important not only to the Democratic party, but also to Jackson himself if he harbored any hopes or plans for future political activity.

In spite of a nationwide survey which showed that Jackson had created considerable enthusiasm for presidential politics, voters could not forget his ethnic slurs against Jews early in the campaign and his lack of apology for those slurs, his refusal to immediately repudiate the statements and support of Black Muslim leader Louis Farrakhan, and his lack of political experience.\(^\text{24}\)

Jackson had also driven a wedge between himself and various Democratic constituencies throughout his campaign.

While Jackson espoused "coalition" politics and even labeled his various Democratic constituencies "The Rainbow Coalition," his campaign rhetoric seemed to induce rather than reduce conflict, creating confrontational situations many believed beyond resolution.\(^\text{25}\)

He had antagonized Southern Democrats when he attacked the use of runoff primaries in the South as discriminatory. He had disappointed a segment of black supporters who had urged him to split from the Democratic party and create a new party which would be more representative of black concerns. And, he had strongly criticized NOW members for "purloining" the issue of a female Vice President without crediting him or the Rainbow Coalition for its impetus.\(^\text{26}\)

Jackson attempted to diffuse these tensions early in his speech by telling his audience, "This is not a perfect party. We are not a perfect people. Yet, we are called to a perfect
mission." With this argument, Jackson was able to reassure his audience that although they might not all agree with each other, or even with Jackson and his candidacy, as long as the party remained focused on the "perfect mission," that was what was truly important. Jackson even went so far as to assure the Democrats that competition among any diverse group is to be expected, and is healthy. "There is a proper season for everything. There is a time to sow and a time to reap. There is a time to compete and a time to cooperate." 

Jackson went even further to reduce tensions when he offered an apology and admitted his own imperfections:

If in my low moments, in word, deed or attitude, through some error of temper, taste, or tone, I have caused anyone discomfort, created pain or revived someone's fears, that was not my truest self. If there were occasions when my grape turned into a raisin and my joy bell lost its resonance, please forgive me. Charge it to my head and not my heart. . . . I am not a perfect servant. I am a public servant. I'm doing my best against the odds. As I develop and serve, be patient. God is not finished with me yet.

Finally, Jackson offered his endorsement and support for the party nominee, whoever it might be.

I ask for your vote on the first ballot as a vote for a new direction for this party and this nation; a vote of conviction, a vote of conscience. But I will be proud to support the nominee of this convention for the President of the United States of America. I have watched the leadership of our party develop and grow. My respect for both Mr. Mondale and Mr. Hart is great.
Jackson’s Introduction of the Rainbow Coalition

After diffusing the tensions between the various constituencies in the party and apologizing for his early campaign behavior, Jackson moved on in his speech to introduce his audience to his Rainbow Coalition. Because Jackson had not been successful in getting the platform proposals of the Rainbow Coalition passed, this was his only opportunity to voice the concerns of his supporters to the party as a whole. Even as he prepared to present his coalition’s agenda, Jackson reminded the Democrats that "Feelings have been hurt on both sides. . . . We cannot afford to lose our way. We may agree to agree, or agree to disagree on issues, but we must bring back civility to these tensions."31

Jackson told the Democrats that if they were to be successful as a party, "we cannot be satisfied by just restoring the old coalition. Old wine skins must make room for new wine."32 Of course, the means to achieving this was through the Rainbow Coalition.

The Rainbow Coalition is making room for Arab-Americans. They too know the pain and hurt of racial and religious rejection. . . . The Rainbow Coalition is making room for Hispanic Americans who this very night are living under the threat of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, and farm workers from Ohio who are fighting the Campbell Soup Company with a boycott to achieve legitimate worker’s rights.

The Rainbow is making room for the Native Americans, the most exploited people of all, a people with the greatest moral claim amongst us. We support them as they seek the restoration of land and water rights, as they seek to preserve their ancestral homelands and the beauty of a land that was once all theirs. . . .
The Rainbow Coalition includes Asian-Americans, now being killed in our streets — scapegoats for the failures of corporate, industrial and economic policies. The Rainbow is making room for the young Americans.

The Rainbow includes disabled veterans.

The Rainbow is making room for small farmers.

... The Rainbow includes lesbians and gays. No American citizen ought to be denied equal protection under the law.

Finally, Jackson called on the Democrats as individuals and the party leaders to embrace the multiple constituencies represented by the Rainbow Coalition. "We must expand our party, heal our party and unify our party. That is our mission in 1984."

Jackson's Attack of the Reagan Administration

The third (and longest) section of Jackson's speech was his scathing attack on the Reagan administration and its military and economic policies. This third portion reflected traditional political speaking more than any other part of the speech. Jackson used this portion of his speech to unite the Democrats around a common enemy — Ronald Reagan.

In the keynote speech the night before, Mario Cuomo had cast the Democratic party as the party of compassion — compassion for immigrants who had come to this country years ago seeking a better life (and, incidentally, producing today's politicians), and compassion for the poor and needy in America today. Jackson expanded on Cuomo's appeal to extend compassion to Americans in need, and chastised Reagan and his administration for failing the American people.
President Reagan says the nation is in recovery. Those 90,000 corporations that made a profit last year but paid no Federal taxes are recovering. The 37,000 military contractors who have benefited from Reagan's more than doubling of the military budget in peacetime, surely they are recovering. The big corporations and rich individuals who received the bulk of a three-year, multibillion dollar tax cut from Mr. Reagan are recovering. But no such recovery is under way for the least of these.35

The "least of these," according to Jackson, were the various victims of the Reagan Administration's policies of tax cuts, Social Security cuts, health care cuts, federal aid program cuts, and energy policies. By implication, the "least of these" were precisely the members of the Rainbow Coalition and the people to whom the Democrats must extend a hand of compassion.

Jackson's Dream of a Future America

In the fourth and final section of his speech Jackson reverted back to his natural evangelical style of speaking and presented the Democrats with a dream of a future America -- a future constructed around the goal of justice. According to Jackson, "The requirement for rebuilding America is justice."36 Jackson argues that this justice will only come about through progressive politics -- through the inclusion and participation of all groups, most notably blacks, and through the enforcement of the Voting Rights Act at every level of political activity.

If blacks vote in great numbers, progressive whites win. It's the only way progressive whites win. If blacks vote in great numbers, Hispanics win. If blacks, Hispanics and
progressive whites vote, women win. When women win, children win. When women and children win, workers win. We must all come up together. We must come up together.\textsuperscript{37}

This is a rather interesting argument in which Jackson is attempting to do two things. First, he is reaffirming the importance of the black vote to his black supporters, and second, he is intimating to Mondale that he (Jackson) holds the key to the election since, supposedly, he represents the black voters.

Finally, Jackson creates a loosely woven set of arguments in this last section of his speech in which justice becomes the catalyst for a variety of other issues and concerns. Justice is "the way out" and enables us to move toward peace and jobs. Once peace and jobs are secured, the "slummy side" of life will become the "sunny side."

Jackson’s speech did not follow any traditional formula for a political speech. Nonetheless, he was able to move through a variety of arguments, issues, and appeals in which his words constantly reinforced the need for party unity, but not at the expense of ignoring particular factions. To fully understand how this was accomplished, it is necessary to examine the style and content of the speech.

\textbf{Jackson’s Speech: Style}

When examining Jackson’s speech three stylistic elements are immediately noticeable: his use of metaphors, his use of religious language and appeals, and the rhythmic construction of his speech. Also of note is the way in which Jackson
carefully constructed and used appeals to (re)establish his credibility as well as the credibility of the Rainbow Coalition.

Jackson's Use of Metaphor

Jackson used two metaphorical images to embody his message to his audience. The primary metaphor was the rainbow, a metaphor which he had used to represent his entire campaign. This was underscored at the beginning of his speech by a second metaphor, the patchwork quilt.

Jackson had chosen the rainbow as the metaphor/symbol for his candidacy because of the intertextuality of the rainbow image. On the most superficial level, the rainbow represents the multiple colors of the voters. Jackson told the Democrats, "Our flag is red, white, and blue, but our nation is a rainbow -- red, yellow, brown, black and white -- and we’re all precious in God’s sight." On deeper levels, the rainbow metaphor takes on added meanings.

The rainbow has often represented positive images. In the biblical story of Noah and the Ark, God sent a rainbow as a sign that the flood which had destroyed the earth was over and the life was beginning anew. Thus, in a religious context, the rainbow is symbolic of a new beginning. Irish legend depicts the Leprechaun as hiding his pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, and anyone who is lucky enough to find it may keep the treasure. And in popular literature and movies, the rainbow is symbolic of the path to better worlds. Solomon and Stewart argue that, "The association of the
rainbow with new beginnings, with promises, and with visions of peace and prosperity is widely held. Jackson used the rainbow metaphor to embody all of these meanings.

Jackson used the rainbow to symbolize a new beginning not only for the Democratic party, but for the country as a whole. America is becoming an increasingly multi-racial, multi-ethnic, and multi-cultural country. Jackson recognized this and replaced the traditional ‘melting pot’ metaphor in which all races, ethnic groups and cultures are blended together with the metaphor of the rainbow. The attraction of the rainbow is that the many colors attain the beauty of the whole yet retain their separate identity.

The rainbow metaphor also symbolizes a new and better world. Just as in popular literature and movies, this new and better world is attained only by passing through or over the rainbow. As noted above, in Jackson’s vision, America becomes a better world when all the ‘colors’ of the rainbow — blacks, progressive whites, Hispanics, and women -- work together.

Finally, Jackson’s rainbow is symbolic of the prosperity he envisions for America once this metaphor is embraced. At the end of the speech, Jackson emplores his audience to dream of what is possible once we move into this new world.

Dream of a new value system. Teachers who teach for life and not just for a living, teach because they can’t help it. Dream of lawyers more concerned about justice than a judgeship. Dream of doctors more concerned about public health than personal wealth. Dream of preachers and priests who will
Jackson underscored his rainbow metaphor with the use of his quilt metaphor.

America is not like a blanket -- one piece of unbroken cloth, the same color, the same texture, the same size. America is more like a quilt -- many patches, many pieces, many colors, many sizes, all woven and held together by a common thread. Just as the rainbow metaphor can be read and understood on a number of levels, so too can the quilt metaphor. On the simplest level, the quilt symbolizes our multi-racial, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural society by re-enforcing the image that we are not all cut from one cloth. When examined more closely, the quilt assumes deeper meanings, just as the rainbow did.

The quilt metaphor is both traditional and forward looking. Quilt making is traditionally an important cultural activity passed from generation to generation, which has marked a time for a community to come together to share the pieces of their lives as well as unite these pieces into a larger pattern. Jackson uses the quilt metaphor as forward-looking by emphasizing the important role of every member of a culture. A quilt is woven from fragmented bits of cloth which by themselves would be too small to be useful. However, when woven together, these bits of cloth become not only useful, they also become beautiful. For Jackson, this
is what happens when society comes together with some sort of common goal or purpose.

Toward the end of the speech Jackson reinserts the essence of the quilt metaphor when he talks about "the least of these" — the victims of the Reagan Administration policies. The Reagan Administration becomes the "common thread" which unites society — the pieces of the quilt. And, because a quilt is usually made from scraps of material which have little or no beauty or value by themselves, but produce a product of greater beauty and value, so too are we to look at the members of our society and look beyond the "slummy side" of life and see the "sunny side."

Jackson used both the rainbow and the quilt metaphors to emphasize the sense of beauty and harmony which arises from diversity. These metaphors underscored his message that it is time for the Democratic party (and the nation as a whole) to adapt to and embrace the changing composition of the American culture. According to Jackson, it is time to welcome the active participation of the many marginalized groups who find themselves either on the fringe of or outside the political process.

Jackson's Use of Religious Language

A second stylistic element of Jackson's speech is his use of religious language and symbols.

In the introductory passages of his speech, Jackson elevated himself and his campaign beyond the ordinary world of politics to the extraordinary realm of religion by uniting
God, the country, and the Democratic party on a "perfect mission: to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to house the homeless, to teach the illiterate, to provide jobs for the jobless, and to choose the human race over the nuclear race."  

Jackson continued to use religious terminology when he defined the tasks of the Democratic party: to "heed the call of conscience, redemption, expansion, healing and unity" and when he described the role of political leadership: "Leadership can mitigate the misery of our nation. Leadership can part the waters and lead our nation in the direction of the Promised Land."  

Solomon and Stewart argued that this heavy use of religious language at the beginning of the speech accomplished a number of important purposes:

- it elevates Jackson from a mere politician (a term of universal scorn) into a leader with a divinely sanctioned mission; secondly, it transforms the political process with its petty deals, compromises and its squabbles over the division of resources into a noble 'mission,' and lastly, it provides a framework for an apology for his demeaning comments about Jews.  

Later in the speech, Jackson used explicit references to the Judeo-Christian traditions to again try to unite the party and soothe any feelings of antagonism that Jews might still harbor toward him.

We are co-partners in a long and rich religious history, the Judeo-Christian traditions. Many blacks and Jews have a shared passion for social justice at home and peace abroad. We must seek a revival of the spirit, inspired by
a new vision and new possibilities. We must return to higher ground. We are bound by Moses and Jesus, but also connected to Islam and Mohammed. . . . We are bound by shared blood and shared sacrifices. We are much too intelligent; much too bound by our Judeo-Christian heritage, much too victimized by racism, sexism, militarism and anti-Semitism; much too threatened as historical scapegoats to go on divided one from another.  

Finally, Jackson used religious overtones to cast the Reagan Administration as morally deficient. Jackson reminded his audience of the 'mission' of the Democratic party and the moral implications of that responsibility:

Our nation at its best feeds the hungry. Our nation at its worst will mine the harbors of Nicaragua; at its worst, will try to overthrow that government; at its worst, will cut aid to American education and increase aid to El Salvador; at its worst our nation will have partnership with South Africa. That's a moral disgrace. It's a moral disgrace. It's a moral disgrace.

By using religious language Jackson was able to assume a divine tone and elevate his speech and his candidacy above normal politics.

Jackson's Use of Rhythm

The third stylistic device to be examine is Jackson's use of rhythm as he constructed his speech. Calling on his religious background and training, Jackson was able to create a sense of rhythm in his speech which William Safire described as an "unmodulated sermon-on-the-stump" that "resolidified the already monolithic black opposition to the Republicans." Among the specific rhythmic devices available,
Jackson relied primarily on repetition and parallelism when constructing arguments and images.

Jackson used repetition when he constructed his argument that Jews and blacks must unite. According to Jackson, both groups are "bound by Moses and Jesus, but also connected to Islam and Mohammed." Furthermore, both groups are "bound by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rabbi Abraham Heschel, crying out from their graves for us to reach common ground." The reason for this connection is that Jews and blacks are "bound by blood and shared sacrifices."49

The most effective passages in which Jackson used repetition were toward the end of the speech. Jackson presented the audience with his "slummy side - sunny side" dichotomy when describing the America he envisioned, and gave his assurance to the audience that this was possible.

... in every slum there are two sides. When I see a broken window, that’s the slummy side. Train some youth to become a glazier, that’s the sunny side. When I see a missing brick, that’s the slummy side. Let that child in a union and become a brick mason and build, that’s the sunny side. When I see a missing door, that’s the slummy side. Train some youth to become a carpenter, that’s the sunny side. When I see vulgar words and hieroglyphics of destitution on the walls, that’s the slummy side. Train some youth to be a painter and artist, that’s the sunny side.50

In the end, it does not matter if critics claim this "slummy side - sunny side" dichotomy was trite or of little substance,51 the repetition of that image was sufficient for Jackson’s purpose of presenting a more ideal world -- one
which is attained by embracing the Rainbow Coalition. More importantly, this passage provided a natural segue to Jackson’s concluding passage in which he directed his audience to dream. Here again he used repetition to reinforce his message, because, according to Jackson, "our time has come."

*Our time has come.* Suffering breeds character. Character breeds faith. And in the end, faith will not disappoint. *Our time has come.* Our faith, hope and dreams will prevail. *Our time has come.* Weeping has endured for night. And, now joy cometh in the morning. *Our time has come.* No grave can hold our body down. *Our time has come.* No lie can live forever. *Our time has come.* We must leave the racial battle ground and come to the economic high ground and moral higher ground. America, *our time has come.* We come from disgrace to Amazing Grace. *Our time has come.*

This repetition of phrase, combined with Jackson’s natural preacherly cadence resulted in the audience being emotionally swept off their feet. Jackson’s speech drew that crowd together in such a way that stranger turned to stranger and people applauded all over town in places where applause had rarely been heard before.52

**Jackson’s Use of Appeals**

The final stylistic element of Jackson’s speech to be examined is his use of various appeals, particularly appeals to help (re)establish his credibility as well as the credibility of the Rainbow Coalition.

The most devastating blow to Jackson’s credibility as a candidate had been his racial slur about Jews. Earlier in
this chapter Jackson’s apology was discussed as a major part of the first section of his speech. Once he had issued the apologetic statement, Jackson offered a religious as well as a political rationale by which the audience, particularly those he had most offended, could now forgive him.

When Jackson told his audience, "I am not a perfect servant. I am a public servant. I’m doing my best against the odds. . . . be patient, God is not finished with me yet," he was publicly confessing his sins. In Jackson’s Baptist tradition, a sinner must seek forgiveness and redemption by publicly confessing of his or her sins and seeking atonement. That is what Jackson did.

Jackson also offered his audience a political rationale for forgiving him in the guise of an emotionally appealing story. Jackson told his audience of his visit with long time Democratic leader Hubert Humphrey just days before Humphrey’s death. During his visit Jackson had asked Humphrey why he had called Richard Nixon. Humphrey’s answer satisfied Jackson’s need:

'Jessie, from this vantage point, with the sun setting in my life, all of the speeches, the political conventions, the crowds and the great fights are behind me now. . . . And what I have concluded about life, when all is said and done, we must forgive each other, and redeem each other, and move on.'

The moral of the story is clear -- if Humphrey could forgive long time political rival Richard Nixon, a Republican, then surely the Democrats could forgive Jackson. This
story had particular poignancy for Mondale supporters since Humphrey was Mondale’s political mentor.

Jackson’s attempt to re-establish and reinforce the credibility and legitimacy of the Rainbow Coalition was a more difficult task. It was important for Jackson to give his followers some sense of worth since he had been unsuccessful in his efforts at getting their platform positions adopted. Black delegates were described as feeling “despondent” and “frustrated” over the “inadequate gestures by Mr. Mondale and the failure of Mr. Jackson to insist on concessions in return for party unity and support of blacks.”

Jackson offered his followers words of conciliation:

Democracy guarantees the right to participate, not a license for either the majority or minority to dominate. The victory for the Rainbow Coalition in the platform debates today was not whether we won or lost; but that we raised the right issues. We can afford to lose the vote; issues are negotiable. We cannot afford to avoid raising the right questions. Our self respect and our moral integrity were at stake. Our heads are perhaps bloodied but not bowed. Our backs are straight. We can go home and face our people. Our vision is clear.

The final appeal employed by Jackson was an attempt to link himself and his speech with Martin Luther King, Jr. and King’s "I Have A Dream" speech. Although the reference is not explicitly drawn, the implication that listeners should connect the two speakers and speeches exists.

Jackson had been a faithful supporter of King and had worked with him up until the day King was assassinated. Upon
King's death, Jackson appointed himself the heir of King's legacy and committed his life to the cause of civil rights. Jackson drew upon this relationship in the final passages of his speech when he resurrected King's 'dream' of being 'free at last.' In the passage cited earlier, Jackson called on his audience to dream and then reminded them that this dream was possible because 'our time has come.'

Reactions to Jackson's Speech

Overall, Jackson's speech was apologetic and conciliatory in its tone. Although Jackson used the speech to excite his audience, he always brought the speech around to his central theme -- that the Democrats must work together. Jackson, while acknowledging that differences existed among members of the party, specifically called up the Democrats to unite as a party and to unite behind a chosen leader seven times in his speech. To that end, the speech can be called a Unity Speech. However, reactions to Jackson's speech and his call for unity were mixed. Some argued the speech had little or no unifying effect on the party.

The despondency of Democrats, palpable beneath the hype and ritual display of camaraderie, showed the openness of their divisions and the destructive effect of their factional fighting. They are a potpourri of groups, hardly a coalition despite Mr. Jackson's last minute apologia and promise to cooperate.58

Others viewed the speech as having a positive effect on the party because it satisfied the needs of everyone's honor.

While Jackson's address could not eradicate the differences among special interest groups in the Democratic party, it could create a
climate in which those differences might exist without paralyzing movement toward common and individual goals. In this way, Jackson's speech 'repaired' some of the damage inflicted by the diversity of the Democratic constituencies and the campaign rhetoric of all three candidates.59

Although Jackson had been the more flamboyant of the two, Gary Hart also represented a challenge to Mondale's nomination. On the third night of the convention, Gary Hart was given the opportunity to address the convention immediately before the roll-call of votes for the party nominee. It is now time to turn to an analysis of Hart's speech.

**Gary Hart's Speech**

Gary Hart's speech was presented to the Democrats on the third evening of the convention, but only after his campaign workers had made a final effort to block a first ballot victory for Mondale. Earlier in the day Hart supporters had urged 400 black delegates pledged to Mondale to abandon him and instead vote for Jesse Jackson in recognition of his pioneering role as a black Presidential candidate. When this attempt failed, Hart was left with only one course of action if he was going to block Mondale's nomination on the first ballot -- he must convince enough uncommitted delegates to join ranks behind him to throw the nomination to a second round of balloting. It is important to note that at the time he delivered the speech in the convention hall, Hart had not publicly conceded defeat, nor had he publicly offered an endorsement for Mondale. It is also important to note that Mondale and the convention planning committee were under no
obligation to allow Hart the opportunity to address the convention.

In spite of this, allowing Hart to address the convention was not considered as risky as allowing Jackson to speak for two reasons. First, Hart was not a dynamic speaker, so Mondale had little to worry about as far as Hart exciting and stirring the convention in any way that would endanger Mondale's nomination. Second, as mentioned earlier in this chapter, several of Hart's platform proposals and language had been accepted and incorporated into the party platform. Confirmation of the low risk factor of Hart's speech is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that it went virtually unnoticed and unmentioned after he gave it. Nonetheless, because it was presented to the convention, and because Hart self-titled the speech, "Unity Speech," it is important to examine it.

**Hart's Speech: Structure**

Hart, like Kennedy in 1980, used the structure of an acceptance speech when he addressed the convention. Unlike Kennedy's speech, Hart's was not as well thought through nor as well developed; still it was similar in construction to an acceptance speech. Hart attempted to assume a role as leader of the party -- particularly through his use of the quest metaphor and his vision of the direction the party must take, he attempted to elicit a strong response from his audience in the hope that he could unite uncommitted delegates to his candidacy, and finally, he attempted to create a sense of
solidarity among party members. As with Kennedy's speech, this sense of solidarity Hart tried to create was not solidarity behind the party nominee, instead he tried to solidify the party against Ronald Reagan.

**Hart's Assumption of Leadership**

The first element of Hart's speech that reflects its similarity to an acceptance speech was his attempt to assume leadership of the party. Hart's theme throughout the campaign had been focused around the idea that the Democrats needed new leadership. In November of 1983 political strategist Pat Caddell had conducted what came to be known as "the Senator Smith" poll in which he asked voters what style of President the country needed. Nearly half the people responding to his poll indicated that the President should be a new, youthful leader who would inspire the country with bold ideas and programs for a better future -- someone like John Kennedy.61 To that end, Hart had tried to mold his candidacy around this profile of the ideal Presidential style and present himself as that new political leader. Hart continued to do this in his speech to the Democratic convention in San Francisco.

Hart began his speech by presenting himself as the leader of the party when he told his audience "together we stand tonight at the gates of change" because "together, we have made a difference." Hart then thanked his supporters for making his "dream come true."62 Then, after a somewhat lengthy passage in which Hart offered his thanks and
appreciation to his supporters and challengers alike, Hart made two pledges to his audience — to devote all of his time and energy to defeating Ronald Reagan, and to continue working for the good of the party and the country.

While these statements are not particularly remarkable in their own right, the tone and language associated with these words is usually reserved for the winning candidate. Specifically, Hart's references to standing 'at the gates of change' and that his supporters had made his 'dreams come true' are not comments a defeated candidate who had run on the issue of a change in leadership would use.

Hart also attempted to assume a role of leadership through his use of the quest motif. (The quest motif will be examined in detail a bit further in this analysis.) Hart described his efforts as a candidate as having been on a "quest for the Presidency, a quest with many ideas but with one driving theme -- that our party and our nation need new leadership, new directions and new hope." He went on to describe his quest as a "struggle against great odds" in an attempt to win his "cause." The use of terms such as 'quest,' 'hope,' 'struggle,' and 'cause' prepare the audience to hear a narrative of mythic proportions in which the questing hero -- Hart -- struggles valiantly towards some sort of Holy Grail in an effort to secure redemption for the country. This mythic motif was reinforced when Hart assured his listeners that 'his dream has come true' -- in other words, he had succeeded in his quest. But, this could only
be true if he had won or in some way assumed the role of leader for the party.

Later in the speech Hart again asserted his leadership of the party when he defined his vision of the party. He told his audience, "our party and nation must disenthrall themselves from the policies of the comfortable past that do not answer the challenges of tomorrow." The method to accomplish this, according to Hart, is to construct "a blueprint for a new democracy."

We must rebuild the foundation of this nation’s economy, not merely patch over its widening cracks. We must adopt an industrial policy to modernize our manufacturing base, re-employing dislocated workers to rebuild our urban infrastructure. And especially, we must invest in education, training and research to guarantee American leadership in trade and technology.64

These were precisely the issues and agenda Hart had been using throughout his campaign, and issues he had argued Mondale could not and would not fulfill because Mondale represented the old political machine, not new leadership.

Thus, like Kennedy in 1980, Hart attempted to assume a role of leadership for the Democratic party. He postured himself in tone and language as the winning candidate; he presented himself as the questing hero whose dream had been fulfilled -- whose mission had been accomplished; and he attempted to define the direction of the party.

Hart’s Attempt to Create Enthusiasm

The second way in which Hart’s speech was similar to an acceptance speech was his attempt to create enthusiasm. Gary
Hart has never been described as a dynamic or inspiring speaker. Two of the reasons often cited for his lack of effectiveness as a speaker are that he is basically a shy person who feels more comfortable observing and reflecting on what is going on around him, and, because he is shy and feels uncomfortable speaking, his speeches lack warmth and feeling. Hart’s campaign speeches have been described as being read in a "hurried monotone" with "one hand jabbing holes in the air."65

Hart’s speech to the Democrats was meant as a personal credo much as Jackson’s had been the night before. Hart wanted this to be an emotional statement which would emphasize his belief that the party ought to be more than just a coalition of various interest groups and an historical depository for old political relics. Unfortunately, Hart’s delivery was hurried and high-pitched, as if he were too excited, and the speech still had long passages with the quality of dry abstraction with which the public Hart seemed most at home.66

Just as Kennedy had used his speech to create enthusiasm for himself and a possible candidacy in 1984, so too did Hart use his speech to try to create enthusiasm around his possible candidacy in 1988. Hart told his listeners, "This is one Hart you will not leave in San Francisco."67 Later he proclaimed, "this is one Democrat who is ready to lead our party in recapturing the issue of a sound defense."68
The most extended example of Hart trying to create enthusiasm for his candidacy, both in 1984 and his potential future candidacy in 1988, was toward the end of his speech when he spoke of upholding the torch that Kennedy had passed to a new generation of Americans:

Our campaign has tried to lift and light that torch -- a torch of hope beyond the mundane politics of the moment, a torch of hope beyond the old arrangements and the favored alliances, a torch of hope, in this urgent hour, that parties can change, that leaders can change, that this nation can change. . . . Tonight the torch of idealism is lit in thousands of towns and tens of thousands of lives, among the young in spirit and the young in age. It cannot go out. It will not go out. It will continue to burn. . . . For somewhere out there, in some small town, in some young life, the torch is lit. And someday that young person, perhaps as President, will change the world. But even if not, that person will see that the torch is passed to yet another generation.69

New York Times reporter Howell Raines argued that Hart "staked his claim to the future leadership of the party" with this speech and that "many delegates were watching to see how he stacked up against the well-received speech of Mr. Cuomo, who is regarded as one of Mr. Hart's competitors in future nomination contests."70 Unlike Kennedy, however, Hart did not succeed in creating much enthusiasm. Hart's speech was described as being received "politely" and "curtiously," but not particularly enthusiastically.71

Hart's Call for Unity and Solidarity

The final way in which Hart's speech reflected its similarity to an acceptance speech was his call for unity and
party solidarity. He emphasized the importance of the party coming together because, "we meet at an urgent national hour, when all seems well but few are content. Upon this convention’s actions will rest not simply our party’s success, but our nation’s destiny." This urgency created a "moral imperative" for the Democrats -- an imperative to defeat Ronald Reagan because, "the stakes could not be higher."

Hart then outlined the ‘stakes’:

Consider, as we must, the costs of a second Reagan term: Do you want Ronald Reagan to appoint the next Supreme Court? Do you want Ronald Reagan to have four more years to sell off our environment to the highest bidder? Do you want Ronald Reagan to have four more years to turn his back on civil rights for minorities and equal rights for women? Can we allow Ronald Reagan to keep on undermining the rights of organized labor? Can we allow Ronald Reagan to send our sons to die without cause in another Lebanon, or to serve as bodyguards for dictators in Central America? Can we continue to tolerate a President who urges us to love our country but hate our government? Most important of all, can we allow Ronald Reagan four more years to accelerate a dangerous and unnecessary nuclear arms race?  

Gary Hart developed his speech to the Democratic convention using the structure of an acceptance speech. He tried to assume a role of leadership in the party, both for 1984 and potentially for 1988 both by offering himself as the model of new leadership for the party and by defining the direction he felt the party must take; he tried to create enthusiasm for his candidacy and for the challenge he defined for the party; and, he tried to call for party unity and solidarity to defeat Ronald Reagan.
Hart's Speech: Style

The style of Hart's speech is somewhat different from
the style associated with most political convention oratory,
because he did not utilize repetitive or parallel structure
to create a sense of rhythm. The repetition of a single
phrase or line creates not only a sense of rhythm for the
speech, but it also creates a sense of dramatic tension. The
audience is encouraged to participate in this by waving can-
didate placards, chanting, shouting, using noise makers, etc.
When a speaker does not use such rhythmic devices as repeti-
tion or parallelism, it is difficult for the speech or speak-
er to create this sense of drama, and it is equally difficult
for the audience to get caught in the emotion of the moment.

Hart had the opportunity to use repetition when he was
identifying the 'stakes' of four more years of a Republican
presidency:

Consider, as we must, the costs of a second
Reagan term:  Do you want Ronald Reagan to
appoint the next Supreme Court?  Do you want
Ronald Reagan to have four more years to sell
off our environment to the highest bidder?
Do you want Ronald Reagan to have four more
years to turn his back on civil rights for
minorities and equal rights for women?  Can
we allow Ronald Reagan to keep on undermining
the rights of organized labor?  Can we allow
Ronald Reagan to send our sons to die with-
out cause in another Lebanon, or to serve as
bodyguards for dictators in Central America?
Can we continue to tolerate a President who
urges us to love our country but hate our
Government?  Most important of all, can we
allow Ronald Reagan four more years to
accelerate a dangerous and unnecessary
nuclear arms race?24
Hart could have restructured these queries slightly and used the same phrase to begin each one. Had he done this, he would have created a sense of rhythm or a cadence which could have captured the attention and enthusiasm of the audience. Unfortunately, even the slight change in rhythm and cadence represented by the beginning phrases is enough to prevent the passage from developing a sense of drama or tension.

This passage was the only place in the speech Hart even came close to using repetition. The rest of the speech was punctuated with long abstract paragraphs which were usually followed by short one or two sentence paragraphs. Again, the constant shifting back and forth between long, well developed images/ideas and very short ones did not help Hart create a sense of emotional development for his speech.

This is not to say Hart’s speech was void of stylistic elements. Hart did use two types of appeals in his speech -- the mythic image of the quest motif, and emotional appeals through references to John Kennedy.

The first appeal that Hart used was the quest motif. As mentioned earlier, Hart presented himself to the convention delegates as a man on a 'quest' of 'hope,' a 'struggle' for a 'cause.' Hart also told his audience that his 'quest' was of great national urgency and that it "transcends partisian politics" and was, in fact, "a moral imperative." These terms created a strong mythic view which Hart tried to weave throughout his speech. If he had used the mythic force these terms connoted successfully, Hart could have achieved a level
of transcendence similar to that of Mario Cuomo or Jesse Jackson. Both Cuomo and Jackson were able to use their speeches to move the audience beyond the realm of the convention hall and the immediacy of the convention itself through their use of language, symbols, and appeals. Hart on the other hand failed to do this.

Hart failed to achieve a level of transcendence with his speech because he never consistently moved the delegates beyond the immediacy of the convention, nor did he resymbolize the convention as an event possessed with mythic potentials. The first example of Hart's failure to achieve transcendence has been discussed earlier -- Hart identified his 'quest' and his 'struggle,' then thanked the audience for helping make his dream come true. Hart made it sound as if he had accomplished his 'quest' or that his 'struggle' had been successful. This was not the case.

A second example of Hart's failure to take full advantage of mythic rhetoric is his attempt to define the political situation as one which 'transcends partisan politics.' Hart told his audience that they met at a crucial time:

This is not simply another national election, a choice between parties or even a contest of ideologies. This election is a referendum on our future -- perhaps even whether our children will have a future. For we meet at an urgent national hour, . . . Upon this convention's actions will rest not simply our party's success, but our nation's destiny. . . . It creates in each of us -- as Americans, not simply Democrats -- a moral imperative.
However, rather than telling his audience how he, the questing hero, could lead the party to achieve this moral imperative, Hart shifted his focus from the party working to transcend partisan politics to achieve this moral imperative back to the individual when he asked his audience, "Did you do everything you could to defeat Ronald Reagan?" That abrupt break and shift of focus negates the mythic potential he had created when he presented the audience with the image of the moral imperative.

The final example of Hart’s failure to take full advantage of the mythic potential occurred at the end of his speech when he was describing the torch of idealism:

> Tonight the torch of idealism is lit in thousands of towns and tens of thousands of lives, among the young in spirit and the young in age. It cannot go out. It will not go out. It will continue to burn.  

However, rather than casting himself as the bearer of the torch, Hart again shifted to abstraction:

> For somewhere out there, in some small town, in some young life, the torch is lit. And someday that young person, perhaps as President, will change the world. But even if not, that person will see that the torch is passed to yet another generation. And, if not now, some day, we must prevail. If not now, some day, we will prevail.

Hart certainly had the opportunity to complete the image by presenting himself as the torch bearer who would lead the Democrats beyond the convention and who would help them achieve their moral imperative of making the world a better place for future generations, but he did not.
Because Hart failed to complete these mythic images he created in his speech, he failed to achieve the same level of transcendence that earlier speakers at the convention had, and thus, he failed to move the audience as earlier speakers had.

The second appeal Hart used in his speech was one he had used (and sometimes been criticized for\textsuperscript{80}) throughout his campaign -- a comparison of himself to John Kennedy. Hart had been drawn to politics by the idealism of John Kennedy, and saw himself as a member of the 'new generation' to whom Kennedy passed the torch of power. Hart had even adopted some of Kennedy's physical mannerisms such as restlessly running his fingers through his hair and worrying the flaps of his jacket pockets.

In his speech to the Democratic convention, Hart invoked the image of Kennedy by both making specific reference to him and by using the image of the torch. Hart appealed to his audience to come together because of the unique bonds of tragedy and triumph they shared. These bonds included "witnessing the deaths of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King" and "the tragedies of Vietnam and Watergate."

Hart reminded his audience why many of them had become involved in politics:

Many of us were drawn to public service by the most inspiring President of our time, 'Let the word go forth from this time and place,' he said, 'that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans.'\textsuperscript{81}
Hart again tried to present himself in the image of Kennedy by reintroducing the image of the torch being passed and carried forth to create a better nation. However, rather than carrying the image to its logical conclusion and presenting himself as the bearer of the torch -- as Kennedy would have done -- Hart ambiguously passed the torch to some unknown and unspecified 'young person' in 'some small town' who would keep the torch lit and would help the party prevail -- someday.

Reactions to Hart's Speech

The reaction to Hart's speech was limited but somewhat mixed. Although the speech went virtually unmentioned in the press, the few references to it presented different interpretations of its impact on the Democratic party as a whole and on the willingness of Hart's supporters to join ranks. Columnist William Safire argued the speech did little to convince Hart's supporters to join the party ranks in voting:

> the yuppie crowd . . . may pay lip service to joining in the defeat of Mr. Reagan, but in the hearts of Senator Hart's supporters is the secret hope that they will 'prevail' in 1988. That requires going through all the loyal motions in public but voting their personal interest -- the defeat of party regulars -- in the privacy of the booth.²

Howell Raines, on the other hand, argued that Hart's speech was supportive of the party. According to Raines, Hart "sounded the main themes of youth, new ideas and dedication" to the interests of the nation, but Hart refrained from
denigrating Mondale as "failing to measure up in these areas" as he had done throughout the primaries. 83

**Conclusion**

Jesse Jackson and Gary Hart both used their podium time to appeal to their constituents to unite as a party in an effort to defeat Ronald Reagan. The message that rang forth from both men's speeches was that Ronald Reagan must be defeated at any cost -- even if that meant abandoning their chosen paths and uniting behind Walter Mondale as the Democratic nominee. One of Gary Hart's delegates summarized this best when she said, "Mr. Reagan is probably doing more to reconcile his rivals than any Democratic strategist." 84

The question at the end of the convention remained: could two speeches -- one an explosive, emotionally charged call for the party to expand its definition of itself and embrace its marginalized members for the benefit of the party as a whole, and the other a more moderate, unemotional call for unity around the idea of possible future greatness -- unite a party that had been so torn and divided throughout the primaries?

Jackson assured the Democrats that conflict among the many constituencies of the party was normal. Jackson also humbled himself by apologizing for any hurt feelings he had caused or bitterness he had created during the campaign. This apology seemed satisfactory:

As Henry Siegman, national director of the American Jewish Congress, pointed out, it would take more than one speech to 'wash
away' Jackson's contributions to 'polarizing Americans.' Yet, Siegman went on to say that in the face of such a 'dramatic expression of regret and apology,' it seemed unlikely there would be any further demands, at this point, from Jewish leaders for Mondale to denounce Jackson.65

Hart urged the Democrats to unite in their effort to defeat Ronald Reagan in November. Although his speech was not as emotionally charged and engaging as Jackson's had been, Hart reinforced his speech by returning to the convention hall during the nomination roll-call and calling on the convention to nominate Mondale by acclamation.

However, just as Edward Kennedy had used his speech to the 1980 convention to test the waters for a potential candidacy in 1984, both Jackson and Hart did the same with their speeches. To that end, neither candidate could, or did, offer an unequivocal endorsement of Mondale.
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CHAPTER V
JESSE JACKSON AND THE 1988 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

The 1988 presidential nomination campaigns held an air of excitement that had not existed for years. It had been eight years since the nominations for both parties had been highly contested, twenty years since both were contested in the absence of an incumbent nominee, and twenty-eight years since the incumbent president had been ineligible to run for renomination.¹

The early field of nominees for the Democrats was led by Colorado Senator Gary Hart who hoped to carry his support from the 1984 race to victory in 1988. However, after Hart became embroiled in scandal, his support quickly dwindled so that by the time he officially re-entered the race, he was mathematically out of contention for the nomination.² Hart’s withdrawal from the race left the other seven nominees jockeying for constituents and leadership of the party. Although Arizona Governor Bruce Babbit and Delaware Senator Joseph Biden were soon out of the race, Missouri Representative Richard Gephardt, Illinois Senator Paul Simon, Tennessee Senator Al Gore, Chicago’s Jesse Jackson and Massachusetts Governor Michael Dukakis all won significant victories during the course of the campaign.

By the time the Democrats convened in Atlanta for the Democratic National Convention, the race for the nomination was technically over. As with previous conventions, the delegates entered Atlanta knowing the outcome -- Michael
Dukakis had secured enough popular votes and delegates to win the party nomination on the first ballot. However, just as in the 1984 campaign and convention, Jesse Jackson was a force with which Michael Dukakis had to reckon.

During the primary season, Jackson had received seven million votes, 4.4 million of these votes from blacks, which doubled his 1984 total. He had won 13 primaries and caucuses across the country. Furthermore, Jackson entered the convention having won more than 1,200 of the 4,162 candidate delegates. As Dukakis admitted, probably no one had ever done more to register new voters and get them excited about presidential politics than Jesse Jackson. Finally, through this demonstration of political strength, Jackson had awakened hopes among blacks to whom politics had long seemed a blocked forum. As Kathleen Jamieson argued, Jackson's vote-getting ability had been confirmed:

In Oregon, a state with only a small black population, the candidate of the "Rainbow Coalition" received 38% of the Democratic ballots. On Super Tuesday, Dukakis won the most delegates and the most states, but Jackson received the most votes.

Spurred on by the support he had received during the primary campaign, Jackson demanded an unprecedented level of participation in the Dukakis organization. Although Jackson never issued a "formal list of demands," he and his support staff made it clear to the Dukakis organization that Jackson expected to be represented at every level of Dukakis's fall campaign effort. New York Times correspondent R. W. Apple,
Jr. pointed out that this representation "would seem to include leadership roles for Jackson supporters in city, county, state, regional and national campaign organizations, and possibly designation as 'chief-surrogate' or as co-chair of the Democratic National Committee."  

While Dukakis assured Jackson and the media that "I want Jesse Jackson to play a major role in this campaign. I want his supporters, who are out there by the millions, to be deeply involved in this campaign," many felt this attempt to integrate Jackson into the fall campaign could lead to potential trouble. One Dukakis staff member acknowledged that Jackson's demand for representation posed real problems for Dukakis:  

The Governor risks driving away Mr. Jackson's supporters if he is not conciliatory, but could alienate conservative white Democrats if he were perceived to have caved in to Mr. Jackson. This is barbed wire on top of land mines.  

Jackson's ardent followers were also considered a source of concern. "He has encouraged them to expect things that were never in the cards, and he keeps roaring that he is 'qualified,' though he has never held an official job in his life."  

The precarious relationship between the Dukakis and Jackson campaign camps was further strained when Dukakis's choice of a running mate, Texas Senator Lloyd Bentsen, was revealed (leaked) to the press before it was told to Jackson. Although Dukakis denied that the press had been purposely
informed first, Jackson was angered that he had not been consulted and threatened to challenge Bentsen's nomination on the convention floor.

As the Atlanta convention opened, Dukakis and Jackson met to come to an acceptable understanding. Dukakis had assured the Democrats that he would brook no challenge to his authority at the convention or during the fall campaign. "You can't have two quarterbacks. Every team has to have a quarterback. That's the nominee." During their meeting, Dukakis and Jackson settled on a number of issues including Jackson's role in the fall campaign. As a part of the agreement, Jackson would endorse Dukakis, but only after Dukakis had officially won the nomination. Jackson's name would be put before the convention as a nominee in honor of the work he had done and the accomplishments he had made, but it was understood that Jackson would not try to convert delegates to his cause as he had done in 1984. Finally, Jackson was given the podium on the second night of the convention to address the delegates with a film and speech.

With a speech that was described as, "probably the best speech ever given in the history of politics," Jackson brought hundreds of delegates in the crowd to tears and stirred voters all across America. The convention crowd cheered and applauded for three minutes when Jackson and his family entered the convention hall. Michael Oreskes described the scene:
Dukakis signs vanished under seats and so many red signs proclaiming "Jesse!" sprouted from the floor that a visitor from another political world might have thought it was Mr. Jackson who was about to be nominated by this convention.13

**Jackson's Speech: Structure**

Just as Jackson’s speech to the 1984 Democratic Convention had been without a traditional political structure, so too was his speech to the 1988 Democratic Convention. This was for two reasons: first, Jackson’s natural style of speaking is that of a preacher delivering a message (sermon) — everything in the speech focuses on a central theme or message and comes back to support that theme; and, second, much of the 1988 speech was the same text he had presented in 1984. This is not to say the speech was without any sense of structure. Jackson's speech was divided into four sections: the first section was a personal and emotionally filled reflection on how far the Democratic party had come; the second section was Jackson’s appeal to party unity around the metaphor of the quilt and the call for reaching common ground; the third section was Jackson’s indictment of Reagan and his policies of the previous eight years; and the final section was a highly personal appeal to disenfranchised blacks and poor voters.

Jackson began his speech with a personal tribute and reminder to the Democrats emphasizing exactly what his candidacy and his speaking to them meant. In the same way Barbara Jordan used her keynote address to the 1976 Democratic
National Convention as a form of enactment, Jackson used his speech to the 1988 Democratic National Convention as enactment and affirmation of the long struggle of civil rights. The first person Jackson introduced in his speech was Mrs. Rosa Parks, "The mother of the civil rights movement." After then introducing his family and paying tribute to former President Jimmy Carter and his family, Jackson reminded his audience, "My right and my privilege to stand here before you has been won -- in my lifetime -- by the blood and the sweat of the innocent.

As a testament to the struggles of those who have gone before; as a legacy for those who will come after; as a tribute to the endurance, the patience, the courage of our forefathers and mothers; as an assurance that their prayers are being answered, their work has not been in vain, and hope is eternal; tomorrow night my name will go into nomination for the presidency of the United States of America.

To further underscore the importance of his nomination and the challenge faced by the Democrats, Jackson told his audience that they were now at a crossroads, a point of decision. "Shall we expand, be inclusive, find unity and power; or suffer division and impotence." With this statement Jackson began his transition to the second section of his speech in which he urged the Democrats to unite.

In 1984 Jackson had urged the Democrats to unite around or embrace the Rainbow Coalition. Jackson had warned the Democrats that they would be triumphant only when all members of the Democratic party -- the marginalized as well as the
mainstream — united. Jackson had tried to assure the Democrats that unity did not mean there would be no sense of conflict or tension; it was to be expected that diversity in the party would lead to conflict, but this was healthy and should be embraced, not avoided.

In 1988 Jackson again urged the Democrats to unite, but this time he de-emphasized the Rainbow Coalition and instead urged the Democrats to transcend petty politics and move to "higher ground" which he defined as "common ground."

Think of Jerusalem -- the intersection where many trails met. A small village that became the birthplace for three great religions -- Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Why was this village so blessed? Because it provided a crossroads where different people met, different cultures, and different civilizations could meet and find common ground. . . . Take New York, the dynamic metropolis. What makes New York so special? It is the invitation of the Statue of Liberty -- give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses who yearn to breathe free. Not restricted to English only. Many people, many cultures, many languages -- with one thing in common, the yearn to breathe free. Common ground! . . . That is the challenge to our party tonight.19

Jackson continued to drive home the importance of party unity when he reminded his audience "The only time that we win is when we come together."20 Jackson offered the convention empirical evidence to support his claim:

In 1960, John Kennedy . . . beat Richard Nixon by only 112,000 votes -- less than one vote per precinct. He won by the margin of our hope. He brought us together. He reached out. He had the courage to defy his advisors and inquire about Dr. King's jailing in Albany, Georgia. We won by the margin of our hope, inspired by courageous leadership.
In 1964, Lyndon Johnson brought both wings together. The thesis, the antithesis and to create a synthesis and together we won.

In 1976, Jimmy Carter unified us again and we won. When we do not come together, we never win.

In 1968, division and despair in July led to our defeat in November.

In 1980, rancor in the spring and summer led to Reagan in the fall. When we divide, we cannot win. 

After emphasizing the importance of party unity for the Democrats, Jackson offered his unofficial (pre-nominating roll-call vote) endorsement of Michael Dukakis. Jackson’s endorsement of Dukakis came in two forms: first, Jackson offered a salute to Michael Dukakis for running a well managed and dignified campaign, one in which Dukakis always resisted the temptation to ‘stoop to demagoguery’; and second, Jackson identified the levels of differences between himself and Dukakis, and emphasized the common ground they shared.

I’ve watched a good mind fast at work, with steel nerves, guiding his campaign out of the crowded field without appeal to the worst in us. I’ve watched his perspective grow as his environment has expanded. I’ve seen his toughness and tenacity close up. I know his commitment to public service.

Mike Dukakis’ parents were a doctor and a teacher; my parents, a maid, a beautician and a janitor.

There’s a great gap between Brookline, Massachusetts and Haney Street, the Fieldcrest Village housing projects in Greenville, South Carolina.

He studied law; I studied theology. There are differences of religion, region, and race; differences in experience and perspectives. But the genius of America is that out of the many, we became one.

Providence has enabled our paths to intersect. His foreparents came to America on
immigrant ships; my foreparents came to America on slave ships. But whatever the original ships, we’re in the same boat tonight.22

Jackson continued to emphasize the common ground he and Dukakis shared as he moved to the third section of his speech in which he indicted eight years of Reagan Administration policies. Specific policies to which Jackson turned his wrath included Reaganomics — ‘a form of reverse Robin Hood which took from the poor, gave to the rich, and was paid for by the middle class,’ Reagan’s military buildup and spending for defense, and cuts for social services. As he expounded on each of these areas of ‘failure’ by the Reagan Administration, Jackson constantly reinforced the idea that he was calling for ‘common sense’ to be introduced and applied — the implication being that the Democrats, united behind Dukakis (and Jackson) would provide this common sense which was currently lacking.

Throughout this portion of his speech, Jackson carefully wove his arguments by identifying what he claimed were some of the absurdities of the Reagan Administration and asserting that common sense would remedy the situation.

I just want to take common sense to high places. We’re spending $150 billion a year defending Europe and Japan 43 years after the war is over. We have more troops in Europe tonight than we had seven years ago, yet the threat of war is ever more remote. Germany and Japan are now creditor nations . . . . Let them share more of the burden of their own defense . . . .

I just want to take common sense to high places. If we can bail out Europe and Japan, if we can bail out Continental Bank and
Chrysler . . . we can bail out the family farmer.
I just want to make common sense. It does not make sense to close down 650,000 family farms in this country while importing food from abroad subsidized by the U.S. government.
Let's make sense. It does not make sense to be escorting oil tankers up and down the Persian Gulf paying $2.50 for every $1.00 worth of oil we bring out while oil wells are capped in Texas, Oklahoma and Louisiana. I just want to make sense.23

When Jackson was attacking the Reagan "War on Drugs" program, he again emphasized the need for common sense. "We need a real war on drugs. You can't just say no. It's deeper than that. You can't just get a palm reader or an astrologer; it's more profound than that."24

Throughout this third portion of the speech Jackson was attempting to do two things. First, he was trying to create strong feelings of resentment and antagonism toward the Republicans, and second he was trying to reinforce the need for Democratic unity to ensure that 'common sense' would prevail and win the election.

The final section of Jackson's speech was a very personal and emotionally charged appeal to the disenfranchised poor and black youth who had criticized Jackson during his campaign. Jackson had been heckled and criticized occasionally by poor black and Hispanic youth who claimed Jackson could not speak for them since he was now 'establishment' and did not understand what their lives were like. To this criticism he responded with a long, personal narrative in which he told them that he had more in common with them than they knew. He
ended his narrative with a final appeal for them to not give up or surrender:

I was born in the slum, but the slum was not born in me. And it wasn’t born in you, and you can make it. Wherever you are tonight you can make it. Hold your head high, stick your chest out. You can make it. It gets dark sometimes, but the morning comes. Don’t you surrender. Suffering breeds character. Character breeds faith. In the end faith will not disappoint. You must not surrender. You may or may not get there, but just know that you’re qualified and you hold on and hold out. We must never surrender. America will get better and better. Keep hope alive. Keep hope alive. On tomorrow night and beyond, keep hope alive.  

Jackson’s sermon-like speech to the Democrats defied the structured forms of traditional political convention discourse. Instead of building a speech which would ignite the passions of his audience to support his candidacy the following night, Jackson constructed a speech which emphasized the need for Democrats to seek and find common ground -- to unite in their effort to defeat the Republicans in November.

**Jackson’s Speech: Style**

The real strength and beauty of Jackson’s speech to the 1988 Democrats was his use of stylistic devices. Unlike his speech in 1984 in which he relied primarily on two metaphors, repetition and emotional appeals, in 1988 Jackson utilized a variety of stylistic devices in his speech including metaphors, alliteration, repetition, antithesis, and various emotional appeals.
Jackson’s Use of Metaphors

In 1984 Jackson used two metaphors -- the Rainbow Coalition and the quilt -- to emphasize the appropriateness and necessity of diversity in the Democratic party. In 1988 he mentioned the Rainbow Coalition only once in passing, but developed the metaphor of the quilt in much more specific detail. Jackson reminded the Democrats that, "America’s not a blanket woven from one thread, one color, one cloth" and told them of his grandmother who would take pieces of old cloth and sew them together "into a quilt, a thing of beauty and power and culture."

Now, Democrats, we must build such a quilt. Farmers, you seek fair prices and you are right, but you cannot stand alone. Your patch is not big enough. Workers, you fight for fair wages. You are right. But your labor patch is not big enough. Women, you seek comparable worth and pay equity. You are right. But your patch is not big enough. Women, mothers, who seek Head Start and day care and pre-natal care on the front side of life, rather than jail care and welfare on the back side of life, you’re right, but your patch is not big enough.

Students, you seek scholarships. You are right. But your patch is not big enough. Blacks and Hispanics, when we fight for civil rights, we are right, but our patch is not big enough. Gays and lesbians, when you fight against discrimination and a cure for AIDS, you are right, but your patch is not big enough. Conservatives and progressives, when you fight for what you believe, right-wing, left-wing, hawk, dove, -- you are right, from your point of view, but your point of view is not big enough.

But don’t despair. Be as wise as my grandmama. Pool the patches and the pieces together, bound by a common thread. When we form a great quilt of unity and common ground we’ll have the power to bring about health care and
housing and jobs and education and hope to our nation.26

There are two important aspects of this passage to note. First, Jackson included himself as an example of a patch that 'is not big enough' when he used the pronoun "we" when talking about blacks and Hispanics. Second, Jackson emphasized that everyone on the ideological continuum was correct in their thinking -- from their perspective.

When Jackson included himself as an example of a patch that 'is not big enough' to make a difference alone, he was both admitting that he needed the Democratic party and could not achieve real political success without the party, and he was emphasizing to his primary constituency -- blacks and Hispanics -- that he included himself with them and their concerns; he did not feel he had risen above them just because he had achieved a level of political success. This was another subtle way of emphasizing the theme of his speech -- the need to seek and reach common ground. Additionally, when Jackson publicly acknowledged that every member of the Democratic party, no matter where they fell on the political ideology line, was right from their perspective, he affirmed his audience while at the same time eliminating the legitimacy of arguing against him just because he represented a more liberal political perspective.

Jackson did use other metaphors in his speech, but none were as well developed as the quilt. Jackson drew upon animal metaphors to divide the Democrats along ideological
perspectives. "Whether you’re a hawk or a dove, you’re just a bird living in the same environment, in the same world." He also told his audience, "The Bible teaches that when lions and lambs lie down together, none will be afraid and there will be peace in the valley." This peace will occur because "neither lions nor lambs want the forest to catch on fire. Neither lions nor lambs want acid rain to fall. Neither lions nor lambs can survive nuclear war." Thus, despite the natural enmity associated with these polar opposites — hawks/lions vs. doves/lambs — the common goal of survival is enough to unite them. For Jackson, this was the way the Democrats must respond to the intra-party challenges they encountered.

The third metaphor Jackson used was a ‘mechanical’ metaphor when he described the role government should play in the lives of Americans. "We believe in a government that’s a tool of our democracy in service to the public, not an instrument of the aristocracy in search of private wealth." Of course, for Jackson, the Democrats use government as this tool in an intimate, constructive manner for service for the public good while the Republicans use it in a detached, calculated manner for their own betterment.

All three of these metaphors created vivid images in the minds of listeners, and symbolized goals to which the Democrats must strive. The quilt was a symbol of the beauty and power which could be achieved if all members of the Democratic party united together behind a common cause. The animal
metaphors symbolized the natural alliance of ideological opposite groups, again united around a common cause. Finally, the mechanical metaphor described the way government should function — toward public service, not private wealth.

**Jackson's Use of Rhythm**

In addition to these three metaphors, Jackson also constructed his speech using such stylistic devices as alliteration, repetition and antithesis to create a sense of rhythm and a building of dramatic tension in his speech. Although he did not rely heavily on alliteration, Jackson did use it occasionally. "With so many guided missiles and misguided leadership, the stakes are exceedingly high." Later he argued, "first use beget first retaliation, and that’s mutual annihilation. That’s not a rational way out." Jackson reminded his listeners that, "Progress will not come through boundless liberalism nor static conservatism," and "The common good is finding commitment to new priorities, to expansion and inclusion." The repetition of the sounds in these words helped Jackson create a rhythm in the phrases.

This sense of rhythm was also created through the use of repetition. When Jackson defined what he meant by 'the common good' for the party, he repeatedly emphasized the 'commitment' that he and Dukakis had reached:

> Tonight we choose interdependency in our capacity to act and unite for the greater good. The common good is finding commitment to new priorities, to expansion and inclusion. A commitment to expanded participation in the Democratic Party at every level. A commitment to a shared national
campaign strategy and involvement at every level. A commitment to new priorities that ensure that hope will be kept alive. A common ground commitment for a legislative agenda . . . and commitment to D. C. state-hood and empowerment . . . A commitment to economic set-asides, a commitment to the Dellums bill for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, a shared commitment to a common direction.\textsuperscript{29}

As he identified the many examples of 'common ground' which Democrats could find, Jackson again used repetition:

We find common ground at the plant gate that closes on workers without notice. We find common ground at the farm auction where a good farmer loses his or her land to bad loans or diminishing markets. Common ground at the schoolyard where teachers cannot get adequate pay, and students cannot get a scholarship and can't make a loan. Common ground, at the hospital admitting room where somebody tonight is dying . . .\textsuperscript{30}

In addition to these two extended passages, Jackson periodically repeated the 'commitment' the Democrats had to the nation and her people, and the means to achieving this 'commitment' was through seeking and finding 'common ground.' Thus, the repetition of these words and phrases not only created a sense of rhythm when he used them in extended passages, but they also served to constantly reinforce the theme or message of the speech.

Other examples of Jackson's use of repetition have been noted earlier in this chapter when Jackson explained why lions and lambs could find common ground, when he created his quilt metaphor and told each constituent group, "you are right, but your patch is not big enough" and when he proclaimed, "I just want to take common sense to high places."
One of the most effective examples of repetition occurred when Jackson argued for the need for more and better social services because most poor people are not on welfare.

They catch the early bus. They work every day. They raise other people's children. They work every day. They clean the streets. They work every day. They drive vans with cabs. They work every day. They change the beds you slept in these hotels last night and can't get a union contract. They work every day.31

The final example of his use of repetition is found when Jackson borrowed the final passage of his 1984 convention speech and reissued a challenge to his 1988 audience to dream. After telling the audience to dream of an ideal world in which teachers, doctors, lawyers, and preachers are more concerned with sound values than personal profit, he interwove the call to "go forward" and "never surrender" as he described the actions the Democratic party must take if they were to achieve the moral high ground on such issues as malnutrition, illiteracy, equal rights for women, and help for AIDS patients.

The final rhythmic device Jackson used was antithesis. Although his use of antithesis was not the traditional juxtaposing of an idea on itself, he did create contrasting images which were similar to antithesis and served the same type of function for the speech. For example, early in the speech, when Jackson described the crossroads the Democrats faced, he described Atlanta as "the cradle of the old South, the crucible of the new South."32 Later in the speech, when he
attacked Reaganomics, Jackson told the convention, "let us not raise taxes on the poor and the middle class, but those who had the party, the rich and powerful, must pay for the party!" The final example of antithesis in Jackson’s speech generated tremendous enthusiasm when it was delivered. Jackson informed the convention that, "I would rather have Roosevelt in a wheelchair than Reagan and Bush on a horse."

Throughout the speech, Jackson carefully wove repetitive words and phrases together to create a sense of rhythm which enabled his speech to build in its intensity. Jackson also used alliteration and antithesis to provide some stylistic variety to his speech.

**Jackson’s Use of Emotional Appeals**

The final stylistic element of Jackson’s speech to be examined is his use of emotional appeals. Jackson used a number of emotional appeals throughout his speech, including explicit references to the civil rights struggles he and many others had experienced, anecdotal examples of people who were suffering as a result of Reagan Administration policies, and personal appeals in the form of an extended personal narrative.

Jackson began his speech by utilizing the rhetorical form of enactment -- he used himself as proof that the Democrats had evolved into a party which acknowledged the legitimate role of black delegates on all political levels. The importance of his address to the convention and the placing of his name in nomination was not lost on the press.
The convention hall itself was described as a reflection of the influence of Jackson's campaign. "Not only were black delegates in evidence throughout the hall but so were Hispanic-Americans, Asians, and handicapped delegates." The general consensus of the press was that "Jackson has earned respect, as his place on the Democratic Convention program tonight demonstrates."

Jackson reinforced the symbolic importance of his presence by reminding his audience, "All of us, all of us who are here and think that we are seated. But we're really standing on someone's shoulders. Ladies and gentlemen, Mrs. Rosa Parks." Jackson then described how his 'right and privilege' had been won by the 'blood and sweat of the innocent.'

Twenty-four years ago, the late Fanny Lou Hamer and Aaron Henry -- who sits here tonight from Mississippi -- were locked out on the streets of Atlantic City, the head of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. . . . Many were lost in the struggle for the right to vote. Jimmy Lee Jackson, a young student, gave his life. Viola Luizzo, a white mother from Detroit, called nigger lover, and brains blown out at point blank range.

Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney -- two Jews and a black -- found in a common grave, bodies riddled with bullets in Mississippi. The four darling little girls in the church in Birmingham, Alabama. They died that we might have a right to live.

These graphic images reinforced the magnitude of Jackson's words and reminded the Democrats of their past. Jackson could have mired his speech in these references to the past struggles of blacks, but he moved on and turned the focus of
the speech to the present while casting his vision for the future.

When Jackson addressed the Democrats in San Francisco in 1984, his speech contained extensive appeals to embrace the Rainbow Coalition and all that it implied. What Jackson did not do well in 1984 was to cast these concerns of groups in a real or tangible light. In 1988, he did this much better by providing anecdotal examples of people who were suffering under action, or lack of action, by the Reagan Administration. These examples were concrete, thus the audience could either identify or sympathize with them.

And so I met you at the point of challenge in Jay, Maine, where paper workers were striking for fair wages; in Greenfield, Iowa, where family farmers struggle for a fair price; in Cleveland, Ohio, where working women seek comparable worth; in McFarland, California, where the children of Hispanic farm workers may be dying from poison land, dying in clusters with cancer; in the AIDS hospice in Houston, Texas, where the sick support one another, twelve are rejected by their own parents and friends.  

Each of these examples represented average Americans in normal cities and towns across the country. The first three of the five examples were mainstream examples which would not provoke feelings of hostility or antagonism, even from the most conservative of Democrats.

The final example of an extended emotional appeal was Jackson’s vision of the possible future if Americans would ‘dream.’ Jackson borrowed portions of the final section of his 1988 speech from his 1984 speech, but he did rework the
borrowed passage. In 1984, Jackson told his audience to dream of a better future and to look beyond the 'slummy side' to see the 'sunny side' of life. While this imagery created a hypnotic rhythm, it was void of real substance. In 1988 Jackson again called for his audience to 'dream.'

Wherever you are tonight, I challenge you to hope and to dream. Don't submerge your dreams. . . . even on drugs, dream of the day you're drug free. Even in the gutter, dream of the day that you'll be up on your feet again. You must never stop dreaming. Face reality, yes. But don't stop with the way things are; dream of things as they ought to be.40

Even though this appeal to 'dream' also lacked real depth or substance, the mere appeal itself was effective in the context of the emotion of the moment. Upon later reflection, listeners probably found the call to 'dream' less than satisfying, but at the moment of the speech, it was an effective appeal.

Jackson ended his speech with an extended narrative of his own life. As mentioned earlier in this chapter, Jackson used this impassioned narrative to offer proof to his critics that he did know what a life of poverty felt like, that he had 'common ground' with the poor black and Hispanic youth of America.

These various emotional appeals were designed to draw a sense of commonality not only among the Democrats themselves, but also between the Democrats and Jackson. Appeals based on the history of the Democratic Party and its record of dealing with civil rights called the audience to share in the sense
of pride over the accomplishments made in the last twenty-four years. The use of common examples drew the audience together either through shared experience or shared sympathy. Finally, Jackson's use of the personal narrative emphasized not only the personal growth he had achieved, but also reinforced the idea that he strove to find 'common ground' with all members of the Democratic party. In other words, Jackson presented himself as a man who practiced what he preached.

**Conclusion**

Jesse Jackson was allowed to address the 1988 Democratic National Convention in the hopes of bring about party unity. Jackson's strong showing during the primaries had enabled him to demand a level of post-convention participation that was unprecedented. Indeed, Jackson had called for a 'partnership' with Dukakis and Bentsen. Because Jackson was willing to embrace and support the Dukakis/Bentsen ticket, his speech to the Democrats did appeal to a sense of unity. Jackson used his speech to endorse Dukakis as a man of integrity -- a man Jackson respected. Jackson also emphasized the willingness of the Dukakis/Bentsen ticket to adopt and embrace many of the campaign issues on which Jackson had been basing his candidacy, thus making it easier for Jackson's supporters to feel comfortable switching their allegiance to Dukakis.

Although some political analysts criticized the convention for being too cohesive, others felt the convention marked a real coming together for the Democrats. Jackson's participation in the convention and his endorsement of
Dukakis in his speech "made it plain that he would be a cheerleader for the party ticket, not a heckler." This attitude was further reinforced when, at the end of his acceptance speech on Thursday night, Dukakis was joined on stage by all of his onetime rivals for the nomination except for Gary Hart. During this show of party solidarity, Jackson "smiled and put his arms around Mr. Dukakis, a warm gesture of the endorsement the Governor had sought." 

Jackson's support of Dukakis is at least partially responsible for the success Dukakis enjoyed immediately after the convention. As Kathleen Jamieson noted, "Dukakis left the Democratic National Convention of mid-July ahead in the polls by 18%, a lead artificially buoyed by the upbeat messages of the convention."
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CHAPTER VI
JERRY BROWN AND THE 1992 DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION

Just as the 1988 presidential nomination campaigns had held an air of excitement about them, so too did the 1992 campaigns. The primary cause of this excitement was the on-again, off-again candidacy of Texas businessman H. Ross Perot as an independent candidate. Perot's primary campaign issue was the U.S. economic policy. Perot was highly critical of the policies of the Bush Administration and was concerned with "digging the country out of its economic mess, by taking national power from those who were abusing or squandering it, and giving it back to the people."1

Because Perot's economic indictments were directed primarily at the Bush Administration, the Democrats saw the 1992 election as an opportunity to take advantage of the general public's growing dissatisfaction with politics as usual and turn that dissatisfaction into votes. By the time the Democrats convened in Madison Square Garden in July, their primary concern was presenting a unified convention which would, they hoped, launch party nominee Bill Clinton to victory in November. As Elizabeth Kolbert wrote, "The Democrats were trying to send one simple message: unity. Unity, unity, unity." However, "reporters, it seemed, often had a different story in mind."2

Ron Brown, chairman of the Democratic National Committee and Clinton's campaign advisors had agreed upon a simple but strategic policy for creating this show of party unity.
According to George Stephanopoulos, Clinton’s campaign manager, "The single best decision we made, one of them was, 'you only speak if you endorse.' It was the best rule we ever had. . . . It made sure it wasn’t a traditional Democratic convention." This rule for determining who would be given speaking time sparked a sense of mild controversy for many, and was, allegedly, a cause of major concern and controversy for former California Governor and Democratic challenger Jerry Brown.

Jerry Brown and his supporters had made it clear to Clinton and the Democratic National Committee that this rule was viewed as a means of "enforced uniformity" and would be vigorously opposed by the Brown campaign. On the opening evening of the convention, Brown’s supporters attended the convention with pieces of tape over their mouths and signs which read "Let Jerry Speak!" as a form of protest to the Clinton rule. This provided the press with a story which, up until that point, the convention had been lacking.

The controversy that received the most attention from the press was probably the most artificial -- the demand from Jerry Brown and his rabid followers that the defeated candidate be allowed to address the convention. In fact, Brown was always entitled to speak because his name was going to be put in nomination, and the rules allowed him to use that time to be heard. . . . But the press abhors a news vacuum and, lacking any real story, reporters and camera crews pursued the Jerry Brown protest, forcing Ron Brown and some agents of the Clinton campaign to try to reach an agreement that would elicit the California Democrat’s endorsement and give him a formal place on the program."
Jerry Brown's refusal to endorse the Clinton-Gore ticket was presented as a potentially volatile situation for the convention. News reports indicated that Brown was being pressured by his family as well as the party establishment to endorse Clinton. At the same time, Brown and his supporters were cast as the villains of the Democratic party convention. Virginia Senator Charles S. Robb had dubbed Clinton and Gore the 'Dynamic Duo,,' and the press extended the analogy to include Jerry Brown as the 'Penguin.' Brown's followers were compared to "the fiendish somersaulting clowns" who refused to succumb to political reality and chose instead to go "underground in Gotham City, making political mischief for Bill Clinton." The convention was described as "punctuated by rowdy demonstrations on the floor from supporters of former Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr. of California, who continued to withhold an endorsement of the party's presumed nominee and was thus denied a speaking role in the program." Thus, by the time Jerry Brown's name was placed in nomination late in the afternoon of the third day, the press had created an air of excitement and uncertainty surrounding Brown's speech.

**Brown's Speech: Structure**

Jerry Brown's speech to the 1992 convention was essentially a campaign speech. It was not a typical convention speech designed to create enthusiasm for the party, the party ticket, or even his own candidacy. Instead, Brown used the twenty minutes he was allotted to do two things -- to indict
the Republican administration and to present the issues on which he had based his campaign.

Brown began his speech by explaining what had prompted his candidacy -- "the deepening crisis in democracy." Brown then moved immediately into an extended indictment of the Bush Administration and the pervading attitude of "politics as usual" as the cause of this crisis. According to Brown, "skepticism and discontent" with the party system existed in "every corner of America." The reason for this was "that effective government is breaking down, that the system is paralyzed, and as a result, our society deteriorates." Furthermore, the insidious influence of money (Brown's campaign theme) was the cause of this breakdown of government.

Instead of government by the people, and for the people, and of the people, President Bush and his allies give us government of, by, and for the privileged. It's not citizens who carry the day, but the growing concentration of wealth beyond any boundary of nation or conscience and its influence over our governing institutions through money.

Brown went on to cite the example of Bush's request for ten billion dollars in debt forgiveness to the nuclear power utilities as one way in which the influence of money and power were working against the interests of the American people.

At the same time, Bush and his Republican allies are fighting against fully funding Head Start, the auto safety agency, infant nutrition, immunization programs, drinking
water safety programs, the meat and poultry inspection service, the occupational health and safety agency, and critical federal cancer prevention programs. All these efforts to save life and promote health are less than three quarters of the money that Bush wants to give in forgiveness to those utilities.

The only way to counter this, according to Brown, would be to create power for the powerless. "Whatever the odds, whoever the adversaries, however long it takes, we will create the power for the powerless. For there is no other reason for a Democratic Party to exist."

Brown then made a rather long and rambling transition from indicting the Bush Administration to an explanation of his own candidacy and the issues he represented. Brown told of his efforts as Governor of California to implement small, progressive changes for the betterment of all people, but how at every turn his efforts were thwarted by the influence of money and power.

The words of politics will remain empty forever unless we challenge, and challenge honestly and directly and in a measurable, credible way the corrupt money and the influence that today powers our campaign and puts our words and faces across T.V. screens in five and ten and twenty million dollar campaigns. We've got to get at that root or we're never going to fill the trees of progress. That's what started this candidacy. As much a cause as a campaign.

Throughout his 1992 campaign, Brown had limited the size of contributions he would accept to $100 and had provided a
toll free phone number for people who wanted to call his campaign. In this way, Brown argued, he was empowering the average voter; by limiting contributions he was not at the disposal or mercy of special interest groups, by providing a toll free phone number, he was allowing anyone who wanted to feel actively involved in the political process to do so. These were the type of actions and commitments Brown had wanted the Democrats to accept as part of the party platform. However, since Brown lacked the delegate support to force the adoption of these ideas, he could only present them to the party as ideals. It is important to note that although Brown never mentioned Clinton in the speech, the criticisms he launched against the Bush Administration and Ross Perot were implied against Clinton.

Brown concluded his speech by telling his audience that he intended to "fight for this party, its ideals, tonight, tomorrow, this year, and every year until together we overcome." Brown asked the audience to unite with him in this undertaking. "And as we join together in this spirit, no obstacle will stand in our way."

Brown's speech to the convention was a campaign speech. Rather than calling for any real unity between his supporters and the majority of the party, Brown continued to emphasize the differences between his candidacy and 'politics as usual.' Although this may have been helpful for solidifying his base of support for a possible future candidacy, the question remains -- was it necessary? If Brown's supporters
were as loyal and committed to him as the press represented them, it was not necessary for Brown to reestablish his candidacy and reconfirm the support of his followers.

**Brown’s Speech: Style**

Although the structure of Brown’s speech resembled a campaign speech rather than a convention oration, he did attempt to use stylistic elements to create enthusiasm for what he said. The stylistic element Brown relied on most heavily was appealing to the audience’s emotions through argument by analogy and strong images. He also used repetition occasionally to help emphasize his arguments.

**Brown’s Use of Emotional Appeals**

Brown relied on two analogies -- one historical and the other Biblical -- as well as strong images to construct arguments and create emotional responses from his audience. Early in his speech Brown used an historical analogy to compare the political situation of the present day to the Civil War.

Almost a year ago when this journey began, it was evident that we faced not merely another election, but the deepening crisis of democracy itself. What was at stake was nothing less than the life of our nation -- and its soul, its core principles, the last vessel on earth. President Lincoln faced crisis too. It led to a bloody civil war triggered by the secession of one third of the states. Today, half the people, individually have seceded from our political democracy because they don’t believe their vote makes any difference.

The second analogy Brown used was an implied Biblical reference. In Paul’s first letter to the Apostle Timothy,
Paul wrote, "For the love of money is the root of all evil." This quote is often remembered and used as if written "money is the root of all evil." It is from this second reference that Brown drew his implied analogy — money, and the power it represents, is the root of all political evil.

As mentioned earlier, Brown was highly critical of the Bush Administration: "President Bush and his allies give us government of, by, and for the privileged." Brown also chastised Ross Perot and warned the audience not to be fooled by 'false populism.'

And let’s not get fooled by the false populism that comes to us at a very concentration of wealth and power that we’re sworn to oppose. Outside of advertising, there’s no such thing as a billion dollar populist. Mr. Perot, Mr. Perot, we can afford to pay for our own democracy. We don’t need you to lend it to us.

Both of these analogies were designed to cast Brown in a favorable light. If the audience accepted his argument that money had corrupted the political system to such a point that half the American people had individually seceded, then Brown could present himself as a political savior, the contemporary equivalent of Lincoln.

To underscore the importance of his argument, Brown used strong images to emphasize the crisis of current politics. For example, Brown told the Democrats, "Even to convene here, the homeless had to be swept off the streets and out of sight." Moments later Brown told his audience, "The air, the soil, the water are poisoned for profits sake. And the
future of our grandchildren is stolen to pay for those bloated arms industries even to exist in a time of peace."

Brown's Use of Repetition

In addition to arguments by analogy and strong images, Brown occasionally used repetition to reinforce his claims. Brown used repetition to argue that the only explanation for the current political crisis he had identified was the influence of power and money.

Except for the influence of power and money, how can we explain why high priced corporations are tax deductible, but not the hard earned tuition payments of struggling students? . . .

Except for the influence of power and money, how can we explain the tens of thousands of homeless men and women and children on our streets or doubled up in hallways for lack of federal housing assistance? . . .

Except for the influence of power and money, how can we explain the billions that go to nuclear submarines with non-existent missions while desperate cries from our cities, they go unheeded?

Brown also used repetition later in his speech when he tried to motivate his audience to action -- to fight for a better political system.

That's why we have to fight to take back the airwaves and make it possible for candidates to speak to the people and for the people to hear them on television, without the corrupting influence of money.

That's why we have to fight to take back our own Post Office so that candidates and parties and the people can communicate without mortgaging their future and their integrity to the special interests. . . .

And that's, and that's why we have to ban Political Action Committees so people and corporations are put on the same level.

And that's why we have to fight to insure that the minimum wage, the presidential wage,
and the congressional wage show we're all in it together.

Conclusion

Jerry Brown's speech to the 1992 Democratic National Convention was not a unity speech in any sense of the word. Brown, described by the press as "the Peck's Bad Boy of this year's politics," and "the only prominent Democrat who seemed to still be carrying his own message, rather than the party's" used his speech to reinforce the legitimacy of his campaign. According to Germond and Witcover, Brown had told Clinton what it would take to get an endorsement -- limitations on the size of campaign contributions and the prohibition of political action committee money -- but Clinton had refused to include these measures in the party platform.

...[these actions] would have then given him 'a rationale' for the endorsement. He said he understood as a practical matter that Congress probably would not enact such legislation, but Clinton 'didn't even offer a carrot. They didn't want to give my candidacy any credibility.'

Because Clinton would not 'give [Brown's] candidacy any credibility,' Brown felt forced to use his speaking time to legitimize his campaign and his candidacy.

Fortunately for the Clinton-Gore ticket, Brown's speech did little to damage the picture of a unified party. As Elizabeth Kolbert acknowledged, "By the end of the evening, it seemed that despite the efforts of the reporters and the disparaging remarks of the commentators, the Democrats had probably succeeded in getting their message out."
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CHAPTER VII
PAT BUCHANAN AND THE 1992
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

In the 1992 campaign for the presidency, George Bush found his bid for re-election challenged from three directions. First was the expected challenge by the Democrats, led by front-runner Bill Clinton; second was the on-again, off-again candidacy of the independent candidate, Texas billionaire H. Ross Perot; and third, and in many ways the most problematic, was the early challenge of conservative Republican journalist Pat Buchanan.

Buchanan had entered the race for the presidency in November of 1991 as a means of forcing George Bush to recommit himself to the conservative element of the Republican party. Buchanan told guests that "a scant three years after Bush’s election, the Reagan Revolution is over" and that Bush had "betrayed the most successful political movement of the second half of the 20th century." At first Buchanan’s candidacy was viewed by the Bush campaign as a minor inconvenience, but certainly not a threat to the President’s hope for re-election. However, when Buchanan won 37 percent of the vote in the New Hampshire primary, the media presented this as a major upset for Bush. Despite the fact that Bush won the primary with 53 percent of the vote, the media claimed that Buchanan had dealt the President a serious blow. When Buchanan followed his strong showing in New Hampshire by claiming 36 percent of the Georgia vote, and 30 percent in both Maryland and Colorado,
it became evident that Bush was having difficulty gaining the support of the conservative wing of the Republican party.

By Super Tuesday, Buchanan's momentum had receded to the point that Bush posted wins of two, three, and four times the number of votes Buchanan received. Nevertheless, the damage had been done. George Bush had been presented as a man who was unresponsive to the needs of the conservative element of his party and was thus vulnerable to internal attacks.

Although Bush went into the Republican National Convention in Houston with the party nomination secure, the convention was considered crucial. As Craig L. Fuller, coordinator of the Houston convention, explained, "We've got to rise above the noise level of the campaign. The President has made it clear that this is really the launching pad for his campaign, and that makes the convention very important." It was also considered important that the Bush-Quayle ticket attract the same type of positive television reviews that the Democrats had with their convention. Above all else, the convention coordinators were faced with a single serious goal: to prevent the Republican National Convention from becoming a nationally televised examination of President Bush's campaign problems. This was easier said than done.

Prior to the Republicans convening in Houston, the media was presenting the party as angry, defensive, and -- most important politically -- preoccupied with issues such as abortion and homosexual rights, issues that were not the ones of primary concern to the average Republican voter.
According to Germond and Witcover, many of the Republicans already gathered in Houston prior to the opening of the convention were "clearly upset about how the abortion issue and harsh rhetoric would play with like-minded Republicans and independents back home."³

Jim Lake, Bush's campaign communications director, argued that it was imperative for Bush to 'tie down' the support of the conservative base of the party, and suggested that one way to do that would be to invite Pat Buchanan to address the convention. Campaign chairman Bob Teeter opposed this idea because he felt there was too much risk involved. "He feared that Buchanan might use the occasion to endorse Bush with such faint praise that his tepid support would set off a new round of damaging stories about the president's problems with conservatives."⁶ Despite Teeter's objections, an invitation was extended to Buchanan to speak before the convention.⁷

On the opening night of the Republican National Convention, Pat Buchanan delivered a "tough, partisan endorsement" and "implored the cheering delegates to unite behind his former rival in the November election."⁸

**Buchanan's Speech: Structure**

Pat Buchanan was given a tremendous personal and political opportunity when he addressed the Republican Convention. Buchanan was one of the first major speakers on the first evening of the convention, and his speech was followed by former President Ronald Reagan. Thus, Buchanan was assured
an energetic convention crowd and a large television audience.

Buchanan used the structure of a keynote address when he constructed his address to the Republicans. Edwin Miles identified the two primary purposes of a keynote address: to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates to a high pitch and to rally the voters of the nation to the party's standard. These purposes are accomplished through the use of a standard formula which keynote speakers use on a consistent basis:

... each orator will remind the delegates of the solemnity of the hour and the importance of their decisions; he will hold up his opponents to ridicule and scorn; and he will make a plea for a united effort by his party to achieve a victory in November.

Buchanan's Emphasis on the Solemnity of the Hour

The first way in which Buchanan's speech resembled a party keynote address was that Buchanan used his speech to impress upon the Republicans the solemnity of the hour and the importance of their vote. He did this by casting the election in moral terms rather than just standard political terms or issues.

Friends, this election is about more than who gets what. It is about who we are. It is about what we believe and what we stand for as Americans. There is a religious war going on in this country. It is a cultural war as critical to the kind of nation we shall be as the Cold War itself for this war is for the soul of America. And in that struggle for the soul of American, Clinton and Clinton are on the other side and George Bush is on our side.
Buchanan was able to effectively cast the election in moral terms for two reasons. First, these moral terms were consistent with his own candidacy and his appeal to the conservative base of the Republican Party, and second, Bush himself had cast the election in moral terms just days before the convention when he spoke to the Knights of Columbus:

I stake my claim to a simple belief: the president should try to set a moral tone for this nation. I believe that a central issue of this election year should be: who do you trust to renew America’s moral purpose, who do you trust to fight for the ideas that will help rebuild our families and restore our fundamental values?12

Buchanan did more than just cast the election in moral terms, he provided the voters with a physical manifestation of this ‘war’ by equating the election with the riots that had occurred in Los Angeles after the Rodney King beating. After describing the scene of Los Angeles those first few days after the beating, Buchanan told a story of two young national guardsmen who had protected a convalescent home. "And as those boys took back the streets of Los Angeles block by block, my friends, we must take back our cities, and take back our culture, and take back our country."

Thus for Buchanan, as for Bush, the election was a battle for protecting the soul of America. The battle lines had been clearly drawn with the Democrats, led by Bill and Hillary Clinton, as the enemy on the one side and the Republicans, led by George Bush, as the defenders of the faith on the other.
Buchanan's Reminder of Party Principles and Accomplishments

The second way in which Buchanan's speech resembled a keynote address was his reminding the Republicans of their fundamental principles and all that they had accomplished. Buchanan managed this in two ways. First, he reminded the delegates of the principles and accomplishments of the Republican Party under the leadership of Ronald Reagan, and then second, he emphasized Bush's stand on important conservative issues.

Early in his speech Buchanan praised President Reagan for both his economic and military leadership. According to Buchanan, Reagan's economic policy brought the country out of the 'malaise' of the Carter Administration. "Ronald Reagan crafted the greatest peace time economic recovery in history, reeling in new businesses and twenty million new jobs."

Likewise, Buchanan reminded his audience that it was under the Reagan Administration that communism lost its hold in Central America and the Cold War ended.

Under the Reagan doctrine, one by one, it was the communist dominoes that began to fall. First Grenada was liberated by U.S. Airborne troops and the U.S. Marine Corps. Then the mighty red army was driven out of Afghanistan with American weapons. And then in Nicaragua, that squalid Marxist regime was forced to hold free elections by Ronald Reagan's contra army and the communist was thrown out of power. My fellow American's, we're to remember, it was under our party that the Berlin Wall came down and Europe was reunited. It was under our party that the Soviet empire collapsed and the captive nations broke free.
Because of his leadership in both economic and military policies, "Ronald Reagan made us proud to be Americans again."

In addition to reminding the Republicans of the accomplishments of the Reagan Administration, Buchanan also identified important conservative issues with which he and Bush agreed.

George Bush is a defender of right to life and champion of the Judeo-Christian values upon which America was founded. . . . we stand with him for the freedom to choose religious schools. And we stand with him against the amoral idea that gay and lesbian couples should have the same standing in law as married men and women. We stand with President Bush for the right to life and for voluntary prayer in the public schools. And we stand against putting our wives and daughters and sisters into combat units in the United States Army. We stand my friends, we also stand with President Bush in favor of the right of small towns and communities to control the raw sewage of pornography that so terribly pollutes our popular culture. We stand with President Bush in favor of mental judges who interpret the law as written and against would be Supreme Court justices like Mario Cuomo who think they have a mandate to rewrite the Constitution.

**Buchanan's Ridicule of the Democrats**

While reminding the Republicans of the economic and military accomplishments of Ronald Reagan, and the principles for which the party, and George Bush, stood, Buchanan incorporated the third element of the keynote address by ridiculing the Democrats. Buchanan’s ridicule was directed at the Democratic Party as a whole as well as specific members.

At the beginning of his speech Buchanan ridiculed the Democratic Party:
My friends, my friends, like many of you, like many of you last month I watched that giant masquerade ball up in Madison Square Garden where twenty thousand liberals and radicals came dressed up as moderates and centrists in the greatest single exhibition of cross dressing in our recorded history.

Buchanan also identified the speakers during the Democratic Convention as "the prophets of doom." He reminded the Republicans that the Democrats want "to turn our country’s fate and our country’s future over to the party that gave us McGovern, Mondale, Carter, and Michael Dukakis," and then asked incredulously, "Where do they find these leaders?"

In addition to ridiculing the Democratic Party, Buchanan also ridiculed the Clinton/Gore ticket. Buchanan told his audience that a president has many roles, one of which is to act as a diplomat -- the "architect of American foreign policy."

Well, Bill Clinton, Bill Clinton couldn’t find 150 words to discuss foreign policy in an acceptance speech that lasted almost an hour. You know, what was said, what was said of another Democratic candidate, Bill Clinton’s foreign policy experience is pretty much confined to having had breakfast once at the International House of Pancakes.

A second role of the president is to act as Commander-in-Chief of the United States military. Buchanan recounted the story of George Bush leaving his high school graduation to become the youngest fighter pilot in the Pacific during World War II. On the other hand, "When Bill Clinton’s time came in Vietnam, he sat up in a dormitory room in Oxford, England, and figured out how to dodge the draft."
Even Vice-Presidential candidate Albert Gore and Democratic Senator Edward Kennedy did not escape Buchanan's ridicule. Dubbing Gore "Prince Albert," Buchanan told the Republicans that according to the national taxpayers union, "Al Gore beat out Teddy Kennedy two straight years for the title of 'Biggest Spender in the U. S. Senate' and Teddy Kennedy isn't moderate about anything. . . . How many other sixty-year-olds do you know who still go to Florida for Spring Break?"

Buchanan's scornful derision of the Democrats, coupled with his re-enforcement of the conservative principles of the Republican Party, helped raise the enthusiasm of the convention delegates.

**Buchanan's Call for Unity**

The final way in which Buchanan's speech resembled a keynote address was his call for party unity. At the beginning of the speech Buchanan made it very clear that he was speaking to endorse Bush:

The first thing I want to do tonight is congratulate President Bush and to remove any doubt about where we stand. The primaries are over, the heart is strong again, and the Buchanan brigades are enlisted all the way to a great Republican comeback victory in November.

Later in the speech Buchanan re-emphasized his commitment to the Bush campaign and encouraged the "Buchanan Brigade" to support Bush's re-election efforts.

But I do believe, I do believe, deep in my heart that the right place for us to be now in this presidential campaign is right
beside George Bush. This party, this party is my home, this party is our home, and we've got to come home to it, and don't let anyone tell you different.

With these vigorous calls for unity behind Bush's candidacy, Buchanan completed the form of the keynote address.

**Buchanan's Speech: Style**

The keynote address is marked not only by its structure, but it is also marked by its style. According to Miles, when delivering the keynote address, the speaker engages in impassioned pleas:

> His language is inclined to be bombastic, for custom demands that he avoid no extravagance of speech, either in praise or blame in glorifying the brilliant accomplishments of his own party or in lamenting the dismal failures of the opposition.14

As evidenced in the examples above, Buchanan was certainly 'bombastic' in his references to the Democrats. This 'extravagance of speech' was nothing new to Buchanan who had, according to one fellow journalist, "developed the habit of saying unnecessarily interesting things."15

In addition to the examples cited earlier -- calling the Democratic Convention 'the greatest single exhibition of cross dressing in our recorded history,' limiting Bill Clinton's foreign policy experience to 'breakfast at the International House of Pancakes,' referring to 'Prince Albert,' and calling Ted Kennedy a 'sixty-year-old who goes to Florida for Spring Break' -- Buchanan also used strong language when referring to the "Democratic Agenda."
Both the official Clinton/Gore agenda and the unofficial Clinton/Clinton agenda were attacked by Buchanan. The Clinton/Gore agenda was described as having as a top priority "unrestricted abortion on demand." Additionally, Clinton was described as intolerant to supporters of the pro-life position.

When the Irish Catholic governor of Pennsylvania, Robert Casey, asked to say a few words on behalf of the twenty-five million unborn children destroyed since Roe v. Wade, Bob Casey was told there was no room for him at the podium; that Bill Clinton's convention had no room at the inn.

Additionally, Buchanan charged Clinton and Gore with representing "the most pro-lesbian and pro-gay ticket in history."

Buchanan took advantage of the mixed public reaction that Hillary Clinton had received and included indictments of her as well.

And what does Hillary believe? Well, Hillary believes that 12-year olds should have the right to sue their parents. And Hillary has compared marriage and the family as institutions to slavery and life on an Indian reservation. . . . This, this my friends, this is radical feminism.

After indicting Hillary Clinton, Buchanan went on to list the agenda that Clinton and Clinton would impose on America: "abortion on demand, a litmus test for the Supreme Court, homosexual rights, discrimination against religious schools, and women in combat units."

Finally, Buchanan criticized Al Gore's environmental policies as "extremist."
And the nations forests, and the ancient forests of Oregon to Washington to the inland empire of California. America’s great middle class have got to start standing up to these environmental extremists who put birds and rats and insects ahead of family, workers, and jobs.

Conclusion

Unlike the speeches by Edward Kennedy, Jesse Jackson, Gary Hart and Pat Brown, Pat Buchanan did present a speech whose primary function was to unite the party behind the nominee. Buchanan modeled his speech, both structurally and stylistically, after the convention keynote address to create enthusiasm among the delegates and to rally Republicans across the country to the party’s standard. Interestingly, Buchanan succeeded and failed at the same time.

Buchanan succeeded in rallying the conservative element of the Republican party behind the Bush candidacy. Through his use of bombastic or emotionally charged language, Buchanan was able to cast the Democrats as extremists who were opposed to fundamental moral issues. Additionally, by aligning himself and his conservative positions with George Bush, Buchanan was able to present Bush as a very conservative candidate.

However, at the same time Buchanan was presenting Bush as an attractive candidate for conservative Republicans, he was alienating moderate Republicans who did not take the same hard-line stand on issues.

But reporters at the convention were finding many mainstream conservatives alarmed and dismayed by the tone and religious content
of the rhetoric, the pictures of Pat Robertson and Jerry Falwell perched in the VIP section of the Astrodome, and the repeated attacks on abortion rights and homosexuals.16

Despite the mixed reactions on the part of Republicans, Bush did benefit from the convention as a whole, and, in all likelihood, from Buchanan’s speech. A *Washington Post/ABC News* survey taken immediately after the convention showed Clinton leading by only 9 percent, compared to a 26 percent lead prior to the convention.
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CHAPTER VIII
CONCLUSION

The functions and importance of the national nominating conventions have changed since their inception in the early 19th century. The modern national convention rarely serves to actually choose the party nominee. Indeed, only twice in the last half-century has a national convention needed more than one ballot to choose the party candidate. Although some political analysts and scholars have begun to question the necessity of holding the national nominating convention, these quadrennial events do serve important functions for the party: they provide an opportunity to create a sense of party unity, often through carefully orchestrated spectacle including having popular party leaders speak at key points of the convention and showing the delegates engaging in noisy, jubilant demonstrations; they generate a "bandwagon" effect to enlist the support of nonpartisan or uncommitted voters; and, the conventions usually provide a "bump" in the popularity polls for the nominee. The importance of creating this sense of party unity has been well documented and acknowledged by scholars, by political analysts, and even by the politicians themselves.

Recent political conventions have experienced increased pressure to project an image of a united party for the purpose of propelling the party nominee to victory in the general election. Projecting this image of party unity is often made difficult because of the divisiveness generated during
the primary campaign. One solution to this problem has been the granting of podium time to the candidate(s) who failed to win enough delegates to secure the party nomination. Beginning with their 1980 convention, the Democrats have allowed candidates to address the convention delegates and (usually) the American public during prime-time coverage of the convention proceedings. In 1992, the Republicans adopted this practice as well. The media has titled these events "unity" speeches since the purpose is, ostensibly, for the candidate to appeal to his supporters to unite with the party and support the official party nominee. This dissertation has examined these "unity" speeches to determine if they are in fact speeches designed to unite the party, and, if so, whether these speeches represent a new form or genre of political convention discourse. In Chapter I, five research questions were articulated to address this issue. These questions may now be answered.

Research Question #1 -- To what extent do these speeches actually represent a new type or genre of political convention discourse?

Based on the analysis of the six speeches included in this dissertation, it is inconclusive whether these speeches actually represent a new type or genre of political convention discourse. It is clearly evident that these speeches do not fall within the purview of traditional convention discourse such as the keynote address, the nomination speeches, or the candidate acceptance speeches. It is not clearly
evident if these speeches represent an emerging genre of political discourse because no more than two speeches followed a similar form or construction. Kennedy and Hart's speeches were similar in form, but neither presented a strong call for party unity. Jackson's two speeches were similar to each other, but transcended the typical structure of political convention speeches. Brown's speech was not designed to create a sense of unity. Finally, Buchanan's speech was clearly designed to call for party unity, but was structured differently from any of the others already mentioned. To argue the emergence of a new genre would require more consistency of form in the speeches.

Research Question #2 -- Rhetorical Potential: What are the constraints, rhetorical choices, and formal features of the genre?

Because it is not yet possible to determine whether or not these speeches represent a new genre of political discourse, it is difficult to credibly argue the rhetorical potential of these speeches. It is, however, possible to speculate on the constraints surrounding these speeches. It is also possible to identify common rhetorical choices made by the speakers.

The contenders faced at least two major constraints when presenting their speeches. First, the speech must not alienate their supporters by appearing to capitulate to the nominee, because if the candidate harbored plans to seek the nomination again, he would need this base of support.
Second, assuming he was planning to seek the party nomination during the next election, the speech must not alienate the members of the party at large. In order to effectively operate within these parameters, four of the six speakers chose the rhetorical device of transcendence to cast the election in moral terms. By casting the election in moral terms, the speakers were able to transcend mere 'political rhetoric' (which is always suspect) and present themselves as the selfless defenders of the party ideals. Kennedy told the Democrats in 1980 that the economic plank of the party platform "is a moral issue that I raise tonight." In 1984, Jackson told the Democrats, "This is not a perfect party. We are not a perfect people. Yet, we are called to a perfect mission." At the same convention, Hart presented himself not as a mere politician seeking office, but as the valiant hero on a quest. Finally, in 1992, Buchanan told the Republicans that the election "is about who we are. It is about what we believe and what we stand for as Americans. There is a religious war going on in this country. . . . this war is for the soul of America."

Finally, regardless of the actual form or structure of the speech, all six speakers devoted a significant part of their speech to indicting the opposition party. Most of the speakers were fairly careful to not indict the party nominee, at least not overtly. The exceptions to this were Kennedy in 1980 and Brown in 1992. Both men offered criticisms of
policies associated with the nominee, but neither specifically indicted the nominee by name.

By transcending the realm of mere politics and by denouncing the opposition party, each of the contenders studied was able to operate within the constraints imposed by both their supporters and the party at large.

**Research Question #3 — What functions do these speeches perform other than unity?**

In addition to (sometimes) calling for party unity, these speeches serve two other important functions for the contender and his supporters. First, these speeches serve to legitimize the contender's failed campaign, and often the speech leaves open the possibility of a future candidacy. Second, these speeches reaffirm the delegates and voters who supported the contender by emphasizing the importance and inherent morality of the issues and ideals for which they voted. Unfortunately, these functions often conflict with each other and leave the delegates and voters dissatisfied with switching their allegiance to the party nominee.

In 1980, Kennedy urged his supporters and the Democratic party to "keep the faith" by returning to their traditional, liberal economic principles. Kennedy also used his convention speech to establish himself as the undisputed leader of the liberal wing of the Democratic party, and intimated his possible candidacy in 1984.

In 1984, Jackson used his speech to present himself as a legitimate political contender. Jackson's apology for his
inflammatory statements paved the way for a future candidacy because it reestablished his credibility and the credibility of the Rainbow Coalition. Additionally, Jackson used his speech to reaffirm his supporters and to argue that diversity could exist within the Democratic party, and the party would be stronger as a result. The implied conclusion of this argument was that Jackson was the candidate who could lead such a diverse party in the future.

At the same convention Hart used his speech to emphasize the need for 'new leadership' in the country. Throughout the primary campaign, Hart had constantly criticized Mondale and cast him as representing the old, traditional political machine, so the unspoken implication of Hart's speech was that the party should unite for new leadership -- which Hart represented -- if not in 1984, then in 1988. Hart left open the window for a future candidacy when he told the Democrats, "This is one Hart you won't leave in San Francisco."

Even Brown's speech in 1992 left open the possibility of a future candidacy. Brown's promise to continue fighting to make politics directly accessible to the average voter implied a future candidacy since he was the only candidate running on such a platform.

Unfortunately, these intimations of possible future candidacies have often left the contender's supporters unwilling to embrace the party nominee. Nearly all of Kennedy's delegates cast their votes for him in the nominating roll-call vote, even though he had withdrawn his name from the ballot.
"While he may be releasing us, we are not releasing him." Many of Jackson’s black supporters expressed reservations about embracing Mondale’s candidacy, in part because of the mixed signals Jackson sent during the convention, and also because they felt frustrated by the "inadequate gestures of Mr. Mondale." Even Brown’s supporters in 1992 remained loyal to his candidacy. Chris Kysar, a Brown delegate, told reporters, "We could walk out. That’s one option. We could all of a sudden vote for Clinton. That’s another option. But I don’t think that’s in the realm of possibility."

As noted earlier in this dissertation, each of the standard forms of political convention discourse — the keynote address, the nomination speeches, and the candidate acceptance speeches — have specific functions associated with them. The keynote address is designed to create enthusiasm for the party and to identify the theme of the convention. Nomination speeches are designed to create enthusiasm for the specific candidates. Finally, the candidate acceptance speeches are designed to be capstone speeches in which the nominee assumes the leadership of the party and presents his plans for achieving victory in the general election. All of these forms of convention discourse have in common the goal of generating enthusiasm for the party and the nominee. If unity speeches were truly seeking to unite the party, they would follow this form and attempt to create enthusiasm for the party and the nominee. However, because the speeches
have been used to showcase the contender rather than the nominee, they fail to generate this enthusiasm.

Research Question #4 -- Intertextuality: What earlier genre do these forms draw upon and how do they make use of earlier forms?

As mentioned above, no more than two of the speeches studied followed the same form. Despite the lack of consistency in form, it is possible to discern the use of standard forms of convention discourse in some of these speeches. Specifically, the formal structures of the acceptance speech and the keynote address are noticeable in three of the speeches. Both Kennedy and Hart fashioned their speeches on the traditional nominee acceptance speech in which the nominee assumes the leadership of the party. Both men used their respective speeches to define the direction of the Democratic party, to denounce the Republicans, and then, they offered themselves as leaders to guide the party. On the other hand, Buchanan followed the form of the keynote speech when he addressed the Republicans in 1992. He emphasized the solemnity of the occasion, denounced the Democrats, and created enthusiasm for the upcoming party platform and nominee.

In contrast to these three speeches were the speeches by Jackson in 1984 and 1988 and the speech by Brown in 1992. Neither of Jackson’s speeches followed any traditional form of political discourse. In part this was because of Jackson’s lack of political experience, and in part it was
because of Jackson's background as a preacher. Both of his speeches were described as having 'a preacherly cadence' to them and Jackson was depicted as 'preaching' to his convention audience. On the other hand, Brown's speech to the Democrats in 1992 was essentially a campaign speech. He used his podium time to continue to emphasize the issues on which he had based his campaign and called for Democrats to support him in his efforts. By doing this, Brown continued to distance himself from the rest of the Democratic candidates (as he had during the campaign), and sought personal endorsement rather than arguing for party unity.

At this point it is difficult to draw conclusions about the influence of other forms of political convention discourse. There are similarities in the formal structure of three of the speeches, and only future examples of unity speeches will enable clear conclusions to be drawn. The implication at this point is that the speakers do rely on traditional formal structures of convention discourse.

Research Question #5 -- What has been the critical evaluation of these speeches and do they contribute to our understanding of generic discourse?

To date, scholarly, critical evaluations are lacking on all but two of these speeches. General, public evaluations of the speeches were available in the press immediately after each speech was given. Reactions to the speeches were often mixed.
Kennedy’s speech in 1980 was hailed as "a moment of personal triumph" and "one of the best political speeches of our time." At the same time, the speech was criticized as offering "uncertainty" about the extent to which Kennedy would work for a united party after the convention. This sense of uncertainty surrounding Kennedy’s willingness to work toward uniting the party was underscored when he offered a "loveless midnight endorsement" of President Carter in "five grudging sentences." I congratulate President Carter on his renomination. I endorse the platform of the Democratic party. I will support and work for the re-election of President Carter. It is imperative that we defeat Ronald Reagan in 1980. I urge all Democrats to join in that effort. Additionally, Kennedy "reduced Carter to recruiting his help from the podium and joined him there at the end like a right­ful prince at the court of the usurper, the distance between them plain in his tepid handshake and his gelid smile." In 1984, Jackson’s speech was described as signaling "the re-emergence of the political speech as something to be proud of." Although the speech could not eradicate the many differences among the various special interest groups in the Democratic party, it did serve to help ease the tensions which had been created during the primary campaign. Additionally, Jackson succeeded in solidifying the black vote for the Democrats. On the other hand, Hart’s speech was ignored by the press. Gary Hart has never been characterized as a
particularly effective speaker, and his speech to the Demo-
crats was true to form.

Because both speakers offered only token calls for party
unity, the Democrats left San Francisco almost as fractured
as they had arrived. Although the convention was full of
good feelings and was "far happier than most of the Democrats
expected," there was an underlying wariness because "the
daunting problems of the party have not gone away."22

By 1988, Jackson’s call for party unity was perceived as
more genuine and sincere. Jackson offered a solid endorse-
ment of Dukakis, and throughout his speech emphasized the
necessity of Democratic unity. Unlike 1984 when Jackson had
given mixed signals to his supporters, in 1988 Jackson made
it clear that he endorsed Dukakis and planned to work in
‘partnership’ with Dukakis and Bentsen. Because Jackson
publicly acknowledged his satisfaction with the party nomi-
nee, many of his delegates said they were satisfied, too.23

Brown’s speech in 1992 was not a unity speech. The
speech was described as an "excoriating denunciation of
politics as usual"24 and then promptly ignored by the media.
The only other mention of Brown’s lack of party unity was the
noting of his conspicuous absence from the podium platform at
the end of Clinton’s acceptance speech when Clinton was
joined by most of the prominent Democratic party members.

Finally, Buchanan’s speech to the 1992 Republican
National Convention was described as the most stunning speech
of the convention.25 Unfortunately for the Republicans,
Buchanan's "ultra-conservative" denunciation of the Democrats and his hard-line approach on the issues of abortion and homosexual rights created a backlash among moderate and liberal members of the party. As Germond and Witcover wrote, "many mainstream conservatives were alarmed and dismayed by the tone and religious content of the rhetoric" as well as the perceived role that religious leaders Jerry Falwell and Pat Robertson played in the convention.

Interestingly, public opinion polls do not reflect a major backlash against the Republicans at the end of the convention. The Washington Post/ABC News survey immediately after the convention showed Clinton leading, 49 percent to 40, compared to 60 percent to 34 before the convention. According to Bush campaign chairman, Bob Teeter, the argument that the images of the convention had cost Bush "a big chunk of votes" was never supported in the campaign's polling figures.

Despite the wide diversity of form in the six speeches studied, they do provide us with better understanding of generic discourse. The most notable insight these speeches offer is the reinforcement of Campbell and Jamieson's concern that genres are often assumed and defined a priori. Indeed, the six speeches examined in this dissertation were all assumed to be and presented by the media as unity speeches, because they were supposedly being presented by major party contenders for the purpose of healing campaign wounds and calling for the party to unite in its effort to defeat the
opposition. However, upon critical examination, only two of the six actually merit that description. Indeed, Jerry Brown's speech in 1992 did not meet even the most general assumed attributes of a unity speech.

A second important element of insight these speeches may provide the generic critic -- assuming the tradition of these speeches continues and they continue to be studied -- is an understanding of how and why contemporary genres of political discourse emerge and change. Prior research which identified and described the genres of political convention discourse was restricted to examining the various samples of speeches after the fact. If the trend of allowing these speeches continues in future conventions, it will be possible for researchers to examine the speeches and the factors which influence them literally as they occur, not just as historical artifacts. Campbell and Jamieson argue that a genre is "a constellation of elements" resulting in a dynamic fusion of elements of substance, style, and situation. To be able to examine these speeches and the context under which they are give as they are happening will certainly provide generic re-searchers with opportunity for unique insight.

Directions for Future Research

At this point, it is inconclusive whether a new form or genre of political convention discourse is actually emerging. In order for a clear determination to be made, it is obvious that these speeches continue to be examined. Thus, one area
of future research is to simply continue and extend what this dissertation has started.

A second direction for future research would be to explore whether these speeches (and any future ones) reflect the overall narrative of the particular convention. One assumption to be made is that if the speech reflected the overall narrative of the party, it would appear to be acting as a unifying force rather than a divisive one. In order to accomplish this, the contender's speech would have to examined in relation to the keynote address, the nomination speeches, and the acceptance speeches to determine if common narrative elements and visions were embedded in all of the speeches. It is possible that common narrative elements would be found in all of the speeches of a particular convention, or that the speech presented by the contender would strike a note of discord by breaking from the party narrative or attempting to introduce an alternative narrative.

A third, and perhaps most obvious, direction for future research would be to attempt to measure the effect of the contender’s speech. After all, if the assumption is that these are unity speeches, designed to unite the party, it is logical to see if they succeed in changing attitudes and providing a sense of unity to the party. It is not sufficient to examine the nominee’s standing in popularity polls and assume that any change is a result of the contender’s speech. The change in the nominee’s popularity is due to a number of factors. It would be difficult to isolate the
speech of the contender(s) as a variable after the convention. However, it may be possible to develop an instrument which would allow the researcher to measure attitude change on the part of party members during and immediately after the presentation of the speech.

A final possible direction for future research would be to examine the role of the media in framing these speeches. Murray Edelman has argued that mass audiences respond to "conspicuous political symbols: not to 'facts,' and not to moral codes imbedded in the character or soul, but to the gestures and speeches that make up the drama." It is a given that the media exerts an element of influence in our understanding of political events. Denton and Woodward have argued that "politics invites layers of bureaucracies, writers, and journalists to construct versions of political reality." Thus, the question becomes, how does the media construct the 'reality' of the conventions and in particular the role of and the effect of the contender's speech?

**A Final Opinion**

Based on the analysis of these six speeches, I am of the opinion that they probably do more harm than good. With the exception of Buchanan's speech, none of the speeches were submitted to the party nominee prior to their presentation at the convention. This leaves open the possibility for the speaker to use his time at the podium -- as Kennedy, Hart, and even Brown did -- to promote himself rather than the party nominee or platform. Because these speeches are born
from competing agendas, it is often difficult for candidates to reconcile their own desires with those of the nominee.
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Well, things worked out a little different than I thought, but let me tell you, I still love New York. My fellow Democrats and my fellow Americans: I have come here tonight not to argue for a candidacy, but to affirm a cause.

I am asking you to renew the commitment of the Democratic Party to economic justice. I am asking you to renew our commitment to a fair and lasting prosperity that can put America back to work.

This is the cause that brought me into the campaign and that sustained me for nine months, across a hundred thousand miles, in forty different states. We had our losses; but the pain of our defeats is far, far less than the pain of the people I have met. We have learned that it is important to take issues seriously, but never to take ourselves too seriously.

The serious issue before us tonight is the cause for which the Democratic Party has stood in its finest hours -- the cause that keeps our party young -- and makes it, in the second century of its age, the largest political party on the Planet.

Our cause has been, since the days of Thomas Jefferson, the cause of the common man -- and the common woman. Our commitment has been, since the days of Andrew Jackson, to all
those he called "the humble members of society -- the farmers, mechanics, and laborers." On this foundation, we have defined our values, refined our policies, and refreshed our faith.

Now I take the unusual step of carrying the cause and the commitment of my campaign personally to our national convention. I speak out of a deep sense of urgency about the anguish and anxiety I have seen across America. I speak out of a deep belief in the ideals of the Democratic Party, and in the potential of that party and of a President to make a difference. I speak out of a deep trust in our capacity to proceed with boldness and a common vision that will feel and heal the suffering of our time -- and the division of our party.

The economic plank of this platform on its face concerns only material things; but is also a moral issue that I raise tonight. It has taken many forms over many years. In this campaign, and in this country that we seek to lead, the challenge in 1980 is to give our voice and our vote for these fundamental Democratic principles:

Let us pledge that we will never misuse unemployment, high interest rates, and human misery as false weapons against inflation.

Let us pledge that employment will be the first priority of our economic policy.

Let us pledge that there will be security for all who are now at work. Let us pledge that there will be jobs for
all who are out of work -- and we will not compromise on the issue of jobs.

These are not simplistic pledges. Simply put, they are the heart of our tradition; they have been the soul of our party across the generations. It is the glory and the greatness of our tradition to speak for those who have no voice, to remember those who are forgotten, to respond to the frustrations and fulfill the aspirations of all Americans seeking a better life in a better land.

We dare not forsake that tradition. We cannot let the great purposes of the Democratic Party become the bygone passages of history. We must not permit the Republicans to seize and run on the slogans of prosperity.

We heard the orators at their convention all trying to talk like Democrats. They proved that even Republican nominees can quote Franklin Roosevelt to their own purpose. The Grand Old Party thinks it has found a great new trick. But forty years ago, an earlier generation of Republicans attempted that same trick. And Franklin Roosevelt himself replied "Most Republican leaders . . . have bitterly fought and blocked the forward surge of average men and women in their pursuit of happiness. Let us not be deluded that overnight those leaders have suddenly become the friends of average men and women . . . . You know, very few of us are that gullible."

And four years later, when the Republicans tried that trick again, Franklin Roosevelt asked: "Can the Old Guard
pass itself off as the New Deal? I think not. We have all seen many marvelous stunts in the circus -- but no performing elephant could turn a handspring without falling flat on its back."

The 1980 Republican convention was awash with crocodile tears for our economic distress but it is by their long record and not their recent words that you shall know them.

The same Republicans who are talking about the crisis of unemployment have nominated a man who once said -- and I quote: "Unemployment insurance is a prepaid vacation plan for freeloaders." And that nominee is no friend of labor.

The same Republicans who are talking about the problems of the inner cities have nominated a man who said -- and I quote: "I have included in my morning and evening prayers every day the prayer that the federal government not bail out New York." And that nominee is no friend of this city and of our great urban centers.

The same Republicans who are talking about security for the elderly have nominated a man who said just four years ago that participation in Social Security "should be made voluntary." And that nominee is no friend of the senior citizen.

The same Republicans who are talking about preserving the environment have nominated a man who last year made the preposterous statement, and I quote: "Eighty percent of air pollution comes from plants and trees." And that nominee is no friend of the environment.
And the same Republicans who are invoking Franklin Roosevelt have nominated a man who said in 1976 -- and these are his exact words: "Fascism was really the basis of the New Deal." And that nominee, whose name is Ronald Reagan, has no right to quote Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

The great adventure which our opponents offer is a voyage into the past. Progress is our heritage, not theirs. What is right for us as Democrats is also the right way for Democrats to win.

The commitment I seek is not to outworn views, but to old values that will never wear out. Programs may sometimes become obsolete, but the ideal of fairness always endures. Circumstances may change, but the work of compassion must continue. It is surely correct that we cannot solve problems by throwing money at them; but it is also correct that we dare not throw our national problems onto a scrap heap of inattention and indifference. The poor may be out of political fashion, but they are not without human needs. The middle class may be angry, but they have not lost the dream that all Americans can advance together.

The demand of our people in 1980 is not for smaller government or bigger government, but for better government. Some say that government is always bad, and that spending for basic social programs is the root of our economic evils. But we reply: The present inflation and recession cost our economy $200 billion a year. We reply: Inflation and unemployment are the biggest spenders of all.
The task of leadership in 1980 is not to parade scapegoats or to seek refuge in reaction but to match our power to the possibilities of progress.

While others talked of free enterprise, it was the Democratic Party that acted -- and we ended excessive regulation in the airline and trucking industry. We restored competition to the marketplace. And I take some satisfaction that this deregulation was legislation that I sponsored and passed in the Congress of the United States.

As Democrats, we recognize that each generation of Americans has a rendezvous with a different reality. The answers of one generation become the questions of the next generation. But there is a guiding star in the American firmament. It is as old as the revolutionary belief that all people are created equal -- and as clear as the contemporary condition of Liberty City and the South Bronx. Again and again, Democratic leaders have followed that star -- and they have given new meaning to the old values of liberty and justice for all.

We are the party of the New Freedom, the New Deal, and the New Frontier. We have always been the party of hope. So this year, let us offer new hope -- new hope to an America uncertain about the present, but unsurpassed in its potential for the future.

To all those who are idle in the cities and industries of America, let us provide the new hope for the dignity of useful work. Democrats have always believed that a basic
civil right of all Americans is the right to earn their own way. The party of the people must always be the party of full employment.

To all those who doubt the future of our economy, let us provide new hope for the reindustrialization of America. Let our vision reach beyond the next election or the next year to a new generation of prosperity. If we could rebuild Germany and Japan after World War II, then surely we can reindustrialize our own nation and revive our inner cities in the 1980s.

To all those who work hard for a living wage, let us provide new hope that the price of their employment shall not be an unsafe workplace and death at an earlier age.

To all those who inhabit our land, from California to the New York Island, from the Redwood Forest to the Gulfstream waters, let us provide new hope that prosperity shall not be purchased by poisoning the air, the rivers and the natural resources that are the greatest gift of this continent. We must insist that our children and grandchildren shall inherit a land which they can truly call American the beautiful.

To all those who see the worth of their work and their savings taken by inflation, let us offer new hope for a stable economy. We must meet the pressures of the present by invoking the full power of government to master increasing prices. In candor, we must say that the federal budget can
be balanced only by policies that bring us a balanced prosperity of full employment and price restraint.

And to all those overburdened by an unfair tax structure, let us provide new hope for real tax reform. Instead of shutting down classrooms, let us shut off tax shelters.

Instead of cutting out school lunches, let us cut off tax subsidies for expensive business lunches that are nothing more than food stamps for the rich.

The tax cut of our Republican opponents takes the name of tax reform in vain. It is a wonderfully Republican idea that would redistribute income in the wrong direction. It is good news for any of you with incomes over $200,000 a year. For a few of you, it offers a pot of gold worth $14,000. But the Republican tax cut is bad news for middle income families. For the many of you, the plan a pittance of $200 a year. And that is not what the Democratic Party means when we say tax reform.

The vast majority of Americans cannot afford this panacea from a Republican nominee who has denounced the progressive income tax as the invention of Karl Marx. I am afraid he has confused Karl Marx with Theodore Roosevelt, the obscure Republican president who sought and fought for a tax system based on the ability to pay. Theodore Roosevelt was not Karl Marx -- and the Republican tax scheme is not tax reform.
Finally, we cannot have a fair prosperity in isolation from a fair society.

So I will continue to stand for national health insurance. We must not surrender to the relentless medical inflation that can bankrupt almost anyone -- and that may soon break the budgets of government at every level.

Let us insist on real controls over what doctors and hospitals can charge. Let us resolve that the state of a family's health shall never depend on the size of a family's wealth.

The President, the Vice President, and the Members of Congress have a medical plan that meets their needs in full. Whenever Senators and Representatives catch a little cold, the Capitol physician will see them immediately, treat them promptly, and fill a prescription on the spot. We do not get a bill even if we ask for it. And when do you think was the last time a Member of Congress asked for a bill from the federal government?

I say again, as I have said before: if health insurance is good enough for the President, the Vice President, and the Congress of the United States, then it is good enough for all of you and for every family in America.

There are some who said we should be silent about our differences on issues during this convention. But the heritage of the Democratic Party has been a history of democracy. We fight hard because we care deeply about our principles and purposes. We did not flee this struggle. And we welcome the
contrast with the empty and expedient spectacle last month in Detroit where no nomination was contested, no question was debated and no one dared to raise any doubt or dissent.

Democrats can be proud that we choose a different course, and a different platform.

We can be proud that our party stands for investment in safe energy instead of a nuclear future that may threaten the future itself. We must not permit the neighborhoods of America to be permanently shadowed by the fear of another Three Mile Island.

We can be proud that our party stands for a fair housing law to unlock the doors of discrimination once and for all. The American house will be divided against itself so long as there is prejudice against and American family buying or renting a home.

And we can be proud that our party stands plainly, publicly, and persistently for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment. Women hold their rightful place at our convention; and women must have their rightful place in the Constitution of the United States. On this issue, we will not yield, we will not equivocate, we will not rationalize, explain, or excuse. We will stand for E.R.A. and for the recognition at long last that our nation had not only founding fathers, but founding mothers as well.

A fair prosperity and a just society are within our vision and our grasp. We do not have every answer. There
are questions not yet asked, waiting for us in the recesses of the future.

But of this much we can be certain, because it is the lesson of all our history:

Together a President and the people can make a difference. I have found that faith still alive wherever I have traveled across the land. So let us reject the counsel of retreat and the call to reaction. Let us go forward in the knowledge that history only helps those who help themselves.

There will be setbacks and sacrifices in the years ahead. But I am convinced that we as a people are ready to give something back to our country in return for all it has given us. Let this be our commitment: Whatever sacrifices must be made shall be shared -- and shared fairly. And let this be our confidence at the end of our journey and always before us shines that ideal of liberty and justice for all.

In closing, let me say a few words to all those I have met and all those who have supported me at this convention and across the country.

There were hard hours on our journey. Often we sailed against the wind, but always we kept our rudder true. There were many of you who stayed the course and shared our hope. You gave your help; but even more, you gave your hearts. Because of you, this has been a happy campaign. You welcomed Joan and me and our family into your homes and neighborhoods, your churches, your campuses, and your union halls. When I think back on all the miles and all the months and all the
memories, I think of you. I recall the poet's words, and I say: "What golden friends I had."

Among you, my golden friends across this land, I have listened and learned.

I have listened to Kenny Dubois, a glassblower in Charleston, West Virginia, who has ten children to support, but has lost his job after 35 years, just three years short of qualifying for his pension.

I have listened to the Trachta family, who farm in Iowa and wonder whether they can pass the good life and the good earth on to their children.

I have listened to a grandmother in East Oakland, who no longer has a phone to call her grandchildren, because she gave it up to pay the rent on her small apartment.

I have listened to young workers out of work, to students without the tuition for college, and to families without the chance to own a home. I have seen the closed factories and the stalled assembly lines of Anderson, Indiana and South Gate, California. I have seen too many -- far too many -- idle men and women desperate to work. I have seen too many -- far too many -- working families desperate to protect the value of their wages from the ravages of inflation.

Yet I have also sensed a yearning for new hope among the people in every state where I have been. I felt it in their handshakes; I saw it in their faces. I shall never forget the mothers who carried their children to our rallies. I
shall always remember the elderly who have lived in an America of high purpose and who believe it can all happen again.

Tonight, in their name, I have come here to speak for them. For their sake, I ask you to stand with them. On their behalf, I ask you to restate and reaffirm the timeless truth of our party.

I congratulate President Carter on his victory here. I am confident that the Democratic Party will reunite on the basis of Democratic principles -- and that together we will march toward a Democratic victory in 1980.

And someday, long after this convention, long after the signs come down, and the crowds stop cheering, and the bands stop playing, may it be said of our campaign that we kept the faith. May it be said of our party in 1980 that we found our faith again.

May it be said of us, both in dark passages and in bright days, in the words of Tennyson that my brothers quoted and loved -- and that have a special meaning for me now:

I am a part of all that I have met . . .
Tho much is taken, much abides . . .
That which we are, we are --
One equal temper of heroic hearts . . . strong
in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

For me, a few hours ago, this campaign came to an end. For all those whose cares have been our concern, the work goes on, the cause endures, the hope still lives, and the dream shall never die.
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Tonight we come together bound by our faith in a mighty God, with genuine respect and love for our country, and inheriting the legacy of a great party, the Democratic Party, which is the best hope for redirecting our nation on a more humane, just and peaceful course.

This is not a perfect party. We are not a perfect people. Yet, we are called to a perfect mission: Our mission, to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to house the homeless, to teach the illiterate, to provide jobs for the jobless, and to choose the human race over the nuclear race.

We are gathered here this week to nominate a candidate and write a platform which will expand, unify, direct and inspire our party and the nation to fulfill this mission.

My constituency is the desperate, the damned, the disinherited, the disrespected, and the despised.

They are restless and seek relief. They’ve voted in record numbers. They have invested the faith, hope and trust that they have in us. The Democratic Party must send them a signal that we care. I pledge my best to not let them down.

There is the call of conscience: redemption, expansion, healing and unity. Leadership must heed the call of
conscience, redemption, expansion, healing and unity, for they are the key to achieving our mission.

Time is neutral and does not change things.

With courage and initiative, leaders change things. No generation can choose the age or circumstances in which it is born, but through leadership it can choose to make the age in which it is born an age of enlightenment — an age of jobs and peace and justice.

Only leadership — that intangible combination of gifts, the discipline, information, circumstance, courage, timing, will and divine inspiration — can lead us out of the crisis in which we find ourselves.

Leadership can mitigate the misery of our nation. Leadership can part the waters and lead our nation in the direction of the Promised Land. Leadership can lift the boats stuck at the bottom.

I have had the rare opportunity to watch seven men, and then two, pour out their souls, offer their service and heed the call of duty to direct the course of our nation.

There is a proper season for everything. There is a time to sow and a time to reap. There is a time to compete and a time to cooperate.

I ask for your vote on the first ballot as a vote for a new direction for this party and this nation; a vote of conviction, a vote of conscience.

But I will be proud to support the nominee of this convention for the President of the United States of America.
I have watched the leadership of our party develop and grow. My respect for both Mr. Mondale and Mr. Hart is great.

I have watched them struggle with the cross-winds and cross-fires of being public servants, and I believe they will both continue to try to serve us faithfully. I am elated by the knowledge that for the first time in our history a woman, Geraldine Ferraro, will be recommended to share our ticket.

Throughout this campaign, I have tried to offer leadership to the Democratic Party and the nation.

If in my high moments, I have done some good, offered some service, shed some light, healed some wounds, rekindled some hope or stirred someone from apathy and indifference, or in any way along the way helped somebody, then this campaign has not been in vain.

For friends who loved and cared for me, and for a God who spared me, and for a family who understood, I am eternally grateful.

If in my low moments, in word, deed or attitude, through some error of temper, taste, or tone, I have caused anyone discomfort, created pain or revived someone's fears, that was not my truest self.

If there were occasions when my grape turned into a raisin and my joy bell lost its resonance, please forgive me. Charge it to my head and not my heart. My head, so limited in its finitude; my heart, is boundless in its love for the human family. I am not a perfect servant. I am a public
servant. I'm doing my best against the odds. As I develop
and serve, be patient. God is not finished with me yet.

This campaign has taught me much: that leaders must be
tough enough to fight, tender enough to cry, human enough to
make mistakes, humble enough to admit them, strong enough to
absorb the pain, and resilient enough to bounce back and keep
on moving. For leaders, the pain is often intense. But you
must smile through your tears and keep moving with the faith
that there is a brighter side somewhere.

I went to see Hubert Humphrey three days before he died.
He had just called Richard Nixon from his dying bed, and many
people wondered why. And, I asked him.

He said, "Jesse, from this vantage point, with the sun
setting in my life, all of the speeches, the political
conventions, the crowds and the great fights are behind me
now. At a time like this you are forced to deal with your
irreducible essence, forced to grapple with that which is
really important to you. And what I have concluded about
life," Hubert Humphrey said, "when all is said and done, we
must forgive each other, and redeem each other, and move on."

Our party is emerging from one of its most hard-fought
battles for the Democratic Party's presidential nomination in
our history. But our healthy competition should make us
better, not bitter. We must use the insight, wisdom and
experience of the late Hubert Humphrey as a balm for the
wounds in our party, this nation and the world. We must
forgive each other, redeem each other, regroup and move on.
Our flag is red, white and blue, but our nation is a rainbow -- red, yellow, brown, black and white -- and we're all precious in God's sight. America is not like a blanket -- one piece of unbroken cloth, the same color, the same texture, the same size. America is more like a quilt -- many patches, many pieces, many colors, many sizes, all woven and held together by a common thread.

The white, the Hispanic, the black, the Arab, the Jew, the woman, the native American, the small farmer, the businessperson, the environmentalist, the peace activist, the young, the old, the lesbian, the gay and the disabled make up the American quilt.

Even in our fractured state, all of us count and all of us fit somewhere. We have proven that we can survive without each other. But we have not proven that we can win or make progress without each other. We must come together.

From Fannie Lee Hamer in Atlantic City in 1964 to the Rainbow Coalition in San Francisco today; from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we have experienced pain but progress as we ended American apartheid laws; we got public accommodations; and we secured voting rights; we obtained open housing; as young people got the right to vote, we lost Malcolm, Martin, Medgar, Bobby and John and Viola.

The team that got us here must be expanded, not abandoned. Twenty years ago, tears welled up in our eyes as the bodies of Schwerner, Goodman and Cheney were dredged from the depths of a river in Mississippi. Twenty years later,
our communities, black and Jewish, are in anguish, anger and pain.

Feelings have been hurt on both sides. There is a crisis in communications. Confusion is in the air. We cannot afford to lose our way. We may agree to agree, or agree to disagree on issues, but we must bring back civility to these tensions.

We are co-partners in a long and rich religious history, the Judeo-Christian traditions. Many blacks and Jews have a shared passion for social justice at home and peace abroad. We must seek a revival of the spirit, inspired by a new vision and new possibilities. We must return to higher ground. We are bound by Moses and Jesus, but also connected to Islam and Mohammed.

These three great religions -- Judaism, Christianity and Islam -- were all born in the revered and holy city of Jerusalem. We are bound by Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. and Rabbi Abraham Heschel, crying out from their graves for us to reach common ground.

We are bound by shared blood and shared sacrifices. We are much too intelligent; much too bound by our Judeo-Christian heritage, much to victimized by racism, sexism, militarism and anti-Semitism; much too threatened as historical scapegoats to go on divided one from another. We must turn from finger pointing to clasped hands. We must share our burdens and our joys with each other once again.
We must turn to each other and not on each other and choose higher ground.

Twenty years later, we cannot be satisfied by just restoring the old coalition. Old wine skins must make room for new wine. We must heal and expand. The Rainbow Coalition is making room for Arab-Americans. They too know the pain and hurt of racial and religious rejection. They must not continue to be made pariahs. The Rainbow Coalition is making room for Hispanic Americans who this very night are living under the threat of the Simpson-Mazzoli bill, and farm workers from Ohio who are fighting the Campbell Soup Company with a boycott to achieve legitimate workers rights.

The Rainbow is making room for the Native Americans, the most exploited people of all, a people with the greatest moral claim amongst us. We support them as they seek the restoration of land and water rights, as they seek to preserve their ancestral homelands and the beauty of a land that was once all theirs. They can never receive a fair share for all that they have given us, but they must finally have a fair chance to develop their great resources and to preserve their people and their culture.

The Rainbow Coalition includes Asian-Americans, now being killed in our streets -- scapegoats for the failures of corporate, industrial and economic policies. The Rainbow is making room for the young Americans. Twenty years ago, our young people were dying in a war for which they could not even vote. But 20 years later, Young America has the power
to stop a war in Central America and the responsibility to vote in great numbers. Young America must be politically active in 1984. The choice is war or peace. We must make room for Young America.

The Rainbow includes disabled veterans. The color scheme fits in the Rainbow. The disabled have their handicap revealed and their genius concealed; while the able-bodied have their genius revealed and their disability concealed. But ultimately we must judge people by their values and their contribution. Don’t leave anybody out. I would rather have Roosevelt in a wheelchair than Reagan on a horse.

The Rainbow is making room for small farmers. They have suffered tremendously under the Reagan regime. They will either receive 90 percent parity or 100 percent charity. We must address their concerns and make room for them. The Rainbow includes lesbians and gays. No American citizen ought to be denied equal protection under the law.

We must by unusually committed and caring as we expand our family to include new members. All of us must be tolerant and understanding as the fears and anxieties of the rejected and of the party leadership express themselves in so many different ways. Too often we call it hate — as if it were some deeply rooted in philosophy or strategy — is simply ignorance, anxiety, paranoia, fear and insecurity. To be strong leaders, we must be long suffering as we seek to right the wrongs of our party and our nation. We must expand
our party, heal our party and unify our party. That is our mission in 1984.

We are often reminded that we live in a great nation — and we do. But it can be greater still. The Rainbow is mandating a new definition of greatness. We must not measure greatness from the mansion down, but from the manger up.

Jesus said that we should not be judged by the bark we wear, but by the fruit that we bear. Jesus said that we must measure greatness by how we treat the least of these.

President Reagan says the nation is in recovery. Those 90,000 corporations that made a profit last year but paid no Federal taxes are recovering. The 37,000 military contractors who have benefited from Reagan's more than doubling of the military budget in peacetime, surely they are recovering. The big corporations and rich individuals who received the bulk of a three-year, multibillion tax cut from Mr. Reagan are recovering. But no such recovery is under way for the least of these. Rising tides don't lift all boats, particularly those stuck at the bottom.

For the boats stuck at the bottom there's a misery index. This Administration has made life more miserable for the poor. Its attitude has been contemptuous. Its policies and programs have been cruel and unfair to working people. They must be held accountable in November for increasing infant mortality among the poor. In Detroit, one of the great cities of the Western world, babies are dying at the
same rate as Honduras, the most underdeveloped nation in our hemisphere.

This Administration must be held accountable for policies that contribute to the growing poverty in America. Under President Reagan, there are now 34 million people in poverty, 15 percent of our nation. Twenty-three million are white, 11 million black, Hispanic, Asian and others. Mostly women and children. By the end of this year, there will be 41 million people in poverty. We cannot stand idly by. We must fight for change, now.

Under this regime we look at Social Security. The 1981 budget cuts included nine permanent Social Security benefits cuts totaling $20 billion over five years.

Small businesses have suffered under Reagan tax cuts. Only 18 percent of total business tax cuts went to them — 82 percent to big business.

Health care under Mr. Reagan has been cut 25 percent.

Under Mr. Reagan there are now 9.7 million female-head families. They represent 16 percent of all families, half of all of them are poor. Seventy percent of all poor children live in a household headed by a woman, where there is no man.

Under Mr. Reagan, the administration has cleaned up only 6 of 546 priority toxic waste dumps.

Farmers' real net income was only about half its level in 1979.

Many say that the race in November will be decided in the South. President Reagan is depending on the conservative
South to return him to office. But the South, I tell you, is unnaturally conservative. The South is the poorest region in our nation and, therefore, the least to conserve. In his appeal to the South, Mr. Reagan is trying to substitute flags and prayer cloths for food and clothing and education, health care and housing. But President Reagan who ask us to pray, and I believe in prayer -- I’ve come this way by the power of prayer. But we must watch false prophesy.

He cuts energy assistance to the poor, cuts breakfast programs from children, cuts lunch programs from children, cuts job training from children and then says, when at the table, "Let us pray." Apparently, he is not familiar with the structure of a prayer. You thank the Lord for the food that you’re about to receive, not the food that just left.

I think that we should pray. But don’t pray for the food that left, pray for the man that took the food to leave. We need a change. We need a change in November.

Under Mr. Reagan, the misery index has risen for the poor, the danger index has risen for everybody.

Under this Administration, we’ve lost the lives of our boys in Central America, in Honduras, in Grenada, in Lebanon. A nuclear standoff in Europe. Under this Administration, one-third of our children believe they will die in a nuclear war. The danger index is increasing in this world.

With all the talk about a defense against Russia -- the Russian submarines are closer, and their missiles are more
accurate. We live in a world of might more miserable and a world more dangerous.

While Reaganomics and Reaganism is talked about often, so often we miss the real meaning. Reaganism is a spirit. Reaganomics represents the real economic facts of life.

In 1980, Mr. George Bush, a man with reasonable access to Mr. Reagan did an analysis of Mr. Reagan’s economic plan. Mr. George Bush concluded that Reagan’s plan was "voodoo economics." He was right. Third party candidate John Anderson said a combination of military spending, tax cuts and a balanced budget by '84 would be accomplished with blue smoke and mirrors. They were both right.

Mr. Reagan talked about a dynamic recovery. There is some measure of recovery three and a half years later. Unemployment has inched just below where it was when he took office in 1981. There are still 8.1 million people officially unemployed, 11 million working only part-time jobs. Inflation has come down, but let’s analyze for a moment who has paid the price for this superficial economic recovery.

President Reagan curbed inflation by cutting consumer demand. He cut consumer demand with conscious and callous fiscal and monetary policies. He used the Federal budget to deliberately induce unemployment and curb social spending. He then waged and supported tight monetary policies of the Federal Reserve Board to deliberately drive up interest rates — again to curb consumer demand created through borrowing.
Unemployment reached 10.7 percent; we experienced skyrocketing interest rates; our dollar inflated abroad; there were record bank failures; record farm foreclosures; record business bankruptcies; record budget deficits; record trade deficits. Mr. Reagan brought inflation down by destabilizing our economy and disrupting family life.

He promised in 1980 a balanced budget, but instead we now have a record $200 billion dollar deficit. Under Mr. Reagan, the cumulative budget deficit for his four years is more than the sum total of deficits from George Washington through Jimmy Carter combined. I tell you, we need a change.

How is he paying for these short-term jobs? Reagan’s economic recovery is being financed by deficit spending — $200 billion a year. Military spending, a major cause of this deficit, is projected, over the next five years, to be nearly $2 trillion, and will cost about $40,000 for every taxpaying family.

When the Government borrows $200 billion annually to finance the deficit, this encourages the private sector to make its money off of interest rates as opposed to development and economic growth. Even money abroad, we don’t have enough money domestically to finance the debt, so we are now borrowing money abroad, from foreign banks, governments and financial institutions: $40 billion in 1983; $70-80 billion in 1984 (40 percent of our total) in 1985.

By 1989, it is projected that 50 percent of all individual income taxes will be going just to pay for
interest on the debt. The United States used to be the largest exporter of capital, but under Mr. Reagan we will quite likely become the largest debtor nation. About two weeks ago, on July 4, we celebrated our Declaration of Independence. Yet every day, supply-side economics is making our nation more economically dependent and less economically free. Five to six percent of our gross national product is now being eaten up with President Reagan's budget deficit.

To depend on foreign military powers to protect our national security would be foolish, making us dependent and less secure. Yet Reaganomics has us increasingly dependent on foreign economic sources. This consumer-led but deficit-financed recovery is unbalanced and artificial.

We have a challenge as Democrats; support a way out. Democracy guarantees opportunity, not success. Democracy guarantees the right to participate, not a license for either the majority or minority to dominate. The victory for the rainbow coalition in the platform debates today was not whether we won or lost; but that we raised the right issues. We can afford to lose the vote; issues are negotiable. We cannot afford to avoid raising the right questions. Our self respect and our moral integrity were at stake. Our heads are perhaps bloodied but not bowed. Our backs are straight. We can go home and face our people. Our vision is clear. When we think, on this journey from slaveship to championship, we've gone from the planks of the Boardwalk in Atlantic City in 1964 to fighting to have the right planks in the platform
in San Francisco in '84. There is a deep and abiding sense of joy in our soul, despite the tears in our eyes. For while there are missing planks, there is a solid foundation upon which to build. Our party can win. But we must provide hope that will inspire people to struggle and achieve; provide a plan that shows a way out of our dilemma; and then lead the way.

In 1984, my heart is made to feel glad because I know there is a way our. Justice. The requirement for rebuilding America is justice. The linchpin of progressive politics in our nation will not come from the North, they in fact will come from the South. That is why I argue over and over again -- from Lynchburg Virginia, down to Texas, there is only one black Congressperson out of 115. Nineteen years later, we’re locked out of the Congress, the Senate and the Governor’s mansion. What does this large black vote mean. Why do I fight to end second primaries and fight gerrymandering and annexation and at large? Why do we fight over that? Because I tell you, you cannot hold someone in the ditch unless you linger there with them. If we want a change in this nation, reinforce that Voting Rights Act -- we’ll get 12 to 20 black, Hispanic, female and progressive Congresspersons from the South. We can save the cotton, but we’ve got to fight the boll weevil -- we’ve got to make a judgment.

It’s not enough to hope ERA will pass; how can we pass ERA? If blacks vote in great numbers, progressive whites win. It’s the only way progressive whites win. If blacks
vote in great numbers, Hispanics win. If blacks, Hispanics and progressive whites vote, women win. When women win, children win. When woman and children win, workers win. We must all come up together. We must come up together.

I tell you, with all of our joy and excitement, we must not save the world and lose our souls; we should never short-circuit enforcement of the Voting Rights Act at every level. If one of us rises, all of us must rise. Justice is the way out. Peace is a way out. We should not act as if nuclear weaponry is negotiable and debatable. In this world in which we live, we dropped the bomb on Japan and felt guilty. But in 1984, other folks also got bombs. This time, if we drop the bomb, six minutes later, we, too, will be destroyed. It’s not about dropping the bomb on somebody; it’s about dropping the bomb on everybody. We must choose developed minds over guided missiles, and think it out and not fight it out. It’s time for a change.

Our foreign policy must be characterized by mutual respect, not by gunboat diplomacy, bug stick diplomacy and threats. Our nation at its best feeds the hungry. Our nation at its worst will mine the harbors of Nicaragua; at its worst, will try to overthrow that government; at its worst, will cut aid to American education and increase aid to El Salvador; at its worst our nation will have partnership with South Africa. That’s a moral disgrace. It’s a moral disgrace. It’s a moral disgrace.
When we look at Africa, we cannot just focus on apartheid in southern Africa. We must fight for trade with Africa, and not just aid to Africa. We cannot stand idly by and say we will not relate to Nicaragua unless they have elections there and then embrace military regimes in Africa, overthrowing Democratic governments in Nigeria and Liberia and Ghana. We must fight for democracy all around the world, and play the game by one set of rules.

Peace in this world. Our present formula for peace in the Middle East is inadequate; it will not work. There are 22 nations in the Middle East. Our nation must be able to talk and act and influence all of them. We must build upon Camp David and measure human rights by one yardstick and as we (unintelligible) too many interests and too few friends.

There is a way out. Jobs. Put America back to work. When I was a child growing up in Greenville, South Carolina, the Rev. (unintelligible) who used to preach every so often a sermon about Jesus. He said, if I be lifted up, I’ll draw all men unto me. I didn’t quite understand what he meant as a child growing up. But I understand a little better now. If you raise up truth, it’s magnetic. It has a way of drawing people. With all this confusion in this convention -- there is bright lights and parties and big fun -- we must raise up the simple proposition: if we lift up a program to feed the hungry, they’ll come running. If we lift up a program to study war no more, our youth will come running. If we lift up a program to put America back to work, an
alternative to welfare and despair, they will come working. IF we cut that military budget without cutting our defense, and use that money to rebuild bridges and put steelworkers back to work, and use that money, and provide jobs for our citizens, and use that money to build schools and train teachers and educate our children, and build hospitals and train doctors and train nurses, the whole nation will come running to us.

As I leave you now, vote in this convention and get ready to go back across this nation in a couple of days, in this campaign, I’ll try to be faithful to my promise. I’ll live in the old barrios, and ghettos and reservations and housing projects. I have a message for our youth. I challenge them to put hope in their brains and not dope in their veins. I told them that like Jesus I, too, was born in the slum, but just because I was born in a slum does not mean the slum is born in you, and you can rise above it if your mind is made up. I told them in every slum there are two sides. When I see a broken window that’s the slummy side. Train some youth to become a glazier, that’s the sunny side. When I see a missing brick, that’s the slummy side. Let that child in a union and become a brick mason and build, that’s the sunny side. When I see a missing door, that’s the slummy side. Train some youth to become a carpenter, that’s the sunny side. When I see the vulgar words and hieroglyphics of destitution on the walls, that’s the slummy side. Train some youth to be a painter and artist, that’s the sunny side. We
need this place looking for the sunny side because there's a brighter side somewhere. I am more convinced than ever that we can win. We'll vault up the rough side of the mountain. We can win. I just want young America to do me one favor, just one favor: exercise the right to dream.

You must face reality, that which is. But then dream of the reality that ought to be, that must be. Live beyond the pain of reality with the dream of a bright tomorrow. Use hope and imagination as weapons of survival and progress. Use love to motivate you and obligate you to serve the human family.

Young America, dream. Choose the human race over the nuclear race. Bury the weapons and don't burn the people. Dream. Dream of a new value system. Teachers who teach for life and not just for a living, teach because they can't help it. Dream of lawyers more concerned about justice than a judgeship. Dream of doctors more concerned about public health than personal wealth. Dream of preachers and priests who will prophesy and not just profiteer. Preach and dream. Our time has come.

Our time has come. Suffering breeds character. Character breeds faith. And in the end, faith will not disappoint.

Our time has come. Our faith, hope and dreams will prevail. Our time has come. Weeping has endured for night. And, now joy cometh in the morning.

Our time has come. No grave can hold our body down.

Our time has come. No lie can live forever.
Our time has come. We must leave the racial battle ground and come to the economic common ground and moral higher ground. America, our time has come.

We come from disgrace to Amazing Grace. Our time has come.

Give me your tired, give me your poor, your huddled masses who learn to breathe free and come November, there will be a change because our time has come.

Thank you and God bless you.
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Five hundred days ago, I began my quest for the Presidency, a quest with many ideas but with one driving theme — that our party and our nation need new leadership, new directions and new hope.

Since that day, during months of struggle and against great odds, millions of Democrats have joined this cause, and together we stand tonight at the gates of change.

Since my earliest student volunteer days 24 years ago, I have shared the ideal that one person can make a difference, and that every person should try. Together, you and I have tried — and together, we have made a difference.

Whatever this convention's judgment, Lee, Andrea, John and I are eternally grateful to all of you who helped make our dream come true.

To our delegates who have given the word "loyalty" new meaning, to the thousands of Americans across this land who opened your homes to us, to the tens of thousands who have distributed leaflets and contributed dollars, to the millions who voted for us, you have our deepest gratitude and affection. By your acts of dedication and faith you have created a new legacy of hope — the hope that people, far more than politicians and pundits, still make the difference.
To all of you [who] have joined our cause to make this a better nation and a better world, I say with the poet: "Think where man's glory most begins and ends, and say my glory was I had such friends."

To my outstanding competitors -- to John Glenn, Fritz Hollings and Reubin Askew, to George McGovern and Alan Cranston -- your contribution to the revival of our party was enormous. You make us proud to be Democrats.

To Jesse Jackson, you have been this party's voice for the voiceless, the shut-out and the let-down.

To Fritz Mondale, my friend and colleague, you have honored me by being an opponent of unsurpassed grit, perseverance and determination.

To Geraldine Ferraro, a true political pioneer, I only regret that I did not pick you first.

To the Republicans, I say this: Take no comfort from this Democratic family tussle. Ronald Reagan has provided all the unity we need. Not one of us is going to sit this campaign out. You have made the stakes too high.

And to the Democrats in this hall, in a few moments you will make one of the most important decisions of your lives. You will decide which candidate has the best chance to defeat Ronald Reagan and become the next President of the United States.

Whatever the outcome of your decision, I make to you two pledges: First, that I will devote every waking hour and every ounce of energy to the defeat of Ronald Reagan; and
second, that I will continue to work for the good of our party and our country.

This is on Hart you will not leave in San Francisco.

This is not simply another national election, a choice between parties or even a contest of ideologies. This election is a referendum on our future -- perhaps even whether our children will have a future.

For we meet at an urgent national hour, when all seems well but few are content. Upon this convention’s actions will rest not simply our party’s success, but our nation’s destiny.

That’s why this critical challenge to recapture the White House and redirect our destiny transcends partisan politics. It creates in each of us -- as Americans, not simply Democrats -- a moral imperative. For as long as we live, history and coming generations will ask: Did you do everything you could to defeat Ronald Reagan?

The stakes in 1984 could not be higher, for ourselves and for our children.

Ronald Reagan must not have four more years in which he will not be answerable to the American people.

Consider, as we must, the costs of a second Reagan term: Do you want Ronald Reagan to appoint the next Supreme Court? Do you want Ronald Reagan to have four more years to sell off our environment to the highest bidder? Do you want Ronald Reagan to have four more years to turn his back on civil rights for minorities and equal rights for women?
Can we allow Ronald Reagan to keep on undermining the rights of organized labor?

Can we allow Ronald Reagan to send our sons to die without cause in another Lebanon, or to serve as bodyguards for dictators in Central America?

Can we continue to tolerate a President who urges us to love our country but hate our Government?

Most important of all, can we allow Ronald Reagan four more years to accelerate a dangerous and unnecessary nuclear arms race?

We must defeat Ronald Reagan. And, we must replace the economic royalists. But we must also offer a new generation of ideas to a new generation of voters.

Adlai Stevenson said it best: "What counts is not so much what we are against, as what we are for."

We Democrats are for an opportunity economy, with women as equal partners; so much for equality and justice that our sense of urgency demands immediate ratification of the equal rights amendment; for school lunches for our children and health care for the elderly, paid for by canceled weapons contracts; for a clean environment, without toxic terrorism; for campaigns free of the influence of political action committee money; for reformed and ready conventional defenses, and for an end to the folly that nuclear weapons create security.

And this is one Democrat who is ready to lead our party in recapturing the issue of a sound defense. I say this to
the President: Mr. Reagan, the American flag does not belong to you and the right-wing Republicans. It belongs to all the people.

But to achieve our goals, our party and nation must disenthrall themselves from the policies of the comfortable past that do not answer the challenges of tomorrow. The times change, and we must change with them. For the worst sin in political affairs is not to be mistaken, but to be irrelevant.

There are certain facts we must face. Compassion is based on justice. Justice requires resources. Resources flow from opportunity. Opportunity is produced by creative policies. And the creative policies of our times must come, and will come, from the new leadership of the Democratic Party.

Our party’s greatest heritage is its willingness to change. We have failed when we became cautious and complacent. We have won America’s confidence when we were bold and innovative.

Our party’s great experimenter, Franklin Roosevelt, said it best at a critical hour at the dawn of his Presidency: "We will try something, and if it works we will keep it. If it doesn’t, let’s try something else."

The Democratic Party must continue to be the party of hope, not the party of memory.

To honor this tradition of change in the 1980’s and 90’s, our party must propose new solutions for new times. We
need nothing less than a blueprint for a new democracy. We must rebuild the foundation of this nation's economy, not merely patch over its widening cracks.

We must adopt an industrial policy to modernize our manufacturing base, re-employing dislocated workers to rebuild our urban infrastructure.

And especially, we must invest in education, training and research to guarantee American leadership in trade and technology.

But we have also reached a stage in human development where opportunity is inextricably joined to brain-power, not horsepower. Our greatest asset, the human mind, must be trained and equipped for the jobs of tomorrow.

If this nation is to become the world's leading industrial democracy and offer a bridge to emerging nations and their leaders, we have no choice but to become not the arsenal of the world, but the university of the world.

A healthy economy cannot grow in a dirty environment. So I challenge this party and this nation to dedicate ourselves to a new environmental decade -- a decade in which we end contamination by acid rain, clean up every toxic waste dump and become the faithful stewards of our national heritage.

Ronald Reagan and his pack of greedy polluters can no longer piously sing "America the Beautiful" while they scar her face, poison her air and corrupt her waters. Let them
remember that, while we inherit this land from our parents, we merely borrow it from our children.

And it is for those children that we must learn to trade proposals, not insults, with our foreign adversaries. For we can create a world where conflict and crisis between East and West are resolved not on the battlefield, but at the bargaining table.

What possible greater gift can we offer our children than a more safe, sane and secure world?

What could more insure that world than a President committed to a negotiated freeze on all nuclear weapons and the material used to make them? I have that commitment, and an equal commitment to a negotiated ban on weapons in space, a comprehensive test ban treaty, elimination of all new nuclear systems in Europe and secure means to prevent the use of nuclear weapons through accident, miscalculation or terrorism.

A nuclear freeze today can prevent a nuclear winter tomorrow.

Just as our predecessors had the vision, the faith and the energy to explore this continent, to preserve our Union and to wage two world wars against aggression, so we today must share a vision — a vision of the day, in our time, when we dispel at last the nuclear nightmares that haunt our children, and conquer the nuclear demon that haunts the earth.

And let us abolish not only the threat of a nuclear holocaust, but the blight of human hunger as well.
This Administration cannot cure a problem that it will not see. But the next Administration must set two achievable goals: to end hunger in America in this decade, and to challenge the Soviet Union to join us in a crusade to end hunger in this world in this century.

These are the great challenges we must be ready to conquer.

For a new generation of Americans is coming of age -- a generation that has unique bonds of tragedy and triumph. Our generation witnessed the deaths of John and Robert Kennedy and Martin Luther King. We witnessed the tragedies of Vietnam and Watergate.

But we also marched together in movements that altered the course of American history: the civil rights movement, the women's movement, the environmental movement, the peace movement -- and we will make history yet again.

Many of us were drawn to public service by the most inspiring President of our time, "Let the word go forth from this time and place," he said, "that the torch has been passed to a new generation of Americans."

Today the torch from the Statue of Liberty has been taken down. And if our Government continues to replace the words "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free," with "What's in it for me, tighten your belts and show us your identification card," then they may as well leave that torch on the ground.
Our campaign has tried to lift and light that torch -- a torch of hope beyond the mundane politics of the moment, a torch of hope beyond the old arrangements and the favored alliances, a torch of hope, in this urgent hour, that parties can change, that leaders can change, that this nation can change.

This campaign has sought to touch that particular idealism that identifies us as Americans, to keep alive the belief that each person can make a difference.

For I see an America in our time where greed, self-interest and division are conquered by idealism, the common good and the national interest.

I see an America too young to quit, too courageous to turn back, with a passion for justice and a program for opportunity, and America with unmet dreams that will not die.

Tonight the torch of idealism is lit in thousands of towns and tens of thousands of lives, among the young in spirit and the young in age. It cannot go out. It will not go out. It will continue to burn.

And because of that fire of commitment and hope, we will change the world. Many who before had said, "It doesn't matter, there's nothing I can do," will now say, "One person can make a difference, and every person should try."

So we will never give up.

For somewhere out there, in some small town, in some young life, the torch is lit. And someday that young person, perhaps as President, will change the world. But even if
not, that person will see that the torch is passed to yet another generation.

And, if not now, some day, we must prevail.

In not now, some day, we will prevail.
Tonight we pause and give praise and honor to God for being good enough to allow us to be at this place at this time. When I look out at this convention, I see the face of America, red, yellow, brown, black, and white, we're all precious in God's sight -- the real rainbow coalition. All of us, all of us who are here and think that we are seated. But we're really standing on someone's shoulders. Ladies and gentlemen. Mrs. Rosa Parks.

The mother of the civil rights movement.

I want to express my deep love and appreciation for the support my family has given me over these past months. They have endured pain, anxiety, threat and fear. But they have been strengthened and made secure by a faith in God, in America and in you.

Your love has protected us and made us strong.

To my wife Jackie, the foundation of our family; to our five children whom you met tonight; to my mother Mrs. Helen Jackson, who is present tonight; and to my grandmother, Mrs. Matilda Burns; my brother Chuck and his family; my mother-in-law, Mrs. Gertrude Brown, who just last month at age 61 graduated from Hampton Institute, a marvelous achievement; I offer my appreciation to Mayor Andrew Young who has provided such gracious hospitality to all of us this week.
And a special salute to President Jimmy Carter. President Carter restored honor to the White House after Watergate. He gave many of us a special opportunity to grow. For his kind words, for his unwavering commitment to peace in the world and the voters that came from his family, every member of his family, led by Billy and Amy, I offer him my special thanks, special thanks to the Carter family.

My right and my privilege to stand here before you has been won -- in my lifetime -- by the blood and the sweat of the innocent.

Twenty-four years ago, the late Fanny Lou Hamer and Aaron Henry -- who sits here tonight from Mississippi -- were locked out on the streets of Atlantic City, the head of the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party.

But tonight, a black and white delegation from Mississippi is headed by Ed Cole, a black man, from Mississippi, 24 years later.

Many were lost in the struggle for the right to vote. Jimmy Lee Jackson, a young student, gave his life. Viola Luizzo, a white mother from Detroit, called nigger lover, and brains blown out at point blank range.

Schwerner, Goodman and Chaney -- two Jews and a black -- found in a common grave, bodies riddled with bullets in Mississippi. The four darling little girls in the church in Birmingham, Alabama. They died that we might have a right to live.
Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. lies only a few miles from us tonight.

Tonight he must feel good as he looks down upon us. We sit here tonight, a rainbow, a coalition -- the sons and daughters of slave masters and the sons and daughters of slaves sitting together around a common table, to decide the direction of our party and our country. His heart would be full tonight.

As a testament to the struggles of those who have gone before; as a legacy for those who will come after; as a tribute to the endurance, the patience, the courage of our forefathers and mothers; as an assurance that their prayers are being answered, their work has not been in vain, and hope is eternal; tomorrow night my name will go into nomination for the presidency of the United States of America.

We meet tonight at a crossroads, a point of decision.

Shall we expand, be inclusive, find unity and power; or suffer division and impotence.

We come to Atlanta, the cradle of the old South, the crucible of the new South.

Tonight there is a sense of celebration because we are moved, fundamentally moved, from racial battlegrounds by law, to economic common ground, tomorrow we will challenge to move to higher ground.

Common ground.

Think of Jerusalem -- the intersection where many trails met. A small village that became the birthplace for three
great religions -- Judaism, Christianity and Islam. Why was this village so blessed? Because it provided a crossroads where different people met, different cultures, and different civilizations could meet and find common ground.

When people come together, flowers always flourish and the air is rich with the aroma of a new spring.

Take New York, the dynamic metropolis. What makes New York so special?

It is the invitation of the Statue of Liberty -- give me your tired, you poor, you huddled masses who yearn to breathe free.

Not restricted to English only.

Many people, many cultures, many languages -- with one thing in common, the yearn to breathe free.

Common ground!

Tonight in Atlanta, for the first time in this century we convene in the South.

A state where governors once stood in school house doors. Where Julian Bond was denied his seat in the state legislature because of his conscientious objection to the Vietnam War.

A city that, through its five black universities, has graduated more black students than any city in the world.

Atlanta, now a modern intersection of the new South.

Common ground!

That is the challenge to our party tonight.
Left wing. Right wing. Progress will not come through boundless liberalism nor static conservatism, but at the critical mass of mutual survival. It takes two wings to fly.

Whether you’re a hawk or a dove, you’re just a bird living in the same environment, in the same world.

The Bible teaches that when lions and lambs lie down together, none will be afraid and there will be peace in the valley. It sounds impossible. Lions eat lambs. Lambs sensibly flee from lions. But even lions and lambs find common ground. Why?

Because neither lions nor lambs want the forest to catch on fire. Neither lions nor lambs want acid rain to fall. Neither lions nor lambs can survive nuclear war. If lions and lambs can find common ground, surely, we can as well, as civilized people.

The only time that we win is when we come together. In 1960, John Kennedy, the late John Kennedy, beat Richard Nixon by only 112,000 votes -- less than one vote per precinct. He won by the margin of our hope. He brought us together. He reached out. He had the courage to defy his advisors and inquire about Dr. King’s jailing in Albany, Georgia. We won by the margin of our hope, inspired by courageous leadership.

In 1964, Lyndon Johnson brought both wings together. The thesis, the antithesis and to create a synthesis and together we won.

In 1976, Jimmy Carter unified us again and we won. When we do not come together, we never win.
In 1968, division and despair in July led to our defeat in November.

In 1980, rancor in the spring and summer led to Reagan in the fall. When we divide, we cannot win. We must find common ground as a basis for survival and development and change and growth.

Today when we debated, differed, deliberated, agreed to agree, agreed to disagree, when we had the good judgment to argue our case and then not self-destruct, George Bush was just a little further away from the White House and little closer to private life.

Tonight, I salute Governor Michael Dukakis.

He has run a well-managed and dignified campaign. No matter how tired or how tried, he always resisted the temptation to stoop to demagoguery.

I've watched a good mind fast at work, with steel nerves, guiding his campaign out of the crowded field without appeal to the worst in us. I've watched his perspective grow as his environment has expanded. I've seen his toughness and tenacity close up. I know his commitment to public service.

Mike Dukakis' parents were a doctor and a teacher; my parents, a maid, a beautician and a janitor.

There's a great gap between Brookline, Massachusetts and Haney Street, the Fieldcrest Village housing projects in Greenville, South Carolina.

He studied law; I studied theology. There are differences of religion, region, and race; differences in
experiences and perspectives. But the genius of America is that out of the many, we become one.

Providence has enabled our paths to intersect. His foreparents came to America on immigrant ships; my foreparents came to America on slave ships. But whatever the original ships, we’re in the same boat tonight.

Our ships could pass in the night if we have a false sense of independence, or they could collide and crash. We would lose our passengers. But we can seek a higher reality and a greater good apart. We can drift on the broken pieces of Reaganomics, satisfy our baser instincts, and exploit the fears of our people. At our highest, we can call upon noble instincts and navigate this vessel to safety. The greater good is the common good.

As Jesus said, "Not my will, but thine be done." It was his way of saying there’s a higher good beyond personal comfort or position.

The good of our nation is at stake -- its commitment to working men and women, to the poor and the vulnerable, to the many in the world. With so many guided missiles, and so much misguided leadership, the stakes are exceedingly high. Our choice, full participation in a Democratic government, or more abandonment and neglect. And so this night, we choose not a false sense of independence, not our capacity to survive and endure.

Tonight we choose interdependency in our capacity to act and unite for the greater good. The common good is finding
commitment to new priorities, to expansion and inclusion. A commitment to expanded participation in the Democratic Party at every level. A commitment to a shared national campaign strategy and involvement at every level. A commitment to new priorities that ensure that hope will be kept alive. A common ground commitment for a legislative agenda by empowerment for the John Conyers bill, universal, on-site, same-day registration everywhere -- and commitment to D.C. statehood and empowerment -- D.C. deserves statehood. A commitment to economic set-asides, a commitment to the Dellums bill for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, a shared commitment to a common direction.

Common ground. Easier said than done. Where do you find common ground at the point of challenge? This campaign has shown that politics need not be marketed by politicians, packaged by pollsters and pundits. Politics can be a marvel arena where people come together, define common ground.

We find common ground at the plant gate that closes on workers without notice. We find common ground at the farm auction where a good farmer loses his or her land to bad loans or diminishing markets. Common ground at the schoolyard where teachers cannot get adequate pay, and students cannot get a scholarship and can't make a loan. Common ground, at the hospital admitting room where somebody tonight is dying because they cannot afford to go upstairs to a bed that's empty, waiting for someone with insurance to get sick. We are a better nation than that. We must do better.
Common ground. What is leadership if not present help in a time of crisis? And so I met you at the point of challenge in Jay, Maine where paper workers were striking for fair wages; in Greenfield, Iowa, where family farmers struggle for a fair price; in Cleveland, Ohio, where working women seek comparable worth; in McFarland, California, where the children of Hispanic farm workers may be dying from poison land, dying in clusters with Cancer; in the AIDS hospice in Houston, Texas, where the sick support one another, 12 are rejected by their own parents and friends.

Common ground.

America's not a blanket woven from one thread, one color, one cloth. When I was a child growing up in Greenville, South Carolina, and grandmother could not afford a blanket, she didn't complain and we did not freeze. Instead, she took pieces of old cloth -- patches, wool, silk, gabardine, crockersack on the patches -- barely good enough to wipe off you shoes with.

But they didn't stay that way very long. With sturdy hands and a strong cord, she sewed them together into a quilt, a thing of beauty and power and culture.

Now, Democrats, we must build such a quilt. Farmers, you seek fair prices and you are right, but you cannot stand alone. Your patch is not big enough. Workers, you fight for fair wages. You are right. But your patch labor is not big enough. Women, you seek comparable worth and pay equity. You are right. But your patch is not big enough. Women,
mothers, who seek Head Start and day care and pre-natal care on the front side of life, rather than jail care and welfare on the back side of life, you’re right, but your patch is not big enough.

Students, you seek scholarships. You are right. But your patch is not big enough. Blacks and Hispanics, when we fight for civil rights, we are right, but our patch is not big enough. Gays and lesbians, when you fight against discrimination and a cure for AIDS, you are right, but your patch is not big enough. Conservatives and progressives, when you fight for what you believe, right-wing, left-wing, hawk, dove, -- you are right, from your point of view, but your point of view is not big enough.

But don’t despair. Be as wise as my grandmama. Pool the patches and the pieces together, bound by a common thread. When we form a great quilt of unity and common ground we’ll have the power to bring about health care and housing and jobs and education and hope to our nation.

We the people can win. We stand at the end of a long dark night of reaction. We stand tonight united in a commitment to a new direction. For almost eight years, we’ve been led by those who view social good coming from private interest, who viewed public life as a means to increase private wealth. They have been prepared to sacrifice the common good of the many to satisfy the private interest and the wealth of a few. We believe in a government that’s a tool of our
democracy in service to the public, not an instrument of the aristocracy in search of private wealth.

We believe in government with the consent of the governed of, for, and by the people. We must not emerge into a new day with a new direction. Reaganomics, based on the belief that the rich had too much money -- too little money, and the poor had too much.

That's classic Reaganomics. It believes that the poor had too much money and the rich had too little money.

So, they engaged in reverse Robin Hood -- took from the poor, gave to the rich, paid for by the middle class. We cannot stand four more years of Reaganomics in any version, in any disguise.

How do I document that case? Seven years later, the richest 1 percent of our society pays 20 percent less in taxes; the poorest 10 percent pay 20 percent more. Reaganomics.

Reagan gave the rich and powerful a multibillion-dollar party. Now, the party is over. He expects the people to pay for the damage. I take this principled position -- convention, let us not raise taxes on the poor and the middle class, but those who had the party, the rich and powerful, must pay for the party!

I just want to take common sense to high places. We're spending $150 billion a year defending Europe and Japan 43 years after the war is over. We have more troops in Europe tonight than we had seven years ago, yet the threat of war is
ever more remote. Germany and Japan are now creditor nations -- that means they’ve got a surplus. We are a debtor nation -- that means we are in debt.

Let them share more of the burden of their own defense -- use some of that money to build decent housing!
Use some of that money to educate our children!
Use some of that money for long-term health care!
Use some of that money to wipe out these slums and put America back to work!

I just want to take common sense to high places. If we can bail out Europe and Japan, if we can bail out Continental Bank and Chrysler -- and Mr. Iacocca makes $8,000 an hour, we can bail out the family farmer.

I just want to make common sense. It does not make sense to close down 650,000 family farms in this country while importing food from abroad subsidized by the U.S. government.

Let’s make sense. It does not make sense to be escorting oil tankers up and down the Persian Gulf paying $2.50 for every $1.00 worth of oil we bring out while oil wells are capped in Texas, Oklahoma and Louisiana. I just want to make sense.

Leadership must meet the moral challenge of its day. What’s the moral challenge of our day? We have public accommodations. We have the right to vote. We have open housing.

What’s the fundamental challenge of our day? It is to end economic violence. Plant closing without notice,
economic violence. Even the greedy do not profit long from greed. Economic violence. Most poor people are not lazy. They’re not black. They’re not brown. They’re mostly white, and female and young.

But whether white, black or brown, the hungry baby’s belly turned inside out is the same color. Call it pain. Call it hurt. Call it agony. Most poor people are not on welfare.

Some of them are illiterate and can’t read the want-ad sections. And when they can, they can’t find a job that matches their address. They work hard every day, I know. I live amongst them. I’m one of them.

I know they work. I’m a witness. They catch the early bus. They work every day. They raise other people’s children. The work every day. They clean the streets. They work every day. They drive vans with cabs. They work every day. They change the beds you slept in these hotels last night and can’t get a union contract. They work every day.

No more. They’re not lazy. Someone must defend them because it’s right, and they cannot speak for themselves. They work in hospitals. I know they do. They wipe the bodies of those who are sick with fever and pain. They empty their bedpans. They clean out their commode. No job is beneath them, and yet when they get sick, they cannot lie in the bed they made up every day. America, that is not right. We are a better nation than that. We are a better nation than that.
We need a real war on drugs. You can't just say no. It's deeper than that. You can't just get a palm reader or an astrologer; it's more profound than that. We're spending $150 billion on drugs a year. We've gone from ignoring it to focusing on the children. Children cannot buy $150 billion worth of drugs a year. A few high profile athletes — athletes are not laundering $150 billion a year — bankers are.

I met the children in Watts who are unfortunate in their despair. Their grapes of hope have become raisins of despair, and they're turning to each other and they're self destructing -- but I stayed with them all night long. I wanted to hear their case. They said, "Jesse Jackson, as you challenge us to say no to drugs, you're right. And to not sell them, you're right. And to not use these guns, you're right."

And, by the way, the promise of CETA -- they displaced CETA. They did not replace CETA. We have neither jobs nor houses nor services nor training -- no way out. Some of us take drugs as anesthesia for our pain. Some take drugs as a way of pleasure -- both short-term pleasure and long-term pain. Some sell drugs to make money. It's wrong, we know. But you need to know that we know. We can go and buy the drugs by the boxes at the port. If we can buy the drugs at the port, don't you believe the federal government can stop it if they want to?
They say, "We don’t have Saturday night specials any more." They say, "We buy AK-47s and Uzis, the latest lethal weapons. We buy them across the counter on Long Beach Boulevard." You cannot fight a war on drugs unless and until you are going to challenge the bankers and the gun sellers and those who grow them. Don’t just focus on the children, let’s stop drugs at the level of supply and demand. We must end the scourge on the American culture.

Leadership. What difference will we make? Leadership cannot just go along to get along. We must do more than change presidents. We must change direction. Leadership must face the moral challenge of our day. The nuclear war build-up is irrational. Strong leadership cannot desire to look tough, and let that stand in the way of the pursuit of peace. Leadership must reverse the arms race.

At least we should pledge no first use. Why? Because first use beget first retaliation, and that’s mutual annihilation. That’s not a rational way out. No use at all -- let’s think it out, and not fight it out, because it’s an unwinnable fight. Why hold a card that you can never drop? Let’s give peace a chance.

Leadership -- we now have this marvelous opportunity to have a breakthrough with the Soviets. Last year, 200,000 Americans visited the Soviet Union. There’s a chance for joint ventures into space, not Star Wars and the war arms escalation, but a space defense initiative. Let’s build in
space together, and demilitarize the heavens. There's a way out.

America, let us expand. When Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbatchev met, there was a big meeting. They represented together one-eighth of the human race. Seven-eighths of the human race was locked out of that room. Most people in the world tonight -- half are Asian, one-half of them are Chinese. There are 22 nations in the Middle East. There's Europe; 40 million Latin Americans next door to us; the Caribbean; Africa -- a half billion people. Most people in the world today are yellow or brown or black, non-Christian, poor, female, young, and don't speak English -- in the real world.

This generation must offer leadership to the real world. We're losing ground in Latin America, the Middle East, South Africa, because we're not focusing on the real world, that real world. We must use basic principles, support international law. We stand the most to gain from it. Support human rights; we believe in that. Support self-determination; we'll build on that. Support economic development; you know it's right. Be consistent, and gain our moral authority in the world.

I challenge you tonight, my friends, let's be bigger and better as a nation and as a party. We have basic challenges. Freedom in South Africa -- we've already agreed as Democrats to declare South Africa to be a terrorist state. But don't just stop there. Get South Africa out of Angola. Free
Nambia. Support the front-line states. We must have a new, humane human rights assistance policy in Africa.

I'm often asked, "Jesse, why do you take on these tough issues? They're not very political. We can't win that way."

If an issue is morally right, it will eventually be political. It may be political and never by right. Fannie Lou Hamer didn't have the most votes in Atlantic City, but her principles have outlasted every delegate who voted to lock her out. Rosa Parks did not have the most votes, but she was morally right. Dr. King didn't have the most votes about the Vietnam war, but he was morally right. If we're principled first, our politics will fall into place.

Jesse, why did you take these big bold initiatives? A poem by an unknown author went something like this: We mastered the air, we've conquered the sea, and annihilated distance and prolonged life, we were not wise enough to live on this earth without war and without hate.

As for Jesse Jackson, I'm tired of sailing by little boat, far inside the harbor bay. I want to go out where the big ships float, out on the deep where the great ones are. And should my frail craft prove too slight, the waves that sweep those billows o'er, I'd rather go down in a stirring fight than drown to death in the sheltered shore.

We've got to go out, my friends, where the big boats are.

And then, for our children, young America, hold your head high now. We can win. We must not lose you to drugs
and violence, premature pregnancy, suicide, cynicism, pessimism and despair. We can win.

Wherever you are tonight, I challenge you to hope and to dream. Don’t submerge your dreams. Exercise above all else, even on drugs, dream of the day you’re drug free. Even in the gutter, dream of the day that you’ll be up on your feet again. You must never stop dreaming. Face reality, yes. But don’t stop with the way things are; dream of things as they ought to be. Dream. Face pain, but love, hope, faith, and dreams will help you rise above the pain.

Use hope and imagination as weapons of survival and progress, but you keep on dreaming, young America. Dream of peace. Peace is rational and reasonable. War is irrational in this age and unwinnable.

Dream of teachers who teach for life and not for living. Dream of doctors who are concerned more about public health than private wealth. Dream of lawyers more concerned about justice than a judgeship. Dream of preachers who are concerned more about prophecy than profiteering. Dream on the high road of sound values.

And in America, as we go forth to September, October and November and then beyond, America must never surrender to a high moral challenge.

Do not surrender to drugs. The best drug policy is a no first use. Don’t surrender with needles and cynicism. Let’s have no first use on the one hand, or clinics on the other. Never surrender, young America.
Go forward. America must never surrender to malnutrition. We can feed the hungry and clothe the naked. We must never surrender. We must go forward. We must never surrender to illiteracy. Invest in our children. Never surrender; and go forward.

We must never surrender to inequality. Women cannot compromise ERA or comparable worth. Women are making 60 cents on the dollar to what a man makes. Women cannot buy meat cheaper. Women cannot buy bread cheaper. Women cannot buy milk cheaper. Women deserve to get paid for the work that you do. It’s right and it’s fair.

Don’t surrender, my friends. Those who have AIDS tonight, you deserve our compassion. Even with AIDS you must not surrender in your wheelchairs. I see you sitting here tonight in those wheelchairs. I’ve stayed with you. I’ve reached out to you across our nation. Don’t you give up. I know it’s tough sometimes. People look down on you. It took you a little more effort to get here tonight.

And no one should look down on you, but sometimes mean people do. The only justification we have for looking down on someone is that we’re going to stop and pick them up. But even in your wheelchairs, don’t you give up. We cannot forget 50 years ago when our backs were against the wall, Roosevelt was in a wheelchair. I would rather have Roosevelt in a wheelchair than Reagan and Bush on a horse. Don’t you surrender and don’t you give up.
Don’t surrender and don’t give up. Why can I challenge you this way? Jesse Jackson, you don’t understand my situation. You be on television. You don’t understand. I see you with the big people. You don’t understand my situation. I understand. You’re seeing me on TV but you don’t know the me that makes me, me. They wonder why does Jesse run, because they see me running for the White House. They don’t see the house I’m running from.

I have a story. I wasn’t always on television. Writers were not always outside my door. When I was born late one afternoon, October 8th, in Greenville, South Carolina, no writers asked my mother her name. Nobody chose to write down our address. My mama was not supposed to make it. And I was not supposed to make it. You see, I was born to a teen-age mother who was born to a teen-age mother.

I understand. I know abandonment and people being mean to you, and saying you’re nothing and nobody, and can never be anything. I understand. Jesse Jackson is my third name. I’m adopted. When I had no name, my grandmother gave me her name. My name was Jesse Burns until I was 12. So I wouldn’t have a blank space, she gave me a name to hold me over. I understand when nobody knows your name. I understand when you have no name. I understand.

I wasn’t born in the hospital. Mama didn’t have insurance. I was born in the bed at home. I really do understand. Born in a three-room house, bathroom in the backyard, slop jar by the bed, no hot and cold running water.
I understand. Wallpaper used for decoration? No. For a windbreaker. I understand. I'm a working person's person, that's why I understand you whether you're black or white.

I understand work. I was not born with a silver spoon in my mouth. I had a shovel programmed for my hand. My mother, a working woman. So many days she went to work early with runs in her stockings. She knew better, but she wore runs in her stockings so that my brother and I could have matching socks and not be laughed at school.

I understand. At 3 o'clock on Thanksgiving Day we could not eat turkey because mama was preparing someone else's turkey at 3 o'clock. We had to play football to entertain ourselves and then around 6 o'clock she would get off the Alta Vista bus; then we would bring up the leftovers and eat our turkey -- leftovers, the carcass, the cranberries around 8 o'clock at night. I really do understand.

Every one of these funny labels they put on you, those of you who are watching this broadcast tonight in the projects, on the corners, I understand. Call you outcast, low down, you can't make it, you're nothing, you're from nobody, subclass, underclass -- when you see Jesse Jackson, when my name goes in nomination, your name goes in nomination.

I was born in the slum, but the slum was not born in me. And it wasn't born in you, and you can make it. Wherever you are tonight you can make it. Hold your head high, stick your chest out. You can make it. It gets dark sometimes, but the
morning comes. Don’t you surrender. Suffering breeds character. Character breeds faith. In the end faith will not disappoint.

You must not surrender. You may or may not get there, but just know that you’re qualified and you hold on and hold out. We must never surrender. America will get better and better. Keep hope alive. Keep hope alive. Keep hope alive. On tomorrow night and beyond, keep hope alive.

I love you very much. I love you very much.
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I want to thank all of you across this campaign and all of you across this convention hall that made it possible for this campaign to get here. And I want to thank one other person who is not here tonight, and who is missing his first convention since the depression. A man who beat Richard Nixon in 1962, and almost stopped Ronald Reagan 1966, and in my view is the greatest Democrat in this country -- my father, Pat Brown. Dad, thanks a lot for everything you’ve done. Give him a round of applause. He’s given his whole life to this Democratic party which we all love.

Almost a year ago when this journey began, it was evident that we faced not merely another election, but the deepening crisis of democracy itself. What was at stake was nothing less than the life of our nation -- its soul, its core principles, the last vessel on earth. President Lincoln faced crisis too. It led to a bloody civil war triggered by the secession of one third of the states. Today, half the people, individually have seceded from our political democracy because they don’t believe their vote makes any difference. Yea, they’re out there, and we’ve got to go get them back. Now those of us, those of us on the inside find it easy to fall into the complacent allusion that we’re making change when we engage in politics and speak of change.
But the growing skepticism and discontent in every corner of America with the party system and the refusal to vote on the part of the majority has to sound an alarm for all who care to listen. You know, and everyone watching knows, that effective government is breaking down, that the system is paralyzed, and as a result, our society deteriorates. Even to convene here, the homeless had to be swept off the streets and out of sight. Tonight, one out of every five of our children lives in poverty. Millions of their parents are laboring for $4.25 an hour. Men and women who have worked their whole lives are sitting idle as smug custodians of global finance move their jobs to Mexico.

The air, the soil, the water are poisoned for profits sake. And the future of our grandchildren is stolen to pay for those bloated arms industry ever to exist in a time of peace. And it’s not right.

Instead of government by the people, and for the people, and of the people, President Bush and his allies give us government of, by, and for the privileged. It’s not citizens who carry the day, but the growing concentration of wealth beyond any boundary of nation or conscience and its influence over our governing institutions through money.

Whatever nice programs we speak of, whatever dreams we share, unless the basic fact of unchecked power and privilege is acknowledge and courageously challenged, nothing will ever change.
President Bush talks of A.F.D.C. — Aid to Family with Dependent Children — as though these thoroughly powerless people caused our present predicament. Yet he and his reactionary allies hypocritically overlook the real A.F.D.C. — Aid to Financially Dependent Corporations. They allowed subsidies, loan guarantees, giveaways of natural resources and our public lands, tax breaks. Just add them up. Tens of billions of dollars of federal well payments — federal welfare payments to well connected corporations. It’s far more than all the welfare mothers put together could ever dream of, much less obtain through the paltry payments they receive every month.

In recent months, President Bush has demanded, so far unsuccessfu[lly, ten billion dollars in debt forgiveness that the nuclear power utilities owe Uncle Sam for uranium enrichment. At the same time, Bush and his Republican allies are fighting against fully funding Head Start, the auto safety agency, infant nutrition, immunization programs, drinking water safety programs, the meat and poultry inspection service, the occupational health and safety agency, and critical federal cancer prevention programs. All these efforts to save life and promote health are less than three quarters of the money that Bush wants to give in forgiveness to those utilities. Again, it’s the Democrats who are stopping the give away. And together we will fight to stop giveaways and fight for the people we serve.
In the New Hampshire primary, a woman stood up in a town meeting asking about jobs for her unemployed neighbors. She said they wanted to work as teachers and nurses aides and they didn’t want much. They would be glad to work for $5.50 an hour. That shocked me when she stood up at that town meeting. But local officials, she said, said there was no federal money. Yet the Resolution Trust Company of that same federal government was ladling out six hundred dollars an hour to pay one lawyer, working a few dozen blocks from here, to clean up the S & L mess that a lot of lawyers, investment bankers, and politicians created in the first place.

And so, when I heard that woman speak, it really hit me. It was not lack of federal money, it was lack of firm political power. And that power for the powerless is what we’ve come here to create, and create it we will. Whatever the odds, whoever the adversaries, however long it takes, we will create the power for the powerless. For there is no other reason a Democratic Party to exist.

Except for the influence of power and money, how can we explain why high priced corporations are tax deductible, but not the hard earned tuition payments of struggling students? You tell me, because you know the answer. It’s money, it’s contacts, it’s everything that is wrong with this country.

Except for the influence of power and money, how can we explain the tens of thousands of homeless men and women and children on our streets or doubled up in hallways for lack of federal housing assistance? For if billions, and I mean
billions, go to subsidize mortgages for millionaires, it is not right. And we've got to do something about it.

Except for the influence of power and money, how can we explain the billions that go to nuclear submarines with nonexistent missions while desperate cries from our cities they go unheeded? Are our mayors wrong or do they just lack the special influence to get things done in Washington? You know, the billion dollars the cities got a few weeks ago is less than one day of additional borrowing for our national debt that we do every day of this year.

For many, many years, I've believed that we could change politics through a series of changes -- some small, some large, but all instrumental within the framework of politics as we know it -- progressive appointments, more money for college scholarships, good environmental laws, urban assistance programs. Yet, when I was governor, I'm sorry to acknowledge, wages toward the end started to fall. Factory jobs started moving abroad, and the numbers of the poor began to grow. Ten years later, south central Los Angeles exploded. How I tried to make that system work, as governor of California. And then, more recently, as party chairman, I raised the money, we registered the voters, and what incredible campaigns with our statewide candidates devoting every working day towards collecting thousands of dollars and sometimes tens of thousands of dollars from the top one percent of income earners but always far removed from ordinary people. The victory, it still eluded us. So we
were counseled to raise even larger sums to overcome the opposition and the voter indifference. But in my heart, I knew, and I know now, the problem was not the lack of money. There's never enough and there'll never be enough to buy back the disappearing loyalty of the disillusioned.

What we need, what we needed then, was something more basic. We had to break the growing and dangerous tie in of economic and political power. We had to save our souls as Democrats, return to our roots, listen to our ancestors, and once again, fight on the side of the people who pay the bills and fight the wars but never come to our reception. Those are the people I want to fight for. I know you want to fight for them. And we have to start doing that as we walk out of here.

Good. Let's put it, let's put it simply. The words of politics will remain empty forever unless we challenge, and challenge honestly and directly and in a measurable, credible way the corrupt money and the influence that today powers our campaign and puts our words and faces across T.V. screens in five and ten and twenty million dollar campaigns. We've got to get at that root or we're never going to fill the trees of progress.

That's what started this candidacy. As much a cause as a campaign. To redeem our own past and to reclaim what belongs to all of us -- our democracy and real justice -- social and economic. We didn't begin out of political analysis or personal calculations, but out of raw necessity
to speak truth to power. That’s what we did, that’s what we’re doing, and we’ll continue to do that.

Our goal was to give people, especially those who stopped believing, a real choice and an equal opportunity to participate. That’s why we limited donations to $100 and why we relied on an 800 number. We wanted people who had no access, they didn’t know any particular person with power. We wanted them to take ownership of this cause. You see, I don’t believe that our predicament can be resolved by the election of any one politician, even a president. The future will be determined, not in the White House or on Capitol Hill alone, but it has to be won in every living room and every company office and every classroom and every neighborhood in American. What we need is not a campaign as usual, but a common cause to recast the nation’s politics, to revive our democracy, and reclaim our economic future.

Listen to our founder, Thomas Jefferson, when he said, the purpose of representative government was to counteract the excesses of the monied interests, and to President Andrew Jackson when he stated, that when a democracy’s in trouble, the remedy is more democracy. That’s why every citizen in America should have not only the right, but the real opportunity to vote. It’s the responsibility of government to ensure that by registering every American. That’s why we have to fight to see that government does its job with all its bureaucracy and its computers. They know how to get our
taxes, why don’t they get our votes and the votes of everyone in this country.

That’s why we have to fight to take back the airwaves and make it possible for candidates to speak to the people and for the people to hear them on television, without the corrupting influence of money.

That’s why we have to fight to take back our own Post Office so that candidates and parties and the people can communicate without mortgaging their future and their integrity to the special interests. That’s a basic right. Why can’t we make it free and available to those who wish to participate.

And that’s, and that’s why we have to ban Political Action Committees so people and corporations are put on the same level.

And that’s why we have to fight to insure that the minimum wage, the presidential wage, and the congressional wage show we’re all in it together. All together, and the closer, the better.

And let’s not get fooled by the false populism that comes to us at a very concentration of wealth and power that we’re sworn to oppose. Outside of advertising, there’s no such thing as a billion dollar populist. Mr. Perot, Mr. Perot, we can afford to pay for our own democracy. We don’t need you to lend it to us.

And with these tools of democracy, we’re going to move to higher ground and restore the promise of democracy. And
then truly, we’ll be able to fight trade treaties that reduce wages and then weaken environmental standards. And we can fight to ensure that every child has a decent education, and every family a decent house, and every single American the health care they deserve. And we can fight to see that we have an environment that isn’t poisoned but depends on clean, renewable energy that the people of this country made for themselves.

Hard to build this party in the world. When, whenever change had to be made in this country, in this century that is, it was made through the Democratic Party. But the real changes, the things that really shook things up, these came from below, from the people themselves. The Democratic party gave us the Wagner Act in the ’30’s for working people. But it was only after brave men and women marched and picketed, even unto death, that that law went on the books.

In the ’60’s, the Democratic Party gave us Civil Rights laws, but only after a courageous woman, Rosa Parks, refused to go to the back of the bus and tens of thousands of ordinary people marched and protested and went against what was popular, even to the point of their own blood and their own lives.

And it’s the Democratic Party today which stands behind the women of America in protecting their right to choose. But it was one woman, Anita Hill, who galvanized us all by standing up and speaking truth to power.
And it's the Democratic Party which has the courage and the decency to champion in its platform the rights of gay and lesbian Americans. But only because courageous men and women were not afraid to talk back, act up, and call us to our better selves.

Conventions and nominations are never ending, but only steps along the way. I intend to fight for this party, its ideals tonight, tomorrow, this year, and every year until together we overcome. And I want you to join me in that undertaking. And as we join together in this spirit, no obstacle will stand in our way. Victory will be ours because through our veins runs the blood of those who in the darkest hour gave their lives so that this nation, under God, should have a new birth of freedom, and that the government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from this earth. We shall overcome. All of us, together, working for what we believe.

Thank you very much.
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What a terrific crowd. What a terrific crowd. This may even be larger than the crowd I had in Ellinjay, Georgia. Don’t laugh, we carried Ellinjay.

Listen my friends, we may have taken the long way home, but we finally got here to Houston.

The first thing I want to do tonight is congratulate President Bush and to remove any doubt about where we stand. The primaries are over, the heart is strong again, and the Buchanan brigades are enlisted all the way to a great Republican comeback victory in November.

My friends, my friends, like many of you, like many of you last month I watched that giant masquerade ball up in Madison Square Garden where twenty thousand liberals and radicals came dressed up as moderates and centrists in the greatest single exhibition of cross dressing in our recorded history.

You know, one -- one by one, one by one the prophets of doom appeared at the podium. The Reagan decade they moaned, was a terrible time in America, and they said the only way to prevent worse times is to turn our country’s fate and our country’s future over to the party that gave us McGovern, Mondale, Carter, and Michael Dukakis. Where do they find these leaders?
No way my friends. The American people are not going to go back to the discredited liberalism of the 1960’s and the failed liberalism of the 1970’s no matter how slick the package in 1992.

Those malcontents -- the malcontents of Madison Square Garden not withstanding, the 1980’s were not terrible years in America, they were great years. You know it, and I know it, and everyone knows it except for the carping critics who sat on the sidelines of history, cheering it while the great statesman of modern times, Ronald Reagan -- who out of, remember that time, out of Jimmy Carter’s days of malaise, Ronald Reagan crafted, Ronald Reagan crafted the greatest peace time economic recovery in history reeling in new businesses and twenty million new jobs.

Under the Reagan doctrine, one by one, it was the communist dominoes that began to fall. First, Grenada was liberated by U.S. airborne troops and the U.S. marine corps. Then the mighty red army was driven out of Afghanistan with American weapons. And then in Nicaragua, that squalid Marxist regime was forced to hold free elections by Ronald Reagan’s contra army and the communist was thrown out of power.

My fellow Americans, we’re to remember, it was under our party that the Berlin Wall came down and Europe was reunited. It was under our party that the Soviet empire collapsed and the captive nations broke free.
You know, it is said that every American president will be remembered in history with but a single sentence. George Washington was the father of his country. Abraham Lincoln freed the slaves and saved the union. And Ronald Reagan won the Cold War. And it is just about time, it is just about time that my old colleagues, the columnists and commentators looking down on us tonight from their skyboxes and their anchor booths gave Ronald Reagan the full credit he deserves for leading America to victory in the Cold War.

Most of all my friends, most of all, Ronald Reagan made us proud to be Americans again. We never felt better about our country and we never stood taller in the eyes of the world than when the Gipper was at the helm.

We are here tonight my friends, not only to celebrate with the nominee. An American president has many roles. He is our first diplomat, the architect of American foreign policy. And which of these two men is more qualified for that great role? George Bush has been U.N. Ambassador, director of the CIA, envoy to China. As vice-president, George Bush co-authored and co-signed to policies that won the Cold War. As president, George Bush presided over the liberation of Eastern Europe and the termination of the Warsaw Pact. And what about Mr. Clinton?

Well, Bill Clinton, Bill Clinton couldn’t find 150 words to discuss foreign policy in an acceptance speech that lasted almost an hour. You know, that was said, that was said of another Democratic candidate, Bill Clinton’s foreign policy
experience is pretty much confined to having had breakfast once at the International House of Pancakes.

Well, let's recall what happened. Let us look at the record and recall what happened. Under President George Bush, more human beings escaped from the prison house of tyranny to freedom than any other four year period in history. And for any man, let me tell you, for any man to call this a record of failure is the bullshit political rhetoric of politicians who only know how to build themselves up by tearing America down, and we don't want that kind of leadership in the United States.

The presidency my friends, the presidency is also an office that Theodore Roosevelt called America's "bully-pulpit." Harry Truman said it was preeminently a place of moral leadership. George Bush is a defender of right to life and champion of the Judeo-Christian values upon which America was founded.

Mr. Clinton, Mr. Clinton however, has a different agenda. At it's top is unrestricted, unrestricted abortion on demand. When the Irish Catholic governor of Pennsylvania, Robert Casey, asked to say a few words on behalf of the twenty-five million unborn children destroyed since Roe v. Wade, Bob Casey was told there was no room for him at the podium; that Bill Clinton's convention had no room at the inn. Yet, yet, a militant leader of the homosexual rights movement could rise at that same convention and say, "Bill
Clinton and Al Gore represent the most pro-lesbian and pro-gay ticket in history," and so they do.

Bill Clinton says he supports school choice, but only for state run schools. Parents who send their children to Christian schools or private schools or Jewish schools or Catholic schools, need not apply.

Elect me, and you get two for the price of one, Mr. Clinton says of his lawyer spouse. And what does Hillary believe? Well, Hillary believes that 12-year olds should have the right to sue their parents. And Hillary has compared marriage and the family as institutions to slavery and life on an indian reservation. Well speak for yourself, Hillary. This, this my friends, this is radical feminism. The agenda that Clinton and Clinton would impose on America: abortion on demand, a litmus test for the Supreme Court, homosexual rights, discrimination against religious schools, women in combat units. That’s change all right. But that’s not the kind of change America needs. It’s not the kind of change America wants. And it’s not the kind of change we can abide in a nation we still call God’s country.

The president, the president of the United State is also, the president of the United States is also America’s commander in chief. He’s the man we authorize to send fathers and sons and brothers and friends into battle. George Bush was seventeen years old when they bombed Pearl Harbor. He left his high school graduation, he walked down
to the recruiting office, and he signed up to become the youngest fighter pilot in the Pacific War.

Mr. Clinton, and Bill Clinton, I’ll tell you where he was, I’ll tell you where he was. I’ll tell you where he was. Let me tell you where he was. I’ll tell you where he was. When Bill Clinton’s time came in Vietnam, he sat up in a dormitory room in Oxford, England and figured out how to dodge the draft.

Let me ask a question of this convention. Which of these two men has won the moral authority to send young Americans into battle? I suggest respectfully, I suggest respectfully it is the American patriot and war hero, Navy Lt. JG, George Herbert Walker Bush.

My fellow Americans, my fellow Americans, this campaign is about philosophy and it is about character. And George Bush wins hands down on both counts. It is time all of us came home and stood beside him.

As his running mate, Mr. Clinton chose Albert Gore. But just how moderate is Prince Albert? Well, according to the national taxpayers union, Al Gore beat out Teddy Kennedy two straight years for the title of "Biggest Spender in the U.S. Senate" and Teddy Kennedy isn’t moderate about anything.

I’m not kidding, I’m not kidding about Teddy. How may other sixty-year-olds do you know who still go to Florida for Spring Break?

You know, at that great big costume party they held up in New York, Mr. Gore made a startling declaration.
Henceforth, Albert Gore said, the central organizing principle of governments everywhere must be the environment. Wrong Albert. The central organizing principle of this republic is freedom.

And the nations forests, and the ancient forests of Oregon to Washington to the inland empire of California, America's great middle class have got to start standing up to these environmental extremists who put birds and rats and insects ahead of family, workers, and jobs.

One year ago, one year ago my friends, one year ago I did not expect that I would be here tonight. I was just one of many panelists on what President Bush calls those 'crazy Sunday talk shows.' But I disagreed with the President and so we challenged the President in the Republican primaries, and we fought as best we could. From February to June, President Bush won thirty-three of those primaries. I can't recall exactly how many we won. I'll get you the figure tomorrow. But tonight, I do want to speak from the heart to the three million people who voted for Pat Buchanan for president. I will never, I will never, I will never forget you or the honor you have done me. But I do believe, I do believe, deep in my heart that the right place for us to be now in this presidential campaign is right beside George Bush.

This party, this party is my home, this party is our home, and we've got to come home to it, and don't let anyone tell you different. Yes, we disagreed with President Bush,
but we stand with him for the freedom to choose religious schools. And we stand with him against the amoral idea that gay and lesbian couples should have the same standing in law as married men and women. We stand with President Bush, we stand with President Bush for the right to life and for voluntary prayer in the public schools. And we stand against putting our wives and daughters and sisters into combat units in the United States Army. We stand my friends, we also stand with President Bush in favor of the right of small towns and communities to control the raw sewage of pornography that so terribly pollutes our popular culture. We stand with President Bush in favor of mental judges who interpret the law as written and against would be Supreme Court justices like Mario Cuomo who think they have a mandate to rewrite the Constitution.

Friends, this election is about more than who gets what. It is about who we are. It is about what we believe and what we stand for as Americans. There is a religious war going on in this country. It is a cultural war as critical to the kind of nation we shall be as the Cold War itself for this war is for the soul of America. And in that struggle for the soul of America, Clinton and Clinton are on the other side and George Bush is on our side.

And so to the Buchanan brigades out there, we have to come home and stand beside George Bush. In these six months of campaigning from Concord, New Hampshire to California, I came to know our country better than I have known it ever
before in my life. And I gathered up memories that are going
to be with me the rest of my days. There was that day long
ride through the great state of Georgia in a bus Vice-
president Bush himself had used in 1988 called Asphalt One.
The ride ended in a 9:00 p.m. speech in a tiny town in
southern Georgia called Fitzgerald. There were those workers
at the James River paper mill, northern New Hampshire in a
town called Groveton. Tough, hearty men. None of them would
say a word to me as I came down the line, shaking their hands
one by one. They were under threat of losing their jobs at
Christmas. As I moved down the line, one tough fellow about
my age just looked up and said to me, "save our jobs." Then
there was the legal secretary that I met at the Manchester
airport on Christmas day, who came running up to me and said
"Mr. Buchanan, I’m going to vote for you." And then she
broke down weeping. And she said, "I’ve lost my job. I
don’t have any money, and they’re going to take away my
little girl. What am I going to do?"

My friends, these people are our people. They don’t
need Adam Smith or Edmund Burke, but they come from the same
school yards and the same playgrounds and towns as we came
from. They share our beliefs and our convictions, our hopes
and our dreams. These are conservatives of the heart. They
are our people. And we need to reconnect with them. We need
to let them know we know how bad they’re hurting. They don’t
expect miracles of us but they need to know we care.
There were the people, there were the people my friends, there were the people in Hayfork, a tiny town up in California's Trinity Alps, a town that is now under a sentence of death because a federal judge has set aside nine million for the habitat of the spotted owl forgetting about the habitat of the men and women who live and work in Hayfork. And there were the brave people, and there were the brave people of Korea town, who took the worst of those L.A. riots but still live the family values we treasure and who still deeply believe in the American dream.

Friends, in these wonderful, in these wonderful twenty-five weeks of our campaign the saddest days were the days of that riot in L.A. The worst riot in American history. But out of that awful tragedy can come a message of hope. Hours after that riot ended, I went down to the army compound in south Los Angeles where I met the troopers of the eighteenth cavalry who had come to save the city of Los Angeles. An officer in the eighteenth cav said "Mr. Buchanan, I want you to talk to a couple of our troopers." And I went over and I spoke to these young fellows, they couldn’t have been twenty years old. And they recounted their story. They had come in to Los Angeles late in the evening of the second day and the rioting was still going on and the two of them walked up a dark street where the mob had burned and looted every single building on the block but one -- a convalescent home for the aged. And the mob was headed in to ransack and loot the apartments of the terrified old men and women inside. The
troopers came up the street -- M16's at the ready, and the mob threatened and cursed, but the mob retreated because it had met the one thing that could stop it. Force rooted in justice and backed by moral courage.

Greater love than this, greater love than this hath no man than that he lay down his life for his friend. Here were nineteen year old boys ready to lay down their lives to stop a mob from molesting old people they did not even know. And as those boys took back the streets of Los Angeles block by block, my friends, we must take back our cities, and take back our culture, and take back our country.

God bless you. God bless America.
**VITA**
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