

1970

# A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches of the Democratic and Republican National Nominating Conventions of 1968

Joseph Earl Block  
*Eastern Illinois University*

---

## Recommended Citation

Block, Joseph Earl, "A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches of the Democratic and Republican National Nominating Conventions of 1968" (1970). *Masters Theses*. 4042.  
<https://thekeep.eiu.edu/theses/4042>

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Theses & Publications at The Keep. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses by an authorized administrator of The Keep. For more information, please contact [tabruns@eiu.edu](mailto:tabruns@eiu.edu).

PAPER CERTIFICATE 42

TO: Graduate Degree Candidates who have written formal theses.

SUBJECT: Permission to reproduce theses.

The University Library is receiving a number of requests from other institutions asking permission to reproduce dissertations for inclusion in their library holdings. Although no copyright laws are involved, we feel that professional courtesy demands that permission be obtained from the author before we allow theses to be copied.

Please sign one of the following statements.

Booth Library of Eastern Illinois University has my permission to lend my thesis to a reputable college or university for the purpose of copying it for inclusion in that institution's library or research holdings.

May 12, 1970  
Date

I respectfully request Booth Library \_\_\_\_\_ Illinois University not  
allow my thesis be reproduced because \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Author

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE KEYNOTE SPEECHES OF THE DEMOCRATIC

AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTIONS OF 1968

(TITLE)

BY

Joseph Earl Block

**THESIS**

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS  
FOR THE DEGREE OF  
Master of Arts

IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL, EASTERN ILLINOIS UNIVERSITY  
CHARLESTON, ILLINOIS

1970

YEAR

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THIS THESIS BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING  
THIS PART OF THE GRADUATE DEGREE

5/12/70  
DATE

ADVISER

5/12/70  
DATE

DEPARTMENT

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE KEYNOTE SPEECHES  
OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL  
NOMINATING CONVENTIONS OF 1968**

---

**A Thesis**

**Presented to**

**the Faculty of the Department of Speech  
Eastern Illinois University**

---

**In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts**

---

**by**

**Joseph Earl Block**

**May 1970**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I.	THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS . . . . . 1
	Introduction . . . . . 1
	The Purpose of the Study . . . . . 2
	Hypotheses to be Tested . . . . . 2
	Importance of the Study . . . . . 2
	Limitations of the Study . . . . . 3
	Definitions of Terms . . . . . 3
	Organisation of the Remainder of the Study . . . . . 3
II.	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . . 5
	Concepts of Keynote Speaking . . . . . 5
	General Development of Keynote Speaking . . . . . 10
	Biographical Sketches of the Keynote Speakers of the 1968 National Nominating Conventions . . . . . 13
III.	METHOD OF PROCEDURE AND MATERIALS USED . . . . . 16
	The Materials Used . . . . . 16
	The Method of Procedure . . . . . 17
IV.	A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE KEYNOTE SPEECHES OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTIONS OF 1968 . . . . . 22
	The Republican Keynote Speech . . . . . 22
	The Democratic Keynote Speech . . . . . 35
V.	RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . . 46
	Accumulation of the Data . . . . . 46
	Findings of the Process of Evaluation . . . . . 46

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	51
Summary of the Study . . . . .	51
Conclusions Drawn from the Study . . . . .	52
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	54
APPENDIX . . . . .	57

## CHAPTER I

### THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

#### I. INTRODUCTION

Keynote speeches were presented to the conventions of political parties for almost a hundred years. Politicos thought them to be of significant value to the political setting and to the arousing of enthused spirit among convention delegates.

The keynote speech traditionally held a sentimental place on the convention agenda. Presented during the earliest order of business, so that the delegates were properly stirred and inspired, the keynote speech was traditionally addressed to the glory, laude, and honor of the party. The keynote speakers were carefully chosen for their loyalty to the party causes, their adeptness at eloquent speech, and for their ability to arouse in the convention delegates a spirit of purpose and unity.

Until recent years, the keynote address was a lengthy oration devoted to party causes and goals. The keynoter traditionally expounded the issues of the times, ridiculed the political opposition, and exalted the achievements of his own party. But recent keynoters shortened their remarks to include only the seriousness of the issues and their party's proposals for action and solution. Much of the embellishment of political principles and ideals gave way to straightforwardness and deliberate con-

cepts of political pragmatism.

## II. THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to determine the several factors of criteria applicable to keynote speaking, and to determine how favorably the 1968 political keynote speeches compared relative to the selected criteria.

## III. HYPOTHESES TO BE TESTED

The hypotheses to be tested in this study were: (1) the 1968 keynote addresses were valid examples of meaning and purpose as set forth by writers on keynote addresses; and (2) the rhetoric of the 1968 keynote addresses contained more similarities than differences to the criteria.

## IV. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Since the first political keynote speech was delivered in 1896, according to historian Edwin A. Miles, little was written about political keynote speaking.<sup>1</sup>

Miles believed the keynote speech had only two functions: to raise the enthusiasm of the delegates and to rally the voters to the party's standard. Because of these functions, political party leaders sustained the position of the keynote speech. Party consent and sentiment also influenced the position of the keynote speech.

The importance of the study was based on the investigator's belief that, because political party leaders continued to honor the

---

<sup>1</sup>Edwin A. Miles, the Keynote Speech at National Nominating Conventions (The Quarterly Journal of Speech) Volume XLVI, February 1960, pp. 26-31.

place of the keynote speech on their convention agenda, the keynote speech still held a significant role, and that a comparative analysis of the most recent political keynote speeches was contributive to the general knowledge of keynote speaking.

#### V. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study was limited to an investigation into the concepts of keynote speaking as reported by writers on the subject, the general development of keynote speaking, the life and background of the speakers, and to the analysis of the keynote speeches.

Factors such as contrast with other keynote speeches by other speakers in other times since 1896, intellectual and emotional behavior of listeners, personality manifestations, social incentives, attitudes, propaganda techniques and leadership phenomena were not considered.

To give the study central focus on key issues of importance, other considerations were left to further study.

#### VI. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

For clarity, the term "keynote speech" was defined as that speech which stimulated enthusiasm and spirit, and which was presented during the earliest order of business in order to establish an appropriate mood for the business at hand.

#### VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE REMAINDER OF THE STUDY

The remainder of the study was reported in five chapters.

These chapters were organized to contain the essential information pertinent to the study of the question beyond the preliminary considerations presented in this chapter. The organization of these five chapters was as follows:

Chapter II, Review of the Literature. In order to gain as comprehensible an understanding of the studies problem as possible, the major contributions of literature dealing with keynote speaking were investigated and reported in Chapter II. Biographical sketches of the 1968 keynote speakers were included in Chapter II.

Chapter III, Method of Procedure and Materials Used. The method of procedure and the materials used in conducting the study were organized and reported in the following manner:

1. The materials used.
2. The method of procedure.
3. Selection of the criteria.
4. Application of the criteria to the keynote speeches.
5. Treatment of the data.

Chapter IV, A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches of the Democratic and Republican National Nominating Conventions of 1968. A comparative analysis of the two political keynote speeches of 1968 was made and reported in Chapter IV.

Chapter V, Results of the Study. The results of the study were reported in Chapter V. The organization of Chapter V was as follows:

1. Accumulation of the data.
2. Findings of the process of evaluation.

Chapter VI, Summary and Conclusions. Chapter VI summarized the study and the conclusions arrived at as a result of the study.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### Concepts of Keynote Speaking

Alan H. Monroe, a recognized authority on public speaking, wrote briefly of the keynote speech:

Keynote addresses, intended to inspire or stimulate, are made quite frequently at conventions. At any meeting or series of meetings the opening speaker should endeavor not only to acquaint his listeners with the purpose of the meeting but also to stimulate their enthusiasm and establish an appropriate mood for the business at hand.<sup>2</sup>

Another well-known authority on the subject of public speaking, A. Craig Baird, agreed with Monroe, and added:

My speech has been advertised as a keynoter. The keynote speech should embody the best of the epideictic, forensic, and deliberative types. It should eulogize the past of the party, applaud the present, and glorify the future.<sup>3</sup>

It was the concept of Monroe and Baird that a keynote speech stimulated enthusiasm and created whatever mood was appropriate to the occasion and, as well, logical appeals to the party faithful.

Many critics believed that, in order to do that, the speaker must possess certain qualities of personality and character. Donald G. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace enumerated what those qualities were:

---

<sup>2</sup>Alan H. Monroe, Principles and Types of Speech (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company) 1962, p. 390.

<sup>3</sup>A. Craig Baird, Speech and the New Philosophies, a speech delivered before the CSSA in Chicago, April 6, 1962.

The impression comes to the listener from two main sources: (1) the speaker's reputation of which the listener may know something prior to the speech; (2) the speech as presented, partly through what the speaker says, chiefly through how he says it--through his manner of presentation, his bodily activity, facial expression, and vocal qualities that mean sincerity, earnestness, modesty, respect for others, courtesy, and geniality.<sup>4</sup>

These personal qualities of which Bryant and Wallace wrote related to the speaker's personal, ethical appeal. The ordinary American listener, according to Milton Dickens of the University of Southern California, was often accused of responding mostly to so-called appeals to emotion. Perhaps we contrasted emotional appeals, he said, with appeals to reason, but to do so was misleading. Because, primarily, the keynote speech was one to stimulate enthusiasm and mood, in accordance with Monroe's concept, what Dickens said about the relationship between emotion and logic was important to any examination of the keynote address. Dickens declared that:

Many people believe that speeches or sections of speeches are either logical or emotional, and that as you increase the proportion of one, you decrease the proportion of the other. Furthermore, many people believe that they can readily tell whether a speech is logical or emotional. The foregoing popular beliefs were tested experimentally by Randall Ruchelle. He asked a large number of listeners and readers to evaluate many speeches, rating the speeches in terms of degrees of logical and emotional appeal. The agreement among the judgments was scarcely greater than would have occurred if the respondents had flipped coins. It is fair to say that the concept of appeals to reason vs. appeals to emotion is practically useless in studying public speaking.<sup>5</sup>

Ruchelle completed his studies in emotional and intellectual appeals in 1958. His conclusions were those of Dickens's.

---

<sup>4</sup>Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking (New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc.) 1953, pp. 314-318.

<sup>5</sup>Milton Dickens, Speech: Dynamic Communication (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.) 1963, p. 302.

Related to the keynote address, it appeared that what Dickens and Ruechelle reported was significant in that the keynote address stimulated emotionally and logically, but that neither was wholly independent of the other.

Carl Allen Pitt, of the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, told of former Minnesota Congressman Walter H. Judd's keynote speech at the Republican National Convention in 1960:

During his keynote speech, Judd brought about a lively interaction between himself and his listeners. He set in motion an effective combination of the sussive ingredients imbedded within the communicator, the message, the receivers, and the occasion. Through this harmonious relationship within the total communication configuration, he was able to locate and strike a keynote that inspired his fellow Republicans to strive for victory at the polls.<sup>6</sup>

Pitt's passage was suggestive that Monroe's concept of a keynote speech was correct. Judd, on the occasion of his keynote address, stimulated his audience by bringing about "a lively interaction."

Pitt also observed that Judd "made a strong effort to establish and maintain harmony with his listeners, for his speech indicated definite identification with both the radio-television audience and the convention audience. Broad appeals to Americanism, freedom, national economic welfare, and the Deity characterized an effort to identify the speaker with the massive national audience. On the other hand, the speaker's direct refutation of Democratic charges and his review of Republican achievements in domestic and foreign policy indicated an effort to inspire partisan Republicans."<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Carl Allen Pitt, Judd's Keynote Speech--A congruous Configuration of Communication (The Southern Speech Journal) Summer 1968, Volume XXXIII, p. 278.

<sup>7</sup>Op. Cit., p. 281.

Pitt felt that congruence should be an important part of any keynote address. He stated:

Judd inspired his audience but avoided the rhetorical excesses practiced by many of his predecessors. His keynote address added weight to the concept that congruence is a significant component of inspirational speaking.<sup>8</sup>

In Pitt's remarks was seen a corroboration with what Bryant and Wallace said about the qualities that meant "sincerity, earnestness, modesty, respect for others, courtesy and geniality."

If the keynote speech was to stimulate, and if to stimulate was to rely upon emotional proof, perhaps Joseph Priestley's observation was significant. He looked upon emotional proof as an energizer and expediter of conduct:

The genuine and proper use of the passions undoubtedly is to rouse men to just and vigorous action upon every emergency, without the slow intervention of reason.

Thonssen and Baird agreed. They stated that "demonstration of an idea to others has its root in feelings and attitudes which result from the speaker's having, either directly or vicariously, experienced the thought."<sup>10</sup>

Thonssen and Baird concluded that "pathetic proof includes all those materials and devices calculated to put the audience in a frame of mind suitable for the reception of the speaker's ideas."

And they agreed with A. K. Rogers that the "normal human being is not content merely to be logical and realistic; he craves food for his emotions, also."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup>Op. Cit., p. 288.

<sup>9</sup>Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Company) 1948, p. 357.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 357.

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 359.

Such was the case back in 1916 when Woodrow Wilson ran for the presidency. His slogan "He kept us out of war" literally connoted past accomplishments, but it implied what many countrymen hoped was the future policy for the nation. Martin Glynn, temporary chairman of the 1916 Democratic national convention, was generally credited with creating the motto. His was one of the most successful of all keynote addresses. Glynn was chosen to deliver the keynote address because of his close relationship to the party and to Wilson, but mostly, he was chosen for his adeptness at presenting keynote addresses. On March 1, 1916, Glynn, former Governor of New York, gave a rousing keynote address for the Democratic state convention in Syracuse. The New York Times called it the big feature of the convention:

Everybody understood that in delivering this address he was the spokesman of President Wilson and the Federal Administration. Mr. Glynn's speech here today was intended to sound the keynote of President Wilson's campaign for re-election, as well as to convey to the country his answer to the attacks made on his politics, foreign and domestic, by Mr. Root as spokesman for the Republican opposition.<sup>12</sup>

Then, on Flag Day, June 14, 1916, Mr. Glynn once again was introduced to the rostrum. He began his keynote address. As he spoke, notes were taken which appeared that same day in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, saying that:

The former governor is cock-sure-looking little man in black. He is speaking for the most part without notes, as if what he is saying were his own. His style is that of the finished political school. He knows how to gesticulate, and does not do it simply for the exercise, as most public speakers seem to do. Glynn hasn't any trouble warming the convention up. He very soon has it howling so hard one can just hear the band playing.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup>New York Times, March 2, 1916, p. 1.

<sup>13</sup>St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 14, 1916, p. 1.

Glynn struck the hearts of his listeners when he compared Wilson to the founding fathers: "The fate of the fathers of our country at the hands of a noisy minority is the fate of the President of the United States today. But their reward of dignities merited and honors conferred will be his reward when the people speak on the seventh of next November."<sup>14</sup>

The audience was well-pleased with these words. A wild demonstration lasting sixteen minutes broke out as delegates yelled and waved flags and banners.

#### General Development of Keynote Speaking

Historian Edwin A. Miles traced the general development of keynote speaking from the middle of the nineteenth century to the present time. He discovered that keynote speakers delivered ringing speeches on such issues as free and unlimited coinage of silver, sound money, gold-standard plank, war and peace, trade and commerce, foreign policy, and political administrations.

Miles, Associate Professor of History at the University of Houston, believed that "in present-day politics the keynote speech has two primary 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."<sup>15</sup>

He continued:

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

<sup>15</sup>Edwin A. Miles, The Keynote Speech at National Nominating Conventions (The Quarterly Journal of Speech) Volume XLVI, February 1960, pp. 26-31.

Loud cheers, sustained applause, and prolonged demonstrations are apt to greet the more impassioned passages of the orator. His language is inclined to be bombastic, for custom demands that he avoid no extravagance of speech, either in praise or in blame in glorifying the accomplishments of his own party or in lamenting the dismal failures of the opposition.<sup>16</sup>

According to Miles, the first keynote address was given at the Democratic national convention on July 7, 1896, in the Chicago Coliseum. It was delivered by a courtly ex-Confederate, Senator John W. Daniel of Virginia. He sounded the keynote for silver in a ringing speech. On the following day, William Jennings Bryan electrified the convention with his celebrated "Cross of Gold" speech.<sup>17</sup> Senator Daniel's address found a niche in the limbo of unremembered speeches. But the precedent was not forgotten. In the American political vocabulary, "keynoter" became a synonym for temporary chairman of a national nominating convention, until 1952 when General Douglas MacArthur served as Republican keynoter but not as temporary chairman.<sup>18</sup>

After Senator Daniel's precedent-making address, Democrats and Republicans alike adopted the keynote speech as a regular feature of their national nominating conventions. During the 1920's, the American public was brought into closer contact with the party keynoters through the media of motion pictures, radio, and the press. The keynote speeches of 1928 were the first to be broadcast over a nation-wide radio hook-up.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., p. 26.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., p. 27.

<sup>18</sup>Miles, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

<sup>19</sup>Graham McNamee, The Elephant and the Donkey Take the Air (American Magazine, CVI) November 1928, p. 152.

Over the last two decades, the keynote speech was refined somewhat but still offered the keynoter an opportunity to remind his audience of the solemnity of the hour and the importance of his party's decisions; to recount in detail the principles and accomplishments of his party; to hold up his opponents to ridicule and scorn; and to make a plea for a united effort by his party to achieve victory in November.

E. Neal Claussen summarized his history of the Democratic keynoter by declaring that:

The purpose of keynote speeches has been to evoke enthusiasm from delegates and to inspire the national audience. Partisan interpretations of the records of the two parties, attacks on Republican leaders and platforms, and praise of Democratic leaders have formed the essence of the addresses. Radio and television have significantly influenced the speaker's delivery, appearance, and appeals. Many stylistic devices have been used to reinforce the basic element of the addresses--emotionalism.<sup>20</sup>

Claussen discovered the meaning of Monroe and Baird's concept of what constituted an effective keynote address.

Within the last twenty years, the audience changed for the keynoter. No longer did he address the mere hundreds of delegates in front of him at the convention; he addressed his remarks to the convention, to the radio and television audience, and, as in 1968, to half the world via tel-star satellite communication. The contemporary keynote speaker was very much aware of his vast audience of several millions of people, many of whom were more sophisticated, more knowledgeable, and thus more critical in their analysis and evaluation of what the keynote speeches offered.

---

<sup>20</sup>E. Neal Claussen, "The Democratic Keynoter: A History" (published Doctoral dissertation, Department of Speech, Southern Illinois University, 1964).

Biographical Sketches of the Keynote Speakers  
of the 1968 National Nominating Conventions

The Republican Keynoter

Selected to deliver the keynote address to the Republican national nominating convention in Miami, Florida, August 5, 1968, was Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington.

Governor Evans was born in Seattle in 1925. He attended the public schools of Seattle, and, then, after a tour in the Navy after World War II, he returned to Seattle to earn his bachelor's and master's degrees in civil engineering at the University of Washington. When the Korean War came along, he was recalled to active duty with the Navy. He served as an aide to Admiral William K. Mendenhall, the Navy's representative on the Military Armistice Commission at Panmunjon.<sup>21</sup>

At the end of his second Navy tour, Evans went to work in structural design for the city of Seattle and became assistant manager of the Mountain-Pacific chapter of Associated Contractors.<sup>22</sup>

He first won public office in 1956, when one of the two seats in a heavily Republican Seattle district fell vacant. As a member of the house, he rose to house Republican floor leader, and, then, in 1963, began a year-long campaign for the governorship. He was elected against the incumbent Democratic governor by nearly 150,000 votes.<sup>23</sup>

<sup>21</sup>Time Magazine, August 9, 1968, p. 16.

<sup>22</sup>Chicago Daily News, August 2, 1968, p. 3.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

Essentially, Governor Evans was a loner, and his favorite sports were those that matched a single man against nature, or against the limits of his own endurance—hiking, mountain-climbing, skiing, sailing. He inherited his interest in politics from his mother. "One of the earliest remembrances I have is watching mother dress up to go to the Herbert Hoover victory celebration when he ran against F.D.R.," recalled Governor Evans. "It has become a standing family joke."<sup>24</sup>

Perhaps the most telling expression of the man came from Governor Evans himself: "We cannot afford to put the lid on the cauldron of seething problems and call that law and order. We must instead find solutions, and call that social justice."

#### The Democratic Keynote

Senator Daniel K. Inouye, from the State of Hawaii, was chosen by his fellow Democrats to sound the keynote at the Democratic national nominating convention in Chicago, Illinois, August 26, 1968.

The only American of Japanese ancestry in the United States Senate was born Daniel Ken Inouye on September 7, 1924, in Honolulu, Hawaii. His earliest education came from the schooling he received in the Honolulu public schools. At the age of 19, Daniel Inouye enlisted as a private in the United States Army. That was in March, 1943. By November, 1944, he received a battlefield commission, and by May, 1947, he was mustered out of the Army as a captain. Among his many service decorations were the Distinguished Service Cross, Bronze Star, Purple Heart with cluster, five battle stars, four distinguished unit citations.

---

<sup>24</sup>Time Magazine, August 9, 1968, p. 16.

After completing his military service, Daniel Inouye returned to his native Hawaii to continue his education. He graduated from the University of Hawaii with a Bachelor of Arts degree in government and economics. During the early 1950's, he came to the mainland to study law at George Washington University. After earning his Juris Doctor, Inouye returned to Hawaii to run for the House of Representatives of the Territory of Hawaii. He was elected on the Democratic ticket, and became the Majority Leader of the Territorial House of Representatives, a position he held until 1958. In that year he was elected to the Senate of the Territory of Hawaii.

On August 23, 1959, Daniel Inouye was elected to the United States House of Representatives, and, three years later, in 1962, he was elected to the Senate of the United States. Senator Inouye, in addition to his duties as Assistant Majority Whip, was a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, the Senate Public Works Committee, and the Senate Policy Committee.

Senator Inouye was a member of the Methodist church. And, as time permitted, he enjoyed his membership in Lions International, YCA, Boy Scouts of America, Honolulu Chamber of Commerce, American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, 42nd Veterans Club, and Legion of Valor.

## CHAPTER III

### MATERIALS USED AND METHOD OF PROCEDURE

#### I. THE MATERIALS USED

In order to discover something of the meaning and value of keynote speeches and the criteria for their criticism, an investigation was conducted into the various sources which revealed information useful to the study.

Four source areas were used: (1) Letters to individuals and agencies, inquiring of keynote speakers and speeches, (2) review of writers in speech on the subject of keynote speaking, (3) examination of the past 14 political convention keynote speeches, and (4) specific letters of inquiry to the 1968 political convention keynote speakers.

Also, daily and weekly newspapers, weekly news-magazines, journals, and books were perused for specific information pertaining and contributing to the study.

A tape recorder was used to record the keynote speeches as they were delivered.

The use of these particular materials enabled the investigator to discover or procure the necessary information and documents for rational observation, evaluation, and analysis of the problem. The materials used answered the questions posed by the problem and were useful to the conduct of the entire study.

## II. THE METHOD OF PROCEDURE

Immediately following the decision to conduct a study of the 1968 political convention keynote speeches, two letters of inquiry were drafted. It was not yet known who were the keynote speakers. A letter to the chairman of the Republican nominating committee and a letter to the chairman of the Democratic nominating committee requested the names of those who were chosen to deliver the keynote speeches. The committee chairmen responded by submitting their choices for the keynote addresses. Governor Daniel J. Evans of Washington was chosen keynoter for the Republican Nominating Convention; and Senator Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii was chosen to deliver the keynote address to the Democratic Nominating Convention.

Letters were then sent to the keynoters which asked them to submit their criteria for their keynote speeches. In their reply, they sent information useful to the study.

The United States Government Printing Office submitted a negative reply to a request for any information pertaining to keynote speeches. Similar requests were sent to the Brookings Institute and the Democratic and Republican national committee chairmen.

Upon request, the keynoters submitted biographical sketches which were used in the study.

In order to become familiar with the general substance of keynote speeches, examinations were made of the 14 political keynote speeches delivered since 1936. The results of these examinations aided the speech analysis.

A search for and a review of literature on keynote speeches by writers in speech were major tasks for the study. A review of the

literature was necessary in order to discover what several speech authorities wrote about keynote speaking. Research and review of the literature revealed what was a keynote speech and what an effective keynote speech accomplished. Literature was discovered to reveal epitomized examples of keynote speaking. Various sources of news media were procured and perused prior to and following the delivery of the keynote speeches. This perusal afforded an opportunity to examine media information and criticism of the keynote speakers and their speeches.

Prior to the actual delivery of the keynote speeches over national television facilities, a tape recorder was prepared for recording the speeches. The recorded speeches were used in making the analysis of the textual speeches.

Following delivery of the keynote speeches, official copies of the speeches were requested and received from the chairmen of the national nominating committees. The official copies were compared, in substance, to the published speeches and the recorded speeches. These comparisons indicated that the speeches were delivered as printed and published as delivered. The recordings of the actual delivery of the speeches established the authenticity of the texts.

### III. SELECTION OF THE CRITERIA

A review of the literature was also vital in the search for an acceptable standard of judgment, or criteria, by which the keynote speeches were judged.

The search for specific criteria, by which keynote speeches particularly were judged, did not yield reward. Several models of speech criticism were examined for possible application to the keynote

speeches.

Examined were the models of Lester Thonssen, A. Craig Baird, Donald C. Bryant, Karl Wallace, Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Alan H. Monroe, Thomas R. Nilsen, Kenneth Burke, Albert J. Croft, Loren Reid, and the classical models of Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian.

From these models, the Monroe model was selected for application to the keynote speeches. This selection was made because the Monroe model was more applicable to contemporary speeches; it possessed the measures of effectiveness exclusive of the complexities of more intricate measurement devices. The Monroe devices for speech criticism possessed the elements of simplicity and clarity that did not sacrifice the element of thoroughness in their evaluative nature. Monroe's model particularly applied to the 1968 political keynote speeches because of the general nature and substance of the speeches.

The Monroe criteria for speech criticism which were selected for application to the 1968 keynote speeches were as follows:

Speaker's analysis of problems.

1. Did the speaker properly analyze the problems?
2. Did his proposals advocate the best way to meet the problems?

Reasoning.

1. What type of reasoning did the speaker use?
2. Was his reasoning sound?

Evidence.

1. To what degree did the speaker use supporting material?
2. Was the supporting material reliable?
3. Did the speaker use unsupported assertions reinforced only by vivid phrasing or his own positive manner?
4. Did he present the facts fairly, or did he seem to be biased in selecting which facts to present or which to withhold?

Motivation.

1. What motive appeals did the speaker employ and what were their relation to his reasoning?

Wording.

1. Was the speaker's wording accurate or vague?
2. Were false conclusions suggested by loose phraseology?
3. Did the speaker rely on loaded words, name-calling, and generalities instead of reasoning and evidence?<sup>25</sup>

#### IV. APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA TO THE KEYNOTE SPEECHES

The keynote speeches were examined and an element by element application of the selected criteria was made to each of the keynote speeches. The Monroe criteria for speech criticism were found to be fully adaptable to these particular keynote speeches. Monroe's elements of criteria, although not designed specifically for criticism of keynote speeches, proved ideally suited to the task. None of the elements of criteria was excluded from application to the speeches. Each element, which possessed a quality for direct application to that portion of the speeches for which it was designed, was applied. All elements, as they were applied satisfied the requirements of an effective critical analysis of these particular keynote speeches in accordance with the limitations imposed on the study and Monroe's principles of evaluation.

#### V. TREATMENT OF THE DATA

The collected data were used to determine how favorably the keynote speeches of the 1968 national nominating conventions compared

---

<sup>25</sup>Alan H. Monroe, Principles and Types of Speech (Chicago: Scott, Foresman and Company) 1962, p. 609.

relative to the selected criteria. To make this determination, the data were evaluated, a comparative analysis of the speeches was made, and the findings were reported. Conclusions were drawn from the findings. Data other than those used for the analysis were used to report the concepts and general development of keynote speaking and the biographical background of the 1968 keynote speakers.

## CHAPTER IV

### A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE KEYNOTE SPEECHES OF THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTIONS OF 1968

#### I. THE REPUBLICAN KEYNOTE SPEECH

The background for the speech. Aside from nominating its candidates for president and vice president, the Republican National Nominating Convention served other purposes as well. The party platform was written and adopted and the national committee was elected, which allowed for perpetuation of the party structure until the next convention.

The convention was a time for rallying 'round the party banner, rewarding the faithful, and exhorting the acolytes.

Selected parts of the convention were carried by television satellites to viewers in 28 countries, some of them Communist, on five continents. Within the United States, some 130 million people in 54 million of the nation's 59 million "television households" spent about seven hours viewing the convention proceedings.<sup>26</sup>

The keynote address. Governor Daniel J. Evans of Washington delivered the keynote address to the delegates of the Republican National Nominating Convention in Miami, Florida, on August 5, 1968.

---

<sup>26</sup>The National Observer, July 22, 1968, p. 18.

To that address were applied the following measures of effectiveness, criteria for speech criticism formulated by Alan H. Monroe:

Speaker's analysis of the problems.

1. Did the speaker properly analyze the problems?

Governor Evans cited the problems of war in Vietnam, violence and crime, social welfare, the youth of America, poverty, and leadership. To the problem of war in Vietnam, he addressed these remarks:

We are frustrated by the fourth most costly war in our history—a war in which we spend a million dollars every twenty minutes. A war which has cost us nearly 150,000 casualties and more than 20,000 lives. A war which—under the present administration—we have not won in Saigon, cannot negotiate in Paris and will not explain to the American people.<sup>27</sup>

A great power, Evans declared, cannot view the world from behind the walls of political isolation nor economic protection; nor does it imply that we should withdraw from our obligations and responsibilities to ourselves and to the people of South Vietnam. To have entered the war, he said, by the path of error does not mean we can leave through the door of default.

Governor Evans stated that the challenge to the Republican Party lies in the prevention of wars and not their prosecution.

The problem of violence and crime received less attention from the speaker. Said Evans:

But if we are frustrated by a war on the mainland of Asia, we are even more burdened by the crisis in the main streets of America. A crisis of violence and stolen hope, a crisis of lawlessness and injustice, and impulsive reckless dissatisfaction with what we are.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup>Governor Daniel J. Evans, Keynote Address, p. 1.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

The protests, the defiance of authority, the violence in the streets, he said are more than isolated attacks upon the established order; they are the symptoms of the need for change and for a redefinition of what this country stands for and where it is going.

Within the general area of social welfare, the speaker spent most of his time. He stated that:

Our system of welfare, so long promoted as a cure for social ills has eliminated nothing--with the possible exception of pride and incentive and human dignity.<sup>29</sup>

Our economy stands in the constant jeopardy of inflation; our dollar loses prestige abroad while it loses value at home.<sup>30</sup>

The nation's great resources, he said, are not in doubt, only their utilization, and only those who govern their use. It is time to confront the issues of poverty and disease and human dignity which lie beneath the violence that tears at every conscience just as it strikes fear in every heart, he told his audience. And then he reminded them of something nearly forgotten--the nobility of the American dream. To share a business, he said, to realize a profit of investment, to run a factory or shop, to produce goods and see the money return to the community--these, not welfare are the things which made America great, her people rich and her opportunity unlimited.

Governor Evans told of hearing another voice in the land--the voice of youth. It has served notice, he said, that satisfaction cannot be measured alone in dollars--that there is a need for service and contribution beyond the attainment of material success. For each of our

---

<sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Ibid.

youth who has dropped out, there are a hundred more, Evans declared, who have stayed in; some radical, some demanding, some searching, some hoping, but all concerned; who in their concern to serve their country have set out across the land to participate in the exercise of political power.

The speaker mentioned leadership several times. Hardly was he introduced when he declared that today, as never before, the nation demands new leadership. It is time, he said, when we must have new solutions to new problems; when a leadership encumbered by the past must surrender its place to the party whose hope lies with the future.

Later, Evans pointed out that it is leadership—not the fundamental strength of this country—which is at issue. If we cannot find the courage to accept leadership, he said, then we cannot expect to realize victory. For our direction and for our leadership, he continued, we must turn, not alone to government, but to a new partnership; a partnership of government, private enterprise and the individual citizen.

From what the speaker said about the problems, it was determined that he understood them and analyzed them properly, particularly in view of his own position as the Governor of Washington.

His remarks about the Vietnam war indicated his awareness of the hard, statistical facts of cost-analysis and casualties. For the speaker to say that a great power cannot live in isolation, was indicative of his ability to analyze the geo-political responsibilities of the United States.

Governor Evans saw that the burdens of crisis were not only carried in the mainland of Asia but also in the mainstreets of America. His statements on the crisis of violence and crime indicated an insight

into the causes of such crisis, for he stated that violence was merely the symptom of the need for change and redefinition of what this country stood for and where it was going.

Governor Evans possessed particular perception and insight into the problems pertaining to the social and general welfare of the nation. This was indicated by his sense of history when he stated that to share a business, to realize a profit of investment, to run a factory or shop, to produce goods and see the money return to the community--these were the things which made America great, her people rich and her opportunity unlimited. It was indicative that he understood that the great prosperity of America was based on self-government, individual freedom, and equality of opportunity.

The speaker's ability to analyze the problems of youth and leadership was enunciated by his declarations of youths' intent to render a service beyond the attainment of material success. He noted that many more youths remained in the arena of action than dropped out. He emphasized that observation. Leadership, or the lack of it, was the issue, Evans observed. He based his analysis on the fact that the war in Vietnam was still on and that the utilization and control of the nation's great resources were mismanaged.

2. Did his proposals advocate the best way to meet the problems?

In order to meet the problems, Governor Evans presented the following proposals:

- a. The Republican Party--for its own survival and for the sake of the nation--must be where the action is.
- b. Our Party must remain dedicated to the principles of peace through strength and equal justice within the framework of law.

- o. We must recognize that unless and until we begin to deal with the matter of new priorities in this country, there will be no peace abroad and little security at home.
- d. Only when everyone has a stake in the future of this country, only when the doors of private enterprise are opened to all—only then will each person have something to preserve and something to build on for his children. This nation must find a way for that to happen.
- e. A nation which rebuilt the devastated economy of Europe after World War II can surely rebuild the devastated hopes of its own minorities.
- f. We must find new programs, the resources and the opportunities for young people to serve society and the nation—to participate in the political system, to be heard not for their wisdom or their years but for their dedication, their enterprise and their great aspirations for our country.
- g. We must bring the resources of incentive, of private planning and management skill into a new and creative alliance—the capitalism of social enterprise.
- h. The most important ingredient of all must be added to the other forces—the powerful contributions of the individual citizen; the citizen who sees in the commitment of service our best hope for the nation.
- i. A nation which opened the frontier by offering its land to homesteaders can surely secure the future by sharing its promise of wealth.
- j. We must mobilize the millions of people who share in the dream of a country reunited; the millions who share in the belief that we can secure equality without destroying liberty; that we can realize progress without surrendering principle.
- k. We must proceed not in celebration but in the knowledge that what we do here may well determine the fate of a nation.
- l. We must debate not in fear of the present, but with faith in our future.

m. We must unite to rally a great Party in the cause of a great nation—to seek progress with victory; to find not a way out, but a way forward.<sup>31</sup>

In setting forth his proposals, Governor Evans advocated the best way to meet the problems, for he proposed unity of purpose, participation, strength, dedication, equal justice, new priorities, rebuilding of minority hopes, sharing of wealth, new programs of service, creativity within the capitalism of social enterprises, commitment of individual citizens to service, realization of progress without loss of liberty or principle, and debate out of faith in the future.

These proposals corroborated the findings of humanity's greatest civilizations but created the complex problem of application.

#### Reasoning.

1. What type of reasoning did the speaker use?

Governor Evans reasoned mostly from causation and generalization. He concluded, for example, that the United States was an uneasy nation on the eve of its most crucial political decision in this century because it was frustrated by costly war, riddled by crises of crime and violence and human misery. Again, he said that our economy stood in the constant jeopardy of inflation because our dollar lost prestige abroad while it lost value at home.

The speaker argued from generalization. Just as strength kept us free, he said, so has change kept us strong. He stated that the problems of environment were not apart from private enterprise. Such statements were generalizations unsupported by logical proof.

---

<sup>31</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-3.

## 2. Was his reasoning sound?

In terms of concrete evidence and unequivocal authority, the speaker did not reason soundly. For example, he stated that the steady erosion of our cities left us a legacy of physical decay and human misery, but he did not present concrete evidence in support of the statement. There were no statistical data to support such statements throughout the speech.

In making his proposals, Governor Evans did present specific programs of action which were reasonably sound. There were few so young, he said, and none so old that their abilities could not find a need or their interests an outlet:

To individually tutor a disadvantaged child who has fallen behind in the process of learning; to give hope to the mentally retarded through individual training; to counsel a paroled convict in the responsibilities of renewed citizenship; to advise and assist in the development of a remote Indian village.<sup>32</sup>

### Evidence.

#### 1. To what degree did the speaker use supporting material?

The fact that the speaker was Governor of a rather large and important state suggested that, given personal integrity, he was authoritarian and was not given to irrationalizations. Therefore, to that degree, his own position supported his statements. Although Governor Evans spoke from causation and generalization, mainly, his speech was well-supported with verbal forms.

He gave explanations:

We believed for years that welfare was a substitute for pride and that public charity could replace individual oppor-

---

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

tunity. But black America and poor America are teaching us a new language—the language of participation.<sup>33</sup>

**He used comparisons:**

One group of Americans ask for economic opportunity; another group seeks opportunity for service.<sup>34</sup>

**He used analogies:**

Both of them—and indeed all Americans—seek one thing above all: that their country reject the principle of a 'help yourself' society and create the foundation of a 'self-help' society.<sup>35</sup>

**The speaker used factual illustration:**

Only when everyone has a stake in this country—only then will each person have something to preserve and something to build on for his children. This nation must find a way for that to happen. And I believe it can be found. A nation which rebuilt the devastated economy of Europe after World War II can surely rebuild the devastated hopes of its own minorities. And a nation which opened the frontier by offering its land to homesteaders can surely secure the future by sharing its promise of wealth.<sup>36</sup>

**The speaker used specific instances:**

Let us realize that the challenge to the Republican Party lies within the problems of American, not outside of them. It lies in the prevention of wars and not their prosecution; it lies in the advancement of men and not the destruction of mankind; it lies in the ghettos just as surely as the suburbs; in the factories just as clearly as on the farms; in the hearts of all people and in their great and growing aspirations.<sup>37</sup>

**Only once did he use statistics:**

We are frustrated by the fourth most costly war in our history—a war in which we spend a million dollars every twenty minutes. A war which has cost us nearly 150,000 casualties and more than 20,000 lives.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>33</sup>Ibid.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Ibid.

<sup>36</sup>Ibid., pp. 2-3.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.

The speaker presented testimony:

Dwight D. Eisenhower once defined America's goal in these eloquent words: It is, he said, 'lifting from the back and from the hearts of men, their burden of arms and fears, so that they might find before them a golden age of freedom and peace.'<sup>39</sup>

With the generous use of verbal support forms, Governor Evans managed to project a balance of issues and events within a very short period of time. His use of a variety of support forms gave the speech a quality of interest, if not support.

2. Was the supporting material reliable?

The speaker's supporting material was judged to be reliable based on the speaker's position as a governor and on the fact that his supporting material consistently did what it was supposed to do—it amplified, clarified, illuminated, and convinced.

3. Did the speaker use unsupported assertions reinforced only by vivid phrasing or his own positive manner?

The speaker made several unsupported assertions. For example, he asserted that for each of our youth who dropped out, there were a hundred who stayed in. There was no evidence to support that asserted ratio.

Again, he stated that we gave as no other nation to the securing of world order and the pursuit of human progress. And for it, he asserted, we paid a heavy price on the ledger of neglect—not neglect in terms of ignorance but neglect in terms of priorities. For this assertion, there was no logical evidence in support, only explanation. And the explanation was another assertion. Asserted Evans:

---

<sup>39</sup>Ibid.

It means that the first priority of the United States is the resolution of our internal conflict—the recognition that if we can't unite our own nation, then we can't preserve the hopes of others.<sup>40</sup>

4. Did he present the facts fairly, or did he seem to be biased in selecting which facts to present or which to withhold?

The speaker, throughout the speech, made the following comments which supported his own Party:

In a very real sense, this is the Republican hour.

Today, as never before, the nation demands new leadership.

This party under Abraham Lincoln resolved the question of political union and began the task of human rights.

This Party under Dwight Eisenhower restored the balance of world power and advanced the cause of social justice.

It is from this point that the Republican Party must proceed.

What is now at stake is whether the Republican Party can rise to the challenge created by the winds of a new direction, or whether, in defiance of history, we choose to retreat when the nation so clearly calls.<sup>41</sup>

Governor Evans supported the above statements by preceding or following them with comments that favored his own Party. To that extent, he included only those comments that suggested leadership ability within the Republican Party. He withheld any comments which suggested opposition ability.

#### Motivation.

1. What motive appeals did the speaker employ and what were their relation to his reasoning?

Governor Evans appealed to the motive of fear when he referred to the war in Vietnam. When he spoke of the achievements of the

<sup>40</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>41</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-3.

Republican Party under Lincoln and Eisenhower, how the Party met the challenges of the past and looked to the future with confidence, he appealed to the motives of loyalty and pride. When he talked about our country's past, he appealed to the motive of reverence to American heritage. And when Governor Evans spoke of crime and violence, poverty, the steady erosion of our cities, and lawlessness, he used revulsion as the motive appeal.

The speaker relied upon causal relations to support most of his motive appeals. For example, when he told how war caused frustration and how crisis in the streets of America caused burdens of anguish, the motives were fear and revulsion, and the implication was that the effects were also fear and revulsion.

### Wording.

1. Was the speaker's wording accurate or vague?

From the viewpoint of understanding the speech, the wording was accurate. The speech was understood. This meant that the speaker selected words that accurately stated his own understanding of the problems, issues, and events that constituted the substance of his speech. At no point in listening to the speech or reading it did vagueness obstruct understanding.

2. Were false conclusions suggested by loose phraseology?

There was no loose phraseology in Governor Evans's speech. Therefore, there were no false conclusions. His phraseology was simplified, brief, clear and vivid. His sentences were short—mostly 10 to 15 words—and he avoided dullness by generous use of figures of speech. If the speaker's purpose was to secure understanding,

that end was achieved. According to Monroe, if the speaker achieved understanding, the speech was successful.

3. Did the speaker rely on loaded words, name-calling, and generalities instead of reasoning?

In no instance did Governor Evans rely on loaded words or name-calling. There were, as stated earlier, some generalities. When he stated that the Republican Party was equal to the challenges of tomorrow, or that it was through this great partnership of committed service that we can ultimately fulfill our American Dream, he stated generalities.

## II. THE DEMOCRATIC KEYNOTE SPEECH

The background for the speech. The 35th National Nominating Convention of the Democratic Party opened in Chicago's International Amphitheater on August 26, 1968. No predictable event anywhere compared to the quadriennial American political convention in terms of cost, complexity of arrangements, public interest, and international attention. The logistics alone were staggering: Some 15,000 hotel rooms for the Democrats gathered in Chicago; special transportation that shuttled delegates, newsmen, and hangers-on from hotels to hall, with limousine service for VIPs; a hall that seated 15,000 people; more than 6,000 telephones and 400 teleprinters for the news media and delegations in the hall itself, plus several hundred thousand square feet of reasonably private working space for writers, editors, and photographers.

Broadcasting networks mobilized a force of 4,000 persons to cover the convention. The excitement began as the delegates and alternates arrived at the convention hall. The business at hand began as the Chairman of the Democratic National Committee called the convention to order. The business of the convention was to nominate candidates for president and vice president, elect national committeemen, write and adopt the party platform, and reward the party faithful.<sup>42</sup>

The keynote address. Senator Daniel K. Inouye of Hawaii delivered the keynote address to the Democratic National Nominating Convention in Chicago on August 26, 1968. Applied to that address

---

<sup>42</sup>Chicago Tribune, August 25, 1968, p. 1.

were the following measures of effectiveness as formulated by Alan H. Murray.

Speaker's analysis of the problems.

1. Did the speaker properly analyze the problems?

Senator Inouye determined that the essential matters that needed correction within our society were those of the war in Vietnam, crime, civil rights, violence, and law and order. On the matter of the war in Vietnam, he commented:

Some conveniently blame all our ills and agonies on a most difficult and unpopular commitment overseas. The Vietnam war must end, they say, because it is an immoral war.

Of course, the Vietnam war must be ended. But it must be ended, as President Johnson said last March, by patient political negotiation rather than through the victorious force of arms.

Of course, the Vietnam war is immoral. Whether by the teachings of Moses or by the teachings of Christ or by the teachings of Buddha, I believe that wars are immoral.

In Vietnam we build schools across the countryside and feed the hungry in the cities. And our President has pledged massive sums in aid to all Vietnamese as an incentive to peace. And yet this is an immoral war.

But when young people have rioted in China and Czechoslovakia as well as at Columbia, and in Paris and Berlin as well as Berkeley, I doubt that we can blame all the troubles of our time on Vietnam.<sup>43</sup>

To the problems of crime, the speaker addressed these remarks:

Crime has increased so that we are told one out of every three Americans is afraid to walk in his own neighborhood after dark.

None go so far as publicly to condone a politics of assassination. Yet assassins' bullets have robbed our country of three great leaders within the last five years.<sup>44</sup>

Civil rights was a problem of concern to the speaker. He

<sup>43</sup> Senator Daniel K. Inouye, Keynote Address, p. 1.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., pp. 1-2.

made these comments about the problem:

As an American whose ancestors came from Japan, I have become accustomed to a question most recently asked by a very prominent businessman who was concerned about the threat of riots and the resultant loss in life and property. 'Tell me,' he said, 'why can't the Negro be like you?'

First, although my skin is colored, it is not black. In this country, the color of my skin does not ignite prejudice that has smoldered for generations. Second, although my grandfather came to this country in poverty, he came without shackles; he came as a free man enjoying certain constitutional rights under the American flag. Third, my grandfather's family was not shattered as individual members of it were sold as chattel or used as security on loans. And fourth, although others of my ancestry were interned behind barbed wires during World War II, neither my parents nor I were forced by covenants and circumstances to live in ghettos.

Unlike those of my ancestry, the Negro's unemployment rate is triple the national average. The mortality rate of his children is twice that of white children.<sup>45</sup>

Senator Inouye went on to comment that the Negro often paid more for his living necessities; that he was a decorated hero of the Vietnam war; that he questioned justifiably his place in American history; and that the Negro found it hard to wait another hundred years for acceptance as full citizens in our free society.

On the problems of violence and law and order, Senator Inouye spent most of his time. He said:

We are still embarked on the longest unbroken journey of economic growth and prosperity in our history. Yet we are torn by dissension, and the disrespect for our institutions and leaders is rife across the land.

Riot has bludgeoned our cities, laying waste our streets, our property and, most important human lives.

Voices of angry protest are heard throughout the land, crying for all manner of freedoms. Yet our political leaders are picketed and some who cry loudest for freedom have sought to prevent our President, our Vice President and Cabinet officers from speaking in public.

Too many Americans have come to believe it is their right to decide as individuals which of our laws they will obey and which will they violate.

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid.

I do not mean to say that all our laws are just. They're not, and I don't mean to suggest that protest against unjust laws is not proper. Performed in an orderly manner, the right to protest is a cornerstone of our system.<sup>46</sup>

Because of his position as a United States Senator and as a member of several important senate committees, and because of his personal heritage and experience, Senator Inouye, it was determined, properly analyzed the problems of which he spoke. His estimate of how the war in Vietnam was to be resolved paralleled that of President Johnson. It was to be resolved by peaceful negotiations.

The speaker's concepts of the matter of civil rights were developed from his own background of Japanese ancestry. His comments on civil rights were indicative of his ability to analyze the condition, needs, and desires of minority groups.

The speaker was trained in the law as a lawyer and as a legislator. He was thought of as an authority on law and law-making. Thus, he properly analyzed the problems of crime and law and order. He agreed, for example, that some laws were unjust. But he also agreed that unjust laws must be obeyed until proper repeal was made.

2. Did his proposals advocate the best way to meet the problems?

Senator Inouye, in order to meet the problems of which he spoke, advocated the following proposals:

- a. Law and order must be respected and maintained to protect the rights, yes, the civil rights of all citizens.
- b. Let us reject violence as a means of protest, and let us reject those who preach violence. But let us not tempt those who would hide

---

<sup>46</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

the evil face of racism behind the mask of law and order.

- c. Let us go forward with programs responsive to the needs of today and responsive to the needs of tomorrow.
- d. Let us grow fresh faith in our purpose and new vigor in our citizenship.
- e. Let us welcome the ideas and energies of the young and the talents and participation of all responsible people.
- f. Let us plant trees and grow new opportunities. Let us build not only new buildings but new neighborhoods and then let us live in them, all as full citizens and all as brothers.<sup>47</sup>

Some of his proposals were specific and deliberate in their thought and substance, but others were vague and broad in their advocacy. When he advocated respect for law and order, rejection of violence and of those who preached violence, the welcoming of ideas of the young, and the participation of all responsible people, the speaker's proposals were viewed as the best way to meet the problems of which he spoke. His other proposals needed more directness and substance.

### Reasoning.

1. What type of reasoning did the speaker use?

Senator Inoué argued mostly from generalization and causation. Little did he reason from evidence or authority. He was thought to reason from authority when he told why the Negro was unlike himself. He used personal testimony as evidence.

When the speaker talked of increased crime, riot blighted cities, dissension and disrespect, he reasoned from generalization.

---

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 1-3.

He presented logical evidence in citing the Johnson administration record:

Twenty million older Americans are now protected under Medicare.

Since 1963, President Johnson has approved and Congress has enacted more than 40 major new laws to foster education in our country.<sup>48</sup>

Senator Inouye, in stating that the success of our economic system has freed our young people in ever-increasing numbers and, therefore, we should hardly be surprised when the children of such progress demand to be heard, reasoned from causation.

Again, causation was the base of his reasoning when he asked was it any wonder that the Negro questioned whether his place in our country's history books would be any less forgotten than were the contributions of his ancestors, in light of his maltreatment?

## 2. Was his reasoning sound?

Senator Inouye's reasoning was not too sound in view of the fact that he did not support his statements with evidence and authority. He cited examples of the various problems in our society but he did not support those examples with some kind of authority. For example, he stated that we were told that the revolts were against the system, and that Establishment must be torn down. But he did not cite the source of such a statement, nor did he cite any statistics which supported or denied the statement.

### Evidence.

#### 1. To what degree did the speaker use supporting material?

<sup>48</sup> Ibid., p. 3.

The speaker was a lawyer and a United States Senator. He served on several important senate committees. His ancestry was Japanese. He lost an arm as a result of combat in World War II. These personal facts tended to support many of his statements. To a greater degree, though, his statements were supported by verbal forms.

He used explanations:

An example of explanation was the speaker's answer to the question "why can't the Negro be like you"? This example was previously cited in some length.

Again, previously cited, the speaker went to some length to explain why the Vietnam war was immoral.

He made comparisons:

Unlike those of my ancestry, the Negro's unemployment rate is triple the national average. The mortality rate of his children is twice that of white children.<sup>49</sup>

He used analogy:

To permit violence and anarchy to destroy our cities is to spark the beginning of a cancerous growth of doubt, suspicion, fear and hatred that will gradually infect the whole nation.<sup>50</sup>

He used factual illustration:

Under the health measures first proposed by the Presidency of our most beloved Harry S. Truman and passed during the remarkable administration of Lyndon B. Johnson, 20 million older Americans are now protected under Medicare.<sup>51</sup>

He used specific instances:

Let's look at how much we have already built and then get on with the work. At a time when guns are still heard in some areas of the world, we have laid in place such building blocks

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

<sup>50</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

<sup>51</sup>Ibid., p. 3.

of mankind's survival as the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963, the banning of atomic weapons in space of 1967, and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty of 1968.<sup>52</sup>

**He employed statistics:**

Since 1963, our government has tripled its investment in education and in the last four years alone we have invested twice as much as we spent in the previous 100 years.<sup>53</sup>

**He presented testimony:**

Of course, the war in Vietnam must be ended. But it must be ended, as President Johnson said last March, by patient political negotiation.<sup>54</sup>

By using the verbal forms of support, Senator Inouye gave variety and interest to his speech. Early in his speech, he stated that the keynote address at a national political convention traditionally called for rousing oratory. "I hoped to be excused," he said, "from this tradition tonight, for I did not view this occasion as one for either flamboyance or levity." With those words, he continued his speech with seriousness and ecstacy.

**2. Was the supporting material reliable?**

The supporting material was thought to be reliable because of the position of the speaker as a Senator and as a person of reputable integrity. Some of the supporting material, that which made reference to administrations of the past and present, was a matter of record.

**3. Did the speaker use unsupported assertions reinforced only by vivid phrasing or his own positive manner?**

The Senator used several unsupported assertions. Early in his

<sup>52</sup>Ibid.

<sup>53</sup>Ibid.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

speech, he asserted the reason the Democrats were in convention:

I believe the real reason we are here is that there is a word called 'commitment,' because we are committed to the future of our country and all our people, and because of that future, hope and faith are more needed now than pride in our party's past.<sup>55</sup>

In making such an assertion, he did not state what was meant by commitment, nor did he say how a commitment to the future was to be made.

Again, he failed to support an assertion when he said that the revolution we in the United States were experiencing was born of Democratic processes that not only accommodated economic progress and social mobility, but actively encouraged them. There was no concrete evidence to support the assertion of such a revolution.

4. Did he present the facts fairly, or did he seem to be biased in selecting which facts to present or which to withhold?

In spite of the speaker's statement of need for hope and faith rather than pride in the Party's past, he indicated pride in the party's past. He quoted the party's record of social legislation and gave much credit to President Johnson. He spoke of the violence that cost the lives of such Democratic leaders as John F. Kennedy and Robert F. Kennedy.

Senator Inouye was fair in his treatment of rioters. He stated that when young people rioted in China and Czechoslovakia as well as at Columbia, and in Paris and Berlin as well as in Berkeley,

---

<sup>55</sup>Ibid., p. 1.

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

he doubted that we were justified in blaming all the troubles of our time on Vietnam.

The speaker tried to support his arguments with verbal supports selected to convince his audience of the seriousness of the problems he chose to talk about. To that extent, he was fair. Otherwise he remained loyal or biased in favor of his own party.

### Motivation.

1. What motive appeals did the speaker employ and what were their relation to his reasoning?

When Senator Inouye opened his speech with "this is my country," he appealed to the motive of pride. Again, he appealed to the motive of pride when he referred to John F. Kennedy, Robert F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, Harry S. Truman, Lyndon B. Johnson.

Appealing to the motive of loyalty, the speaker declared that the true dimension of the challenge facing us was loss of faith. "I mean," he said, "a loss of faith in our country, in its purposes, its institutions."

Addressing his motive appeals to freedom, honor, and justice, he made the following remark:

Men must have the opportunity to be heard even when their views are extreme and in a lesser democratic country, dangerous. I, too, have spoken against laws which I considered wrong and unjust, and I am sure I will speak—and vote—against many, many more. But my fellow Americans, I have not burned my birth certificate, and I will not renounce my citizenship.<sup>56</sup>

In such instances, the speaker relied on generalities to support his motive appeals.

### Wording.

---

<sup>56</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

1. Was the speaker's wording accurate or vague?

The speech was not ambiguous at any point, nor was it vague in any way. It was easily understood. Although his statements were not generally well-supported with evidence and authority, his wording was accurate and meaningful. At no point was the meaning of his words in doubt.

2. Were false conclusions suggested by loose phraseology?

Loose phraseology was not noted in the speech. The speaker's conclusions were simplified, even poignant at times. For example, he spoke of the student riots in Paris and how they cut down several hundred-year old trees. Were the goals of these students served, he wanted to know, by the destruction of these trees? How long will it take, he asked, for their beauty and the vitality they symbolized to grow again? He asked what trees did the students plant in their places?

3. Did the speaker rely on loaded words, name-calling, and generalities instead of reasoning?

Scrutiny of the speech did not reveal the use of loaded words or name-calling by the speaker. Although some generalities were noted, not one was glittering or false in their intent and purpose. They were supported with the verbal forms of support.

## CHAPTER V

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

#### I. ACCUMULATION OF THE DATA

Data and information for this study were gathered from letters received from individuals, agencies, and institutions; from reviews of writers in speech on the subject of keynote speaking; from examination of past political keynote speeches; from examination of daily and weekly newspapers and news-magazines, journals, quarterlies, and books concerning keynote speakers and speeches; and from taped recordings of the keynote speeches of 1968.

#### II. FINDINGS OF THE PROCESS OF EVALUATION

A search for judgment criteria which were specifically formulated for application to keynote speeches did not yield reward. Several models of speech criticism were examined for applicability to the 1968 keynote speeches. The examined models were those of Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Lester Thoussen, A. Craig Baird, Donald C. Bryant, Karl Wallace, Marie Hochmuth Nichols, Alan H. Monroe, Thomas R. Nilsen, Kenneth Burke, Albert J. Croft, and Loren Reid.

From these models, the Monroe Model was selected for application to the 1968 keynote speeches. The Monroe model of speech criticism was selected because it was more applicable to contemporary speeches; it possessed the measures of speech effectiveness exclusive of the

complexities of more intricate measurement devices. The Monroe criteria for speech criticism possessed the elements of simplicity and clarity that did not sacrifice the element of thoroughness in their evaluative nature.

The Monroe criteria for speech criticism were applied to the 1968 keynote speeches and evaluations were made to determine how favorably the speeches compared:

Speaker's analysis of the problems.

1. Did the speaker properly analyze the problems?

The speakers spoke about the same problems. They gave the impression of understanding the problems, although they argued from causation and generalization. Both speakers grasped the scope and importance of the problems; they discovered the causes of the problems and determined what needed to be done to correct the problems. They made several proposals for solution of the problems.

The speakers compared favorably in analyzing the problems about which they spoke.

2. Did his proposals advocate the best way to meet the problems?

Most of the proposals advocated by the speakers were ideally the best way to meet the problems from their political base, but their proposals were thought to be broad in scope and difficult to apply. Governor Evans came closer to practical proposals than Senator Inouye. Application of their proposals was possible, but difficult and complex.

Reasoning.

1. What type of reasoning did the speaker use?

The speakers reasoned almost exclusively from generalizations and causation. Both speakers used this type of reasoning to good effect. Their examples were simplified, clarified, and supported well with verbal forms. With regard to reasoning, they compared favorably.

2. Was his reasoning sound?

If soundness seems to always present unequivocal evidence, the speakers were not sound in their reasoning. There were a few statements by both speakers that were sufficiently supported with facts, but the soundness of their reasoning was only noted in their rationale, in their ability to grasp the problems and talk about them with reasonable generalizations. The speakers were found to be parallel in their reasoning.

Evidence.

1. To what degree did the speaker use supporting material?

Both speakers used supporting material to effective advantage. Many forms of verbal support were used by both speakers. They gave comprehensible explanations of the problems and the examples they used were easily understood. Only in a few instances in the speeches was there left a desire for more information or clearer information. The comparison in this area was one of favorableness.

2. Was the supporting material reliable?

The speakers' supporting material was thought to be reliable

because of their positions as Governor and Senator, and because they used material that was clear and vivid. Their examples kept their speeches alive; there was no instance of vagueness or meaninglessness. Governor Evans was more effective in this area. His vivid explanations were more articulate and full of imagery.

3. Did the speaker use unsupported assertions reinforced only by vivid phrasing or his own positive manner?

There were assertions by both speakers. The assertions were unsupported except for their own positive manner. The assertions were made easier to accept because of the positive manner. But the voice played a major role in playing down the assertions. The speakers compared evenly in this area.

4. Did he present the facts fairly, or did he seem to be biased in selecting which facts to present or which to withhold?

Both speakers indicated a bias in favor of their own Party. Although they tried to avoid this kind of bias and even had so stated in their correspondence with the investigator, it came through. This was to be expected, but it was in dignified form. It was the motive of pride and loyalty. They presented their facts fairly.

#### Motivation.

1. What motive appeals did the speaker employ and what were their relation to his reasoning?

The motive appeals of fear, pride, honor, loyalty, revulsion, and reverence were used by both speakers. Most of their motive appeals related to their generalizations. The speakers used these appeals to good effect, for their motives moved the speeches rapidly along. One

speaker was as effective in this area as the other.

### Wording.

1. Was the speaker's wording accurate or vague?

Wording was accurate and well-selected for effect. Both speakers sensed the importance of word-selection. They accurately chose their words, for their material was easily understood. Governor Evans moved his speech a little more vividly than Senator Inouye. His transitions were smoother and more timely.

2. Were false conclusions suggested by loose phraseology?

The speakers' phraseology was well-selected and placed. There were no instances of looseness of phraseology. The speakers achieved effective phraseology, for their speeches were easily understood. Here again, Governor Evans appeared more effective. His phraseology was more vivid and more simplified.

3. Did the speaker rely on loaded words, name-calling, and generalities instead of reasoning?

Neither speaker used loaded words, name-calling. There were some generalities used by both speakers, but these were supported with verbal forms in order to give them the vitality that made both speeches move along to reasonable conclusions.

## CHAPTER VI

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

#### I. SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The purpose of the study was to determine the several factors of criteria applicable to keynote speaking, and to determine how favorably the 1968 political keynote speeches compared relative to the selected criteria.

The study was limited to an investigation into the concepts of keynote speaking as reported by writers on the subject, the general development of keynote speaking, the life and background of the speakers, and the analysis of the 1968 keynote speeches.

The keynote speaker at the Republican National Nominating Convention was Governor Daniel J. Evans of Washington. The Democratic National Nominating Convention heard Senator Daniel K. Inouye deliver the keynote address.

It was agreed by writers on the subject that a keynote speech stimulated enthusiasm and spirit and established an appropriate mood for the business at hand.

To measure the effectiveness of the keynote speeches delivered by Governor Evans and Senator Inouye, the criteria for speech criticism formulated by the reputable speech authority Alan H. Monroe were selected. The following were the Monroe criteria:

Speaker's analysis of problems:

1. Did the speaker properly analyze the problems?
2. Did his proposals advocate the best way to meet the problem?

**Reasoning:**

1. What type of reasoning did the speaker use?
2. Was his reasoning sound?

**Evidence:**

1. To what degree did the speaker use supporting material?
2. Was the supporting material reliable?
3. Did the speaker use unsupported assertions reinforced only by vivid phrasing or his own positive manner?
4. Did he present the facts fairly, or did he seem to be biased in selecting which facts to present or which to withhold?

**Motivation:**

1. What motive appeals did the speaker employ and what were their relation to his reasoning?

**Wording:**

1. Was the speaker's wording accurate or vague?
2. Were false conclusions suggested by loose phraseology?
3. Did the speaker rely on loaded words, name-calling, and generalities instead of reasoning and evidence?

The criteria were applied to the 1968 political keynote speeches to determine how favorably the speeches compared. An evaluation of the data revealed that the speeches were valid examples of the meaning and purpose of keynote addresses as set forth by writers on keynote addresses; the evaluation also revealed that the rhetoric of the speeches contained more similarities than differences. The speeches compared favorably in substance and in relation to the criteria,

## II. CONCLUSIONS DRAWN FROM THE STUDY

Results of the study corroborated the hypotheses. The 1968 political keynote addresses were found to be valid examples of the meaning and purpose of keynote addresses as set forth by writers on

keynote addresses; and the rhetoric of the addresses was found to contain more similarities than differences in its relation to the criteria.

The study revealed that the 1968 political keynote speeches, although they satisfied the general meaning of keynote speeches, were not the fiery oratory expected. They were short speeches of only 30 minutes duration. It was concluded that, since the speakers did not indulge in flamboyance or ridicule, they met more closely the standards of reason and ethics in public address.

The speeches included the kinds of real problems about which serious people were concerned. Obviously, the speakers were well aware of this concern, for they tried to convey their own concern about the problems and the hard solutions. It was concluded that the speakers were sensitive to their own anxieties and, therefore, avoided any temptation to over-emphasize some of the problems about which they spoke. Their approach played down emotionalism and completely excluded sensationalism. This was to their advantage and good effect.

### III. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

It is suggested that, for further study, an investigation into audience reaction at national political conventions be made in order to determine causal relationship between keynote speakers and their visible audience.

The following questions were brought to mind for investigation:

1. Did the keynote speaker create the real enthusiasm, or was the enthusiasm created by some other motivation prior to introduction of the speaker?
2. Can the keynote speech be made to offer greater meaning for the visible audience?
3. To what extent did the keynote speaker motivate emotional response in relation to the extent emotional response was motivated by other forces?

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### A. BOOKS

- Kindiner, Robert. White House Fever. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1960.
- Brambeck, W. L., and Howell, W. S. Persuasion. Englewood Cliff, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.
- Bryant, Donald C. and Wallace, Karl R. Fundamentals of Public Speaking. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc. 1953.
- Chase, Stuart. Guides to Straight Thinking. New York: Harper & Row, 1956.
- Cicero. The Orator, in The Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero, tr. C. D. Yonge. 4 vols. London: H. G. Bohn, 1852; G. Bell and Sons, 1913.
- Dewey, John. How We Think. Boston and New York: D. C. Heath & Co., 1933.
- Dickens, Milton. Speech: Dynamic Communication. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. 1963.
- Eaton, Herbert. Presidential Timber. New York: Free Press of Glencoe. 1964.
- Goodrich, Chauncey A. "Essays." In Select British Eloquence, ed. A. Craig Baird. Carbondale, Ill.: Southern Illinois University Press, 1963.
- Hochmuth, Marie. A History and Criticism of American Public Address, Vol. 3. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1955.
- Kendler, Howard H. Basic Psychology. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts. 1963.
- Lippmann, Walter. Essays in Public Philosophy. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1955.
- Minnick, Wayne. The Art of Persuasion. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1957.
- Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. Chicago: Scott, Foresman & Co., 1962.
- Ogg, Frederick A. and Ray, P. Orman. Introduction to American Government. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc. 1951.

Oliver, Robert T. History of Public Speaking in America. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc. 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. Persuasive Speaking. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech (2d ed.). New York: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd. 1957.

Overstreet, Harry. Influencing Human Behavior. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. 1925.

Quintilian. Institutio Oratoria, tr. H. E. Butler. 4 vols. London: William Heinemann, Ltd.; New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, Inc. 1921-22.

Thomson, Lester and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: The Ronald Press Company. 1948.

Wallace, Karl R. Ed. History of Speech Education in America. New York: Appleton, Century, Crofts, Inc. 1954.

#### B. PERIODICALS

Baird, A. Craig. Political Speaking in 1952: A symposium. Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXXVIII. 1952.

Berls, David K. and Gulley, Halbert E. Some Determinants of the Effect of Oral Communication in Producing Attitude Change and Learning. Speech Monographs, XXIV. March, 1957.

Bryant, Donald C. Rhetoric: Its Function and Scope. Quarterly Journal of Speech.

Clausen, E. Neal. He Kept Us Out of War: Martin E. Glynn's Keynote. Quarterly Journal of Speech. December, 1960.

Lubank, Henry L., Sr., Baird, A. Craig, Brigance, W. Norwood, Parrish, Wayland M., Weaver, Andrew T. What is Speech? A Symposium. Quarterly Journal of Speech. April, 1955.

Jeffrey, Robert C. Convention Speaking: Preface. Quarterly Journal of Speech. October, 1960.

Miles, Edwin A. The Keynote Speech at National Nominating Conventions. Quarterly Journal of Speech, Vol. XLVI.

Pitt, Carl Allen. Judd's Keynote Speech--A Congruous Configuration of Communication. The Southern Speech Journal. Summer, 1968.

Rosenthal, Paul I. The Concept of Ethos and the Structure of Persuasion. Quarterly Journal of Speech. XXXIII. June, 1966.

Whides, Russell. Presidential Campaign 1960: A Symposium. Quarterly Journal of Speech. XLVI. October, 1960.

#### C. MAGAZINES AND NEWSPAPERS

Chicago Daily News. August 27, 1968

The National Observer. July 22, 1968

New York Times. March 2, 1916.

New York Times. August 4, 1968

New York Times. August 11, 1968

New York Times. August 27, 1968

Newsweek. August 12, 1968

St. Louis Post Dispatch. June 14, 1916

St. Louis Post Dispatch. August 11, 1968

Time Magazine. August 9, 1968

Time Magazine. August 16, 1968

U. S. News & World Report. August 12, 1968

U. S. News & World Report. August 19, 1968

#### D. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Evans, Daniel J. Governor of Washington. A personal letter, dated August 2, 1968.

Inouye, Daniel K. United States Senator, Hawaii. A personal letter, dated August 6, 1968.

**APPENDIX**

# Keynote Address

## THE REPUBLICAN HOUR

By DANIEL J. EVANS, *Governor of the State of Washington*

*Delivered before the Republican National Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, August 5, 1968*

**M**R. CHAIRMAN: Delegates and Alternates to the 1968 Republican National Convention; And my fellow citizens: Dwight D. Eisenhower once defined America's goal in these eloquent words: It is, he said, "lifting from the back and from the hearts of men, their burden of arms and fears, so that they may find before them a golden age of freedom and peace."

We have come to Miami to make that vision come true.

And we shall leave here to elect the next President of the United States.

In a very real sense, this is the Republican hour.

Today, as never before, the nation demands new leadership: the fresh breeze of new energy; a full and honest reassessment of national goals; a new direction for its government; and a new hope for its citizens.

Just as surely as we are assembled here this evening, there still remains a savage war in Vietnam and a savage war in the hearts of men seeking justice. And we cannot survive the both of them together for very much longer.

It is not simply a question of guns and butter. It is a matter of death abroad and poverty at home. I think it is time that we recognized each of them for what they really are.

It is a time when we must have new solutions to new problems; when a leadership encumbered by the past must surrender its place to the party whose hope lies with the future.

Let those who offer old promises step aside—and let those who promise new opportunity step forward.

The United States is an uneasy nation on the eve of its most crucial political decision in this century.

We are frustrated by the fourth most costly war in our history—a war in which we spend a million dollars every twenty minutes.

A war which has cost us nearly 150,000 casualties and more than 20,000 lives;

A war which—under the present administration—we have not won in Saigon, cannot negotiate in Paris and will not explain to the American people.

But if we are frustrated by a war on the mainland of Asia, we are even more burdened by the crisis in the main streets of America.

A crisis of violence and stolen hope, a crisis of lawlessness and injustice, an impulsive, reckless dissatisfaction with what we are—and a desperate outcry for what we could be once again.

Above all, we are now witness to the disintegration of the old order;

Our system of welfare, so long promoted as a cure for social ills has eliminated nothing—with the possible exception of pride and incentive and human dignity.

The increasing dominance of the federal government has accomplished little—except the immobilization of our states and destruction of local initiative.

The steady erosion of our cities has left us a legacy of physical decay and human misery. Where once they stood as the symbol of progress, they now founder as the graveyard of hope.

In this process, we have robbed the nation of its great resource of individual initiative and public responsibility; we have become creatures of the system instead of the engineers of progress.

A nation deaf to the pleadings of the young and dumb-founded by the violence of the poor: Instead of the makers of history, we have become the victims of history—urged but not led, promised but not given, heard but not heeded.

Our economy stands in the constant jeopardy of inflation; our dollar loses prestige abroad while it loses value at home; we lose our youth in the agony of conscience as well as the agony of combat; we promote a singleness of purpose to our allies only to realize a division of purpose among ourselves.

We are a nation musclebound by its power, frustrated by the indecision of its leadership and fragmented by its great differences.

It is from this point that the Republican Party must now proceed. For it is leadership—not the fundamental strength of this country—which is at issue.

The nation's great resources—its enormous capacity for good will, its culture, the traditions and institutions of two centuries, the skills and arts of its people; these are not in doubt.

Only their utilization, and only those who govern their use.

We began in revolt against the tyranny of an old and rigid order; and our institutions have remained strong, not by clinging to the past, but by adapting to the future—by giving substance and direction to the heritage of liberty and independence.

Just as strength has kept us free, so has change kept us strong. And those who fear today's upheaval might do well to examine once again the progress of this nation through the past 200 years.

What is now at stake is whether the Republican Party can rise to the challenge created by the winds of a new direction—or whether, in defiance of history, we choose to retreat when the nation so clearly calls.

This Party under Abraham Lincoln resolved the question of political union and began the task of human rights;

This Party under Dwight Eisenhower restored the balance of world power and advanced the cause of social justice; I am convinced that this Party can now best resolve the problems of war and peace which so severely test this country.

We can't remain on the sidelines while change and turmoil strike at the fabric of national purpose. For the deliverance of hope is contained in the demonstration of action; and this Party—the Republican Party—for its own survival and for the sake of the nation—must be where the action is.

If we cannot find the courage to accept leadership, then we cannot expect to realize victory.

There is no quarrel that, above all, our Party must remain dedicated to the principles of peace through strength and equal justice within the framework of law.

There is no excuse for weakness—and no justification for lawlessness.

But we must recognize that strength is no substitute for sound policy and that the rule of law cannot prevail when its foundation is corrupted by injuries and inequality.

And we must recognize that unless and until we begin to deal with the matter of new priorities in this country, there will be no peace abroad and little security at home.

We have stood for twenty years in defense of a free world. We have given as no other nation to the securing of world

order and the pursuit of human progress. And for it we have paid a heavy price on the ledger of neglect—not neglect in terms of ignorance but neglect in terms of priorities.

This does not mean that the United States would abandon its international commitments. A great power cannot view the world from behind the walls of political isolation nor economic protection;

Nor does it imply that we should withdraw from our obligations and responsibilities to ourselves and to the people of South Vietnam.

To have entered the war by the path of error does not mean we can leave through the door of default.

But it does mean that the first priority of the United States is the resolution of our internal conflict—the recognition that if we can't unite our own nation, then we can't preserve the hope of others.

It is time now to reach inward—to reach down and touch the troubled spirit of America.

It is time to confront the issues of poverty and disease and human dignity which lie beneath the violence that tears at every conscience just as it strikes fear in every heart.

We have a long and serious agenda before us and no easy road to its accomplishment. The problems of environment, of congestion, or urban decay and rural stagnation did not suddenly occur; they are the residue of years—even of decades—in which we devoted too much of ourselves to size and quantity and too little to shape and quality.

They are the residue of years in which we believed that welfare was a substitute for pride and that public charity could replace individual opportunity. But black America and poor America are teaching us a new language—the language of participation. They say, "Let us share in your prosperity, let us have not another generation of servitude but a new generation of opportunity." And in this process we are being reminded of something we very nearly forgot—the nobility of the American dream.

That to own a share in business, to realize a profit of investment, to run a factory or a shop, to produce goods and see the money return to the community—that these, not welfare are the things which made America great, her people rich and here opportunity unlimited.

There is no place in that dream for a closed society, for a system which denies opportunity because of race, or the accident of birth, or geography or the misfortune of a family.

Only when everyone has a stake in the future of this country; only when the doors of private enterprise are opened to all—only then will each person have something to preserve and something to build on for his children.

This nation must find a way for that to happen.

And I believe it can be found.

A nation which rebuilt the devastated economy of Europe after World War II can surely rebuild the devastated hopes of its own minorities.

And a nation which opened the frontier by offering its land to homesteaders can surely secure the future by sharing its promise of wealth.

We have heard another voice in this land—the voice of youth. It has served notice that satisfaction can't be measured alone in dollars—that there is a need for service and contribution beyond the attainment of material success.

For each of our youth who have dropped out, there are a hundred more who have stayed in; some radical, some demanding, some searching, some hoping—but all concerned.

Who in their concern to serve their country have set out across the land to participate in the exercise of political power;

Who gives of their time to the poor, the uneducated, the mentally retarded, the blind and the helpless;

Who, in search of a brighter future for America, may have found themselves.

We dare not bank the fire of that hope, nor should we try to remake the young in the image of ourselves. For theirs is a new spirit—a spirit of giving service, a spirit which treasures the values of brotherhood and human dignity and proclaims that they shall not be sacrificed by the pursuit of personal gain.

To break that spirit would be to bankrupt our future.

Instead, let us find the programs, the resources and the opportunity for these young people to serve society and the nation—to participate in the political system, to be heard not for their wisdom or their years but for their dedication, their enterprise and their great aspirations for our country.

These are not the pleadings of a weak and useless generation; they are the strong voices of a generation which—given a chance—can lead America to a new unity, a new purpose and a new prosperity.

One group of Americans asks for economic opportunity; another group seeks an opportunity for service.

Both of them—and indeed all Americans—seek one thing above all: that their country reject the principle of a "help yourself" society and create the foundation of a "self-help" society.

Instead of welfare, they ask for a stake in our capital economy;

Instead of wealth, they ask for a role in creating a human society.

We must now begin the task of rebuilding a nation, and we must do so with the same vision and resourcefulness which gave this country birth and which created the richest, most powerful economy on earth.

For our direction and for our leadership we must turn, not alone to government, but to a new partnership; a partnership of government, private enterprise and the individual citizen.

We must bring the resources of incentive, of private planning and management skill into a new and creative alliance—the capitalism of social enterprise.

The problems of urban growth and rural stagnation—the need for low cost housing, for restoring our central cities, for creating new communities, for retraining the unemployed—these needs are not apart from private enterprise. They are—instead—its newest and perhaps most significant challenge.

Government can establish a direction, but it can't construct the solutions of the next three decades.

Private enterprise and free labor can build, but they can't write and administer the laws which create profit opportunities and business incentives.

To this, now we must add the most important ingredient of all: the powerful contribution of the individual citizen; the citizen who sees in the commitment of service our best hope for the nation.

For it is in individual service that the hidden assets of America lie; the community of citizens who will give of their time, their talent and their education to the advancement of our country and its people. There are few so young and none so old that their abilities cannot find a need or their interests an outlet:

To individually tutor a disadvantaged child who has fallen behind in the process of learning;

To give hope to the mentally retarded through individual training;

To counsel a paroled convict in the responsibilities of renewed citizenship;

To advise and assist in the development of a remote Indian village;

To join together and bring pride to a community; to restore our belief in each other; to share our common burdens.

It is through this great partnership of committed service that we can ultimately fulfill our American Dream.

If these goals require an investment in patience, then let us invest; if they require money, then let us spend.

But let us realize that the challenge to the Republican Party lies within the problems of America, not outside of them.

It lies in the prevention of wars and not their prosecution; In the advancement of men and not the destruction of mankind;

It lies in the ghettos just as surely as the suburbs; In the factories just as clearly as on the farms;

In the hearts of all our people and in their great and growing aspirations.

The protests, the defiance of authority, the violence in the streets are more than isolated attacks upon the established order; they are the symptoms of the need for change and for a redefinition of what this country stands for and where it is going.

This opportunity now rests with the Republican Party—the Party which in other critical times has risen above the luxury of debate and committed itself to the difficult, de-

manding resolution of this nation's problems.

The Republican Party is equal to the challenges of tomorrow:

The challenge of a new technology;

Of a new era of politics;

Of a new spirit of justice;

And of a new and abiding concern for the hopes of a restless society of equals.

We can mobilize the millions of people who share in the dream of a country reunited; the millions who share in the belief that we can secure equality without destroying liberty; that we can realize progress without surrendering principle.

Let us proceed, therefore, not in celebration but in the knowledge that what we do here may well determine the fate of a nation.

Let us debate not in fear of the present, but with faith in our future.

And let us unite to rally a great Party in the cause of a great nation—to seek progress with victory; to find "not a way out, but a way forward."

Thank you.

## Communist Danger

### LASTING SOLUTIONS

By DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, *Former President*

*Delivered to the Republican National Convention from Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, D. C., August 5, 1968*

**M**Y GOOD FRIENDS in Miami and across America. By necessity, not choice, I am talking to you from Walter Reed Hospital in Washington, D. C. For a long time I had counted on joining you personally at the Miami convention, but the doctors have said no and again no.

Yet this Republican convention, the first I have missed in 16 years, is the one I wanted most to attend.

This is why.

For three months I have been sidelined by illness. Enforced inactivity has allowed me time to reflect on our country's growing difficulties and what our party can do to make the future a brighter one.

Today as we contemplate the troublesome developments in the nation it is scarcely possible to escape the feeling that ours is a time of critical testing. Every citizen must become involved, for on the current scene, apathy is scarcely less than a crime.

Work made our country, and work kept it great. Work should be for all of us a word as honorable and as appealing as patriotism.

I have delved into our country's history, yet I believe that none of us has known a time that has placed a higher premium than the present on statesmanship; on courageous, competent leadership; on solid common sense; on a willingness to subordinate self to the general good.

At every level of government we must, through diligent study and reflection, seek out candid and capable leaders. We need people who can point the way to sound progress, serenity and confidence at home, and respect for America throughout the world.

Abroad, in every major sector, we confront a formidable foe—an expansionist tyranny which respects only toughness and strength and still displays little interest in traveling the pathways to peace, with honor and justice.

Remember, it is not by a tyrant's words, but only by his deeds that we can know him.

Today the Communists reach ruthlessly for domination over Southeast Asia and are trying to break our will to foil the attempt. In the Middle East, month by month they move closer to testing our resolution. The same is true in Korea. Constantly they stir new troubles in every area of weakness they can ferret out in Eastern Europe, in Africa and Latin America.

Even here in America they covertly labor to deepen citizen discontent, to incite violence, and to rend the fabric of our society. Meantime, they continue to expand their military power.

There is nothing particularly new in this. I have had personally to deal directly or indirectly with this ideological conflict a good part of my adult life. But what is new is a growing disposition among some of us to ignore these aggressive moves, to discount the blatant threats, to seek, in effect, for surface accommodations rather than to insist upon mutual acceptance in practice or principle. This is wishful thinking at its worst.

Of course, all of us yearn for universal peace with honor and tonight our prayers are both with our representatives in Paris and our brave men in Vietnam. But once we begin to compete over how best to contrive an American retreat in such a struggle—then we are heading for trouble. But I must offer this thought:

It is one thing to call for a peaceful settlement of this struggle. It is quite another to call for retreat by America. The latter is the best way I know to stockpile tragedy for our children.

This we are resolved to prevent.

Here at home let us first remind ourselves of the greatness of this nation and its people. In spite of the publicity given to disorderly riots and criminal violence, the vast portion of our people are law abiding and proud of their country and ready to sacrifice in her behalf. So, in what I have to say about what I believe to be mistaken general policies of government

and the lawless acts of some minorities, that so crowd the TV screen and capture the headlines, all but a tiny percentage of Americans are patriotic, optimistic, forward looking and loyal.

Yet grave injury, some of it irretrievable, has been done for our country. News media tell us daily of the scourge of inflation, crippling interest rates, rising production costs that damage our world trade, a recently deteriorating currency, successive Federal budgets of increasing and stupendous size, and a rapidly mounting national debt. These are only part of the scene.

I suggest we should be more concerned with the evil spirit manifested in so many corners of the land. Violence is desolating our cities with causes either inadequately understood or ineffectively combated, major crimes are at a shocking level and the nation is suffering because of embittered race relations. Millions of poor are dispirited or resentful due to promises unkept and misery uneased. Many of our youth are rebellious, somehow disillusioned, but without remedies close to their hearts or acceptable to their minds. With all this our people are out of patience.

Let us not waste time this year searching out someone to blame, even though some seem more disposed to concede rather than to stand firmly for America's good, seeking short range political advantage instead of less popular, more lasting solutions. They are the ones who are more willing to extol the promised land than to knuckle down and work for it.

To these and other problems this Republican convention must find adequate answers. They must be generous in meeting the nation's need, with common sense plans couched in terms that provide hope to all and assure effectiveness, real progress and national solvency and a universal respect for law

and order. Moreover, all Republicans must accept your plans and programs as a personal pledge of honor, not merely as a flytrap to catch an unwary voter.

I know that this convention will demonstrate its concern for every citizen, regardless of any consideration of race or creed, whether he lives in a hovel or a mansion. Every delegate must be guided by his own convictions as to the long term good of our country. All other goals are secondary.

Another thing—I, for one, am tired of having the Republican party referred to in sarcastic terms as a "minority party." The basis of this myth is that merely in official registration—the Republicans comprise only 27 per cent of the electorate.

But consider for one moment these figures taken from *The World Almanac*. In the sum total of popular votes in the most recent four Presidential elections the Republican candidates polled more than 106,000 over the Democratic candidates. Certainly, in the voting booths the Republicans were not a minority.

So—whatever the judgment of this convention as to nominees, let us stand behind our standard bearers, and enthusiastically seek out the millions of independents and discerning Democrats who can feel our sincerity, see the good sense of our proposals, and when the chips are down, will again vote with us.

Thus we shall carry our story across the land until every citizen of every city, village and farmstead recognizes that the entire Republican effort is dedicated to his good. Thus America, newly inspired spiritually and materially, will again begin climbing the mountain of true progress.

And one thing more—I am not a candidate.

Thank you! Godspeed in your great work.

## A Return To Peace And Progress

### A STABLE ECONOMY

By the Honorable THOMAS E. DEWEY, *Former Governor of New York*

*Delivered before the Republican National Convention, Miami Beach, Florida, August 6, 1968*

**W**E ARE ASSEMBLED here to appraise the state of the nation and determine ways to improve it. As I look at the situation we are in, both at home and abroad, it seems to me to need a whole lot of improvement.

It is said that those who forget history will be compelled to live it over again. The converse is that those who remember history will benefit from its teachings. So let's look for a moment at recent history. In 1952 a Democratic administration had brought the government to a condition of intolerable confusion and corruption. All this was combined with a war in Korea which it was unable to win and unable to bring to an end. The nation called on General Dwight Eisenhower and the Republican Party to get us out of the mess and they did.

Within four months the fighting in Korea was stopped and South Korea has become a showcase of social and economic progress.

Communist subversion or conquest was on the march around the world, including Iran, Guatemala, the City of Trieste and occupied Austria. Every one of them was rescued and is free today. Lebanon was threatened and, at the request of that beleaguered government, the American marines landed. They saved the free government and not one shot was fired. In West Berlin freedom was preserved and, over the protest of many of those confused thinkers who are still with us today, so too were Quemoy, Matsu and Formosa saved, and again without our firing a shot.

I would be the last to argue that everything was perfect then or ever will be, either abroad or at home, but we were making genuine social and economic progress, raising still further the highest standard of living in the world. There were no riots, no student violence and no organized alienation from society. No one was burning draft cards and no one was desecrating the American flag. It was customary for the law to be enforced so our people could go about their daily lives without fear.

We were at peace among ourselves. We were at peace in the world and no American boy was fighting anywhere in the world.

This was the achievement of the Republican Party and I say we can start doing it again next January. Admittedly it will not be easy. After these eight years of Democratic administration, the nation is once again in sad disarray. Indeed, many of our pseudo-intellectuals are telling us in books, in the press, on television and radio, that all is lost. They tell us that we have become a "sick society," that we have "lost our bearings" and even that revolution and anarchy are the only solution to our problems. They tell us we have "lost our identity," that we don't even know "who we are."

Well, I have news for them. We, the American people, do know who we are. We have not lost our bearings. We are not alienated from society. This is not a sick country and it doesn't need a revolution or anarchy to cure its ills. I deeply

pants in the politics of our time. Never were you needed so much, and never could you do so much if you want to help now.

Martin Luther King, Jr. had a dream. Robert F. Kennedy as you saw tonight had a great vision. If Americans will respond to that dream and that vision, if Americans will respond to that dream and that vision, their deaths will not mark the moment when America lost its way. But it will mark the time when America found its conscience.

These men, these men have given us inspiration and direction, and I pledge from this platform tonight we shall not abandon their purpose—we shall honor their dreams by our deeds now in the days to come.

I am keenly aware of the fears and the frustrations of the world in which we live. It is all too easy, isn't it, to play on these emotions. But I do not intend to do so. I do not intend

to appeal to fear, but rather to hope. I do not intend to appeal to frustration, but rather to your faith.

I shall appeal to reason and to your good judgment.

The American Presidency, the American Presidency is a great and powerful office, but it is not all-powerful. It depends most of all upon the will and the faith and the dedication and the wisdom of the American people.

So I call you forth—I call forth that basic goodness that is there—I call you to risk the hard path of greatness.

And I say to America. Put aside recrimination and dissension. Turn away from violence and hatred. Believe—believe in what America can do, and believe in what America can be, and with the vast—with the help of that vast, unfrightened, dedicated, faithful majority of Americans, I say to this great convention tonight, and to this great nation of ours, I am ready to lead our country!

## Commitment

### KEYNOTE ADDRESS

By DANIEL K. INOUE, *United States Senator from Hawaii*

*Delivered before the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, August 26, 1968*

**M**Y FELLOW AMERICANS: This is my country. Many of us have fought hard for the right to say that. Many are struggling today from Harlem to Danang so that they may say it with conviction.

This is our country.

And we are engaged in a time of great testing—testing whether this nation, or any nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to opportunity for all its citizens, can not only endure but continue to progress. The issue before all of us in such a time is how shall we discharge, how shall we honor our citizenship.

The keynote address at a national political convention traditionally calls for rousing oratory. I hope to be excused from this tradition tonight. For I do not view this occasion as one for either flamboyance or levity.

I believe the real reason we are here is that there is a word called "commitment," because we are committed to the future of our country and all our people, and because for that future, hope and faith are more needed now than pride in our party's past.

For even as we emerge from an era of unsurpassed social and economic progress. Americans are clearly in no mood for counting either their blessings or their bank accounts.

We are still embarked on the longest unbroken journey of economic growth and prosperity in our history. Yet we are torn by dissension, and disrespect for our institutions and leaders is rife across the land.

In at least two of our greatest universities, learning has been brought to a halt by student rebellions; others of the student revolution have publicly burned draft cards and even the American flag.

Crime has increased so that we are told one out of every three Americans is afraid to walk in his own neighborhood after dark.

Riot has bludgeoned our cities, laying waste our streets, our property and, most important human lives. The smoke of destruction has even shrouded the dome of our Capitol, and in Washington the task of restoring order drew more than twice as many Federal troops as were involved in the defense of Khe Sanh in Vietnam.

Voices of angry protest are heard throughout the land, cry-

ing for all manner of freedoms. Yet our political leaders are picketed and some who cry loudest for freedom have sought to prevent our President, our Vice President and Cabinet officers from speaking in public.

None go so far as publicly to condone a politics of assassination. Yet assassins' bullets have robbed our country of three great leaders within the last five years.

Why? What has gone

Why—when we have at last had the courage to open up an attack on the age-old curses of ignorance and disease and poverty and prejudice—why are the flags of anarchism being hoisted by leaders of the next generation? Why, when our maturing society welcomes and appreciates art as never before, are poets and painters so preponderantly hostile?

Some conveniently blame all our ills and agonies on a most difficult and unpopular commitment overseas. The Vietnam war must end, they say, because it is an immoral war.

Of course, the war in Vietnam must be ended. But it must be ended, as President Johnson said last March, by patient political negotiation rather than through the victorious force of arms—even though this may be unpalatable for those raised in the tradition of glorious military victories.

But like our other complex problems, this one must also be solved responsibly. Just as we shun irresponsible calls for total and devastating military victory, so must we guard against the illusion of an instant peace that has no chance of permanence.

Of course, the Vietnam war is immoral. Whether by the teachings of Moses or by the teachings of Christ or by the teachings of Buddha, I believe that wars are immoral. During the Crusades, Christians in the name of Jesus Christ slaughtered innocent men, women and children and plundered their cities—because they were of another faith. These were immoral wars.

In Vietnam we build schools across the countryside and feed the hungry in the cities. And our President has pledged massive sums in aid to all Vietnamese as an incentive to peace. And yet this is an immoral war.

Perhaps by the time my 4-year-old son is grown, men will have learned to live by the Ten Commandments. But men

have not yet renounced the use of force as a means to their objectives.

And until they do, are we more immoral—if there be such a degree—to fracture our solemn commitments and then see our word doubted, not only by our friends abroad, but by our enemies?

Knowing that this could lead to tragic miscalculations, is it less immoral now to make the easier course, and gamble the lives of our sons and grandsons on the outcome?

These are not easy questions and perhaps there are no certain answers.

But when young people have rioted in China and Czechoslovakia as well as at Columbia, and in Paris and Berlin as well as in Berkeley, I doubt that we can blame all the troubles of our time on Vietnam.

Other critics tell us of the revolution of rising expectations. They charge that it has reached such proportions that men now take it as an insult when they are asked to be reasonable in their desires and demands.

If this is too often true as a generalization, it is all too frequently aimed particularly at our fellow citizens of African ancestry, whose aspirations have burst full-blown on us after more than 100 years of systematic racist deprivation.

As an American whose ancestors came from Japan, I have become accustomed to a question most recently asked by a very prominent businessman who was concerned about the threat of riots and the resultant loss in life and property. "Tell me," he said, "why can't the Negro be like you?"

First, although my skin is colored, it is not black. In this country, the color of my skin does not ignite prejudice that has smoldered for generations.

Second, although my grandfather came to this country in poverty, he came without shackles; he came as a free man enjoying certain constitutional rights under the American flag.

Third, my grandfather's family was not shattered as individual members of it were sold as chattel or used as security on loans. And fourth, although others of my ancestry were interned behind barbed wires during World War II, neither my parents nor I were forced by covenants and circumstances to live in ghettos.

Unlike those of my ancestry, the Negro's unemployment rate is triple the national average. The mortality rate of his children is twice that of white children.

He often pays more for his miserable tenement than comparable space will cost in the white suburbs. He is likely to pay more for his groceries, more for his furniture, more for his liquor and more for his credit.

And, my fellow Americans, today many thousands of Vietnam with medals of black Americans return from valor; some of them have been crippled in the service of their country. But too often they return to economic and social circumstances that are barely, if at all, improved over those they left.

Is it any wonder that the Negro questions whether his place in our country's history books will be any less forgotten than were the contributions of his ancestors? Is it any wonder that the Negroes find it hard to wait another 100 years before they are accepted as full citizens in our free society?

Of course, expectations are rising—and they are rising faster than we in our imperfect world can fulfill them.

The revolution we in the United States are experiencing was born of Democratic processes that not only accommodate economic progress and social mobility, but actively encourage them.

But it is important to remember that these expectations are the children of progress and that today's restlessness has been nurtured by our very real achievements. Out of these should emerge a brighter and better society than we have known.

Nowhere is this clearer than in the situation of our young people today. The success of our economic system has freed them in ever-increasing numbers from the tragedies of premature mortality and early labor.

It has built the schools in which they are being educated to higher levels than ever in our nation's history. And this progress has been achieved in a political system that not only admits but safeguards the right of dissent.

So it should hardly surprise us when the children of such progress demand to be heard when they become aware of inequities still to be corrected. Neither should we fear their voices. On the contrary, whether we know it or not, the marching feet of youth have led us into a new era of politics and we can never turn back.

But what should concern us is something far more fundamental. The true dimension of the challenge facing us is a loss of faith. I do not mean simply a loss of religious faith, although this erosion is a major contributor to our unease. I mean a loss of faith in our country, in its purposes and its institutions. I mean a retreat from the responsibilities of citizenship.

The plain fact is that in the face of complexity and frustration, too many Americans have drifted into the use of power for purely destructive purposes. Too many Americans have come to believe it is their right to decide as individuals which of our laws they will obey and which they will violate.

I do not mean to say that all our laws are just. They're not, and I don't mean to suggest that protest against unjust laws is not proper. Performed in an orderly manner, the right to protest is a cornerstone of our system.

Men must have the opportunity to be heard even when their views are extreme and in a lesser democratic country, dangerous. I, too, have spoken against laws which I considered wrong and unjust, and I am sure I will speak—and vote—against many, many more.

But my fellow Americans, I have not burned my birth certificate, and I will not renounce my citizenship.

Those who would do such things are relatively few. But there is a much larger number who in the face of change and disorder have retreated into disengagement and quiet despair. Less destructively but not less surely, such men are also retreating from the responsibilities of citizenship.

Now let us not deceive ourselves about the consequences of such abdication. It is anarchy. It is a state in which each individual demands instant compliance with his own desires, and from there it is but a short step to the assumption by each individual of the right to decide which of his neighbors shall live and which shall not, and so accelerate the sickening spiral of violence which has already cost us our beloved John F. Kennedy, our great leader Martin Luther King Jr. and the voice of this decade, Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

We have been told that the revolts are against the system, and that Establishment must be torn down. But my fellow Americans, in Paris recently, students cut down hundred-year-old trees to erect temporary street barricades. Those trees had lived through two world wars. Some of them had even survived the revolution of 1848.

Were the goals of these students served by the destruction of those trees? How long will it take for their beauty and the vitality they symbolized to grow again? What trees did the students plant in their place?

If we cut down our institutions, public and private, and with indifference starve the systems which have given us our achievements, who will feed the hungry? Who will train the unskilled?

Who will supply the jobs that mean opportunity for the generation whose voices are not yet heard? And who will launch the much-needed Marshall Plan to rebuild our cities

and open opportunity for all Americans. These undertakings are too great for individuals going their separate ways.

Finally, my fellow Americans, let us remember that even anarchy is only a way station. Man, the social animal, has always craved order. He has made the most essential function of his government the maintenance of some level of order.

Chaos and anarchy have never been more than preludes to totalitarianism. Tyrants like Adolph Hitler have taught this before.

So, my fellow Americans, let us reject violence as a means of protest, and let us reject those who preach violence. But let us not tempt those who would hide the evil face of racism behind the mask of law and order.

To permit violence and anarchy to destroy our cities is to spark the beginning of a cancerous growth of doubt, suspicion, fear and hatred that will gradually infect the whole nation.

Poverty, discrimination, deprivation, as evil as they are, do not justify violence or anarchy, do not justify looting or burning and do not justify murder or assassination.

Law and order must be respected and maintained to protect the rights, yes, the civil rights, of all our citizens.

But let us resist also the temptation to apathy because we can never cure the causes of violence with indifference. And, my fellow Americans, in the last analysis law and order can only rest securely with justice and its foundation.

So let's look at how much we have already built and then get on with the work.

At a time when guns are still heard in some areas of the world, we have laid in place such building blocks of mankind's survival as the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963, the banning of atomic weapons in space of 1967, and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty of 1968. These are vital foundations, vital foundations of peace and we must build on them.

Under the health measures first proposed by the Presidency of our most beloved Harry S Truman and passed during the remarkable administration of Lyndon B. Johnson, 20 million older Americans are now protected under Medicare.

Our elder Americans can now live their autumn years in dignity and in security. And infant mortality has declined to a new low and federally funded community health centers are now serving nearly 50 million Americans. These too are vital foundations and on them we must build fuller lives for our citizens.

And since 1963, President Johnson has proposed and Congress has enacted more than 40 major new laws to foster edu-

cation in our country. Since 1963, our Government has tripled its investment in education and in the past four years alone we have invested twice as much as was spent in the previous 100 years. These are the foundations from which towers of human achievement can soar.

The last 11 years have seen the passage of the five civil rights laws passed during the entire history of the United States, and I might note in passing that Lyndon Baines Johnson is the author, chief architect or primary sponsor of each of the civil right laws.

When all summers are long and hot, it is well to remember that the 100 years of the Emancipation Proclamation is finally but slowly but becoming a reality, and the occupants of some of our highest offices are testimony that black talent is just as important as white talent.

Working together, we have done much. We can and we must do much, much more.

Fellow Democrats, we are here tonight because in large part we share our faith in our country and in its processes of orderly, humanistic change. Change and challenge should not deter us now—we have long been a party of change and challenge.

The need for new ideas and improved institutions should not deter us now—we have long been a party of new ideas.

That today's crisis in the human spirit should not deter us—we have long been a party which gave priority to the needs of human beings.

So let us go forward with programs responsive to the needs of today and responsive to the needs of tomorrow.

Fellow Americans, this is our country. Its future is what we, its citizens, will make it.

And as we all know, we have much to do. Putting aside hatred on the one hand and timidity on the other, let us grow fresh faith in our purpose and new vigor in our citizenship.

Let us welcome the ideas and energies of the young and the talents and participation of all responsible people.

Let us plant trees and grow new opportunity. And, my fellow Americans, let us build not only new buildings but new neighborhoods and then let us live in them, all as full citizens and all as brothers.

In closing I wish to share with you a most sacred word of Hawaii. It is aloha. To some of you who visited us it may have meant hello. To others aloha may have meant good-bye. But to those of us who have been privileged to live in Hawaii, aloha means I love you.

So to all of you, my fellow Americans, aloha.

## Acceptance Speech

### CANDIDATE FOR VICE PRESIDENT

By EDMUND S. MUSKIE, *United States Senator from Maine*

*Delivered before the Democratic National Convention, Chicago, Illinois, August 29, 1968*

**M**R. CHAIRMAN, that great young Senator from the great State of Oklahoma, Senator Harris, the Governor of my home state of Maine, Governor Curtis; that distinguished Governor of the State of New Jersey, Governor Hughes, and my old and good friend from the great State of Michigan, Senator Phil Hart:

Fellow delegates, fellow Americans—may I first of all say in behalf of myself and my wife, Jane, a sincere thank you for your trust and for your confidence.

To those who preferred someone else, I'd like to tell you of something that happened in my home town in Maine late

this afternoon.

I learned of the Vice President's decision about 4 o'clock. It was too late for me to bring any of my family to Chicago. As a result, they were all besieged by reporters, television people, an experience they weren't very accustomed to.

And so my mother was asked by one reporter whether or not she expected to vote for me. And you'd be interested in her reply. She said, Well, if no one offers anyone better, I suppose I will.

That one vote I'm going to have to work for. I didn't really expect that this opportunity and responsibility would come to

me. Let me assure you that no Democrat from my state in my lifetime would ever expect to have the opportunity to speak in a room of this many Democrats.

And with that background, we have learned to be proud to be a Democrat in a state where it's hard to prove that it's a worthwhile status in life.

And so my reaction to this responsibility and to this opportunity is a very mixed one—but, above all else, it is an acute awareness of the work we have to do.

To build a peace, to heal our country. To make a society such as ours work is not easy. It means learning to live with, to understand and to respect many different kinds of human beings, of different colors, of different races, of different national origins, of different cultural levels, of different tastes and intellectual capacities, of different educational attainments, of different social backgrounds, personalities and dispositions, and to accept them all as equals.

It means learning to trust each other, to work with each other, to think of each other as neighbors. It means diminishing our prerogatives by as much as is necessary to give others the same prerogatives. It means respect for the rule of law as a dispenser of justice as well as a mainainer of order.

It means giving all citizens an equal opportunity to participate in American life and in the policy-making processes of our society. And in all frankness, our society has not worked in this way up to now.

There are risks in such a society because there is evil as well as good. There is meanness as well as generosity. There is dishonesty as well as honesty, and there is violence as well as peace.

But these are risks we must take.

There are those who believe that a society of this kind cannot work. To put their doubts in perspective, let us not forget that when we began this experiment in government we did not instantly achieve an equal chance for every member of our society.

But we did promise to work toward it. We made that promise because we believe that when men, however different, are free to grow, they will enlarge their intellectual and spiritual power; they will achieve more satisfying lives for themselves; they will become better neighbors to others—and they will make possible a more enlightened and a more civilized society.

The practice of freedom since that time has made possible tremendous advances in the lives of the average citizen of our country. But, ironically, those very advances have highlighted our shortcomings, shortcomings which have denied hope for improvement to too many Americans; shortcomings which have concealed the reality of hunger, poverty and deprivation for many under an illusion of prosperity and equality for all.

We have learned painfully at times that freedom does not automatically correct the inequities, the injustices and the human failings of any society. Freedom does not automatically

create concern, understanding and compassion in all citizens.

And so we have learned that freedom does not work.

And that I believe to be part of the reason for the surging determination of so many of our young people and the disadvantaged among us to make a place for themselves in building the future of our country.

In identifying the direction in which it should go, in setting the pace at which we should move. Such a force as this generated by these young people should hearten those who believe in freedom as the most creative expression of the human spirit. But there are some disquieting aspects to this force because it can be expressed and often is in unrestrained, irrational and even explosive ways.

These may be the products of impatience with results, of lack of confidence in our intentions, of lack of experience with the Democratic process.

And they may also be product of exploitation by militants whose motives are suspect.

We, we who have had the advantages of living and experiencing freedom must have the patience to make the distinction between these two groups and to deal with each of them differently.

We must learn to work with these people, to insure their continued and more meaningful participation in the democratic process.

We must inspire their confidence, that their efforts will achieve the dignity, the opportunity and the equality which they seek. This is the way. This is the way to develop the self-discipline of free citizens in an enlightened and civilized society without which it cannot survive.

This is the kind of work which the Democratic party knows, which it has responded to instinctively and which it has done so well.

And let me say to you, my fellow Democrats, that in this election year we must surpass all our previous efforts—not so much for the success of our party but for the survival of liberty in our country.

And I might close by suggesting as a standard the words of a voice from an ancient democracy in Greece. The words were these:

"We are capable at the same time of taking risks and of estimating them beforehand. Others are brave out of ignorance. When they stop to think they begin to fear. But the man who can most truly be accounted brave is he who best knows the meaning of what is sweet in life and of what is terrible, then goes out undeterred to meet what is to come."

So, my fellow Americans, let us make certain that we know the difference between what is sweet in life and what is terrible, and that we then go out undeterred to meet what is to come.

It is in this spirit that I accept your nomination and will try to justify it.

## The Vietnam War

### THE OBJECTIVES OF THE UNITED STATES

By LYNDON B. JOHNSON, *President of the United States*

*Delivered at the Convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Detroit, Michigan, August 19, 1968*

GENERAL WESTMORELAND, Reverend Varner, Congressman and Mrs. Teague, Governor Docking, Mayor Cavanagh, my beloved friend Bill Driver, ladies and gentlemen.

Tonight as we meet here to honor American veterans, I

want to first of all thank you for your kindness to me and to my family. And as we assemble here tonight one of the great veterans of our time is waging one of the greatest struggles of his life.

The hearts and the hopes of all of us in this room and of

1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois

July 8, 1968

Chairman  
Republican National Committee  
Republican National Committee Headquarters  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

I am a Graduate student at Eastern Illinois University. My major area of concentration is Rhetoric and Public Address.

I have selected as a master's thesis A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches Delivered at the National Party Conventions in 1968.

It would be much appreciated if you could forward to me the name of the keynote speaker at this year's Convention and any information you may have on keynote speakers or speeches of past Conventions.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Block



RAY C. BLISS, CHAIRMAN  
1625 EYE STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006

# Republican National Convention

## Committee On Arrangements

OFFICES  
FONTAINEBLEAU HOTEL  
MIAMI BEACH, FLORIDA 33139  
TELEPHONE 305 534-8311

July 15, 1968

Mr. Joseph E. Block  
1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Dear Mr. Block:

The Keynote Speaker for the 1968 Republican National Convention is the Honorable Daniel J. Evans, Governor of the State of Washington. The Temporary Chairman of the Convention is the Honorable Edward W. Brooke, United States Senator from Massachusetts.

Traditionally, the Keynote Speaker is the Temporary Chairman of the Convention. In 1952, the Republican Party departed from this system and elected a special Keynote Speaker--General Douglas MacArthur. In 1956 and 1960 the Keynote Speaker was again chosen for this specific role only. In 1956 the Honorable Arthur B. Langlie was the Keynote Speaker and in 1960 the Honorable Walter Judd, then a Member of Congress from Minnesota, was chosen. In 1964 we resorted to the old system of having the Temporary Chairman deliver the Keynote Address. This was done by the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, who was then Governor of the State of Oregon.

Sincerely yours,

Kay

RCB:cd

1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

July 18, 1968

Honorable Daniel J. Evans  
Governor of the State of Washington  
Olympia, Washington

Sir:

I am a Graduate student at Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois. My area of concentration is Rhetoric and Public Address, and I have selected as my master's thesis A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches Delivered at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions in 1968.

I have just received word from the Republican National Committee in Washington that you have been selected to deliver the Republican keynote address. May I congratulate you, sir!

As a research scholar, I am interested in knowing what you believe to be the necessary criteria for an effective keynote address. Within your busy schedule, if it would be possible, could you jot down these criteria and have them forwarded to the above address? I would sincerely appreciate it.

I shall be listening to your address, recording it, and evaluating it. The best of speaking to you.

Thank you, sir, for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

Joseph E. Block



STATE OF WASHINGTON

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

OLYMPIA

DANIEL J. EVANS  
GOVERNOR

August 2, 1968

Mr. Joseph E. Block  
1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Dear Mr. Block:

In response to your letter relative to the Keynote Speech, I would list the following as some of the criteria I used in preparing my remarks.

1. The Keynote should be relatively brief--no more than 25-30 minutes.
2. It should be directed primarily to the audience on radio and TV and not exclusively to the assembled delegates and alternates. The speech must appeal to the majority of the voters in the country as that majority is conceived by the Keynote speaker.
3. The speech should articulate the views of the party of the speaker as he sees them and not just be an attack on the opposite party.
4. It should be a personal expression of the views of the speaker and not simply a "party line", a composite or a consensus.

Sincerely,

Daniel J.  
Governor

DJE:w1

1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

July 15, 1968

Senator Daniel K. Inouye  
Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Inouye:

I am a Graduate student at the Eastern Illinois University, Charleston, Illinois. My area of concentration is Rhetoric and Public Address, and I have selected as my master's thesis A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches Delivered at the Democratic and Republican National Conventions in 1968.

I have just received word from the Democratic National Committee in Washington that you have been selected to deliver the Democratic keynote speech. May I congratulate you, sir!

I am interested, as a research scholar, in knowing what you believe to be the necessary criteria for an effective keynote address. Within your busy schedule, if it would be possible, could you jot down these criteria and have them forwarded to the above address? I would sincerely appreciate it.

I shall be listening to your speech, recording it, and evaluating it. The best of speaking to you.

Thank you, sir, for your kind consideration.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Block

## United States Senate

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

August 6, 1968  
(Dictated 8-2-68)

Mr. Joseph E. Block  
1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

Dear Mr. Block:

Your recent letter which was received in my Washington office during my absence was brought to my attention. Your Master's thesis promises to be a most interesting one.

When I received word of my appointment, I immediately sent an inquiry to the Library of Congress for books on "keynote addresses". Needless to say, there is no textbook on this subject. Therefore, I did the second best thing by studying the keynote addresses of the past. I went as far back as 1952. As a result of this study, I have reached certain conclusions as follows:

(1) I believe that the speeches in the past have been exceedingly too long. The speech of 1952 lasted for approximately two hours. In fact, the speaker completely lost his voice during the last thirty minutes. I plan to limit my remarks within a 30-minute period.

(2) Speeches of the past generally touched upon many subjects. I believe it was thought that this was necessary to fit the demands of the different regions of our nation. For example, in one speech, the keynoter covered everything from farm prices to the space program, with about twenty subjects in between. I propose to limit my remarks to a few matters, such as the war in Vietnam, the general subject of law and order and violence, racism and poverty. Because tradition requires it, I will spend a few minutes reviewing our accomplishments. Although tradition seems to require that a keynoter ridicule the opposition, I do not plan to do so.

August 6, 1968

(3) I gather that the keynoter served a dual purpose: one, as a cheer leader; the other, as a person to set the tone for the Convention. I am not a cheer leader and I do not propose to serve as one in this Convention. I believe the tone of the Convention should be one of seriousness and concern, and I hope that my message will be able to provide the necessary prelude.

(4) I am personally preparing my remarks. I am pleased to tell you that, contrary to popular belief, neither the White House nor the National Committee has offered me suggested drafts. In fact, I have been told that the speech should be my own and that the thoughts expressed need not necessarily coincide with that of the Administration.

I hope that the above will be of some assistance to you.

United States Senator

DKI:ki

1506 Third Street  
Charleston, Illinois 61920

July 8, 1968

Chairman  
Democratic National Committee  
Democratic National Committee Headquarters  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir:

I am a Graduate student at Eastern Illinois University. My major area of concentration is Rhetoric and Public Address.

I have selected as a master's thesis A Comparative Analysis of the Keynote Speeches Delivered at the National Party Conventions in 1968.

It would be much appreciated if you could forward to me the name of the keynote speaker and any information you may have on keynote speakers or speeches of past conventions.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Joseph E. Block



## THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

The keynote speaker for the 1968 Democratic National Convention will be Senator Daniel K. Inouye' from Hawaii. He will serve as temporary chairman of the convention as well.

We advise that you check the proceedings from past conventions at your local library to learn more about the keynote speech procedure.

Thanks for your inquiry.

Brent Clark  
Research Dept.

