Barry Goldwater: The Prophetic Father of Modern Conservatism
A Dramatistic Analysis of Goldwater’s 1964 Acceptance Address

“‘Are you a prophet?’ he was asked in the twilight years. ‘No,’ he laughed. ‘I just came around back then to what people are thinking today’” (Kolbe, 13). At the height of his political career Barry Goldwater was a man with ideas ahead of his time, and an ideology that the greater United States was simply not ready to hear. Goldwater’s rhetorical and political legacies have been widely disputed amongst scholars. Despite losing the 1964 presidential election by the largest margin and total vote in American presidential elections to that time, today he is widely regarded as the “Father of Modern Conservatism.” What cannot be disputed is Barry Goldwater’s wholehearted devotion to his beliefs, and his rhetorical aptitude to spread his message and develop a following. Much in the way of the prophet Jeremiah’s message to Judah, Goldwater delivered a warning to the American people aimed at preserving the liberty the United States was founded on. Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance address at the Republican National Convention most exemplifies this message as well as his rhetorical capacity and political ideology; the monumental speech is nearly always discussed by critical scholars when analyzing Goldwater. However, work placing the speech within an accurate historical and perspective based framework is lacking. The 1964 acceptance address defied the rhetorical expectations of its immediate audience, thus placing it within such a framework is necessary to accurately understand the speech. Hence, a Burkean dramatistic analysis, using the pentad as a methodological tool, will provide unique insights into the rhetorical motivations of Goldwater.
This essay will proceed logically. First, a comprehensive historical framework will be provided. This will function to help better understand the scenic elements at the time of the speech, as well as add to the defining of this analysis’ pentad. Then, a literature review of rhetorical criticisms on Goldwater will better establish Goldwater the rhetor, and will be pivotal in adding to the analysis. Following the historization, Burke’s method of dramatism will be discussed. The methodology of dramatism will be laid out and particular dramatistic criticisms will be examined to understand the scope of the theory and justify its application to Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance address. A dramatistic analysis of Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance address will then be performed, in light of the construction of the methodology. The paper will conclude with a synthesis of the analysis and the observations that can be taken away from it. Hopefully this process will distinguish some of the motivational factors influencing Goldwater and affecting his subsequent rhetorical choices, or why he delivered such a radical speech.

Before an analysis of Goldwater can be performed, the speech and Goldwater must be placed within an adequate historical framework so as to fully understand the significance of his rhetorical choices. As an initial reference, Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance address takes place on July 16th 1964 in San Francisco at the Republican National Convention where just days before, “civil rights leaders from around the country assembled on Market Street in downtown San Francisco to march to the city’s Civic Center in protest against the impending nomination of Barry Goldwater” (Schoenwald, 142). This adverse situation arose from equitably controversial decisions and ideas throughout Goldwater’s rise in politics. Whether or not his decisions and ideologies were justifiable can be debated, but they certainly were his and Goldwater owned them fully throughout his time in the political lime-light. Perhaps Goldwater’s upbringing
foreshadowed his political success or lack thereof. Ernest Wrage describes him as, “a man of considerable substance and small learning,” which for this author seems to highlight the paradoxity of Goldwater’s political career, or how many see success in such an unsuccessful political campaign (Wrage, 210).

Goldwater flunked out of high-school to end up graduating from military school and subsequently failing to complete his freshman year at the University of Arizona, but his early political success can be attributed to his prominent family name within Arizona, his war record, and his numerous Arizonan acquaintances (Wrage, 210). “In 1952 [Goldwater] was elected to the US Senate [representing Arizona], his first of five terms” (Schoenwald, 125). During this time Modern Republicans commanded the GOP, modern or rather moderate in the sense that their political ideologies rested nearer to the middle of the political spectrum and often conceded with liberal initiatives. A mere eight years after his senate victory, Goldwater published the work he is most famous for, *The Conscience of a Conservative*, a concise guide detailing traditional conservative philosophy, and demonstrating, “the bearing of a proven philosophy on the problems of our own time” (Goldwater 1960, 1). This work, Goldwater’s Bible if you will, birthed the political journey Goldwater would embark on, ultimately redefining the ideologies of the Republican Party.

“This short primer inspired thousands of Americans to join the still-young conservative movement. Goldwater and Bozell did not say anything new; rather they took a handful of ideas, clarified them, and added examples with which a mainstream audience could identify” (Schoenwald, 126). The new buzz surrounding Goldwater made him the prime candidate to overcome Republican Moderates’ hold on the GOP. Complemented by an “extensive
campaign of writing and speaking,” Goldwater was vaulted to prominence and a grassroots infrastructure for his presidential campaign emerged (Hammerback, 324). The unorganized conservatives of the time collected and rallied as Goldwater Conservatives in an effort that resulted in his unexpected clenching of the GOP nomination. “Conservative activists saw Goldwater’s nomination not as a time for restraint and perhaps winning the presidency but as a celebration that finally ended their exile and anonymity,” furthermore, “having made himself the spokesman of American conservatism, Goldwater had an obligation to represent the millions of Americans who looked to his leadership” (Schoenwald, 125-7). Both Goldwater and his Goldwater Conservatives understood the grim probabilities of their campaign defeating Lyndon B Johnson and the Democratic Party based on a variety of constraining factors.

Leading up to Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance speech numerous situational elements and personality characteristics placed constraints on Goldwater’s campaign, however, they failed to limit his rhetoric and in fact may have justified it. First and foremost “the election [was] unwinnable against a popular incumbent in a period of economic prosperity and political dominance by liberalism” (Hammerback, 323). The assassination of the beloved John F Kennedy served to further strengthen Johnson’s campaign, Goldwater writes, “JFK would have been a challenge but facing the dead president’s memory as well as the consummate politician Johnson made the long [campaign] hours and endless miles [of campaigning] torturous” (Schoenwald, 152). Beyond his formidable opponent, empowered by the spirit and charm of the late JFK, the Republican Party was split with many GOP members displaying a great deal of distaste for their new presidential candidate. “By the time of the Republican National Convention, the party had grown so far apart that at times its members seemed to be speaking different languages…”
moderates fretted about the future of their party” (Schoenwald, 141). Moderates disapproval of Goldwater stem directly from Goldwater’s personality and ideology, which they and most other Americans labeled as extremism.

Goldwater’s persona of rugged individualism and staunch conservatism further constrained his political career. Goldwater stressed three political themes throughout his campaign, “reduce and localize government activities and responsibilities, protect private property, and achieve complete victory over communism by militant means if necessary” (Hammerback, 325). Goldwater’s anti-collectivist beliefs became particularly problematic when he cast the lone senate vote against the 1964 Civil Rights Act. He writes in his memoirs, “The debate went far beyond race. Rather, it referred to the central principle of conservatism, clear limits on the central power of Washington. States have all the rights not specifically reserved to the federal government by the Constitution” (Goldwater 1988, 172).

Goldwater insisted he had never been a racist and also rejected claims that his vote was to appeal to southern-segregationists, but rather that this was purely an issue of Federal Law overstepping its Constitutional bounds. But Goldwater’s affiliation with the John Birch Society, a group of far right extremists, only reiterated the accusations. Beyond segregationist claims Goldwater’s concept of absolute disintegration of communism by any means necessary, during a time of globally expanding communism, raised concerns of Goldwater being a nuclear-war threat.

Goldwater’s war-hawking label is best demonstrated in Johnson’s Daisy Ad; aired only once, the ad depicts a young girl pulling pedals from a daisy as a countdown from ten transforms the scene to a nuclear mushroom cloud. “The message was clear: with Goldwater’s finger on the nuclear trigger, anything could happen” (Schoenwald, 154). The ad resonated with the American people,
and the Johnson campaign further capitalized on both of these criticisms, “treating Goldwater ‘not as an equal who has credentials to be President, but as a radical, a preposterous candidate who would ruin this country and our future’” (Schoenwald, 154).

However, despite these situational and personal barriers, Goldwater remained steadfast in his message and chose not to succumb to external criticisms. His dedication to his personal beliefs, in the face of so much controversy, functioned to define him as bold, unmoving, and in retrospect even prophetic, “Goldwater’s reputation as a man of unshakable character came in large part from his unwillingness to lower himself into the morass of politics” (Schoenwald, 124). This strategy hardly served his political career, evinced in Johnson’s landslide 61%-39% victory, but as a capable body of literature suggests, Goldwater may have never intended to secure the presidency. Instead, he was motivated to secure his party and preserve liberty. Thus, the exigency of this speech arises from Goldwater’s vision of an America losing sight of liberty, and as such only a prophetic warning could possibly set the nation back on the righteous path it strayed from. Regardless of the expectations of the speech to tone down the extremism and unite the GOP, Goldwater delivered his Jeremiadic rhetoric disregarding the political influences attempting to constrain his beliefs. With a proper historical context established, the rhetorical insights on Goldwater by other scholars should be considered to better understand Goldwater and further justify a pentadic analysis of the 1964 acceptance address.

Analysts’ views of Goldwater have evolved over time as the effects of his rhetoric took place in the elections of conservatives Nixon and Reagan. Immediately post election, “his rhetorical failures appeared to be so immense and obvious that they required attention from those who reported on and interpreted American politics and public addresses” (Hammerback, 323).
Such criticisms are even prevalent in works prior to the election, take for example Ernest Wrage who writes, “For surely, Barry Goldwater’s world is Utopia fashioned out of nostalgia,” in his appropriately titled presentation, “The Little World Of Barry Goldwater” (Wrage, 207). The work specifically focuses on Goldwater’s “was-ism” crusade, attempting to bring the US back to a conservative time of greatness that perhaps never existed. The criticisms surrounding Goldwater in proximity to the election acknowledge him as the spokesman of conservatism, but criticized his anti-welfare regime and simple answers to complex problems. Expectedly so, post-election emphasis on Goldwater took a more negative turn, as Richard Hofstadter suggests, Goldwater “may have given the Republican party the coup de grace as a genuine major-party competitor” (Hofstadter, 20). However, criticisms of Goldwater as “lacking intellectual and other capacities… [and] rhetorically insensitive or inept,” ceased and became increasingly favorable as Nixon and Reagan saw success embodying Goldwater’s ideology and rhetorical strategy (Hammerback, 323).

Currently, “many commentators and scholars now view his campaign as on which succeeded both in moving the party rightward and paving the way for presidential victories by conservatives… analysts even identify Goldwater as the initiator of an eventual successful conversion of the American public from liberal to conservative” (Hammerback, 323). Scholars have also identified particular intricacies within Goldwater’s rhetoric and persona that attribute to his rhetoric’s lasting effects. John C. Hammerback identifies Goldwater as the embodiment of his ideology, the rugged individual. By identifying that Goldwater’s political success “relied on rhetoric,” he observes the audiences his rhetoric appealed to; mainly: college students, individuals looking for simple and immediate answers, political conservatives, and the far-
rightists (Hammerback 1972). “Goldwater’s themes and appeals emphasized one pervasive ideal, rugged individualism. With increased liberty and responsibility, individuals, businesses, and communities must handle their own domestic affairs” (Hammerback 1972, 180). Developing this concept further, Hammerback argues in a later essay, “He preached rugged individualism; and thanks to providence and his own design, to artistic proofs in his speaking, writing, and promotional materials, and to inartistic ones in his heritage and to some degree his life and appearance, he seemed to be a rugged individualist” (Hammerback, 329). Hammerback establishes that Goldwater developed such a devoted following of conservatives, “primarily through personal identification… the completed rhetorical transformation left audiences indistinguishable from their leader in many ways” (Hammerback, 330).

Mark Moore distinguishes the inherent contradictions within the rugged individual’s message in, “Uniting Individuals: Barry Goldwater’s Rhetoric of Paradox.” Moore observes, “The legitimacy of a political campaign based on individualism is questionable since its followers become a collection of individuals through their identification with the effort” (Moore, 2). He equates Goldwater’s rhetoric as a paradox of uniting individuals in a collective action, thereby limiting the ideal of individualism. He demonstrates how much of Goldwater’s rhetoric and ideology are nestled in paradoxity, take for example simplistic answers to complex issues, liberty for all by militant force, or equality for all but at the state level (in reference to the economy, communism, and civil rights respectively). He distinguishes the paradox that ultimately led to Goldwater’s “victorious defeat” (a paradox in and of itself), “By moderating his views, he would have abandoned his moral principles, resulting in a conflict between the pragmatics of resolving the issues and the idealism of his brand of conservatism” (Moore, 20).
Although paradoxity certainly brands Goldwater in general, Olson’s discussion of his rhetorical form is most pivotal when analyzing Goldwater.

Kathryn Olson uses generic criticism to classify Goldwater’s rhetoric into the Jeremiad genre. As Sayer suggests, “the Political Right has used Jeremiadic rhetoric in its public advocacy, employing the basic Jeremiadic notions of repent and reform in explaining the disasters facing the United States” (Sayer, 59). Olson argues Goldwater began this tradition of the Political Right, and paved the way for future conservatives with his master-narrative. By placing Goldwater within the jeremiad genre she explains numerous elements of Goldwater’s campaign: his acceptance of the nomination she equates with a prophet serving their duty, by linking the rhetor’s perception of the situational demands she explains his counterproductive strategy, and she offers a coherent explanation of Hammerback’s and Wrage’s observations on Goldwater’s rhetoric. By furthering her generic criticism through rehistorization she also accounts for the links between Goldwater and Reagan. “In fact Reagan seems to function as a priest relative to Goldwater’s role of prophet,” she writes, given that Reagan’s rhetoric follows Goldwater’s stylistic patterns (Olson, 312). However, she also notes, “It is important to consider the possibility that Reagan’s success redeemed or rehabilitated Goldwater’s political rhetoric” (Olson, 312).

A synthesis of these analyses on Goldwater creates a more complete image of Goldwater the rhetor. Moore’s discussion of paradox generally characterizes Goldwater’s campaign and ideology. Olson’s Jeremiad genre, “makes explicable [Goldwater’s] harkening back to an idealized past, a time before the fall away from the covenant,” deafening Wrage’s “was-ism” critique (Olson, 310). Olson’s analysis adds to that of Hammerback’s identification of audiences,
“Hammerback’s conclusion that Goldwater was effective among four of his contemporary target audiences becomes even more enlightening, since the same groups would seem already to be among this prophet’s ‘elect’ or would hold situational perceptions most amenable to the radical solutions offered by an authoritative, charismatic prophet” (Olson, 310). And Hammerback’s identification of Goldwater as the embodiment of rugged individualism adds to Olson’s jeremiad critique, defining Goldwater as one who stands for his cause despite the status-quo or external pressures. Holistically then, Goldwater is seen by scholars as the rugged individual or prophet, commanding his followers with his paradoxically driven message and campaign. Establishing a pentad emanating these qualities in regards to the 1964 acceptance address will likely provide more insights into Goldwater the rhetor, but a systematic understanding of Burke’s dramatism must be arranged prior to any such analysis.

“The titular word for our own method is ‘dramatism,’ since it invites one to consider the matter of motives in a perspective that, being developed from the analysis of drama, treats language and thought primarily as modes of action” (Burke 1945, xxii). Kenneth Burke’s method of dramatism is a dense, philosophical, and abstract form of rhetorical criticism. It is important to note that Burke is not arguing the world is a stage in which we are all actors, but rather Burke contends that dramatism provides literal statements on reality because we are by nature symbol using beings (Lamoureux). The method, developed by Burke over a span of fifty years, prides itself on its inherent simplicity, yet “Burke’s rhetorical system is developed throughout so many books and articles over such an extended period of time with so many diverse terms that the complexity rather than simplicity stands out for many” (Brock, 22). Dramatistic criticism uses the five pentadic terms to, “offer a system of placement, and should enable us, by the systematic
manipulation of the terms, to ‘generate,’ or ‘anticipate’ the various classes of motivational theory” (Burke 1945, xxiii). A discussion of the pentad and pendatic ratios will further demonstrate how “human conduct being in the realm of action and end… is most directly discussible in dramatistic terms” (Ling, 221).

“Any complete statement about motives will offer some kind of answers to these five questions: what was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how he did it (agency), and why (purpose)” (Burke 1945, xv). Burke’s five pentadic terms are the working tools of dramatistic criticism, “they need never to be abandoned, since all statements that assign motives can be shown to arise out of them and to terminate in them… it should provide us with a kind of simplicity that can be developed into considerable complexity, and yet can be discovered beneath its elaborations” (Burke 1945, xv). Although the terms can most certainly be applied to any form of action, the terms are also purposefully ambiguous and can be defined in an infinite number of ways in an effort to ascertain the motives of a rhetor.

“Accordingly, what we want is not terms that avoid ambiguity, but terms that clearly reveal the strategic spots at which ambiguities necessarily arise” (Burke 1945, xviii). In essence, Burke argues that certain pentadic definitions of a given situation can strategically reveal those terms which a rhetor grounds themselves in, terms which influence the rhetor and ultimately the rhetor’s motives. To exemplify this ambiguity Burke discusses how war can be seen as any of the pentadic terms, “War may be treated as an agency, insofar as it is a means to an end; as a collective Act, subdivisible into many individual acts; as a Purpose, in schemes proclaiming a cult of war. For the man inducted into the army, war is a Scene, a situation that motivates the
nature of his training; and in mythologies war is an Agent, in the figure of the war god” (Burke 1945, xx).

Defining the pentad in a specific way based on the text, keeping ambiguity in mind, enables the critic to establish the grounding term. Barry Brummet writes that most people, “define most things in life with one term or ratio [serving as] the core of an ideology… A system of values and beliefs forms around that core as people apply the controlling term or ratio to particular issues” (Brummet, 252). Discovering the grounding term is fundamental to dramatistic criticism, but the critic must also, “inquire into the purely internal relationships which the five terms bear to one another, considering their possibilities of transformation, their range of permutations and combinations,” Burke continues with a metaphor, “we have also likened the terms to the fingers, which in their extremities are distinct from one another, but merge in the palm of the hand” (Burke 1945, xvi-xxii). Although each individual term may function specifically, they also function together as a unit. One can clearly observe the complexities of Burke’s pentad; the necessity of establishing the dominant term while still sensitively observing the other term’s functions within an act and how they relate to the dominant term, not forgoing all the terms individual as well as synthesized reflections of motive. Pentadic ratios help the critic operationalize this analytical feat.

Burke writes, “and so with our five terms: certain formal interrelationships prevail among these terms, by reason of their role as attributes of a common ground or substance” (Burke 1945, xix). These formal interrelationships arise in pentadic ratios when two terms are placed against one another to further distinguish the grounding or controlling elements of a given rhetorical situation. In the Grammar of Motives, Burke stresses the scene-act and scene-agent ratios which
provide a fairly simplistic example of pentadic ratios generally. Take for example a discussion on politics, “the scene-act ratio… can be applied deterministically in statements that a certain policy had to be adopted in a certain situation” (Burke 1945, 13). In this instance Burke argues the scene grounds the act, or that the scenic situation and elements of that situation determined the action that took place. Although focusing on a particular pentadic ratio may be beneficial to analysis, examining all the pentadic ratios can help the critic determine which pentadic term or ratio is central to the rhetor. “Critics are well served by experimenting with various treatments of the terms within the text under study in an effort to determine which formulation will provide the fullest explanation for the relationships between those terms in that text” (Birdsell, 273). For the purposes of this analysis act agent ratios will be central to understanding Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance speech, but an explanation of these ratios will be more beneficial during the actual criticism. Dramatism is a rather complex methodological theory founded in necessary ambiguity; consequently the method has been used in a variety of ways by rhetorical scholars. A brief literature review of a group of particularly paramount dramatistic criticisms will clarify the elements of dramatism, demonstrate the variety of ways the method can be used, highlight its strengths and weaknesses, and justify this criticism’s application of Burke’s theory.

Reading dramatistic criticisms by the likes of Birdsell, Blakenship, Brummett, and Fisher, allows the various usages of the pentad and dramatism in general to be ascertained. These regularly referenced works demonstrate the applicability of the pentad to almost any event or rhetorical artifact. Each author applies the pentad in an original but still prolific fashion. Birdsell observes the importance of the root, or grounding, term when analyzing Reagan’s speeches on Lebanon and Grenada. He argues that although all the pentadic terms are important to an
analysis, “one term will probably come to ground the others … [and] the most useful pentadic explanation will often rest upon criteria external to the pentadic vocabulary,” as he demonstrates in his analysis focusing on the singular terms Scene and Act for their respective speeches (Birdsell, 268). While Birdsell’s analysis may disregard pentadic ratios entirely, Jane Blakenship’s work on Reagan uses the scene-actor ratio as a platform for her pentadic transformation criticism. She argues Reagan’s framing in televised political debates, coupled with “his strategy of thematic envelopment,” helped transform him from an actor “contained by the scene to the container, the scene itself” (Blakenship, 36). She relies on Burkeian theory and the scene-actor ratio when describing how one can shift from actor to scene, but she hardly uses the pentad itself; instead her main argument relies on external criteria, as Birsell suggests often the most productive pentadic criticisms do. Brummet’s analysis of Gay Rights controversies identifies how, “featuring one kind of term or ratio between terms over another creates different definitions of a situation” (Brummet, 251). By observing the rhetoric of both sides of the argument he establishes that each stresses the ratio between act and agent. While supporters of gay rights feature the agent, the opposition features the act: this dichotomy highlights how people tend to ground their entire world perspectives in a single term. Conversely, Jeanne Fisher uses the pentad in a rather traditional sense in an effort to determine the motive or a murder suicide case. Although outside the bounds of traditional rhetoric, her analysis “provides an opportunity for fusion of Burkean rhetorical theory with his critical calculus… [Whereas] most Burak criticism isolates the calculus from the theory” (Fisher, 189). The calculus being the pentad and the theory being Burke’s general communication arguments, this essay demonstrates
most clearly how the pentad in combination with Burke’s more abstract theories can create literal
motivational claims.

From these key examples of dramatistic criticism the true scope of the theory in application is revealed. A critic may use parts of the pentad and add their own insights, use Burkean dramatistic theory generally, or use the method in its complete form when performing dramatistic criticism. Essentially, the critic uses whatever application of the dramatistic method provides the most fruitful analysis for a given text or act; given the complexity, inherent ambiguity, and intense progression over time of dramatism, perhaps Burke intended his method be used in such a fashion. Regardless, these essays also reveal the strengths and weaknesses of dramatism. Ambiguity is both the main strength and weakness of the dramatistic method.

Although ambiguity allows for observing rhetorical situations from unique perspectives and provides the critic a great deal of free range when analyzing; this ambiguity also means the quality of analysis lies heavily on the insights and conceptualization of the method by the critic. The depth of this method adds to the problem of ambiguity, the method being so dense makes it more difficult for a critic to understand Burke’s theories and apply them correctly. Beyond ambiguity the strengths of dramatism can be noted in that rhetoric is inherently pentadic and so the pentad can be applied to nearly any rhetorical situation, also the method takes into account background and thus does a better job of ascertaining motivation.

This analysis will be performed in a rather abstract fashion. The pentad will be formed drawing on various sources beyond the speech text itself. As a result, this analysis will rely heavily on the written work and theories of dramatism by Burke generally. In such, it will be keeping with Birdsell’s observation that often the most fruitful analysis rely on external criteria.
While establishing the pentad it will be important to justify the application both in and outside of the speech text. Observing Burke’s insights on agent and act ratios will hopefully shed light on the motivational factors behind Goldwater’s paradoxical campaign.

With the underlying principles and methodology of dramatism framed, the theory can be applied to Goldwater’s 1964 campaign address. The beginning of this analysis will observe the themes and stylistic elements of the rhetoric. The speech is centered on three fundamental themes: The Democratic Party is not the right party to lead America; in the face of communism and collectivism America is in grave and imminent danger; and Conservatism is the only way to restore America to its historical greatness and ensure continued liberty for all. These themes are evident throughout the text. Goldwater argues the Democratic Party is leading America in the wrong direction by criticizing their party and leader’s moral fiber, stating, “Now those who seek absolute power… they are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyrannies,” (p12) in reference to collectivist government policies. He criticizes their ability to protect the country by pointing out the spread of communism, and that “It has been during democratic years that our strength to deter war has stood still” (p23). By pointing out the “pace set by centralized planning, red tape, rules without responsibility, and regimentation without resource,” (p10) Goldwater identifies their lack of ability to lead the nation to prosperity.

Throughout the speech Goldwater also addresses Communism and Collectivism’s threat to national liberty, for example he writes, “The good Lord raised this might Republic to be a home for the brave… not to stagnate in the swampland of collectivism, not to cringe before the bullying of communism” (p5). He further demonstrates this point by noting the negative aspects of the current state of the country and the failures the Democratic Party has seen. Since
Communism and Collectivism threaten the United States, the final theme in the speech is that Conservatism is the only way to restore America. He establishes this through his policy points, mainly the need for protection of private property, states-rights, and the conquering of communism by any means necessary. Perhaps the best portrayal of this is in his concluding statements when he proclaims, “Our Republican cause is to free our people and light the way for liberty throughout the world” (p54). These themes are prevalent throughout the text, and, from descriptions of Goldwater, were likely core beliefs of his life. The stylistic elements of this text add to the themes and overall feel of the speech.

The text is written in the Jeremiad format, as established by Olson, which is particularly important for this pentadic criticism. The Jeremiad is a powerful tool for Goldwater and his message. As Olson argues, “there was virtually no rhetorical strategy that could overcome Johnson’s initial advantages… Thus, Goldwater needed a radical strategy to even attempt to address his first problem of winning the election and may have decided to focus more heavily on a strategy appropriate to the second problem of giving a voice to ‘true’ conservatism” (Olson, 309). The Jeremiadic form observes a prophet who, “speaks to people who by themselves presumably cannot see as the prophet does. Their view has been clouded by the apparent pleasantness of their current material conditions. The prophet must clear their vision and get the people to change their ways if doom is to be forestalled” (Olson, 308). Goldwater’s speech embodies the Jeremiad because Goldwater’s situational perception is one in which the United States requires the jeremiadic prophet, a country in imminent danger for straying from the covenant (or in this case the Constitution). Coupled with his overtly religious language throughout the speech, the two elements create a grandiose almost preachable message. This
stylistic framework becomes Goldwater’s tool for creating change, as will be evinced in the following labeling of the pentad.

Keeping in mind Burke’s fundamental point of ambiguity, the pentad will be labeled retrospectively, with the knowledge of what occurred after the speech. Whereas traditionally the speech could be defined in terms of the scene being the Republican National Convention, the agent as Goldwater, etc.; this pentad will be labeled more poetically using the findings of other scholars on Goldwater, Goldwater’s perspective from his own recount, and historical political knowledge. Thus the pentad for Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance address is labeled as follows:

- **The Scene:** A Liberal America straying from the Covenant at risk of foregoing liberty
- **The Agent:** Barry Goldwater the rugged individual, or prophet, with his co-agents the Goldwater Conservatives
- **The Act:** Shifting the hold of the Republican Party to Conservatives from the hands of Moderates
- **The Agency:** The Jeremiad, and his almost biblical *Conscience of a Conservative*
- **The Purpose:** Defending the liberty America was founded on

Defining the pentad in this fashion is justifiable both in and outside of the text. This definition of scene can be observed in the text when Goldwater writes, “The tide has been running against freedom. Our people have followed false prophets,” (p6) a metaphorical reference to the Democratic leadership of Kennedy and Johnson demonstrating Goldwater’s perception of the scene, mainly that he believes American freedom is fleeting. Also, as Hammerback notes, Goldwater ran, “against a popular [Democrat] incumbent in a period of economic prosperity and political dominance by liberalism,” solidifying the applicability of scene as a Liberal America externally (Hammerback, 323).
The agent is most certainly Goldwater and his Conservative following, but justifying Goldwater as the rugged individual or prophet is derived from the work of Hamemrback and Olson. Throughout Olson’s text she equates Goldwater with prophetic status due to his jeremiadic rhetoric stating, “A rhetor employing a jeremiad adopts the moral tone of prophet and calls for a return to the covenant governing the group. Goldwater used this moral tone” (Olson, 307). Hammerback argues Goldwater embodies the rugged individual, who, “would seemingly posses virtues necessary to assume his own responsibilities: self-reliance, dynamism, courage, and perseverance” (Hammerback rug, 181). Because, “the prophet bears the ‘truth’, he or she does not accommodate his or her stand to identify with the audience,” and given the stand-up-for your own beliefs attitude of the rugged individual, the terms are congruent or Goldwater is the prophet (Olson, 310). Hammerback also asses that Goldwater built, “an audience which would zealously support solidly conservative candidates and ideologies,” the co-agents in this case (Hammerback, 323). The speech text also demonstrates the concept of prophet and following as an agent, “Our task would be too great for any man, did he not have with him the hearts and the hands of this great Republican Party, and I promise you tonight that every fiber of my being is consecrated to our cause” (p3).

The act is perhaps the most debatable application point of this pentad. Labeling the act as the shifting of the Republican Party ideology to right-wing conservatism can only be done retrospectively, or as a rehistorization if you will. Although evident in the text that Goldwater believes Conservatism is the sole prescription for the economy, “we must and we shall return to proven ways,” (p6) post the speech and election this was most definitely not the act that had occurred. Regardless, given numerous accounts of Goldwater’s intentions, both in his words and
others, and that current commentators, “view his campaign as one which succeeded in moving the party rightward,” realistically this is the act that occurred (Hammerback, 323). Thus, labeling the act as transforming the Republican Party to a fundamentally conservative party is justifiable, despite the vast time-frame it took place in.

Agency then in this instance refers to the speech text, in and of itself a Jeremiad. The speech can necessarily be paired with *The Conscience of a Conservative* because the speech reflects the ideologies Goldwater cements throughout his book. This reflection can be identified in both the texts, as Goldwater writes in his primer on Conservative philosophy, “The ancient and tested truths that guided our Republic through its early days will do equally well for us,” and also in his speech, “we must, and we shall, return to proven ways—not because they are old, but because they are true” (Goldwater 1960, Foreword; p6). Olson’s generic criticism crystallizes the speech as following the jeremiad form, but arguing that solely this speech was the tool of the agent’s act can be problematic due to a lack of evidence suggesting causality from this text alone. However, this writer argues that the 1964 acceptance address most comprehensively embodies Goldwater’s campaign rhetoric generally; Hammerback also regards the speech as, “perhaps the address most representative of his 1964 presidential discourse” (Hammerback, 323). Additionally, Olson establishes Goldwater’s campaign rhetoric generally, “as a generic embodiment of the ‘jeremiad’” (Olson, 300).

Finally, purpose is of particular significance in any pentadic analysis because, “Burke introduced the system as a means for ‘pondering matters of human motivation,’” and purpose unavoidably corresponds to motivation. Thus, defining purpose in the pentad would appear to defeat the function of assigning terms demonstrating strategic ambiguities in an effort to
determine motive. However, in the speech Goldwater quite clearly determines the purpose of his cause, perhaps most notably in the famous line, “I would remind you that extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice” (p51). Moreover the entire speech is structured around the idea of the imminent threat to liberty, suggesting all the more his intentions are to protect this liberty through the means he deems necessary. But purpose such as this can still be motivated. Although Goldwater and his followers knew the political climate was not in favor of their campaign, they most definitely did not have to employ, “an obviously suicidal rhetorical strategy for a presidential contender” (Olson, 308). Additionally one could contend that no one in their right mind would willingly concede a presidential election. Raising the question this analysis hopes to answer, why did Goldwater champion the cause of Conservatism when it came at such great costs?

Goldwater initially never had intentions of running for president. White, Rusher, and Ashbrook, the architects of the Goldwater campaign, deceptively forced Goldwater into accepting the candidacy, “having made himself the spokesman of American conservatism, Goldwater had an obligation to represent the millions of Americans who looked to his leadership. While he might refuse the plotters’ advances, if they drafted him and used the masses to disguise their own goals, Goldwater would have a difficult time refusing” (Schoenwald, 127). Even Goldwater admits, “Circumstance had made me the leader. I could not in conscience refuse the responsibility no matter how distasteful the prospect, no matter how uncertain the outcome” (Goldwater 1979, 163). As a result of the campaign Goldwater becomes regarded as the “Father of Modern Conservatism,” but continually rejects this title long after his time in politics. Did he run to progress Conservatism, to win the election, or did he take on this sacrifice
solely in his conservative nature? Defining the pentad by drawing on aspects beyond the speech text itself creates a need to analyze the pentad beyond the speech text, especially since the speech is a form of agency in this pentad. Thus, Burke’s insights on act and agent ratios in *The Grammar of Motives, The Rhetoric of Motives,* and *Language as Symbolic Action* provide a corpus of theory that will help explain this anomaly of motivation. The remainder of this analysis will examine the previously established pentad in light of these insights in an effort to determine or at least describe the motivational forces affecting Goldwater.

Burke notes on the agent-act ratio, in reference to Machiavelli, “people do not always act in accordance with the requirements set[sic] them by the scenic conditions… People also act in accordance with their own natures, or temperaments,” listing such motivations, “under the heading of the agent-act ratio, since they say in effect: Here is the kind of act proper to such a person” (Burke 1950, 162). This statement identifies with Goldwater, especially given this pentadic stance, in that, “Goldwater declared that he would not change his beliefs to win votes—and he didn’t,” and also that Goldwater acts prophetically by essentially sacrificing his campaign in the name of Conservatism (obviously ignoring the immediate requirements of the literal scene) (Olson, 310). Burke continues, “The scenic conditions require a certain kind of act; and the ruler may happen to have exactly the kind of temperament and character that leads him into this same kind of act” (Burke 1950, 162). This statement places the Agent, Goldwater the prophet, within this pentad’s perceived scenic elements of a threatened nation, distinguishing that Goldwater’s temperament, or undying devotion to the cause, coincidentally may have been perfect for championing Conservatism.
Burke also writes on personality, which encompasses temperament, “And insofar as a given social order contains some measure of injustice, personality turns towards the ideal transcending of the social order by negations variously along the line between revolution and gradualist improvement” (Burke 1966, 473). Which is significant to this analysis when observing Goldwater’s perception of the social order and its injustices, or liberal centralized government’s threat to liberty (the scene), and how his personality, the rugged individual/prophet (or his temperament), commands the audience to transcend these injustices. Relating transcendence to Goldwater would be in the return to traditional conservatism. “Terministically, the possibility of an act is grounded in the ‘will’ of an agent (That is: Regarded from the standpoint of terministic tactics, the word, ‘will,’ states the motivational place where an act might originate in an agent.)” (Burke 1966, 436) This statement rounds on the temperament and personality of Goldwater by claiming his “will” grounds the act. For Goldwater the Agent, his “will” describes, “a man of unshakable character” (Schoenwald, 124). Essentially arguing the act may have originated in Goldwater’s “will” or sense of duty and purpose to the cause, a prophetic attribute generally. But where did Goldwater’s persona (will and temperament) originate? Burke’s concepts of will and temperament grounding an act can be better explained when observed in context with the act-agent ratio.

“The consideration of words for ways calls for special attention to the act-agent ratio” (Burke 1945, 15). When discussing the act grounding the agent Burke identifies a pattern of shaping that occurs. “The agent is an author of his acts, which are descended from him being good progeny if he is good, or bad progeny if he is bad, wise progeny if he is wise… And conversely his acts can make him or remake him in accordance with their nature… They would
be his product and he would be theirs” (Burke 1945, 16). This shaping plays a fundamental role in explaining the motivational factors behind Goldwater’s sense of duty to the Conservative cause, or rather his willingness to run a political campaign detrimental to his career. The actions of Goldwater, writing *The Conscience of a Conservative* and this speech particularly, reinforce his character (temperament and will). Although these actions are his progeny and are derivative of his “will,” they also serve to further embed this sense of duty in Goldwater. However, “The agent does not contain the act, though its results might be said to pre-exist virtually within him. And the act does not ‘synecdochically share’ in the agent, though certain ways of acting may be said to induce corresponding moods or traits of character” (Burke 1945, 16). Note the prophetic qualities of this statement; more importantly this suggests an inherency of Act within the individual and again shows that acting a certain way necessarily reinforces those attributes in the Agent that originated the Act in the first place.

This inherency is further revealed by the actions of the Agent. For Goldwater his natural rugged individualism, or Conservatism, remains in his discourse despite the situational demands of a more moderate rhetorical strategy to secure the presidency. “One may deflect attention from scenic matters by situating the motives of an act in the agent” (Burke 1945, 17). Situating the motives of this act in Goldwater and the Goldwater Conservatives deflects the necessity of moderating the campaign rhetoric to attract a larger following. Rather, “Goldwater and his associates were simply trying to seize power by not excluding anyone who believed in conservative principles, no matter how kooky” (Schoenwald, 124). Burke relates the act-agent ratio to a democratic people faced with the prospects of a necessary dictatorship, stating democratic acts are derived from a democratic agent, “agents who would remain democratic in
character even though conditions required temporary curtailment or abrogation of basic democratic rights… By the act-agent ratio; a democratic people would continue to perform democratic acts; and to do so they would even, if necessary, go to the extent of restoring former conditions most favorable to democracy” (Burke 1945, 17). Coincidentally Burke’s metaphor parallels Goldwater’s rhetorical situation quite perfectly. Situated within this pentad, Goldwater sees the Democrat Party leaders of Collectivism generally as, “Those who seek absolute power, even though they seek it to do what they regard as good… they are the very ones who always create the most hellish tyrannies” (p12). Goldwater also stresses, “The beauty of the very system we Republicans are pledged to restore and revitalize, the beauty of this Federal system of ours is in its reconciliation of diversity with unity” (p53), or the restoring of former conditions favorable to a true democracy.

Burke makes a final remark that summarizes these prior theories and the Act of this pentad by relating the Act and Agent to the Scene, “There is, of course, a circular possibility in the terms. If an agent acts in keeping with his nature as an agent (act-agent ratio), he may change the nature of the scene accordingly (scene-act ratio), and thereby establish a state of unity between himself and his world (scene-agent ratio)” (Burke 1945, 19). Goldwater effectively changed the nature of his scene in keeping with his rugged individualist persona through his prophetic discourse. Although the immediate effects of this shift were veiled, one could argue Goldwater established a state of unity between himself and his world by, “paving the way” for conservatives through the “conversion of the American public from liberal to conservative” (Hammerback, 323). Touching again on the compounding forces of act reinforcing agent and vice-versa, Burke states, “Our act may change us and our scene, producing a mutual
conformity” (Burke 1945, 19). Perhaps Goldwater’s sacrificial campaign had a humbling effect on the Agent, as, “Goldwater rejects the attempts to re-read his candidacy as a success” (Olson, 313). The act of converting the party was one of submissiveness through the standing of ground in the face of utter defeat and harsh criticism. It could certainly account for this humbleness, especially as Goldwater comments, “I still get mad at people who say I was Reagan’s political godfather or his prophet opening up the wilderness for him. Both of us are and have been our own men. We are merely symbols of a deeper political movement” (Hume, 10). The Act produced a humbled, yet still wholeheartedly Conservative, individual mutually conformed to his immediate scene of losing the election and the post scene of Conservative dominance. A summarization of this rhetorical string of theories will further clarify the revelations of this analysis precluding a discussion of motives.

A synthesis of Burke’s theories would proceed as follows. The act-agent ratio accounts for Goldwater’s temperament of the rugged individual/prophet and his undying will for the conservative cause. This persona of Goldwater the Agent helps explain his ability to ignore the immediate conditions of the scene and lack of moderating his rhetoric to win votes. At the same time, his persona makes him the ideal candidate in the rehistorized pendatic Scene, a nation requiring a return to Conservatism in the wake of losing liberty. Furthermore, this personality or persona leads to the necessity of transcendence; rugged individualism creates a need for Goldwater to transcend the immediate scene. This sense of duty is confounded in the reciprocal relationship between act and agent in the agent-act ratio. Acts shape an individual, but the Agent is the author of his Acts, suggesting an inherent reciprocal relationship between the two. Goldwater the prophet, dedicated to his cause, reinforces his dedication through his rhetorical
message. Ultimately the Agent is unable to act in any form other than that of what he is and thus he attempts to change the scene. This successful shift in scene creates a mutual conformity between the agent and scene through the act, in this case the eventual shifting of Republicans and the population generally to Conservatism, or the essence of Goldwater’s being.

But, as Burke also importantly notes, “In reality, we are capable of but partial acts, acts that but partially represent us and that produce but partial transformations” (Burke 1945, 19). Of course causality cannot be applied from this rhetorical analysis. Despite this pentad and analysis being grounded in the theoretical works of Burke, his insights are still just theories. Stating positively and definitely the motives behind a certain act are beyond the scope of rhetorical criticism generally. However, this analysis provides a unique perspective on this rhetorical situation, and does provide some description of the motivational forces behind the 1964 acceptance address.

If anything this analysis suggests that Goldwater was self-motivated to champion the cause of Conservatism. His embodiment of the rugged individual, essentially the conservative individual, likely perpetuated his need to say what he believed despite what people wanted to hear. Although Goldwater never intended to run for president his persona facilitated in his accumulation of a conservative following, which in turn made him feel a sense of duty to represent this following. No one could force Goldwater to run a campaign that was destined to fail. But by the compounding of acting as “The Father of Modern Conservatism” and Goldwater being the fundamental conservative Agent, running in the unwavering name of conservatism was realistically the only appropriate action Goldwater could conceive. Attributing Goldwater’s actions to self-motivation is not applying any sort of causality to Goldwater’s rhetorical and
political decisions. Rather, it is merely suggesting his sense of duty likely played a role in these decisions. This analysis adds and is complemented by the findings of Olson and Hammerback. Olson writes, “A prophet serves because it is his or her duty; he or she speaks for something larger than self” (Olson, 310), Goldwater’s sense of duty then can be explained through his self-motivation, which likely relates him to a prophet all the more. Also, it adds to Hammerback’s argument that a, “rhetor’s merger of character and ideas can create a rhetorical identification powerful enough to reformulate the character of the audience” (Hammerback, 324). Goldwater’s merger of character and ideas confides in the reciprocal relationship between acts and agents. Both the actions of Goldwater and his persona help explain the subsequent merger of character and ideas in that his actions were guided by his character, likely aiding in Goldwater’s reformulation of the audience to die-hard conservatism.

This dramatistic analysis has examined Barry Goldwater placed within a unique pentadic formulation in an effort to ascertain the motives behind running such a potentially detrimental presidential campaign. From a purely suggestive standpoint, the analysis argues that Goldwater was likely self-motivated to run a campaign for the furthering of the Conservative movement. This application of dramatism, although rather abstract, is grounded in the words of Kenneth Burke himself. Though this pentad is defined by drawing on history, the thematic elements of Goldwater’s rhetoric, Goldwater’s own recounts, and historical knowledge; it is also justified within the text of the 1964 acceptance address. Labeling the pentad as such allowed for a more strategic unveiling of motivation by comprising future knowledge and personal perspectives for a more holistic view of the situation. In theory, this dramatism adds to the more purely theoretical works of Burke and other colleagues by linking Burke’s insights on the act-agent and agent-act
pentadic ratios over the course of multiple Burkeian works. Despite not adding theory itself, this work shows how Burke’s concepts can draw upon one another to form a formidable statement on motive. To continue this study it would be particularly interesting to examine Goldwater’s transformation of scene and its potential unification to Reagan, as this unification could account for some of the naturalness exhibited in Reagan’s rhetoric. Regardless, from this analysis alone, one can take away that Goldwater and his persona were quite luckily the ideal remedy for conservatives wanting to take hold of the Republican Party. This is because his devotion to the cause was likely self-motivated, and given the torturous campaign he faced, it would have been difficult to motivate anyone else to endure that road. Thus, whatever view of Goldwater one takes: a prophet, the rugged-individual, a conservative politician, or simply a fool; He is undeniably a Conservative who stood behind his beliefs in the face of relentless criticism and conflict.
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APPENDIX

Historical Outline of Goldwater’s 1964 Acceptance Speech

Political Context Outline

- Beginnings of Political Career
  - Elected to US senate in 1952 Representing Arizona
  - “In 1952 he was elected to the US Senate, the first of five terms” (Schoenwald, 125)
  - Publishes *Conscience of the Conservative* in 1960
  - “Published the Conscience of a Conservative. This short primer inspired thousands of Americans to join the still-young conservative movement” (126)
  - Begins to initiate unique group of campaign managers and supporters in early 1960’s
  - “The men building the infrastructure around Goldwater were virtually unknown in the 1956 and 1960 campaigns” (Showenwald, 124).
  - Unexpectedly secures 1964 nomination
  - “Barry Morris Goldwater was an unlikely candidate for the president of the United States” (Schoenwald, 125)
  - Kennedy dies, complicating the election
  - “JFK would have been a challenge but facing the dead president’s memory as well as the consummate politician Johnson made the long hours and endless miles torturous” (Schoenwald, 152)

- Political Climate
  - Growing threat of communism abroad
  - Generally liberal American public
  - “For a generation, conservatives have stood largely discredited before the bar of public opinion” (Wrage, 209)

- The 1964 Campaign
  - Reputation tarnished
    - Extremism: Goldwater’s extreme views off-put conservatives and the American public alike
    - Racism: Goldwater votes no on the 1964 Civil Rights Act (for purposes of state-rights), and affiliation with John Birch Society further tarnish the extremist’s reputation
      - “In addition to extremism, the dilemma of civil rights illustrated the rift best” (Schoenwald, 141)

- Campaign Acceptance Speech
  - Despite rift in Republican Party, Goldwater stays true to his cause
- “By the time of the Republican National Convention, the party had grown so far apart that at times its members seemed to be speaking different languages” (Schoenwald, 141)
- “Goldwater’s reputation as a man of unshakable character came in large part from his unwillingness to lower himself into the morass of politics” (Shoenwald, 124)
- Results in, “Goldwater’s speech pushed the moderates and conservatives further apart” (Shoenwald, 145)

Post Speech
- Press bashes Goldwater
  - “Nearly all conservatives blamed unfair reporting by the press” (Schoenwald, 154)
- Johnson releases Daisy add and further ostracizes Goldwater
  - “The Johnson campaign exploited Goldwater’s missteps… Treating Goldwater ‘not as an equal who has credentials to be President, but as a radical, a preposterous candidate who could ruin this country and our future” (Shoenwald, 154)
- Landslide Victory for Johnson
  - “Johnson’s 61%-39% victory was the landslide [Johnson] wanted” (Shoenwald, 155)
- Republicans still revel in Goldwater’s accomplishments
  - “Conservative activists saw Goldwater’s nomination not as a time for restraint and perhaps winning the presidency but as a celebration that finally ended their exile and anonymity” (Schoenwald, 125)

Exigency
- After receiving the nomination, Goldwater was required to provide an acceptance speech
- This speech needed to unite the Republican Party
  - “By the time of the Republican National Convention, the party had grown so far apart that at times its members seemed to be speaking different languages” (Schoenwald, 141)
- Goldwater had different intentions, converting the party to his beliefs

Audience
- Moderate Republicans
- Goldwater Conservatives
- The General American Public

Constraints
- Tarnished Reputation
  - Extremism
  - Racism
  - “In addition to extremism, the dilemma of civil rights illustrated the rift best” (Schoenwald, 141)
- Adverse expectations for campaign
- “Goldwater recalls that after Kennedy was killed, he knew, ‘We’d lose the election but win the party’” (Schoenwald, 136)
- Divided Party
- Mostly liberal public

Discussion of Exigency, Audience, Constraints

While this speech was called into being due to campaign formalities, Goldwater took it as an opportunity to further his cause. Because Goldwater and his supporters approached this campaign not in the light of winning the presidency, but rather in shifting the Republican Party ideologies and uniting conservatives in general this rhetoric was most logical for Goldwater. So clearly there are some exceptions when defining this piece of rhetoric. First and foremost that Goldwater cared little about the constraints placed on him and his audience’s perception of him. Thus, to mild conservatives and the general public this speech was far too radical, and really destroyed his chances of succeeding in the campaign. However, for the true intentions of Goldwater and his supporter, this speech served the purposes he intended, mainly igniting a party of staunch conservatism.

**Annotated Bibliography and Lit Review**

**Political Articles:** These political articles provide a political context to help place Goldwater’s extremism next to the ideas of moderate conservatives. Furthermore, these articles discuss the political atmosphere of the country, liberal LBJ supporters, as well as the growing Goldwater conservative movement.


This article looks closely at Goldwater and his anti collectivism rhetoric. “Senator Barry Goldwater’s nomination by the Republican Party contravened the proposition that neither of America’s major parties could abandon electoral pragmatism for an intense ideological campaign.” It’s a rhetorical analysis of the speech, focusing specifically on the anti welfare rhetoric, a major theme of the speech, and thus will be fundamental in discussing this aspect of Goldwater’s acceptance address


Farrell examines convention acceptance speeches as a genre from 1960 to 1976. He discusses Goldwater’s speech in detail, and focuses on constraints and requirements of acceptance addresses as well as the process of legitimation that occurs at the convention. This will be helpful in looking at Goldwater’s speech in the broader context of acceptance addresses at conventions

This is an overall examination of the Goldwater candidacy, his rhetorical strategies, and political choices. This article most closely focuses on the Goldwater candidacy of any of the articles I found. This will be a basis for the rhetorical claims I make throughout my paper, and will be cited heavily.

**Goldwater Books:** These books written by Goldwater will be helpful in providing biographical and historical context for the paper. They will also serve to help justify some of Goldwater’s own views, which will be crucial when defining my pentad of Goldwater.


This is a standard autobiography of Goldwater that will help contextualize a lot of the race, and Goldwater’s views. It will not be used heavily throughout the paper, but will be nice to be able to reference when talking about Goldwater as a person and his life experience (i.e. ethos and credibility)


This is a heavily cited book written by Goldwater, it was released before he ran for President but outlines Goldwater’s strictly conservative views. It’s written to justify conservative views during a time when liberals were taking over the government, “The challenge of Conservatives today is quite simply to demonstrate the bearing of a proven philosophy on the problems of our own time.” This book will be important in helping define Goldwater Conservatism as it is the main theme of his acceptance speech.


This is a retrospective look at Goldwater’s campaign, written by Goldwater. “At no time during that campaign or at any point in my public life have I ever advocated or suggested the use of atomic weaponry. But the media said I did.” It’s a chance for Goldwater to give his side of the story, and will be interesting to see how his words were twisted by LBJ and the media. It’s an overall interesting retrospective perspective that will certainly add to the scope of the paper.

**Rhetorical Articles:** This is a fairly comprehensive body of rhetorical criticisms written about Goldwater. These articles are by far the most important aspects to my paper, as they establish what rhetorical scholars have already claimed about Goldwater, and provide insights into his method of rhetoric which will be drawn on both prior and throughout my analysis.

This is Hammerback’s first article on Goldwater in which he establishes the uniqueness of Goldwater as a politician and rhetor. Rather than relying on politics, Hammerback argues Goldwater relies on is rhetoric centered on individualism, and his undying devotion to this cause. The article discusses how Goldwater chose not to compromise to simply please audiences, yet still formed a devoted group of followers in the early 1960’s


This article serves a number of purposes for my paper. Not only does it do a fine job of summarizing both the past and present rhetorical criticisms of Goldwater, but it also adds to the literature demonstrating, “how to build and animate an audience which would zealously support solidly conservative candidates and ideology.” Within the article Hammerback equates Goldwater to some of the great and peculiar rhetoricians with devoted followings of the past, and divulges the rhetoric of Goldwater to examine correlations.


This article will be particularly useful for my paper in that it discusses Goldwater’s general paradoxical rhetoric. It reflects the simplicity in Goldwater’s writing, and the fact that he often combines pushing and pulling ideologies. For example Goldwater stresses the individual, yet calls for them to collect as a whole motivated towards a single call. These ideas are inherently conflicting, and thus paradoxical. It also relates to seeing victory in Goldwater’s campaign defeat, another paradox.


Olson performs a generic analysis of Barry Goldwater’s 1964 acceptance address, analyzing the piece through the form of Jeremiad. By doing so she exemplifies how the speech and Goldwater in general moved the moderate conservatism of the time to the far right. She rehistoricizes the speech and relates it to Reagan’s campaign some eight years later.


This article is not focused on Goldwater per-se, but examines him briefly in context of the rhetoric of conservatives. Goldwater essentially being the father of modern conservatism is discussed as paving the way for the GOP rhetors of the future, mainly Nixon and Reagan. The work as a whole examines Jeremiadic rhetoric and its function in political discourse.

This article was written prior to the 1964 election describing Goldwater and his conservative views. This article talks about the growing support the Goldwater campaign has seen, and addresses his political significance for the time period. The article is interesting because it is written before Goldwater truly solidified his legacy. Furthermore the article is written from almost a scared perspective, observing the growth of support and assessing the potential problematic influences Goldwater could have on American politics.
Brief Lit Review:

Although this literature review excludes some of my purely historical sources, such as Schoenwald and Schweizer, as well as any methodology resources, it does however provide a fairly comprehensive set of works which I have used to fully understand Goldwater and his 1964 speech. The political resources listed provide a generally balanced political context to place Goldwater in. Annuziata and Farrell write pieces more generally on the rhetoric of conservatives and acceptance speeches, providing a general background for this function of rhetoric. On the other hand, Matthews provides a political analysis of Goldwater himself, which is useful when discussing his rhetorical decisions given the political playing-field Goldwater was in.

The books written by Goldwater himself are rather self explanatory. *Goldwater*, is a general autobiography in which Goldwater describes his life not necessarily focused on politics. This information will be useful in developing my pentad, although this source will likely not be heavily cited, it provides a nice non-politically driven examination of Goldwater. *The Conscience of a Conservative* is easily the piece of literature Goldwater is most famous for. Its heavily cited in almost all academic work written about Goldwater, and is truly the work to turn to when establishing Goldwater’s political views, and for that matter, the political views of the modern conservative. Finally, the work *With No Apologies* is a retrospective examination of Goldwater’s campaign by Goldwater. It will be incredibly useful in attempting to see the campaign through Goldwater’s views. Also many of the claims within the book will help formulate my research questions, such as the motive behind Goldwater acceptance address, when he claims in the title he had no intention of moving GOP ideology to the right, but rather was simply sticking to his cause.
Finally, the rhetorical works really provide a groundwork for me to begin my analysis in. The work by Olson actually made me rethink my methodology, because I wanted to write the piece she did. Regardless, her Jeremiadic analysis will foster my pentadic analysis with Goldwater’s genre being predetermined and thoroughly examined. The works by Hammerback provide a general rhetorical analysis of Goldwater, examining how his rhetoric ignites an audience. On the note of audience, Wrage examines those who were against the rhetoric of Goldwater, and examines his choice not to mitigate his extremism. Also, Moore’s work on paradox will greatly influence my pentadic analysis; given Goldwater’s paradoxity is a rhetorical choice, and an interesting one at that.

In summary, the combination of these works provides a fairly comprehensive overview of the Goldwater 1964 acceptance speech, and Barry Goldwater in general. By examining the event and speech through numerous lenses, I have created an all encompassing viewpoint. I understand the concerns of the American public, the moderate GOPs, the Goldwater Conservatives, Democrats, and hopefully through my pentadic analysis will unveil the concerns and motivations of Goldwater himself.

Dramatism Methodological Outline

Principal Procedures

Dramatism
- Dramatism examines history from the perspective of a play
  o “Human Conduct being in the realm of action and end… is most directly discussible in dramatistic terms” (Ling, 221)
  o “History can be viewed as a play” (Ling, 221)
- Examining situations as a play reveals strategy and motive
  o “While traditional criticism seeks to understand how persuasive techniques function to bring about specific results, dramatism is more concerned with philosophical, psychological, and sociological questions: What does rhetoric reveal about human motivation, action, and linguistic clarity” (187)
- Since humans are symbol using being, language can tell a lot about action
  
o  “As I see it, the relation between ontology and epistemology, from the standpoint of my terminology, is most quickly stated thus: My Dramatism article (1968) is ontological. It stresses what we are: the symbol-using animal. I call logology epistemological because it relates to the initial duplication that came into the world when we could go from sensations to words for sensations.” (Burke, 3)

  o  “Burke’s point is that our reality is mostly experienced through language” (Darr, 8)

  o  “Burke has clearly shifted from a way (method) which provides multiple understanding of ‘human motivations’ to a philosophical stance which identifies the essence of ‘human motivation’ as an act” (Brock, 101)

  o  “In this view, the human being is cast as an active, self determining, and responsible agent acting through a decisively physical symbol using process” (Brock, 103)

- Burke’s pentad defines the drama of the situation

  o  “As man describes the situation around him, he orders these five elements to reflect his view of that situation (Ling, 222)

  o  “To apply Burke’s method, critics simply need to apply the five terms… and label the ratios in order to identify the dominant term, and thus the way in which the artifact attributes motive” (Darr, 10)

**Pentad**

- Burke labels five pentadic terms

  o  “Five terms suggested by five questions provide a complete statement about motives: What was done (act), when or where it was done (scene), who did it (agent), how did he do it (agency), and why (purpose).” Burke views the relationship among the five terms of the pentad as principles and the resulting philosophies as casuistries which apply as principles to temporal situations. SO the pentad becomes an instrument designed to understand the nature of reality- human symbolic reality” (Brock, 98)

- These terms can be used in a variety of ways to determine motivation
o “To apply Burke’s method, critics simply need to apply the five terms... and
label the ratios in order to identify the dominant term, and thus the way in
which the artifact attributes motive” (Darr, 10)

o “Curiously enough the veiled motive may be the strongest reason for
exploring the Blank-White case through Burke’s critical system, the Pentad,
because Burke introduced the system as a means for ‘pondering matters of
human motivation” (Fisher, 181)

o “A major function of the pentad is discovering the featured terms that form
the core of a speaker’s motivational appeal. Such an analysis reveals rhetorical
structures used by a speaker to facilitate identification with other participants
in the speaker’s rhetorical world” (215)

- Pentadic Ratios

  o “Burke elaborates on how critics might investigate the terms of the pentad,
stating that any term of the pentad can be paired with any other term in order
to come up with a ratio... these ratios constitute statements that attribute
motive” (Darr, 10)

  o “The notion of a single term or ratio can provide a basis for a consistent
interpretation of pentadic ambiguity within a single text and establish a
grammar that the critic can use to guide the analysis of that text... there is not
necessarily a single correct rule for applying the terms in any particular
situation” (277)

- Ambiguity

  o “The terms of the pentad are necessarily ambiguous, and are, as Burke notes,
‘Like the five fingers. Each is distinct, yet all merge in the hand’” (Birdsell,
273)

  o “Terms can be made readily obscure, they overlap, and may convert into one
another. Since terms are convertible, critics are well served by experimenting
with various treatments of the terms within the text under study in an effort to
determine which formulation will provide the fullest explanation for the
relationships between those terms in that text” (Birdsell, 273)

  o “Burke seeks not terms that avoid ambiguity, but terms that clearly reveal the
strategic spots at which ambiguities necessarily arise” (28)

- Unique uses
Single Term

- “The value of focusing on a single term is not limited to instances in which scene is controlling” (Birdsell, 274)

Terministic Screens

- “He argues that the terministic screens guide and color our perception of the world… In other words, the terms used by rhetors embody and guide audiences to specific world views… Reality therefore is constituted by and colored by the symbol system we use” (Darr, 9)

- “Frame analysis looks to see how a situation or event is named/defined, and how that naming shapes public opinion. It accomplishes this analysis by highlighting the inherent biases in all storytelling, namely selectivity and structure” (Ott, 221)

Procedural synthesis: Burke’s method of Dramatism allows a rhetor to examine an act in terms of a drama. This is relevant because human action is nearly always confined within the elements of the pentad. By defining the terms of the pentad, and examining pentadic rations, a critic can determine what elements of the pentad affected or impacted the rhetor the most which sheds light on their motivation. “The disposition to define most things in life with one term or ratio serves as the core of an ideology for most people” (Brummet, 253). Thus, highlighting this term or ratio reveals the reasoning often defines the motive behind a rhetor. In terms of procedural application, the pentad can be used in a variety of ways. One can focus on a single term or ratio, apply the pentad in the traditional sense using all five pentadic terms, ignore ratios, or define the dominant ratios within a text. Essentially, the critic is free to use pendatic terms in whatever way they best serve to analyze the text.

Strengths:

Ambiguity in:

Pentadic terms: The critic can define the five pentadic terms in unconventional ways as to better understand the motives of the rhetor (Birdsell, Fisher)

Pentadic Method: The critic can use either parts or the whole of the pentadic method to analyze a text, as well as not using pentadic ratios or just a single term (Birdsell, Fisher, Blakenship). This allows the critic free range when analyzing the text and allows for a specialized analysis.

Rhetoric is inherently pentadic:

Most if not all rhetorical acts contain the five pentadic terms (Burke, Brock). This means the pentad is applicable to practically all artifacts.

Reveals motive:
Based on the pentadic terms and ratios, the motive of the rhetor (which is often either veiled or misunderstood) can become clearer when using this method. (Burke, Fisher)

Uses Background:
Background historical information, alternative artifacts, and outside biographical information can often be used to help better understand and label the pentadic terms within an artifact when using dramatism (Birdsell, Blakenship, Darr).

Weaknesses:
Ambiguity:
This strength is also a weakness. Given that the pentadic method can be used in part or whole in just about any way a critic wants, the strength and validity of a criticism is heavily dependent on the critic. (Brock, Rountree)

Depth of Method:
This method is derived from the mind of Burke and has been developed over a span of 50 years. Thus, it’s incredibly difficult to have a comprehensive understanding of the method through the eyes of Burke, and so using the method to its full potential can be difficult. (Brock, Rountree)

Justification for Application: After Goldwater lost the 1964 election by a landslide, “close observers offered a wide range of explanations for his rhetorical failures… and in recent years Goldwater’s 1964 performance has been evaluated more favorably” (Hammerback, 323). However, “[Goldwater] does not accept the mantle of father of 20th century conservatism, though in truth he should” (Olson, 314). A Pentadic analysis of Goldwater’s convention speech will likely provide more insight into the motivation of his speech; A speech which at the time critics thought was absurd, currently critics think it was brilliant and created the modern conservative, and a speech which Goldwater denies was either. Thus, a rather untraditional application of the pentad to the speech (altering the most obvious definitions of the pentadic terms) may enlighten us as to the true motivations behind Goldwater’s peculiar 1964 address.


