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THE METAPHORIC WORLDVIEW OF MARANATHA CAMPUS MINISTRIES: WORKING GOD’S HARVEST ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

David E. Procter
Hastings College
Hastings, Nebraska

"As far as I am concerned Ph.D. might as well mean post-hole digger."
—Rice Broocks

This opening statement, vivid and attention-getting, reveals something of the worldview of the speaker, Rice Broocks. From this statement, it is easy to discern that Broocks is not overly enamored with advanced degrees. Broocks is a “traveling evangelist” for Maranatha Campus Ministries (MCM). His statement above was part of a sermon to a group of MCM members proclaiming the virtues of Jesus Christ and the decadence of secular humanism. He exhorted his listeners to bring students to the saving grace of Jesus Christ. His statement is indicative of the rhetoric of all members of Maranatha Campus Ministries. Their discourse is a dualistic, aggressive, and moralistic rhetoric that “commands” listeners to get right with God. In this essay, I will attempt to explicate the worldview of MCM. By locating their worldview metaphorically, one can gain insight not only into this student Christian group but also—and more important—into the rhetoric of Fundamentalist Christian organizations in general. To achieve my goal, I will examine the influence of MCM and will examine the worldview its members establish metaphorically.

MCM and Fundamentalism

Maranatha Campus Ministries,1 established in Kentucky in 1972 by Bob and Rose Weiner, is a Fundamentalist, evangelical, and charismatic group whose major purpose is to proclaim on every major campus in the world the Lordship of Jesus Christ. One Maranatha member stated that MCM’s

1 When I began my original research in 1981, all the information I accumulated in the form of brochures, newsletters, and magazines referred to the Christian organization I was studying as Maranatha Ministries International. In 1984 I found an article in Christianity Today that referred to this campus group as Maranatha Campus Ministries. I wrote a letter to Maranatha Ministries International for clarification and received a letter in return (Bob Nolte, letter to the author, 26 August 1985). Mr. Nolte informed me that their formal name is Maranatha Christian Churches, that Maranatha Campus Ministries is an adjunct of MCC, and that “there is no such entity as Maranatha Ministries International.” I conclude from his letter that at some time after 1972, Maranatha Ministries International reorganized. My research does not indicate that this reorganization resulted in any concomitant change in rhetorical strategies. Thus, to avoid confusion in the text, I will always refer to this Christian organization as Maranatha Campus Ministries.
purpose is to tell students to "get right with God, get real," while another claimed that MCM is proclaiming "Jesus Christ is real." "We preach the Lordship of Christ," another proffered. Members focus on college campuses because they believe the students of today "will have the most impact" tomorrow (Spearman). An MCM brochure is explicit in explaining their purpose.

Today’s universities are preparing tomorrow’s leaders... politicians, doctors, lawyers, scientists, teachers, and business men. The goal of Maranatha Campus Ministries is to see this new generation of leaders provide a standard of life that promotes character, honesty, sincerity, and wisdom that can only come through a life totally yielded to Jesus Christ. (The New Generation n.p.)

Maranatha Campus Ministries has been steadily expanding its ministering. In 1980 they had thirty-eight ministries in America and throughout the world, in 1981 sixty-five ministries, and in 1984 Christianity Today reported that the organization had grown to one hundred campus chapters in the United States and in sixteen foreign countries (Frame 39). MCM claims five thousand active members and estimates that they have brought fifty thousand students to a personal relationship with Jesus Christ (Nolte).

But MCM's pious purpose and expanding demographics do not tell the entire story of its significance. The organization is also exemplary of an increasingly active Fundamentalist movement in the United States. Fundamentalism, deriving its name from twelve paperback books entitled The Fundamentals, is based on five essential ideas: the inerrancy of Scripture, the virgin birth of Jesus, the substitutionary atonement of Jesus Christ, His bodily resurrection, and premillennialism. Fundamentalists are those people who view themselves as the legitimate heirs of historical New Testament Christianity and as the militant and faithful defenders of biblical orthodoxy (Falwell 1-2). As Bob Weiner wrote in The Forerunner, "(w)e must return to the preaching of the true gospel—the message proclaimed by the Lord Himself and His earliest disciples. The gospel was designed to deal with the basic selfishness of man, not to condone it or promote it. A candy-coated gospel may taste sweet to man, but it is nauseating to God" (7). When asked

---

2 The majority of the evidence cited in this study comes from nondirective interviewing and participation in MCM revivals. While I did learn the names of some members, most often they are not revealed in the text. Some of the interviewees knew I was researching; others did not. Therefore, I believe it is important to keep names confidential. I am willing to provide transcripts of all my interviews for any reader who desires further information.

3 A 1985 letter from MCM Ministry Relations gave approximately the same demographics regarding the number of churches. Bob Nolte indicated that since 1972, Maranatha had established ninety campus groups in the U.S. and in fifteen foreign countries.

4 One evangelist challenged his audience to show him something untrue in Scripture and said he would "rip that page out of the Bible."

5 There are some slight differences over what Fundamentalists hold most dear. Neuhaus also claims there are five fundamentals but lists six including Falwell's five plus "the authenticity of biblical miracles." See Neuhaus 44. Barr argues that the most pronounced characteristics of Fundamentalists include a belief in the inerrancy of the Bible, a strong hostility toward modern theology, and an assurance that those who do not share their religious viewpoint are not really "true Christians" at all. See Barr 3.
what MCM is, members gave the following responses: “it’s a Bible-based organization proclaiming that God is real” and “it’s very Biblical and there’s nothing spooky [about it], it’s just that God speaks to your heart.”

It is evident that Fundamentalist Christian groups are having an impact on our political and social life. Newsweek argued that “What is clear on both the philosophical level—and in the rough-and-tumble arena of politics—is that the Falwells of the nation and their increasingly militant and devoted flock are a phenomenon that can no longer be dismissed or ignored” (“Tide” 36). For example, Tim LaHaye’s American Coalition for Traditional Values is engaging in a “battle over whose values are going to dominate in American society.” According to Christianity Today, he claims his organization registered nearly two million new voters during the 1984 election (“Some Leaders” 46). Also during the campaign, Christian Voice printed and distributed 2.5 million copies of the voting records of Democratic officeholders (McLaughlin). Jerry Falwell encourages Fundamentalists to get “out of the pew and into the precinct” and then outlines how the Moral Majority will contribute to bringing America back to moral sanity. His notions include educating Americans about the vital moral issues of the day, mobilizing “inactive” Americans, lobbying in Congress, informing all Americans about the voting records of their representatives, organizing Americans who can become moral activists, and encouraging and promoting nonpublic schools in their attempt to excel in academics while also teaching traditional family and moral values (192–194).

Fundamentalists certainly have the means to promote their moral sanity, for they control a large percentage of the Protestant media. The “electric churches” currently claim 47 million devoted listeners who turn to religious television for entertainment, conversion, healing, positive thinking, and political signal calling (Marty 38). These devoted listeners are also providing a great deal of money to the televangelists. In 1983, television ministers reportedly raised over $500 million in contributions (“Influence”). John Neuhaus concludes that activist fundamentalists want us to know that they are not going to go back to the wilderness. They explain ... that they did not really want to bash in the door to the public square, but it was locked, and nobody had answered their knocking.... Surely it is incumbent on the rest of us, especially those who claim to understand our society, to do more in response to this ascendance of fundamentalism—and indeed of religion in general—than to sound an increasingly hysterical and increasingly hollow alarm. (46)

Maranatha’s Worldview

Examining the worldview of MCM as created metaphorically is a move away from “hysterical” and “hollow alarm” to an understanding and defi-
nition of the argument. Metaphors can provide insight into people’s feelings, thoughts, and actions. Lakoff and Johnson maintain that “most of our ordinary conceptual system is metaphorical in nature… [It] is the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day is very much a matter of metaphor” (3-4). Often implicit in the metaphors of creative speakers and writers is a whole philosophy of life, as well as the philosophy of an entire generation, indeed, of an entire civilization (Embler v). The position just articulated, the one I hold, supports the following arguments: (1) metaphor implies a framework of interrelated perceptions, beliefs, values, and actions; (2) metaphor has underlying assumptions about how one is to respond to the world; and (3) a metaphor’s strength depends on how well it fits the situation or how well the situation fits it and how well it satisfies the values, needs, and goals of the audience (Hastings 193). Finally, it is especially useful to examine “archetypal” metaphors, which are the most powerful in creating identification because they carry the same or very similar meanings for most, if not all, of mankind (Osborn 239-240).

The metaphoric language of Maranatha Campus Ministries serves three functions: there are metaphors that prepare members for the longevity of their task, metaphors that create a social hierarchy, and metaphors that steel the members for the intensity of the struggle for students’ souls. Examined holistically rather than separately and independently, MCM metaphors combine to form a strong and compelling view of the world for the listeners and believers of Maranatha’s messages. It is my contention that these metaphors, when used together, cast the foundation of a persistent, moralistic, and aggressive religious partisan.

A metaphor that prepares MCM members for their long struggle is “the harvest.” This metaphor might also be labeled the “seasonal change” or “natural” metaphor. It is appropriate for religious use because of the long-term commitment inherent in working, waiting for, and reaping a harvest. It creates a cognitive structure that entails working hard, working long, possibly encountering a lost crop, but finally reaping a bountiful harvest. Osborn writes that “The succession of the seasons is a slow, deliberate process. It is suited more for long-range representations of the process of change and of the general condition of men within that process. It fits the poet’s or philosopher’s elevated perspective upon time and the gradually evolving nature of man’s destiny” (246-247).

The Bible speaks through a Maranatha brochure and proclaims that “The harvest is plentiful, but the workers are few. Therefore, beseech the Lord of the Harvest to send out workers into His Harvest” (Campus Update n.p.). Maranatha’s monthly periodical The Forerunner offers this reminder to members: “The Word says that we are co-workers with Jesus as we go out into the harvest; we do our part and He does His part” (Weiner 7). This metaphor is echoed in MCM church services when a preacher exclaims that “... young people are just walking around the campuses of the world with no direction. The thing is, there is such a ripe harvest here” (Broocks). Maranatha’s message points out not only that there is a harvest to be brought in but also that it is “plentiful” and “ripe.” MCM members believe that if they toil hard for students’ souls, they will see the day of harvest. As one member proclaimed:
The Lord said, "I'm the God of the harvest and I'm going to send you out for the harvest." So we're goin' out and we're goin' to harvest some fruit. Some of them [students] are ripe fruit already, but then there are some, they need a little bit more plowin', we need to tend the ground a little longer. They're like apples. First [they're] green, then they're a little red-speckled, then more red, then finally, you just barely touch it and it falls out into your hand and that's what we want, someone just falling out into our hand.

MCM metaphors also establish social hierarchy between members and nonmembers, between believers and nonbelievers. The light/dark metaphor creates hierarchy for MCM and indicates proper behavior for members. Osborn explicates the hierarchical connotations of the light/dark metaphor when he writes that "One first observes a fusion . . . between the archetypes of light and darkness and the vertical scale, a frequent combination because of the natural association of light with above and darkness below" (243). Further, the light/dark metaphor infuses the hierarchy with power. Osborn explains that the light/dark metaphor creates "opposing value judgments [which] are intense, the presence of rhetorical determinism unmistakable. The situation has been simplified until there are two—and only two—alternatives" (243). Thus, light and darkness create a hierarchy because of the natural association of light with up and of darkness with down. The hierarchy this metaphor creates is likely to be rigid because of the metaphor's dualistic, differentiating entailments.

Rice Broocks imposes social hierarchy for MCM members when he rails that "The things about God are so different from the world that there is no comparison between the darkness and light. There is absolutely nothing in common between you and a nonbeliever. Zero!" Weiner reminds the readers of The Forerunner that "Men loved the darkness rather than the light, for their deeds were evil" (7). People whose lives are "falling apart" belong to the "Kingdom of Darkness," Broocks declares. Contrasting the failure and misery of the Kingdom of Darkness are the purity and goodness of the white (light). "But a few of you . . . have kept your clothes clean. You will walk with God, clothed in white, because you are worthy to do so," Broocks promises.

Maranatha's message is peppered with the spatial-orientation metaphor of up/down, up corresponding to some ideal and down to some failing or fault. MCM ministers exhort members to "press on to the high call," and members proclaim "we stand on the Word." Contrasting these positive aspects of up is the use of down and low. MCM audiences are warned not to "lie down and be lazy" or they are likely to be "laid low in the wilderness."

Light emanates from above, from the heavens. Light, up, and high all represent goodness, purity, and Godliness in Maranatha rhetoric. Similarly, darkness is associated with the worldliness of "down here" or worse yet "down there." Darkness, down, and low symbolize sin, evil, and humanism.

While the harvest metaphor prepares MCM members for the length of their mission and the light/dark metaphor establishes a hierarchy, the war metaphor infuses intensity into MCM's struggle for students' souls. The war metaphor saturates MCM's rhetoric, appearing in sermons, interpersonal discussions, brochures, and newspapers. Audiences are "one step from
death,” MCM ministers warn. Members must “escape the destructive lust in the world,” ministers admonish. “We’re already dead! If you can’t be killed what can they do to you?” a preacher questions. During one revival, an evangelist walked into a Spartan sanctuary, looked around the chapel, fixing his gaze intently on each parishioner, then slowly lowered his head and prayed.

Lord, we want to take up your arms. Lord, we want to take upon ourselves the Great Commission and we want to see the kingdoms of this world topple. Lord, we’re going to see the strongholds in this city topple. Father, we believe the minds and people that are gripped by the rebellion of this generation, Lord, we believe that they will be freed even now. In Jesus’ name. Amen.

MCM conversation rings with the war metaphor. Members talk of engaging in “spiritual warfare” for students’ souls and “battling for their spiritual minds.” The war metaphor is also evident in Maranatha brochures. One brochure proffers that “Young adults everywhere are responding to the call of Jesus Christ to ‘follow Him’ in setting free the people of the world from the bondage of spiritual death and self-destruction. This generation is overcoming through the Lordship of Jesus Christ and the power of the Cross” (The New Generation n.p.). Through the war metaphor, Maranatha Campus Ministries names allies and enemies. Allies are those persons who are totally committed to Christ. These are people who are saved by the blood of Jesus, who are born again, and who have a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. Lukewarm Christians are named as enemies because they are concerned more with the social aspects of religion than with serving the Lord. MCM members claim that these enemies are believers merely in “churchianity” rather than in Christianity. Other enemies include those persons who do not have the total dedication that comes through sacrifice as well as those individuals who are dedicated to humanism as a way to decision making and problem solving. Those who have left Maranatha also report being named as enemies. Ministers “attempt to deliver them [those who leave the organization] from spirits of rebellion” (Frame 43). Some members who have left the church claim that MCM pastors predicted their spiritual death and destruction (Frame 38).

Conclusion

Burke suggests that a name directs the way one acts toward the thing named when he argues that “far from aiming at suspended judgment, the spontaneous speech of a people is loaded with judgments. It is intensely moral—its names for objects contain the emotional overtones which give us the cues as to how we should act toward these objects” (176–177). Edwin Black explains that “moral judgments, however balanced, however elaborately qualified, are nonetheless categorical. Once rendered, they shape decisively one’s relationship to the object judged. They compel, as forcefully as the mind can be compelled, a manner of apprehending an object” (109). Metaphors are the ferment of these moral judgments. Because we daily construct, consume, and confront metaphoric reality, it is essential to discern, understand, and explicate metaphor. It seems especially essential
to understand the metaphoric worldview of those rhetors who seek to direct our souls.

Maranatha Campus Ministries' rhetoric constructs a worldview based on three interacting archetypal metaphors: the harvest, light and darkness, and the war. Together, these metaphors provide a schema for listeners to perceive, talk about, and in formulating their reactions to the world. These metaphors seem appropriate for this type of Christian organization. In a Christian organization where the individual works long and hard preaching "the Word," encountering a bellicose public, facing daily rejection, and watching as friends continually leave the organization, the combination of these metaphors appears felicitous. The MCM metaphoric strategy calls on the individual to make a long-term commitment, acknowledging that success may be far in the future. The strategy polarizes people into good and sinful, constructing a rhetorical world of us versus them. Finally, the war metaphor prepares the Maranatha Christians for the intensity and seriousness of their mission.

Certainly this paper represents only a beginning. In conducting this analysis, I have studied many of Maranatha Campus Ministries' brochures and periodicals and have examined several sermons and interpersonal messages. I hope it is now more lucid why people in this Fundamentalist Christian organization are so persistent, tend to argue dualistically, and are not afraid to use aggressive confrontation tactics in their communication strategies.

In this analysis, I have attempted to go beyond the alarm mentioned by Neuhaus and toward understanding. By examining the worldview of Maranatha Campus Ministries, one gains not only a better sense of the operation of this Christian organization but also—and possibly more important—a deeper understanding of Fundamentalist rhetoric in general.

Works Cited

Osborn, Michael N. "Archetypal Metaphor in Rhetoric: The Light-Dark Family." Con-
FANTASY THEMES AND RHETORICAL VISIONS IN THE 1984 PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN: EXPLAINING THE REAGAN MANDATE

Roger C. Aden
University of Nebraska-Lincoln

Counting the votes was a mere formality. Any doubts about the outcome of the “race” were erased with the early returns. Ronald Reagan was well on his way to winning reelection to the presidency of the United States. For the loser, Walter Mondale, there was little consolation in the ten electoral votes his home state of Minnesota cast for him, because Minnesota was the only state he carried.

What makes Reagan’s romp so intriguing is the evidence demonstrating that many Americans disagreed with him on important issues. Approximately half the respondents to a 6 August 1984 Harris Survey indicated that they disagreed with Reagan on such issues as the nuclear freeze, affirmative action, and the Equal Rights Amendment, but would still cast their votes for him.

The key to understanding Reagan’s hold on the electorate lies in the themes and vision of each candidate. Ernest Bormann’s insightful work “Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality” is a foundation for the construction of a clear perspective on Reagan’s victory and Mondale’s failure.

According to Bormann, distinct fantasy themes chain out among the public and combine to form a rhetorical vision that provides the audience “with a social reality filled with heroes, villains, emotions, and attitudes.” Rhetorical vision serves a “coping function” for individuals, providing “a sense of meaning and significance for the individual that helps protect him from the pressures of natural calamity and social disaster.” Thus, audience members seek themes and visions that provide shelter from the real world and allow them to live in their own world where “meaning and significance” exist.

In this essay, I argue that the Regan/Mondale election results are explainable through the fantasy themes and rhetorical vision articulated by each candidate. Reagan’s vision was the most meaningful and significant to voters in the 1984 social and political situation. Consequently, he obtained...

The author has recently received a master of arts degree from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

3 Bormann 400. I have substituted the word that for and to clarify my meaning.
an overwhelming victory. Before analyzing the Reagan and Mondale fantasy themes and rhetorical visions, it is necessary to understand the setting that gave rise to the candidates’ messages.

The Context

The 1960s began with hope and optimism. A vibrant young president named John F. Kennedy promised that America would expand to reach a New Frontier. As the decade progressed, however, faith in Kennedy’s vision of hope turned to despair. His assassination, along with those of his brother Bobby and Martin Luther King, Jr., tarnished the golden dreams of Americans. As the decade dragged on, the nation became entangled in Southeast Asia, while on this continent America’s youth burned flags, rioted, and fled to Canada.

The 1970s brought little change. “Peace with honor” became a code phrase for the nation’s humiliation in Vietnam. The Watergate scandal forced the president to resign and shattered people’s confidence—what little they still had—in American government. A brief moment of hope in the election of newcomer Jimmy Carter gave way to despair as interest rates skyrocketed and economic growth plummeted. Americans endured scenes on the nightly news of Iranian fanatics spitting on the United States flag—fanatics who held fifty-two Americans hostage for over a year. A botched rescue mission convinced Americans further that their country was not the great nation it once had been.

But Ronald Reagan took office in 1980 and ushered in a new era of confidence in America. Regan assumed office at a time when, as he put it himself, “an awful lot of people thought that the good days were over for America—that the country had reached the limits of its dreams and would never again be what it once had been.” Thus, “people wanted to feel good about their country again, and in Reagan’s infectiously confident presence, a working majority of them seemed to.” During his first term, Reagan saw the economy rid itself of spiraling inflation and interest rates. He restored the public’s confidence in America’s military with a quick and decisive invasion of Grenada. He stood up to the Soviets and proved that Americans were not just going to sit back and take whatever the Russians gave them. The American people felt good again and sensed that other nations respected them once more.

As the 1984 presidential campaign began, it became clear that the contest would be a battle of visions. In this analysis, I examine the fantasy themes and rhetorical vision of each candidate as presented in his election eve television commercial. The commercials serve as representative samples of rhetoric, illuminating the themes and vision articulated by each candidate during the campaign.

A strong case can be made for the representativeness of the rhetoric in

---

* Goldman 35.
* The samples of the candidates’ rhetoric were obtained from video tape recordings of their respective commercials. Reagan’s spot ran approximately twenty-three minutes, Mondale’s about four minutes and twenty seconds.
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these commercials. First, political commercials are an effective means of transmitting a vision to the voters. The format of political spot messages forces a candidate to stress the essential components of his or her candidacy. As political commercial producer Robert Goodman notes, political commercials allow a candidate to “try to become the good guy. You dramatize virtue where it exists. You compensate for weakness, real or perceived. You draw a contrast, put the white hat on.”

Second, the election eve commercials provided Reagan and Mondale one last chance to present their visions to the voters. Diamond and Bates’s classification of political commercials terms the final stage of commercials in a campaign as “I see an America...” In this stage, “it remains now for each candidate to sum up, to appear on camera in repose, thoughtful and dignified with the overpowering visuals and the strident noises of the campaign.” While Mondale did not appear on camera “in repose,” his commercial did attempt to sum up the themes of his campaign.

In the commercials of the candidates a fundamental difference in rhetorical visions appears. At the heart of Reagan’s vision was the belief that America and its citizens had always been great, but that they had been thwarted by government officials who thought they knew what was best for America. Reagan’s vision let the people choose what was best for America. Voters accepted this vision because of Reagan’s trust and faith in Americans. He gave voters confidence in themselves.

Mondale, on the other hand, said that America could be better—and that it would be if Americans trusted him as their leader. Mondale’s vision implied that Americans needed his help to succeed and to make the right choices. Instead of building confidence, Mondale and his vision destroyed America’s self-confidence.

The differences between these two visions are most apparent when two fantasy themes of Reagan’s are paralleled with Mondale’s message. One of Reagan’s themes calls for renewed American independence, while Mondale stresses dependence. The second thematic difference is Reagan’s optimistic view of the future compared with Mondale’s prediction of doom. Therein lies the explanation for Reagan’s landslide victory: frustrated by the tarnished and failed visions of the 1960s and 1970s, the electorate sought a vision that restored feelings of hope and opportunity. Reagan’s themes and vision gave Americans a sense of the meaning and significance for which they had been searching.

Independence versus Dependence

Reagan stresses the theme of independence of the individual in his vision. Essentially, his vision includes a laissez-faire philosophy of government; the citizens can take care of themselves.

I told you what I’d believed all my life, that the greatness of America doesn’t begin in Washington—it begins with each of you in the mighty spirit of free

8 Diamond and Bates 344.
people under God, in the bedrock values you've lived by each day in your families, neighborhoods, and workplaces. Each of you is an individual worthy of respect, unique and important to the success of America. And only by trusting you, giving you opportunities to climb high and reach for the stars, can we preserve the golden dream of America as the champion of peace and freedom among the nations of the world.

The key to Reagan's ability to make people feel good about themselves can be found in the statement above: he simply builds their egos. He tells Americans that they are "worthy of respect," "unique," and "important to the success of America."

Throughout his vision, Reagan maintains that America is a nation in which individuals can accomplish anything they want to if they only try. By employing this theme of independence, he makes each American feel that he or she contributes to the nation's successes. Reagan takes this enhancement of self-esteem a step further when he tells Americans that they are all heroes.

On election eve four years ago, I mentioned those who said America was in her fading years, that she had no more heroes; and I noted the news coverage about the death of my friend John Wayne. One headline read, "The Last American Hero." I said then that no one would be angrier than Duke Wayne at the suggestion that he was America's last hero. Just before he died he said in his unforgettable way, "Just give the American people a good cause and there's nothing they can't lick." And you've proven he was right.

If anyone is looking for heroes, let them look at Mainstreet America.

Reagan affirms his faith in the greatness of America's citizens through the great American hero, John Wayne. The statement tells Americans not only that the president thinks they are great but also that John Wayne thought so too. Additionally, Reagan points out that Americans are heroes just like the Duke.

After telling the voters that they are important to the success of America and are great American heroes, Reagan provides proof that individuals working independently are collectively responsible for America's comeback: "Small businessmen and women, teachers, farmers, ranchers, blue-collar workers, homemakers, and hi-tech entrepreneurs: you brought America back and you're making us great again. All we did was get government out of your way." Surely any American would feel good "knowing" that he or she brought America back.

While it is difficult to determine whether Reagan's vision was responsible for his success at the polls, it seems plausible that voters would be likely to cast their ballots for a man who believes that they make America great. Reagan boosted Americans' egos by attributing to them the success of America's turnaround. By making Americans feel better about themselves, Reagan also may have prodded them into believing that the rest of the country was in better shape as well. As president, he received credit from the voters for the turnaround, even though he told the people that they were responsible.

Mondale's vision, on the other hand, offered Americans a theme of dependence upon the government. The idea apparent throughout his commercial is that people need help. Near the beginning of the commercial, two elderly women appear on camera to lament about the care they have
received under the Reagan administration. Both stress their dependency
upon the government. As the first says: "I get thirty-five dollars in food
stamps when I used to get seventy-six. So they cut me right in half there."
The second echoes the theme of government's responsibility for its citizens:
"Well I worked all my life and paid in, but then when I need it, it’s not
there." Mondale deflates self-esteem among Americans by telling them
through the two elderly women that they need help from the government.
In Mondale's vision, government is a parental figure to the people. Just as
children are dependent upon their parents, according to Mondale, Amer-
ica's citizens are dependent upon their government.

Even when he attempts to sound positive, Mondale seems like a father
figure talking down to his children.

I want your generation and all generations in American history to get the
very best. I want you to learn. I want you to challenge yourself. I want you
to stretch that mind. I want you to think of new things and dream of new
dreams. I want your life to be thrilling. And I want to help you.

By employing the phrase "I want you to," Mondale sounds like a father
telling his children what he wants them to do when they grow up. In ad-
dition, his last line—"I want to help you"—implies that Americans cannot
succeed at these tasks on their own, just as children need help from their
parents to accomplish difficult tasks.

Mondale's theme of dependence is insulting to Americans. Rather than
increasing their self-esteem, Mondale implies that Americans are like chil-
dren who need guidance from a parental figure. When a potential leader
seems to have little respect for those he would lead, it is logical that the
followers would have little respect for him. Mondale's chance of election
may have been damaged by this probable lack of respect from the voters.

The Future: Optimism versus Despair

Both candidates referred to the election as a watershed. Thus, each de-
votes a significant portion of his commercial to discussing the future. Reagan
promises an optimistic future for the nation, presumably because of the
greatness of its citizens.

He points out that the new American era is already underway and will
continue to gain momentum in the future.

Watching the Olympic games last summer, Nancy and I were thrilled, as I'm
sure you were, when we heard those repeated chants of "USA, USA." Did
it occur to you as it did to us that while each of those words—United States
of America—is important, none is more so than the first? Yes, we are united.
That is our rich heritage. There were moments in recent years when we
wondered if we were still united, but not today.

Reagan creates optimism for the future by noting that America has already
taken the first few steps, exemplified by success in the Summer Olympics
and a united citizenry.

America is coming together again. We’re building together. But what I’m
really thankful for is that all across this shining land, we’re hoping together.
We can say to the world and pledge to our children, America’s best days lie
ahead, and you ain’t seen nothin’ yet.
Reagan's use of the phrase "you ain't seen nothin' yet" creates even more optimism for the future, because Americans already feel good about their country.

The incumbent foreshadows that visionary future.

A strong America will continue to push back frontiers of science and space and discover wonders of the unknown and achieve breakthroughs in medicine, technology, and communication that will enable the world to make great new leaps in human progress.

In this statement, Reagan neatly ties together the independent spirit of the past and his optimistic future. Just like our rugged ancestors, today's Americans can "push back frontiers" to make the world a better place to live, Reagan says.

Continuing this link between the past and the bright future, Reagan explains that America will also gain respect from the rest of the world in the future.

In speaking tonight of America's traditional values and philosophy of government, we must remember the most distinctive mark of all in the American experience: to a tired and disillusioned world we've always been a new world and, yes, a shining city on a hill where all things are possible.

In Reagan's vision, the future for both America and the world becomes brighter.

With this optimistic view of the future, Reagan creates an even more positive image of himself in the eyes of the voters. He assures them that the country is on the right track today because of their independence, then promises them a bright future for the nation. Reagan expresses confidence in the voters, and they reward him by bestowing their confidence in him with votes.

Mondale's commercial paints quite a different picture of America's future. Contrary to Reagan's message, Mondale's commercial claims that America has not taken the first step toward a bright future. According to a steelworker in the commercial: "In the steel industry and any industrial area in the United States, we're hurting. We've lost jobs, we've lost communities." Rather than providing an optimistic message, the commercial says America is in trouble. As the narrator at one point intones, "This is a fight about whether America is really back, or can we do better." And in the words of an elderly woman: "I want to live a decent life. I don't want to live in poverty." Consistent throughout these statements is a feeling of despair. Mondale's vision does not include a bright future. He promises no "shining city on a hill" to the voters.

Instead, Mondale's vision includes an uncertain future. Even when he refers to a Mondale administration, the vision is vague and couched in uncertain terms. Toward the end of the commercial, the narrator urges: "Tuesday your vote does matter for all of us. Do what's right. Mondale-Ferraro: They're fighting for our future." At another point, the narrator gives a word of caution.

Here is the future [picture of two children coloring in books], and you alone in the voting booth with your conscience will leave them a legacy. Make it
one of economic opportunity for all, of a Supreme Court free to judge for liberty, of an end to the arms race at last.

While the message in this statement is intended to be positive, the future hopes are worded in a manner that implies hopelessness. For example, "an end to the arms race at last" conveys a feeling of frustration.

When offered the choice of two futures—one bright, the other uncertain—it seems logical that the voters would have chosen the former. Mondale did not make voters feel good about the future of the nation. And because the citizens of a country are responsible for the future of their nation, voters probably felt that Mondale had little faith in their abilities. His vision did little, if anything, to increase the self-esteem of the voters. Consequently, Mondale's commercial probably lost him respect.

Conclusions

My examination of the themes and visions offered by Reagan and Mondale leads to several judgments about the 1984 presidential campaign. Even with twenty-twenty hindsight, it is difficult to isolate incidents or strategies that could have changed the course of a political campaign. However, it seems that Mondale had no chance to win the election unless Reagan made several major gaffes. No matter what strategy the Mondale team had employed during the campaign, they would have found themselves facing an incumbent whose vision was neatly tailored to the subjective knowledge of the American voters. The voters believed in Reagan and felt that the country was on the right track. In short, Reagan was the recipient of a rebound strategy. His message created confidence in the voters. The voters in turn felt confident about the state of the nation. And Reagan was there to receive the accolades.

Reagan owes much of his success to the man he defeated in 1980, Jimmy Carter. Johnstone writes that Carter had campaigned in 1976 as a candidate who restored faith in American citizens. The Carter presidency, however, simply added to the woes of the nation. During Reagan's first term, voters hungered for signs of a resurgent America. When he provided such signs, he became the savior of the nation. His strategy of giving credit to the citizens for the turnaround increased their confidence and his popularity.

Mondale's chances for scoring an upset were diminished by the vision he offered. Reagan's vision was so bright that Mondale could not hope to offer a brighter message. Mondale was seen as the candidate who cried wolf when he proposed a message that directly challenged the bright view presented by Reagan—a view apparently held by most of the voting public.

Mondale's vision brought back memories of the years of despair under Carter. It also reminded voters of Mondale's connection with the Carter administration. Reagan was viewed as the president who turned around the mistakes of the Carter administration. This understanding was another item of the voters' subjective knowledge that hurt Mondale.

Reagan's vision can also explain the so-called teflon factor, which posits

---

that criticism bounces off of Reagan because of some unknown force. Such a theory is not new. The Greek philosopher Isocrates explained the existence of this tendency in his "Antidosis." In the following excerpt, insert America for Athens to understand Reagan's popularity.

For if you please the people of Athens, no matter what you do they will not judge your conduct by the facts but will construe it in a light favourable to you; and if you make mistakes, they will overlook them, while if you succeed, they will exalt your success to the high heaven. For good will has this effect upon all men.\(^{10}\)

Implicit in Isocrates's statement is that such a communicator is unethical, for he or she is able to deceive the audience through good will.

Telling the people what they want to hear is not necessarily unethical, of course; it can have positive effects, such as restoring a sense of national pride. However, Reagan's articulation of his rhetorical vision is potentially dangerous. The claim of a Reagan mandate is indicative of that danger. If the leader of a nation believes that the people of that nation will blindly support whatever he deems fit, democracy is tossed aside. The threat is made worse when the citizens, because of their belief in their leader, accept without question the leader's premises. Trusting a leader is beneficial for a nation's citizens; blind trust, on the other hand, is a danger to a free-thinking society. People must always remind themselves to critically question the motives and decisions of their leaders.

The true test of Reagan's vision will occur, of course, in 1988 when the voters can see whether the bright future he promised is closer to reality. If the bright future has somehow vanished, the optimistic Reagan vision may have caused more harm than good. The higher citizens' expectations are lifted, the further they will fall if the vision does not become reality. In such a case, the four years of happiness may be outweighed by the following years of despair. Carter paid the price in 1980 for having failed to deliver on his bright promises for the future. The Republican successor to Ronald Reagan may have to pay that same price in 1988.

AN ANALOGIC ANALYSIS OF THE KEYNOTE ADDRESSES AT THE 1980 PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATING CONVENTIONS

William L. Benoist and J. Justin Gustainis

The two presidential nominating conventions are among the most important political events of the campaign. Sometimes, of course, the identity of one or both nominees is a foregone conclusion by the time of the convention, thus stripping the proceedings of much suspense. In some years, the clash of nominees in presidential debates offers greater drama than the quest for a major party's nomination. However, even these circumstances cannot totally rob the convention of its significance in the campaign.

Many factors contribute to the importance of the nominating conventions. The attention accorded them by the mass media is enormous. The public's attention naturally follows the media coverage, and this coverage is well deserved. Even if the identity of the presidential nominee is known beforehand—which, of course, is not always the case—the vice presidential candidate is frequently decided upon at the nominating convention. Party officials and supporters from across the country gather to praise their party and its candidate and often to castigate the opposition. Excitement runs at high levels and the national exposure gained from the pageantry and spectacle of the convention is undeniable.

This investigation provides a rhetorical analysis of the 1980 presidential nominating conventions, analyzing the speech that is "an essential item on the agenda of all national nominating conventions,"¹ the keynote address.²


² The printed source for the Republican keynote address was Vital Speeches of the Day 46 (15 Aug. 1980): 646–651. This transcript was edited by checking it against a tape of the speech recorded from television. Although the New York Times printed extensive excerpts from Morris Udall's keynote speech (see "Excerpts from the Text of Udall's Keynote Address to the Democratic Convention," New York Times 12 Aug. 1980: B11), no complete transcript of this speech has been published. The text employed for this analysis was transcribed by the authors from a tape recording of the televised address. Page references to Udall's address refer to pages of this transcript.
The analog method underpins this analysis, and its logic is discussed briefly before turning to analysis of the speeches by Guy Vander Jagt and Morris Udall.

The Analog Method

The notion that speeches delivered in similar circumstances are likely to resemble each other in certain significant regards is venerable. Rosenfield was the first to operationalize this assumption in his method of “analog criticism,” asserting that “the generic resemblance of . . . two speeches . . . invites what may be called analog criticism—comparing the speeches in such ways that each address serves as reference standard for the other.” He recognizes that analog criticism can be a study of two speeches of the same genre, as in the case, of this analysis. If the situations in which two discourses develop are similar, given the assumption that the situation is likely to influence the discourse produced in it, it is reasonable to conclude that any similarities in the discourses delivered in the two situations may very well be functions of that similar set of circumstances. This knowledge permits the explanation of past and present—and the prediction and control of future—discourse presented in such a situation.

The analog method is useful for a variety of reasons, three of which are identified by Rosenfield.

Comparison of these particular speeches is fruitful on several counts. First, an element of objectivity . . . is introduced when the speeches are played off against each other in the critic's analysis. Second, the identification of similar qualities in the two messages suggests to the critic certain constraints operating in an otherwise undefined form. . . . Where we discover similarities in the messages, we have grounds for attributing those qualities to the situation or the genre rather than to the individual speaker. And should we at some future date find modified tactics in . . . speeches, we would be in a position to determine whether an evolution had occurred in the form itself. Finally, because the surface conditions of these two speeches are so similar, the critic will be alert to the distinctive qualities of each. And having recognized these differences, he will be justified in evaluating the configuration of unique features in each speech as evidence of the individual speaker’s artistry in responding to the exigencies of the situation.

This suggests that the analog criticism can serve as or be conceived of as a preliminary to a generic study. Certainly the confidence with which the critic ascribes similarities to the situation would increase with the number of speeches examined, at least up to a point (Campbell develops a similar argument, although her evaluation of analog criticism is more negative). The analog method possesses a unique advantage exploited by this essay.

---

5 Rosenfield 435.
The logic of generic criticism groups together all manifestations of a genre examined by the critic, the superb with the mediocre and the disastrous. In contrast, the analog's limitation of the focus of a critical study to two instances permits both comparison and contrast. The analog method facilitates analysis that isolates, analyzes, and explains key rhetorical differences between two otherwise similar discourses, a task for which generic criticism is ill suited. Thus, while it is perilous to base generalizations about an entire genre on a sample of two instances, the analog method has other uses that this study illustrates.

This essay examines two national nominating convention keynote addresses for several interrelated purposes. First, the essay illuminates these discourses, providing insights into choices made by their rhetors. Second, the essay explores the genre of keynote addresses as well as the possibility that there are subgenres depending upon the situation and the rhetor's purpose. It should be stressed that we do not attempt to establish the existence of these subgenres: such an undertaking requires the examination of more than these two speeches. Nevertheless, we can explore such possibilities while illuminating these particular rhetorical efforts.

The Keynote Address

The keynote address at a national nominating convention is intended to set the tone (note) for that convention. Thomas Farrell elaborates that as the musical etymology of keynote suggests, one responsibility of a keynote speaker is to sound the theme of the convention in a "responsive chord"—one that will set a proper mood for the proceedings. Of course, it is not just any note that should be struck by the keynote address, not just any theme. This speech is intended to generate tremendous enthusiasm for the party and its eventual nominee among the delegates specifically and the voters generally. Edwin Miles concludes that "in present-day politics the keynote speech has two primary purposes: to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates to a high pitch and to rally the voters of the nation to the party's standard."

This analysis identifies themes that run through the keynote addresses of Representative Guy Vander Jagt (delivered at the Republican National Convention in Detroit on 16 July 1980) and Representative Morris Udall (given at the Democratic National Convention in New York City on 11 August 1980). At this point it is appropriate to briefly sketch the situations faced by Vander Jagt and Udall at their respective nominating conventions.

The Republican party was in the strongest position it had occupied since Richard Nixon defeated George McGovern in 1972. The delegates and power brokers were united behind Ronald Reagan, whose nomination was assured before the convention opened. The only discordant note was struck by some Republican women who demonstrated on behalf of the Equal Rights Amendment, but their number was not large enough to pose a serious problem for the convention or the candidate. As the New York Times observed, "This year, the tranquility, the unity—and the potent political is-

---

8 Miles 26. See also Pitt 278.
sues—belong to the Republicans, while the party in power [is] . . . almost as divided, if not as bitterly, as in the 60's."

Ordinarily, an incumbent president enjoys an advantage in the convention. However, the Democratic party and President Jimmy Carter faced various tribulations in 1980. The major divisive factor for the Democrats was Senator Edward Kennedy, who had offered President Carter a strong challenge for the nomination. Kennedy would remain a bitter opponent until the day of the Democratic keynote address, when he would finally withdraw in favor of Carter. Other factors creating concern in the Democratic ranks included the third-party candidacy of John Anderson (a liberal Republican congressman), the links emerging between the president's brother Billy Carter and the government of Libya, an economy characterized by double-digit inflation and high unemployment, and the erosion of Carter's prestige by the ongoing Iranian hostage crisis. The result of these and other factors was that during the month before the Democratic convention, Carter trailed Governor Ronald Reagan in all major public opinion polls. A New York Times/CBS News poll, for example, showed Reagan as the preferred candidate of 47% of those polled, with Carter chosen by only 27% (Anderson's total was 13%).

These two keynote addresses delivered at their respective conventions were subjected to categorical content analysis using the word as the unit of analysis. The relative proportion of these themes was then determined. Such an approach has, of course, certain limitations. Factors such as selection and arrangement of words, supporting material, and nonverbal emphasis contribute to the impact of a message. However, number of words (amount of time) is surely one valid index of the importance of the topics included in an address; it is a relatively objective index, and it does not seem to influence the contrast of two speeches in any way that would systematically bias the results in an exploratory investigation. Future investigations should refine this approach.

Results

Table 1 displays the data obtained by this method. In the following discussion, each theme is illustrated with excerpts from the speeches. The themes are grouped by topic and are discussed in order of importance (importance was determined by the number of words the speaker devoted to each theme).

The first group of themes deals with praise of the speaker's party and candidate. The first theme in this group—a theme occurring in both speeches—is praise of the speaker's party. In one passage, Vander Jagt advances the philosophy of the Republican party.
TABLE 1. Republican and Democratic Keynote Addresses, 1980.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Vander Jagt</th>
<th>Udall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praise of Party and Candidate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. praise of the party itself</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>1,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. appeals for unity</td>
<td></td>
<td>547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. defense of the record</td>
<td></td>
<td>465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. praise of other party candidates</td>
<td></td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. praise of the candidate himself</td>
<td></td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. promise of benefits if elected</td>
<td></td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. praise of existing unity</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attacks on the Opposition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. attacks on the party</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>1,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. attacks on the candidate</td>
<td>745</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. prediction of disaster if elected</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. praise of America</td>
<td>1,233</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. praise of the opposition</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. prediction of victory</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. praise/invocation of God</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Words (coded and uncoded)</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>4,187</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Democrats believe that America is great because of all the good things that government does for people. Republicans—all Republicans together believe just the opposite. We believe that America is great not because of what government does for people, but because of what in America a free people can do for themselves and for their country.  

Udall touches on this theme frequently, lauding Democratic actions that further competition.

Democrats don't just preach competition, we practice it. And, as I said, Franklin Roosevelt, I believe, saved the free enterprise system. And American business has nearly always done better under Democratic presidents. And business and government has talked for generations about deregulation, but it was the Democratic party, working this past year with President Carter and the incumbent administration, that moved to deregulate the railroads.

Similar statements on the subject of energy are included in Udall's address.

And let me tell you that this Democratic Congress, working with this Democratic administration, has worked together to turn our energy situation around. In 1980, due to the conservation programs of the Congress and the administration, we'll be using a million barrels a day of oil less than was the case in 1977. This turnaround is permanent, it's important, and we're finally heading in the right direction of energy conservation.

---

13 Vander Jagt 649.
14 Udall 7–8.
15 Udall 9–10.
Both speeches contain numerous statements of this sort, which is not surprising, considering the functions keynote addresses at national nominating conventions are intended to perform.

There exists, however, a significant difference between these addresses in this area—Udall devotes over three times as much time to this theme as does Vander Jagt (23.2% of Udall’s speech versus 6.5% of Vander Jagt’s speech). This phenomenon may be related to the particular nature of the 1980 Democratic convention. At several points in his address, Udall expresses concern over the possibility that fights over various issues might tear the Democratic party apart. He declares, for instance, that “if we handle ourselves right in the next 72 hours, we can come out of here with a fighting chance.” Later, he admits that “we’re going to have some fights this week—so be it. But we should insist that there be no low blows, that we fight fair.” Later still, Udall goes so far as to state that “let’s point the finger this week at he in our midst who strikes the low blow. And let’s be genuine with each other, as Democrats. Because this November, that could make the difference.”

It seems clear from these statements that Udall anticipated fights—such as the Kennedy fight over delegates—when he prepared his speech and that he feared such fights could lose the election for his party. The last passage quoted above suggests that Udall also thought if they were all “genuine with each other, as Democrats,” then that fate might be avoided. Thus, Udall’s greater emphasis on this theme of praising one’s party may well have been occasioned by his fear that infighting could lose the election and by his corresponding belief that stressing the commonality and strength of his party could help to defeat the Republicans in November.

Appealing for party unity, the second theme, plays an important role in Udall’s address. In the following passage, Udall underlines the importance of party unity: “And so we do have our fights. But let none of us poison the well this week. In this uphill fight we face, we need every part of this Democratic coalition.” Later, he directly faces the issue again.

And you know, if you don’t feel unified by all that goes on here by Thursday, let me recommend Dr. Udall’s patent unity medicine. Just take one tablespoon of it; it can be water, or milk, or beer, or whatever turns you on. But take one tablespoon and close your eyes and say, “I want President Ronald Reagan.” Now if that doesn’t unify us, I don’t know what will.

This appeal is consistent with the analysis advanced above, involving Udall’s concern for the fallout of a bitter Democratic fight at the convention. Vander Jagt, on the other hand, did not need to appeal for unity. As is seen in
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16 Udall 3.
17 Udall 14–15.
18 Udall 16.
20 Udall 11.
21 Udall 15.
the seventh theme, his party was already perceived as being sufficiently unified.  

The third theme is defense of the candidate's record. This category is empty in Vander Jagt's address, but it is an important factor in Udall's. Near the beginning of his speech, Udall says of Carter and Mondale that "no administration in modern times has received less credit for some pretty solid achievements they've developed in the last three years." Other examples of this defense can be found in Udall's praise of the party's competition and energy, where he specifically includes Carter and his administration in his praise of the Democrats. 

The difference between the two keynote addresses can be accounted for by the different situations faced by the speakers. Reagan was not an incumbent and consequently had no record to defend. While his experience as governor of California could have been mentioned, that had not yet become a serious focus for discussion. As an incumbent, however, Udall's candidate was subject to attack on the basis of his record in office. Thus, Udall had factors on which to be defensive (the economy, for example). As seen later, this topic constitutes a large part of Vander Jagt's convention presentation, delivered prior to Udall's address. It is likely, therefore, that Udall felt an obligation to defend Carter's record in his speech. 

The fourth theme involves praising other candidates who contended for the party's nomination during the primaries. Vander Jagt includes only a passing reference to them: "Ronald Reagan comes to this convention a winner, a winner over the finest field of Presidential candidates that any party ever assembled, and we're proud of all of them." Udall spends more time on this topic, particularly in discussing Kennedy (recall that Kennedy did not withdraw his candidacy until the day of the keynote address): "Almost anybody can be a great winner. What takes real class and real gallantry is the kind of performance that Senator Kennedy has put on these last few months through disappointment of all kinds." Udall also refers to Kennedy as a "great American and a great man."

Here, as with the first theme, the difference in time spent by Udall and Vander Jagt on this topic—over 6% of Udall's speech compared with less than 1% of Vander Jagt's speech—can be accounted for by Udall's fears of a Democratic fight that could cost them the election. Praise of particular candidates, especially Kennedy (who was Carter's chief challenger), may well have been intended to placate certain factions of the party and to improve Democratic chances in the general election.

The last three themes appear to a significant degree only in Vander Jagt's discourse. The fifth theme consists of praise of the candidate. This praise is relatively abstract and general. While it is similar, of course, both to Udall's defense of Carter's record and to the next theme, promise of benefits if

22 Reagan was spoken of as "uniting his contentious party for the first time in the generation around the colors of conservatism and the sudden, heady scent of victory." Newsweek 96 (28 July 1980): 14.
23 Udall 2.
24 Vander Jagt 648.
25 Udall 1.
26 Udall 1.
elected, these latter themes tend to cite specific instances. The following excerpt from Vander Jagt's address exemplifies the fifth theme and illustrates how it is distinct from the others.

When Ronald Reagan started the campaign, he did not have the support of the country clubs, the boardrooms, the media, the Washington establishment, or the Republican establishment. The only thing Ronald Reagan had was the support and loyalty and love of the people. He had that and an unmatched ability to feel and to express the hopes of the people for themselves and for America, and so the people responded to Ronald Reagan.27

While there is no reason why Udall could not have employed this theme to his advantage, he may have preferred the more concrete instances categorized in the second theme. As discussed earlier, unless he wished to bring up Reagan's past record as governor, Vander Jagt had no record of his candidate to defend. Thus, more abstract praise was required.

The sixth theme concerns promises or predictions of benefits to be gained upon the election of the speaker's candidate. The Republican keynote displays this theme to some extent, with statements like the following: "We want to make America great again and we know that under the leadership of Ronald Reagan and a New Republican Congress, America can be great again."28 There seems to be no particular reason why this theme is not developed by Udall—it would seem to be appropriate, and its omission may be considered a flaw in his speech.

The seventh theme, the last to be grouped under praise of the speaker's party and candidate, is praise of party unity. Vander Jagt explains that "just as Ronald Reagan has brought unprecedented unity to our Republican Party, Ronald Reagan can bring America together for a new beginning."29 The fact that this theme fails to emerge in Udall's address is accounted for quite simply: the Democratic party was not united like its opposition; and Udall was quite aware of it, as was discussed earlier.

Within this broad first grouping, the distribution of remarks is not extraordinary. Praise of party is a topic likely to go over well at a party convention, and more remarks by both keynote speakers fall into this category than into any other. If we combine the fifth and sixth themes—praise of the candidate and benefits upon the candidate's election—and juxtapose this combination with the other related category—defense of the candidate's (Carter's) record—it becomes apparent that the second most frequently employed topic is praise of the party's nominee, another idea likely to be popular at a nominating convention.

The second major grouping to be considered consists of attacks on the opposition. Here, attacks on the opposing party (the eighth theme) are the most numerous, especially if both speeches are considered. Vander Jagt, for instance, claims that our economic problems were deliberately brought about by Carter and the Democratic Congress.

Really—on purpose—they increased interest rates; on purpose—they tightened credit; on purpose—last Fall the Carter Congress adopted the Carter

27 Vander Jagt 648.
28 Vander Jagt 647.
29 Vander Jagt 648.
budget of despair which their own chairman said was deliberately designed to slow the economy down. "Slow the economy down" means "put people out of work." They predicted it and they succeeded—889,000 added to the unemployment rolls in May alone. That's the biggest monthly jump in history, including the depths of the Great Depression.\(^{20}\)

Vander Jagt also levels attacks at the Washington Democratic establishment: "The Washington establishment, big government Democrats long separated from their own heritage and their own people insist on making government even bigger and stronger, and people become smaller and weaker."\(^{31}\)

Udall's speech is not without its attacks on the Republicans. As he mentions at one point, "I can't help kidding my Republican friends a little bit, poking fun at 'em. These candidates they crank up now and then seem to be recycling old ideas, and old candidates."\(^{32}\) Later Udall responds to the Republican claims of unity: "Republicans want to boast, I suppose, of the unity they have this year. But let 'em boast, because it isn't difficult to unify a narrow-based political party, which is what the Republicans have become."\(^{33}\) Before discussing the implications of this theme, the other two themes in this group are illustrated.

The ninth theme consists of attacks on the opposition candidate. Vander Jagt blasts the economic situation that emerged during Carter's presidency.

Four years ago, Carter ran for office running against high taxes, high inflation and high unemployment. He's missed the ball on all three. Taxes—they've gone up under Carter in three years more than any other three-year period in the history of the Republic. That's strike one. Inflation—Carter's doubled it and tripled it since he's been in office. That's strike two. Unemployment—we're adding to the rolls faster than ever in history, and that's strike three.\(^{34}\)

Udall attacks Reagan in a slightly more humorous way with this passage.

Somebody reported the other day that the Reagan plan was, in case of nuclear attack, he would have Michael Landon get the wagons in a circle first thing around. And the other old story that Ronald Reagan had signed a new film contract with a company called Eighteenth-Century Fox.\(^{35}\)

Both of these attacks are sharp, although the one employed by Vander Jagt utilizes more substance.

Both keynote speakers predict disaster if the opposition party is elected, the tenth theme. In the Republican keynote we find this claim.

And if Carter's inflation of the first quarter continues unabated, by the time some of today's babies are finishing their education the bill for a cheeseburger, a milkshake and french fries at the Big Boy would come to $355. And if you think that's bad, by the time they're ready for their three-bedroom dream home in the suburbs, it would be over $7 million and steak at the supermarket $1093 a pound.\(^{36}\)

\(^{20}\) Vander Jagt 648.
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On the other hand, the Democratic view of a Republican future asserts the following.

*Business Week* magazine said two years ago of the Reagan-Kemp-Roth money tree, and I quote, they said it would add $100 billion to the deficit that is already dangerously swollen, and it would touch off an inflationary explosion that would wreck the country and impoverish everyone on fixed incomes.37

Neither Vander Jagt’s nor Udall’s prediction is very comforting.

Examining all three of these attacks on the opposition together, we find, first, that Udall attacks the party much more frequently than does Vander Jagt (Udall employs this theme 36.2% of the time; Vander Jagt uses it only 11.5% of the time). Perhaps the Republican keynoter is better able, or prefers, to attack the opposition candidate rather than the opposition party. Udall, then, concentrates on the party. Vander Jagt, however, uses well over eight times as much material as Udall in attacking the candidate (18.0% for Vander Jagt as compared with 2.1% for Udall). This is reasonable, for the Republicans, who surely wanted to attract Democratic voters, were more likely to do so if their attack focused more on the president than on the Democratic party in general.

The second quotation from Vander Jagt attacking the Democrats distinguishes between the establishment leaders, who are criticized, and “their own people”—the Democratic voters—who are not attacked. In addition, the Republicans postponed Vander Jagt’s speech so that it would air on prime time television, thus providing further evidence of the importance accorded to the national audience.

Nevertheless, Vander Jagt does not spend as much time attacking Carter as Udall spends attacking the Republican party. This may be because Vander Jagt felt no need to emphasize this topic. In fact, in one passage he declares that he “didn’t come here tonight to tell you how bad Jimmy Carter is. You know that, the American people feel it. There’s no need to dwell on it.”38 This statement could have been made for effect only, but the fact remains that he did spend less time on the strategies in this grouping than did Udall.

Just as with the sixth strategy, it is not clear why Udall spends so little time predicting disaster upon Reagan’s election (only 1% compared with Vander Jagt’s 4.6%). Again, this would seem to be at least as effective as attacking the Republican party, if not more so. Of course, Udall’s immediate audience—the Democratic leaders, officials, and delegates—were likely to appreciate attacks on Republicans, but this does not entirely account for the distribution of remarks in this grouping.

The last four themes do not fit into groupings as well as do the earlier ones. Praise of America (the eleventh theme) constitutes the single largest theme in Vander Jagt’s speech. As he says, “We believe that America is great not because of what government does for people, but because of what in America a free people can do for themselves and for their country.”39 Later,
Vander Jagt asserts that “There are no two words that have better described our American spirit than ‘We can.’ Whenever duty said to Americans ‘you must,’ Americans responded with ‘If we must, we can and we will!’—and we did.” This theme also occurs in Udall’s discourse.

Back during the celebration for the Bicentennial, as thousands of people poured into Washington to see the fireworks on the night of their 200th birthday, I drove past one of the family places where they were parked along the river, and an old man had placed along the river a sign. And that sign said “America ain’t perfect, but we’re not done yet.” And I think that old man kind of said it all.

Both speakers praise their country, which is not an unexpected strategy in speeches of this nature. The question arises, however, why Vander Jagt spends so much time on this theme—over eight times the words Udall uses. As mentioned earlier, this is the largest individual category in Vander Jagt’s speech: 29.8% of the speech as opposed to 2.9% of Udall’s speech. Perhaps Vander Jagt was more responsive to the television audience. Republicans, Democrats, Independents, and others can all react positively to this material. Such appeals would help to achieve a broader base of support, which the Republicans surely wanted.

The twelfth theme is praise of the opposition. Vander Jagt emphasizes this in certain passages such as the following: “And there are millions of good Democrats in America who agree with Woodrow Wilson and Ronald Reagan that only by limited government can we increase liberty, opportunity, and productivity.” Those “millions of good Democrats” are all potential voters, and Vander Jagt distinguishes the voters from the leaders (the “Washington Democratic establishment”), whom he attacks. While this theme can be found in Udall’s speech, when he states that “since Lincoln’s time, the Republican party has had an honorable place in our history,” it is not a significant theme for Udall (0.3% of Udall’s speech; 4.6% of Vander Jagt’s).

Both keynote addresses contain predictions of victory, the thirteenth theme. Vander Jagt declares that “From all over America, we have come here to Detroit this week to select Ronald Reagan our standard-bearer. We will go forth from Detroit to elect Ronald Reagan our President.” Udall’s approach is somewhat different. At one point he states that “A lot of folks are writing Democratic obituaries for 1980, but understand that this old Democratic mule isn’t easy to get rid of. And if we handle ourselves right in the next 72 hours, we can come out of here with a fighting chance to put this all together.” Later, Udall points out that while “Governor Reagan feels pretty good about the big lead he has in the polls ... so did Tom Dewey.” Later still, he muses that “somebody once said that if there’s a way to lose, the Democrats’ll find it. But I don’t think we’re going to do
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that this year." In only one place does Udall sound enthusiastic and certain: "Governor Reagan, if you're listening out there, we're coming after you and we're gonna win." Thus, although both keynote speakers develop this theme of victory and spend about the same amount of time on it (Vander Jagt spends 3.3% of his speech on this theme, Udall 2.9%), it appears that Vander Jagt is much more confident about this claim of impending victory.

The final theme deals with appeals to/invocations of God. This theme appears only in the Republican’s discourse. Part of Vander Jagt’s praise of America is based on this theme.

Our system is sound and great because it’s founded where all greatness has to begin—upon a faith in God. That’s the bedrock and everything springs from that. And, that faith is enunciated at the very beginning in the opening words of the Declaration of Independence. “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that man is endowed by his Creator with certain unalienable rights.” That’s the source of our rights as Americans, not the government, but God. All, all the rest of it was set up to preserve and protect the rights that God gave us when he created us in His own image.

Because emphasizing man’s place in God’s plan was an important aspect of the Republican campaign, it is not surprising to discover such emphasis in Vander Jagt’s address. It is not clear why Udall makes no reference whatever to the Deity in his speech, especially given the fact that his party’s candidate is a born-again Christian.

Summary of the Keynote Addresses

Table 1 provides a summary of the themes developed in these two speeches and of their relative emphasis. The two keynote addresses have the following elements in common:

—praise of the speaker’s party
—praise of the speaker’s candidate (including benefits upon his election and defense of his record)
—(at least some) praise of the other candidates in the party
—attacks on the opposition party
—attacks on the opposition candidate
—(at least some) prediction of disaster upon the election of the opposition candidate
—praise of America
—(at least some) praise of the opposition
—predictions of victory

Conclusion

In accordance with the analysis advanced in the discussion of the analog method, the common themes outlined above are likely to be characteristic of the genre of keynote addresses. Of course, these conclusions are highly
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tentative, based as they are on only two examples of the genre. For instance, it could be that references to God are part of this genre, and that Udall's speech is defective in this regard. On the other hand, praise of the opposition may not be characteristic of the genre. Vander Jagt's development and Udall's brief mention of this theme may be accidental features, constituting part of only these (and possibly a few other) keynote addresses. Nevertheless, these conclusions are a useful contribution to the study of keynote addresses; they describe some of the rhetorical traits that these two instances of the genre have in common.

Contrasting the two addresses is especially useful. Vander Jagt's speech holds together well. He spends a fair amount of time praising his party and its candidate, an endeavor well suited to his immediate audience. He levels a vehement attack on Carter specifically as well as on the Democratic party. However, in at least one place, he carefully distinguishes his attack on the Democrats, criticizing only the "Washington Democratic establishment." Elsewhere, he praises the "millions of good Democrats in America." This strategy, along with Vander Jagt's extensive praise of America and of the Deity, may well have improved the Republican candidate's appeal to many Democratic voters and to others as well. For a keynote speaker of the minority party, who surely wanted to attract crossover tones, this was an especially important distinction.

Udall's speech seems to be largely a response to the rhetorical situation he faced. He, too, praises party and candidate, but he attacks the Republicans indiscriminately. He spends much less time than Vander Jagt does in praising America's virtues. His attention, in many places, is given to defusing potential clashes and to unifying a party that had been rendered asunder both in and after the primaries. Udall makes no serious appeal to non-Democratic voters. Neither does he spend much time delineating either the benefits of another Carter administration or the disadvantages of a Reagan presidency.

Most important, this study supports the notion of subgenres and the idea that factors in addition to the general situation systematically exert influence on the rhetoric produced. Genre theory suggests that the discourse occurring in a given situation (e.g., the nominating convention keynote address) provides the speaker with an impetus to make certain rhetorical choices (e.g., including such topics as praise of one's party, of the party's candidate, and of America generally; attacks on the opposition; and so forth). Once keynote speakers have made these choices, expectations arise that increase the likelihood that future keynoters will also include these topics.

However, this investigation suggests that other, less global, features than the speech situation may systematically influence discourse produced within a given genre. For example, an extremely important variable in the political campaign equation concerns party unity. Some keynoters speak to unified parties, and the unity becomes a resource for them to exploit. On the other hand, some keynote speakers face sundered parties, and the disunity becomes an obstacle that they are impelled to overcome. These situational differences, each common to our electoral system, are likely to influence the discourse produced by keynote speakers. Hence, an examination of the topics covered in Vander Jagt's and Udall's discourses, along with a study of their respective political circumstances, strongly suggests
that the genre of keynote addresses has two variants: keynote speeches addressed to a unified party and keynote speeches presented to a disunified party.

This investigation, based on one instance of each proposed subgenre, is not proffered as conclusive evidence of the existence of subgenres generally or of these particular subgenres. The sample is, of course, too small for such claims. The sample does provide strongly suggestive evidence for each claim. Furthermore, the proposed classification is not without difficulty, for "party unity" presumably is manifested in a continuum rather than in two discrete categories. Nor is this analysis intended to be exhaustive: other factors besides party unity may play important roles in the genre, and other features besides topics included may yield interesting similarities and differences. Even so, this analog provides interesting grist for the speculation that at least some generic classifications are overly broad and susceptible to further refinement and that the notion of subgenres is a useful addition to the critic's repertoire.
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