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ABSTRACT

THE IMAGES AND ATTITUDES IN TIME AND NEWSWEEK COVERAGE OF EDMUND G. BROWN, JR.
JUNE 1974 - JULY 1976:
A SYMBOLIC CONTENT ANALYSIS

by
Jacqueline Marie Cartier

Master of Arts in Mass Communications, Journalism

After television, the national newsmagazines are the most widespread source of news for the nation. Both Time and Newsweek have circulations in the millions. These two major newsmagazines are also looked to as a news source by other reporters and are used by broadcast personnel as an indicator of what stories to cover from what viewpoint. Thus, their potential extended influence is great.

Few studies of these newsmagazines have been performed recently. This analysis of Time and Newsweek articles on Edmund G. Brown, Jr. is a step in resuming scrutiny of their reportage.

A form of Kenneth Burke's symbolic content analysis was used in the study. Developed by Hermann Stelzner for analysis of speeches, it is adapted here for use on short journalistic writing. It recognizes and allows into evidence linguistic elements capable of altering a
seemingly straightforward account into a subtly biased one: changes in definition between two uses of the same term; inference; analogy; patterns of association. Context is regarded as primary and the entire article is analyzed for its interlocked meanings.

Most of the articles in both newsmagazines presented their views of Jerry Brown to readers under the aspect of an extended analogy. Some of these, such as *Newsweek*’s early portrayal of Brown as a reincarnate "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," were apparent. Others, such as *Time*’s subtle comparison of Brown with Don Quixote, were not.

The analysis showed that most articles on Brown from both newsmagazines were negatively biased. Significantly, however, in the *Newsweek* stories the bias was evident enough for an alert reader to recognize. Often the article’s viewpoint on Brown was presented in a direct statement somewhere in the article. In the *Time* coverage, many articles contained negative assertions under the cover of subtle implications. These were difficult to detect on first reading. They were neither stated nor clearly implied anywhere in the articles. Rather, these views were woven into the factual content where readers would likely encounter them without immediately recognizing their presence or their import.
A. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Considering journalism as a form of literature is similar to regarding a house or garden tool as a work of three-dimensional art. Because of its common utility, some effort is required to change perspective, to recognize in journalistic writing literary qualities which for the most part are overlooked.

Archibald MacLeish, in his essay "The Poet and the Press," points out:

You cannot distinguish journalism from poetry to the extreme degree in which we distinguish them, merely by saying that one is art and the other is not. The theory would be, I imagine, that the poet is supposed to create a world in his poem, whereas the journalist is supposed not to create one but to stick as close as he can to the world he's got. I should say, rather, that an examination of actual poems and actual journalism would lead any reader to the conclusion that both are re-creations, different in degree but not different in kind, for the material in each case is our human experience of the world and ourselves. The purpose of both is the recording of the fragments selected in a sequence that makes sense.

MacLeish thus holds that journalistic writing is indeed a form of art.

James Carey, professor of journalism at the University of Iowa, is one of the primary spokesmen for this changed perspective. He states:

Journalists are of all groups who expose their works to the public, less critically examined by professional critics, the public
or their colleagues. A fundamental reason is that journalism is rarely thought of as a literary act, parallel with the novel, the essay and the scientific report.²

Asserting that press criticism is essentially the criticism of language, Carey says:

This criticism is a vital response on the part of the public to the language the press uses to describe events and to the events that accepted standards of journalistic language allow to be described.³

Journalism, then, can be evaluated and its meanings clarified on the same critical bases that apply to other forms of literature. Carey states:

Journalism provides what Kenneth Burke calls "strategies for situations"—implicit commands or instructions of one sort or another. Journalism provides audiences with models for action and feeling, with ways to size up situations. It shares these qualities with all literary acts and therefore, like all literary acts, must be kept under constant critical examination for the manner, method and purpose whereby it carries out these actions.⁴

Kenneth Burke, whose works on critical theory and its philosophical bases range over 36 years of consistent participation in that field, has developed a systematic method which applies to the study of language in all its forms. Burke's key assertion is that language is never neutral: that words do not only name but also convey an attitude toward the thing named.⁵ This perspective will be explained fully in the Methodology section of this study.

Regarding journalistic writing, Burke points out:

We can but infer what the diplomat did. But we can cite "factually" some report that says what he did. If you agree that the words, or terms, in a book are its "facts," then by the same token you see there is a sense in which we get our view of deeds as facts from our sense of words as facts, rather than vice versa.⁶
Burke is saying directly here that one cannot get to the "factual" content of a news story without encountering and dealing with its language as such. Perhaps it is easier for the reader of fiction to recognize that the story being read contains only language. Even though the story may be powerfully symbolic of human life, the reader understands that the characters and events are given form only in the words and phrases created by the writer. Readers of nonfiction accounts, on the other hand, tend to feel they are being vicariously made present to the actual event. They are mentally transported to the scene of the accident or to the news conference. As a result, the language of the report becomes "invisible," not thought about, as the mind adheres instead to the mental images and experiences it makes present. Thus, Kenneth Burke's method of analysis is especially useful for analyzing journalistic writing because it functions to stop the reader/critic's vision at the level of the language, making it visible once more. The language itself can then be examined to determine how it functions to create the image it presents to the reader.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of Burke's approach is this reliance on the terms of the work under study in themselves as the primary determiners of the study's contents. The method's function is to furnish a way in to the work. There is no set pattern to which the work is expected to conform nor any external criteria against which it is to be measured. The work is unique; the method allows it to remain so and studies, systematically, the functional elements which compose its unique perspective.

This study utilizes Kenneth Burke's methodology to analyze
a segment of magazine journalism from the perspective described above. Specifically, it will evaluate the coverage given by *Time* and *Newsweek* magazines to Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. of California from June 1974 through July 1976. During this period Brown, commonly referred to by his nickname, "Jerry," emerged onto the political scene first as Democratic gubernatorial candidate for the California office vacated by Ronald Reagan, then in 1976 as a contender for his party's presidential nomination.

*Time* and *Newsweek* are selected for study for three reasons.

The first is their extensive national readership. In 1976, *Time*’s circulation numbered over four million. *Newsweek* ran a strong second with over three million. Also, since magazines are often read more than once, potential audience for each is greater than the circulation figures show.

Another is the evidence of bias previously noted in the coverage of each magazine.

In the third edition (1971) of his thorough study of the nation’s magazines, James Playsted Wood reports that *Time*’s editors had reiterated their "constant position that it is the duty of the press to evaluate as well as to report." *Time*, Wood states, has never claimed to be objective.

Wood notes that *Newsweek* was founded as an objective competitor to *Time*’s admittedly subjective coverage but says:

The once vaunted objectivity of *Newsweek* is no longer apparent. *Newsweek*’s reporting leaves little doubt where its writers stand, thus, in unsigned pieces, where the magazine stands. What used to be called editorial comment is generally obvious in *Newsweek*’s news stories.
In *The Messenger's Motives*, John Hulteng points out: "Time's editors and writers have through the years acquired a widespread reputation for their adroit blending of fact and opinion in what is still advertised as 'the weekly newsmagazine.'" Newsweek's title also proclaims it to be a newsmagazine in distinction to the many journals of opinion.

Therefore, these two magazines which purport to offer their readers news will be studied to determine whether or not bias is present, and if present, how substantially. More importantly, if attitudes are found to be present in the articles, the study will determine whether these are easily accessible to the reader or whether, on the other hand, the language chosen serves instead to conceal or obscure these attitudes.

The importance of making this evaluation rests on the importance of the newsmagazines themselves in the media spectrum of the country. William Rivers points out that they have a distinct and separate role to fulfill unmet by other media. They are able, since published weekly, to place news events in perspective and offer an interpretive view. And they offer a national and international perspective, in contrast to what the local paper or broadcast may provide.

Rivers notes:

As a continuing publication the magazine can serve as a forum for discussion by carrying responses from its readers. It can sustain campaigns for indefinite periods and work for cumulative impact. Its available space enable the magazine to cover subjects at length and thus to appeal to the intellect more than to the emotions.

Rivers also points out that interpretive reports in magazines
may be the chief educator beyond college, and he notes that a magazine is neither as transitory as broadcasting nor as easily discarded as a newspaper. These magazines, with their widespread circulation, also provide a possible basis for the development of a national consensus.\textsuperscript{15}

A third reason for the selection of \textit{Time} and \textit{Newsweek}--their readership among the members of the national political press corps--will be dealt with in the section \textit{Significance of This Study}.

All of these factors indicate that newsmagazines function as an important part of the country's communications processes. Yet they have been almost completely exempted recently from formal critical scrutiny. A review of the literature shows that very few studies involving newsmagazines have been done over the past seven years.

It is curious that this should be so. Possibly the state of flux in the magazine industry generally has tended to keep researchers away while the business regrouped and redefined itself. With new and successful magazine markets established after the devastation of mass circulation markets by television\textsuperscript{16} and with the continuing stability of both \textit{Time} and \textit{Newsweek}\textsuperscript{17} it would seem to be time to resume full critical appraisal of this segment of the communication field.

\textbf{Edmund G. Brown, Jr. as Subject of the Reportage under Study}

This study will evaluate the present performance of \textit{Time} and \textit{Newsweek} in terms of their coverage of Edmund G. Brown, Jr., governor of California and contender for the 1976 Democratic presidential nomination. The son of California's popular former governor Edmond G. ("Pat") Brown, Jerry Brown has proved to be a highly unique and often
controversial figure. His seemingly offhand manner of entering the 1976 presidential race—he casually mentioned his intentions to reporters just three months before the July nomination—is one indication of his novel approach to politics.

Jerry Brown has proven to be unusual in other ways as well. Nation said:

There has been occasional scoffing at Brown's puritanical life style and his inclination toward Zen meditation, Sufi religious music, health foods and Socratic dialogue. And press attention does still respond primarily to his unusual personal value system, his small car, his mattress on the floor of a frugally furnished apartment, his occasional two-day fasts, his willingness to line up for plane tickets or cafeteria meals.

Political and personal idiosyncrasies make good copy, and doubtless it is to be expected that much along these lines would be found in the newsmagazine articles under study here. Brown himself intensified the public curiosity concerning these aspects of his life by consistently evading questioning about them. As an article in America pointed out: "Jerry Brown is impatient with personality cults, and responds to questions about his personal background and motivation with testy counterattacks." In California, figuring Brown out became the state pastime if not an obsession. In September of 1976, the California Journal ran an article titled "The Handwriting on the Wall: A Graphological Solution to the Jerry Brown Puzzle," written by a handwriting analyst who had in fact studied a sample of Brown's script and who reported her findings concerning Brown's personality.

Few political personages engender this kind of intense curiosity or evade convenient categorizing so successfully. Reporting on Jerry Brown was thus doubly difficult: a new political figure with no
long record of public service from which writers could draw information and analogies, he was also an enigma both by lifestyle and by deliberate choice.

Jerry Brown had been an enigma politically as well. The *California Journal* is published in Sacramento by the nonprofit Center for Research and Education in Government and acts as a watchdog over the state government. A month before Brown's inauguration as California governor, Journal editor Ed Salzman attempted to profile Brown's political stance, but noted that Brown had made so few commitments during the campaign that it was difficult to determine what kind of governor he would be. "While Brown put himself on record generally about issues," Salzman says, "his stands would dissolve in wisps before attempts to deal in details."22

Salzman characterizes Brown as hard-working, intellectual, aggressive, at times abrasive, tough and politically shrewd, and illustrates the varying aspects of the Brown political philosophy:

**Conservative:** Brown adopted almost a Reagan line on welfare and on state spending. He favors sure and speedy punishment for violators of the law.

**Liberal:** He opposes capital punishment, favors liberalization of marijuana and sex laws, wants to put government to work harder solving problems.

**Idealist:** Brown took a few stands during the campaign—capital punishment, and public-employee right to strike—that he knew might cost him votes.

**Pragmatist:** His campaign took the public pulse weekly and many of his actions are based on what will help advance his political career.23

Ten months later, Salzman evaluated Brown's first legislative record and noted that the governor had accomplished six out of the seven goals
he had stated in his brief inaugural address. Most notable among them was the achievement of legislation guaranteeing secret-ballot elections for farm workers' unions. Salzman noted, however, that Brown did not risk defeat many times by actively backing many bills, but on issues where he chose to put his administration on the line, he posted a remarkable record of success. Salzman also conceded that his earlier evaluation of Brown's intent to be an active governor in using the state's legislative machinery was open to question.24

Some members of the state's legislature were uncomfortable with the governor's approach to executive power. America editor Edward J. Cripps, S.J., said of Brown: "Jerry Brown's highly personal approach has angered those who see executive action on legislative matters as needing a deliberate, explicit strategy."25 He cited examples of Brown's inaction: failure to lobby in Washington for important employment legislation favorable to California; passing up $64 million in federal money because the program furnishing it was "too complicated."26

Yet, as Nation had noted:

Though legislators are beginning to voice their disenchantment, there is an uneasy impression abroad in Sacramento that Brown's unorthodox refusal to follow accepted modes of dealing with public problems is in harmony with public expectations.27

In fact, despite evidence of misgivings on the part of their representatives, the people of California evidently liked what their new governor was doing. Brown had attained an 86.9 percent popularity rating in the state's respected Field Poll, highest ever given to any governor in its history.28

Both the skepticism on the part of professionals and the
indication of approval by large numbers of people were soon repeated at the national level. Anthony Lewis of the New York Times, commenting on Jerry Brown's entry into the presidential primary race, asked:

Could he conceivably be serious about running for President? A man who has just turned 38, has been Governor for 15 months and has no long list of accomplishments does not sound exactly like a possibility.29

Lewis goes on to note, however, that Brown's ranking on the then most recent Gallup Poll shows him, with 9 percent, leading in popularity two of the better-known Democratic hopefuls.30

Certainly Brown's ascent to national political prominence was aided by Democratic Party regulars who, fearing the Southern and independent Jimmy Carter more than the son of a well-known liberal Democratic governor, looked eagerly to Brown's candidacy as a way of stopping Carter.31

Jerry Brown's rise was also helped considerably by the press.

Much soul-searching had gone on concerning media coverage following the 1972 presidential campaign and subsequent Watergate exposure. Praise of the press for bringing the Watergate situation to light was muted by the fact that the media nearly missed the event and its significance altogether.

In discussions among media persons and campaign managers, it was widely acknowledged that the press covering the 1972 campaign had made some glaring mistakes. They had at first ignored Eugene McCarthy, who eventually won the Democratic nomination. At the beginning of the season they had all but declared Edmund Muskie the winner. Television commentators had decreed, in races among three or more candidates, what percentages of the vote would signal "victory" or "defeat" for each
individual running. And the incumbent President, re-elected only to be forced out of office soon after as grossly unfit, was hardly resolved to do better in 1976; specifically, it vowed to pay attention to all candidates, no matter how unlikely.32

Jerry Brown was the beneficiary of that determination.

"We never had to find ways to get Jerry before the press," said Brown's campaign manager, Mickey Kantor. "They were all over him." Kantor noted that Jimmy Carter had received the same "newcomer" treatment when he entered the race.33

Nevertheless, Brown managed to remain enigmatic throughout his presidential campaign, responding to reporters' questions with enough aphorisms and counter-questions to, literally, fill a book. Entitled Thoughts of Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., its sales indicate the degree of interest in reading about Brown: 7,000 copies were sold nationwide in two weeks and another edition was planned.34

Quotes from media articles comprise the book's contents (79 pages, $2.00). Samples printed in a New York Times book review showed sometimes contradictory thoughts:

"Inaction may be the highest form of action."
"We're going to move left and right at the same time."
"I don't have any goals. They will evolve as we go along."35

The book's preface says, "It is still an open question whether we are confronted by a man who has abandoned the principles of expediency or is merely expediently principled."36

E. B. Drew, in a diary-like account of the Brown campaign, commented in the New Yorker on the extensive press coverage given Brown, and on his ability to be taken seriously as a possible President, so
soon after entering national politics. Brown's rise is attributed to "the magnification that goes on via the communications process," whereby something new is rapidly blown up from a speck into a phenomenon, and often as rapidly passes out of the public consciousness.37

The article states:

The magnification process cannot study nuances, wander around among complexities. It is well suited to such things as a governor who turns down the governor's mansion. It is not well suited to issues. It can make a man a national force—perhaps even a President—before we have time to find out very much about him.38

Jerry Brown as Symbol

In periods of change and uncertainty, according to Kenneth Burke's interactionist perspective, the emergence of new symbolic figures is to be expected. In his essay "Burke's Dramatistic View of Society," Hugh Duncan points out:

In times of transition shifts in allegiance to symbol of authority are common. Problems of identity, not simply the need to belong but with whom to belong, become crucial. When men cannot act under one set of names they must choose others. Conflicts must then be resolved in the symbolic realm by the expression of attitudes which make conformity possible. Identification is always dependent on objectification through communication. All such expression, like prayer, is an exhortation to the self and to others. It is a preparation for social action, an investment of the self with confidence and strength.39

"Objectification" here means "presentation of an image available to all"—a common view of the personage around which a consensus is able to form.

The period during which the articles under study were written was decidedly such a transitional period. The National Journal quoted Patrick Caddell, now President Carter's chief pollster:
Today there is a crisis of public confidence, not merely in specific officeholders, but in the functioning of government itself; not merely in bad policies, but in the entire process of policy making. It is a crisis of confidence in the political process and the future of the nation.40

Other articles seconded this assessment. A Newsweek article on a Gallup Poll, "The Skeptical Voters," showed that the level of distrust had not improved since Gerald Ford had assumed the Presidency.41 Jeffrey Hart, editor of National Review, noted that neither political party had shown much ability to sense or respond to the enormous changes in the nation.42

These changes were noted and discussed by the respected Congressional Quarterly, Inc., which offers a variety of research services for professional newsmen and whose publications are considered a prime background source by national political reporters,43 furnished a study of the nation's mood before the 1976 primary season.

The booklet Candidates '76 contained the commentary "Post-Industrial Politics: A Guide to 1976," which points out that a new class is emerging in America. The report says members of this new class are "college-educated elite whose livelihood and culture are tied to knowledge—and who vote accordingly." This group, which the study rates as comprising approximately one-third of the nation, is seen as less interested in material acquisitions and consumption, more interested in reading and leisure activities.44 A study in Editorial Research Reports, also published by Congressional Quarterly, Inc., noted that this group of people tends to vote in primary elections.45

The Candidates '76 article points out that sustaining a long series of primaries requires enthusiastic volunteers—the kind drawn
out by a radical or ideological approach. It states, "These incentives usually come not from the compromising, consensus-seeking center of politics, but from the fringes, from those candidates with a radical program or with simple solutions."46

Enter Jerry Brown. Depending on how one looks at his brief record and his manner of operation, Brown can be seen as either radical or simple in his approach to government. And at least one commentator saw him as a symbol in the sense Duncan spoke of. Following his citation of some legislative disapproval of Brown in Sacramento, Edward J. Cripps, editor of America, concludes:

Brown does not only say what will please the audience of the moment. Instead, he often does the opposite, indicating his own direction and expecting to be followed or voted out of office. Now that leadership is in desperately short supply among us, and ethics and restraint have become major issues of national politics, no one should underestimate the potential of a man who successfully articulated the public's idea of its own better self.47

Evidently, whatever it was that they were able to perceive about Jerry Brown, it met a felt need on the part of at least some of the nation's voters. In three months he had won four presidential primaries, done well in two, and was being spoken of as a possible contender for 1980.46

Conclusion

The reporters covering Jerry Brown could be forgiven for finding him difficult to categorize. He is one of the tiny group of highly unique personalities, including such figures as Adlai Stevenson and Eugene McCarthy, who manage to become nationally recognized in politics even though they refuse to stay within the well-defined range of
of standard political behavior.

The iconoclasm and unpredictability of such personages gives reporters headaches. Yet they had to write about Jerry Brown: and to do so, they had to formulate for themselves and in their writing an attitude toward this unusual and powerfully symbolic figure.

Therefore E. B. Drew's question remains: From their articles, what could anybody really learn about Jerry Brown? What impression of him was put forth by Time and Newsweek to an evidently interested public, one debating its choices for the presidential nomination? What "objectification," or image, of Brown were they in effect exhorting their readers to accept? Was this image presented fairly, or was it in some way distorted?

This study will attempt to determine whether the view of Jerry Brown offered by these newsmagazines was unfairly biased or balanced; predominantly positive or negative. It will also seek to clarify the mechanisms by which the language of the reportage itself conceals or shows adequately what attitude is present, and under what aspect.

B. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE MAGAZINE STUDY

Analyzing Time and Newsweek's coverage of Jerry Brown offers a valuable and unique opportunity to assess these newsmagazines' present performance.

Brown's rapid ascent to national prominence posed some difficulties for reporting on him. As has been shown, due to Brown's dislike of probing questions concerning his attitudes and motivations and his short tenure in office, an extensive backlog of factual information was not available to newswriters on either his personal and political
philosophy or his executive ability.

More than for most politicians, then, what reporters wrote about Jerry Brown they had to develop themselves. In particular, according to Mickey Kantor, Brown's campaign manager, during the primaries members of the political press corps had to acquire information for their articles in one of two ways: by listening to or interviewing Brown himself, or by reading each other's stories. During the three months of the campaign, no press kits were prepared or released, Kantor said.

Kantor points out that reporters regularly clip and file one another's writeups for future background use in their own material on the same or related topics.

There is also evidence that reporters, respecting each other's expertise, sometimes borrow more directly than that. Gary Hart, campaign director for George McGovern in the 1972 presidential campaign, says:

The people who report politics are, by and large, excellent. But there are lazy ones who want to see what Johnny Apple (of the New York Times) is going to say and what Dave Broder is going to say and then write their stories. I have literally seen reporters gather around Johnny Apple as he files his lead on the phone, and then go back to their typewriters and type their stories.

Kantor affirms this: "They copy each other. They're afraid they'll miss what everybody else thinks is the main point."

This tendency of the national political reporters to use one another's material is especially significant to this study. According to a survey taken by one of them, Time and Newsweek are among those sources read faithfully each week by most members of the national
political press corps. 54

Given this inclination among these reporters to depend on one another's professional judgment, the chances seem to be increasingly good that the view of Brown carried by these newsmagazines could quite easily find its way into the stories of other reporters as well.

Professionals in other media also rely on what they see in print for directions on what to cover. Ben Wattenberg, campaign adviser to Sen. Henry Jackson in the 1972 campaign, states:

When you try to work the press on behalf of a candidate, you find that the way to get the video coverage you want is to get the print coverage that you want. In other words, video people take their cue from what the commentators, the reporters, the guys traveling, write. . . . 55

This means that aspects of Jerry Brown portrayed by the coverage of *Time* and *Newsweek* may well have found their way, through the magazines' impact on televised news coverage, to millions of people whose main source of information is television.

The image of Brown created by these magazines' reportage clearly has a potential range much greater than that of their subscription lists. The possible impact of their coverage on the formation of a national consensus on any issue, including the candidacy of Jerry Brown, appears to be extensive.

Therefore, it would seem to be incumbent upon responsible journalists with such potential influence to try to make a potentially successful contender for the Presidency as comprehensible as possible, to present a balanced view of such a person in as fair a manner as they are able.

Precisely because of the combined difficulty and the importance
of the task, how Time and Newsweek handled their coverage of Jerry Brown deserves careful scrutiny. Ostensibly, they are newsmagazines as distinct from magazines of opinion. This study, then, will attempt to evaluate the impartiality of their presentations of Jerry Brown.

C. HYPOTHESES FOR THIS STUDY

This study will attempt to show:

1. That a definite bias concerning Edmund G. Brown, Jr. is present in each of the Time and Newsweek magazine articles under study;
2. That in most of the articles for each magazine, the attitude shown is positive;
3. That in most of the articles for each magazine, the attitude is implied rather than explicitly stated;
4. That the factual content in each article is woven into the language structures which present the attitude, so that the reader is offered the news content about Brown under the aspect of the attitude.

D. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study will analyze the terms used in the reportage under study in order to specify how these terms were employed to create the image of Jerry Brown they present to their readers.

Though Jerry Brown is the subject of the reportage, the articles are under scrutiny here, not the person. Since these materials, including the interviews and signed articles, are edited, they present the thought structures of each of the magazines taken as an entity in itself.

Since it is the image presented in these articles which is
under analysis, this study will not extend into an evaluation of their specific factual content in the sense of documenting what is present and how much. The factual content will be evaluated in terms of its function in presenting the articles' image of Brown.

This study also does not presume to say what actual impact the portrayal of Jerry Brown here contained may have had on any individual or group. The study intends only to determine, as clearly as possible, what image of Brown these articles contain and what elements constitute that image.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This thesis deals most directly with the fields of rhetorical and literary criticism, sociology, political science and journalism. Accordingly, abstracts and indexes in these areas were searched.

A check of Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences from January 1970 through May 1977, and of the Journalism Abstracts for the same period, showed that no dissertation or thesis has been done to date on the subject of this study, nor on major newsmagazine coverage of a prominent national figure concerning the image presented to the readership of that individual.

A search of the Humanities Index and the Social Sciences Index from April of 1974 through May 1977 showed no journal articles written on Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr. or on magazine reportage of a national figure from the standpoint of attitude portrayal. No entries were found in these indexes for articles analyzing the general mood of the nation shortly before or during the period of the 1976 presidential primaries, concerning the selection of primary contenders as national symbols.

Sources on the National Mood in 1976

The Public Affairs Information Index, surveyed from October 1975 through May 1977, showed two entries on the political-social atmosphere which proved highly useful.
The National Journal, a periodical frequently read as reference by members of the national political press corps, carried the article "The Pols and the Polls - Taking the Pulse of the People." It documents the difficulties professional political analysts had in figuring out the mood of the country during the 1976 primary season. The article's subtitle reads, "While polling techniques have become more refined, the electorate has undergone a profound change, leaving candidates groping for the key to the voters." Pollsters are quoted as saying they see a profound cynicism present in the country, not about specific problems so much as concerning the political system itself.

The second study was contained in Editorial Research Reports, published by the respected Congressional Quarterly, Inc. The February 13, 1976, issue carried the study "Evaluating Presidential Performance," setting the hopes of the American people for an effective President in the context of Watergate, the aftermath of Vietnam, the complexities of the national government, and the people's mood, which is defined as cynical and apathetic. The essay includes a commentary on image-making by the press.

Also published by Congressional Quarterly, Inc., is the booklet Candidates '76: Presidential Outlook. Its opening page describes the company which produced it as a subscriber service for professional newspeople, printing the Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, also read weekly by the national press corps as its basic publication. The company maintains a consulting service and query desk for the convenience of its subscribers.

Candidates '76 is a handbook for the use of reporters covering
the campaigns and for other media professionals. It presents back-
ground on the national mood, the political picture and basic facts and
chances for all known prospective candidates for the 1976 presidential
primary season.

The introduction notes that the nation for the first time has
an incumbent President who was not elected by the people; this situ­
tion has encouraged more candidates than usual to run against him.
Adding to the general picture of great uncertainty about the political
situation is the fact that 30 states, a record number, will hold pri­
mary elections. 7

The first chapter presents a description of "the general poli­
tical milieu of bicentennial America." The study cites what it con­
siders the primary reality to be considered by politicians in approach­
ing the public: deep changes taking place in the American economy and
society are producing a "post-industrial society," in which knowledge
and technology replace manufacturing and physical labor. Its members,
the essay states, are college-educated persons "whose livelihood and
culture are tied to knowledge--and who vote accordingly." 8

However, it is noted that about two-thirds of the nation's pop­
ulation find the values of the new class "distant and uncomfortable";
this segment reaffirms old values and upholds the status quo. Both
groups are seen as having causes to fight for if a leader rallies them.
The study also points out, "Drawing increasingly independent and skepti­
cal, even cynical, getting voters to the polls is likely to require
moral incentives." 9
Importantly, the study notes: "The mass media—centerpiece of
the post-industrial power for many observers—has also become the cen-
terpiece of the modern political campaign." For the past decade, can-
didates have depended increasingly on direct personal contact with
voters through the media, and decreasingly on party organizations.\textsuperscript{10}

The Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, checked from
January 1976 through May 1977, showed other articles, listed below,
on the nation's mood, media in presidential campaigns, and articles on
Jerry Brown.

"The Skeptical Voters" in Newsweek, April 12, 1976, reports on
a Gallup Poll which indicates that voter apathy had neither declined
further nor risen since Gerald Ford assumed the Presidency.\textsuperscript{11}

A view of the California electorate in 1974, the first to
evaluate Jerry Brown, was offered in Ramparts by Francis Carney, a
political writer and professor of political science. Carney analyzes
the state's voters as cynical, narcissistic, isolated from each other,
looking for the good life more than for substantial improvement of the
world and supporting changes only if these benefit them.\textsuperscript{12} Carney,
noting the state's reputation as a microcosm of the nation, wondered
if the rest of the country was not after what they perceived California
to already have. Carney stated that the deep problems facing the state
would require drastic alterations of lifestyle for their solution.\textsuperscript{13}
perceived no clue in Brown's campaign statements in the gubernatorial race that he was prepared to offer the needed leadership. Carney showed Brown's public support in his campaign for the California governorship as resting on the popularity of his father, former governor Pat Brown, since people widely were held to assume that the younger Brown would carry on the same Liberal traditions his father had sponsored. Carney noted that Brown, Jr. had done nothing to dispel this view.14

Several key articles on Jerry Brown, his approach to government and his record during his first year in office were provided by the California Journal, located in Sacramento and published by the non-profit California Center for Research and Education in Government. The group and its publication act as a watchdog over the operation of the state government. These articles are noted below.

"The New Spirit," December 1974 edition, describes Brown's campaign procedures as he ran for the governorship of California. His stand on the issues, Journal editor Ed Salzman said, was general; when pinned down to particulars, it would disappear. Since, Salzman said, Brown had offered so few specifics, it was difficult to tell what kind of governor he would be. Salzman noted that Brown's stance could be seen from a variety of political philosophical perspectives, and gives examples of Liberal, Conservative, Idealist or Pragmatist positions in Brown's statements.15

In May of 1975 the Journal ran "The Greening of Governor Brown." Salzman noted that Brown's philosophy is available only by assessing the sum of his actions taken on a particular issue. Adding
to his former list of political descriptive labels for Brown, Salzman noted that Brown's anti-government, anti-involvement stance might qualify him as a Libertarian. He noted that the public is supposed to like Brown's stance on frugality, but "the average California can hardly understand Brown." Salzman points to Brown's symbolizing as the key to his popularity—giving up the state limousine, removing the paper-shredders from government offices, his modest apartment—and the more open, less imperial aspect of the Governor's Office, compared to its appearance under Ronald Reagan.

Under the caption "Brown for President?" Salzman concluded that if Brown is looking toward becoming a candidate in the 1976 race, . . . he certainly is going about it in a self-defeating way. He has avoided national conferences. He has tackled the political establishment. And he does not seem to be engaged in shaping the image of a national candidate. He's working night and day at the details of state government.

In "Brown's First Legislative Record: Little Ventured, Little Lost," Salzman credits Brown with accomplishing six out of the seven goals he set in his brief inaugural address, most notably establishing secret-ballot elections for farm workers' unions. Salzman noted that while Brown did not risk himself many times by fighting for legislation, where he chose to put his administration on the line he had accomplished some notable legislation.

Salzman noted also that at the end of his first year in office, Brown remained an enigma, whose central value system from which his judgments were proceeding was still unclear.

In its September 1976 issue, the California Journal ran an article by a handwriting expert who had indeed studied a sample of
Brown's script from a published note and who reported her findings about Brown's personality in detail. The article is notable for its documentation of the intense curiosity Brown's resistance to personal probing brought about.21

Other magazines of opinion also dealt with Jerry Brown. In the July 1975 issue of Ramparts, Francis Carney comments on Brown again, but this time to wonder whether, despite Brown's inaction in legislative areas, he and the young activists he had brought to his executive team were the distilled product of the '60's, ready to work for change. Carney saw Brown's "lower your expectation" philosophy as beginning to take hold in the state.22

In "California's Gadfly Governor," Edward J. Cripps, S.J., editor of America, stated, "California is being governed by the Socratic method."23 Crediting Brown for raising difficult questions, the article also pointed out his avoidance of questions meant to determine his personal patterns of values and decisionmaking. Cripps, a Jesuit, discounted the impact of Brown's short seminary training on his philosophy. Cripps also noted the failure of Brown in not acting to ensure passage of jobs legislation in Washington needed by Californians and his bypassing of $64 million in federal money because the program providing it was "too complicated."24 Cripps mentioned the displeasure of some state legislators with Brown's failure to provide active leadership in passing legislation. However, Cripps also pointed out that Brown's actions did not seem aimed at pleasing the audience of the moment, that in indicating his own direction for acceptance or rejection by the voters he seemed to demonstrate ethics and restraint. He states, "No
one should underestimate the potential of a man who successfully articulated the public's idea of its own better self."25

Jerry Brown as Primary Candidate

The New Republic article, "Jerry Brown to the Rescue?" cited similarities between Brown and Jimmy Carter," each sharing some elements of the anti-establishment image that's appealing this year," and pointed out differences: "Carter, while anti-Washington, is not anti-government. Brown is more skeptical of government as a court of first resort and certain that programs designated to remedy social ills also create special constituencies of users that needlessly prolong the life of the programs."26

The Nation's "What Makes Jerry Run" by Mary Ellen Leary noted the "rumblings of disappointment" from activists, Liberals, consumer groups and lawyers involved in poverty cases. The complaint: "His first year in office lacked firm direction and a solid commitment to reallocate resources for the benefit of society's outcasts. A common remark is that Brown has spent a year now asking questions. Isn't it about time he risked giving some answers?"27

Candidates '76, the Congressional Quarterly publication cited earlier, mentioned Edmund G. Brown Jr. briefly, along with Gov. Hugh Carey of New York, noting that the governors of the two most populous states always have to be considered as possible contenders for a presidential nomination. It commented about Brown:

Any call for national service may be a long time coming. Brown is far less popular with party professionals outside California than he is with the voters at home. Since he took office in January 1975, Brown has emerged as an anomaly. During his
campaign Brown was viewed as a Liberal. He has since startled Californians, however, with massive budget cuts and a tough, no-nonsense approach to many issues, including prison reform and poverty programs; he has called the latter "the last refuge of scoundrels."28

Sources on Politics and the Media

Interview with Mr. Mickey Kantor, 1976 presidential primary campaign manager to Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr., July 6, 1977, Los Angeles, California29

Mickey Kantor, Jerry Brown's presidential campaign adviser and manager, is a Los Angeles attorney with the law firm of Manatt, Phelps, Rothenberg, Manley and Tunney. The interview, conducted at his office in Century City, provided much useful information for this study. This information is listed topically below. Kantor's statements are paraphrased.

1. How important is the print media compared to television and radio?
   Electronic media depend for their selection of topics and viewpoints on the print media.

2. What are the most important print media for a national political campaign?
   The New York Times, the Washington Post, local papers when the campaign is centered in their locality; Time and Newsweek. U.S. News and World Report is more important in Republican contests.

3. What message about Jerry Brown did the campaign hope to present or to see presented by the media?
   Brown's honesty, leadership and integrity were the major messages of the campaign.
4. Are press kits from the campaign available for study?

No press kits were prepared or distributed. The media staff prepared only two press releases and one speech. Brown writes most of his own material. When the candidate is getting sufficient coverage, the job of the staff is to watch for holes in the information coming out, guide the press to any main points being overlooked, and watch the balance of the coverage in terms of the other candidates. When the candidate himself is good, there's not much problem.

5. How much "packaging" of candidates does go on in a campaign?

Packaging attempts, strategy are in inverse relationship to the size of the campaign. The smaller the campaign, the more effective it may be. In a large campaign, there's no way to create an image; press people are too smart to fall for it. They can see for themselves what the candidate is.

6. There are reports that the national press corps get material from one another's stories. Is this so?

Yes. They copy each other. They're all afraid they'll miss what everybody else thinks is the main point.

7. How accurate was the coverage Brown got?

Accurate? It was balanced and fair ... fairly accurate.

8. Were there any problems with press coverage during the campaign?

Only once. We felt coverage given to Brown was out of balance with that being given to Carter. We complained, and they responded—television news. Generally, we didn't have to find ways to get Jerry before the press—they were all over him.
9. Was any of the coverage due to the notable failure of the 1972 campaign to pay balanced attention to unlikely candidates?
Yes. Carter got the same "newcomer" treatment when he entered the race.

10. How did press coverage this time compare with that of the 1972 campaign?
They tried harder to be fair and to pay attention to all the candidates.

11. How does a campaign office assess a candidate's progress?
The media output is checked constantly to determine voter impact of the coverage, the sense of excitement, importance, popularity. It is becoming more and more important for a candidate to make national news. The unpaid media coverage substantiates, makes credible the paid coverage (i.e., ads, paid time).

Many of Kantor's statements verified information found in other sources which might otherwise have been considered possibly out of date, as applied to the 1976 primary campaign.

SOURCES ON POLITICS AND THE MEDIA

Magazine Sources

A Time magazine commentary on press coverage of the 1976 primary campaign, "From Unknown to 'What's He Really Like?" ran boxed under the heading Newswatch and was signed by Thomas Griffith. It noted the impression of "journalistic overkill" as the media arrived for the nation's first primary in New Hampshire and evaluated whether the media had become the new "power broker." Griffith said that study
groups from Yale, M.I.T. and Duke University were present to study the media at work, and stated that general analysis of the press is needed, especially since "reporters, questioning each other in the intimacy of press buses, are in danger of returning look-alike, inbred answers."

Griffith pointed to some weaknesses mentioned in other articles surveyed in this Review--overconfidence in survey results, tendency of the media to appoint victors by their decree. Candidates, said Griffith, seek exposure from the press but not intensive scrutiny. He noted that television fosters a sense of familiarity with formerly unknown candidates but fails to show what they are "really like."

"Reporter in Washington, D.C." by E. B. Drew in the New Yorker is a diary-like, retrospective account of the 1976 primaries. The writer documents Jerry Brown's Oregon campaign, including extended conversations with Brown in which he comments on his own media image. Drew offers a valuable commentary on the tendency of press coverage to magnify an unknown person into wide notability on the basis of style alone and to generate popularity which can translate quickly into power--before people know anything of real substance about the person.

"Presidential Campaign Coverage," by Mary Costello in the April 9, 1976 edition of Editorial Research Reports is a thorough, highly informative in-depth study detailing problems in the coverage of the 1972 presidential campaign. It noted that studies of that coverage were undertaken by members of the press themselves, and stated their intention to do better in 1976, primarily by giving adequate coverage to all contenders, no matter how unlikely.

The article discussed the influence of the media on elections,
noting that some candidates complain of too little coverage, others of biased coverage, others of unrealistic expectations created by the media. The article noted an instance where reporters announced in advance what percentage of the vote in multi-candidate contests would signal a "setback" or "advance" for a particular candidate. Media, the article said, generally downgrade their influence on elections, pointing to the variations in coverage available to voters throughout the range of media viewpoints. The report cited a study by the Social Science Research Council's Committee on Mass Communications and Political Behavior. In its proposals for the study, begun in mid-1975, the committee noted that "Our understanding of media effects is imprecise and speculation far exceeds documentation."

The article also quotes Elmer W. Lower, vice president of the American Broadcasting Company, in a speech given at the American Embassy in London on February 13, 1976, as saying each of the different fields within the media has something unique to offer in the manner of coverage for a candidate. Of the newsmagazines, he says, "I would court the weekly newsmagazines because they offer a unique perspective on campaign themes and personalities."

Books

The book Thoughts of Governor Edmund G. Brown, Jr. was a unique twist on the standard campaign biography. It was published, not by the candidate's staff, but by a small avant-garde San Francisco company better known for publishing the works of Beat poets. The work contained, not a biography, but a nearly comprehensive listing of
topics of Brown's celebrated aphorisms and Socratic counter-questions. The *New York Times* reviewed the book on June 6, 1976. The Times had also run an announcement of its publication on April 25, 1976, and a news story two weeks later when the book had sold 7,000 copies and a second edition was planned. The sales figures document the high rate of interest in reading material about Jerry Brown, an indication that the magazine articles under study in this analysis may have had a wide and interested readership.

*Campaign '72: The Managers Speak* presents discussions among 22 newsgivers and campaign managers directly involved in the 1972 presidential primary campaigns. Among them are: David Broder, political correspondent for the *Washington Post*; Gary Hart, national presidential campaign director for George McGovern; Jeb Magruder, deputy campaign director for Richard Nixon; James Perry, senior editor of the *National Observer*; Ben Wattenberg, campaign adviser to Sen. Henry Jackson. Their evaluations of the mistakes they made during the 1972 campaign are useful for understanding the mentality of their two groups as they interact, and for setting the stage for attempts at improvement during the 1976 campaign.

*Languages of the Mass Media* is a collection of essays dealing with the various forms of mass communication from the standpoint of language. The essay by Archibald MacLeish, speaking from his unique view of journalism gained by the fact that he is both a poet and a former Librarian of Congress, is of basic importance to the perspective of this study.
MacLeish maintains that journalism, like poetry, is art, because both are re-creations, drawn from the material of our human experience of the world and of ourselves. The purpose of both, he holds, is the recording of the fragments selected in a sequence that makes sense. It would follow from this that journalism falls within the domain usually referred to as literature, and is subject to critical evaluation from that perspective, as James Carey holds.

The Making of the President 1972 by Theodore White is part of his series on presidential elections which began in 1960. The book contains quantities of facts, descriptions and behind-the-scenes views of politicians, and of press people at work. The series is highly regarded; however, James Perry offers a critique of White's approach and of what Perry considers to be its detrimental impact on political writers covering campaigns.

Perry's book, Us and Them: How the Press Covered the 1972 Elections, has that critique as its central theme. Perry says:

White showed, by his exceptional writing skill, that the story of a campaign can be told in vivid, chronological detail. He made us think we were missing most of it. And so, I would argue, consciously or unconsciously, we began to imitate his technique. We have become nitpickers, peeking into dusty corners, looking for the squabbles, celebrating the trivia, and leaping to those sweeping, cosmic, melodramatic conclusions and generalities that mark the Teddy White view of American politics. Thanks to White, our coverage is sometimes out of focus. We are too interested in "images."

Perry's comments offer further substantiation for the view that the persons covering national politics may be influenced by each other's work. The book further contributes to the present study. Perry presents his survey of his fellow national political reporters,
documenting their weekly reading habits. *Time* and *Newsweek* were two of the consistent news sources for these reporters.\(^43\) This survey was of basic importance in determining what segment of press coverage would be chosen for this analysis.

*Mass Media in a Free Society* contains a speech by Bill Moyers, reporter and White House Press Secretary under Lyndon Johnson. His commentary on journalistic 'truth' credits all with honesty, but at the same time provides evidence that journalistic objectivity is a myth.\(^44\)

*Politics and the Press*, like the above, a set of speeches from a university conference, contains the address "Role of the Press in Presidential Politics," which noted the readiness of journalists to contribute to the creation of a politician's public image due to their awareness of public interest in this aspect of the candidate.\(^45\)

David Broder's address in the same collection, "Politicians and Biased Political Information," gives important insights into the actual relationships between reporters and the candidates they cover:

It is a myth that there can somehow be a neutral relationship between a politician or public official and the reporter or the press. That relationship can be good or bad, it can be tense or relaxed, it can be smooth and workable or angry and contentious. But whatever it is, it can never be a neutral relationship.\(^46\)

*The Presidential Campaign: The Leadership Selection Process after Watergate* is an extended essay by Steven Hess, a senior fellow at Washington's Brookings Institution. Hess calls for a reassessment of Presidential nomination procedure following Watergate; discusses qualities a candidate should have; considers the varied functions of the campaign; and calls for continuing examination of the mass media's
involvement in the process.47

Newspapers

The New York Times furnished one of the few thorough assessments of Brown's record as governor, by Richard Reeves, on August 24, 1975, after Brown's first six months in office.48

Another analysis was presented by Brown's "home town" newspaper, the Los Angeles Times, after his first 100 days. It appeared on the front page of the April 20, 1975 edition.49 A feature on Brown's presidential aspirations, on June 6, 1976, was also run on the front page.50

Newspaper Indexes

Indexes for the New York Times, the Los Angeles Times, the Wall Street Journal, the Christian Science Monitor and the Washington Post were checked from January of 1974 through July of 1976 for informational article on Jerry Brown, and to document his presidential campaign and rise to prominence. The New York Times index furnishes the most comprehensive chronology of this time period, and of Brown's involvement in other aspects of national life. The Los Angeles Times index provides the most thorough listing of Brown's activities within California.

SOURCES ON MAGAZINE JOURNALISM

Journal Articles

A search of the indexes cited showed no journal articles dealing specifically with magazine journalism.

The study "Press Opinion in the Eagleton Affair," by Donald S.

The report, while illustrating that supposedly objective magazine stories carried evident subjective material, focuses on what was said but does not study the uses of language which carried the messages.51

**Books**

The following books contained background information on magazine journalism and general analysis of its elements.

*The Messenger's Motives: Ethical Problems of the News Media* by John L. Hulteng, discusses *Time* magazine's consistent statement of intention to mix judgment with its news content. Hulteng cited a 1965 study by John C. Merrill, "How *Time* Stereotyped Three U.S. Presidents," where the author demonstrated the magazine's use of language to bias the story toward the view it favored.52 This study, done before the death of *Time*'s founder and editor-in-chief Henry Booth Luce, was considered out of date for the present study, but it serves to illustrate the magazine's adherence to its policy statements. Hulteng noted that these have always clearly indicated its reportage included opinion.

Hulteng further noted, however, that the subtitle "The weekly newsmagazine" connotes objectivity and probably misleads many readers into acceptance of the magazine's contents as objective.53
Hulteng noted that *Newsweek* was founded as an objective periodical to counter *Time*'s position-oriented coverage, but its objectivity has declined. He pointed to instances where the reportage has contained innuendo unsubstantiated by fact to suggest a direction of thought.54

*Mass Media and Mass Communication in Society* by Frederick C. Whitney discussed the impact of television on the magazine industry, pointing out that magazines serving a general-interest function failed because as their audiences turned to television, advertising revenue followed.

Whitney documented the general unsettledness in the magazine industry over the past decade as a result of this change, noting that magazines which survived were those which adapted to or already served specialized needs which television, now the general-interest medium, did not meet. *Time* and *Newsweek* were shown as belonging to this category.55

*The Mass Media and Modern Society* by William Rivers, Theodore Peterson and Jay Jensen noted several unique contributions newsmagazines perform within the communication picture, citing interpretation as their greatest value. However, the authors pointed out that these magazines, like other media, share the blame for helping to create a "pseudo-world—one so nearly in focus that some readers confuse it with reality."56

*Magazines in the United States* by James Playsted Wood is a thorough study of the history and styles of American magazines, now in its third edition.57 This edition, published in 1971, documented the
"editorializing which is an essential part of most Time stories. Far from hiding the attempt, Time boasts of it. From the beginning it said it would give both sides of a story but clearly indicate which side it believed to have the strongest position." Wood states, "Its editors have reiterated their conviction that it is the duty of the press to evaluate as well as to report."^58

About Newsweek Wood notes that it was founded as an objective magazine in opposition to Time's subjectivity, but has since shown evidence of subjective reporting also. ^59

SOURCES ON THE METHODOLOGY OF KENNETH BURKE

Applicability of Burkean Methodology to Journalistic Writing

A search of the Humanities Index and the Social Sciences Index from April 1974 through May 1977 showed no journal articles pertinent to the formulation of Burke's methodology as used here.

However, the essay by James Carey, "Journalism and Criticism: The Case of an Undeveloped Profession" in The Review of Politics, April 1974, was of primary importance to this study. It presented an explanation of why journalism should be regarded as a form of literature, gave reasons why an active and systematic criticism of press performance from the standpoint of language is necessary, and specifies Kenneth Burke's methodology as most appropriate for such analysis. ^60
Sources on Content Analysis

The book *Content Analysis: A Technique for Systematic Inference from Communication* by Thomas F. Carney is a comprehensive treatment of this area. The book contains a clear definition of content analysis which embraces traditional forms of this method, the newer quantitative forms, and recent qualitative procedures. Burke's method is one of the latter.61

*Research Methods in Social Relations* by Claire Selltiz, Lawrence S. Wrightsman and Stuart W. Cook contains a clear section on content analysis in communications. The text, while noting the gains in precision brought about by the addition of quantitative procedures, noted also that possible distortions of meaning can result from their use on studies for which they are not well suited.62

Sources on Symbolic Interactionism

The theory of symbolic interactionism forms the philosophical and procedural base for Kenneth Burke's methodology. An understanding of this perspective is essential for the use of his technique.

*Sociology: Human Society* by Melvin DeFleur, William D'Antonio and Lois DeFleur is a basic text containing a comprehensive survey of that field. The authors devote considerable space to symbolic interactionism, defining human communication in its terms. This is one of the clearest and most comprehensive treatments available of the theory's history, development and social applications.63 Their presentation is given at length in the Methodology section of this study.

In *Approaches to Human Communication* by Richard Budd and Brent
D. Ruben, an essay by Herbert Blumer, "Symbolic Interactionism," gives a straightforward, definition-oriented treatment of the theory, helpful for pinpointing its central elements. Blumer, the theory's chief spokesman at present, is chairman of the Department of Sociology at UC Berkeley.

In Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook Norman Denzin also offers a useful definition of symbolic interactionism and shows its philosophical orientations.

The Books of Kenneth Burke

Kenneth Burke's own key works, in which his methodology is formulated and explained, follow here in order of their original publication dates. This chronological sequence is given since many of Burke's ideas evolve from one work to the next. A student of Burke's thought can sometimes find a simpler formulation of a complex explanation in an earlier work.

Counter-Statement (1931)

Burke's "Lexicon Rhetoricae" contained in this volume is the earliest working-out of his evolving theory of literary analysis. He defined at length what he means by "Symbol," the key term in his analytic procedure. In the essay's introduction, Burke also indicated why his method applies to journalistic writing:

Sometimes literature fails to arouse emotions—and words said purely by way of explanation may have an unintended emotional effect of considerable magnitude. A discussion of effectiveness in literature should be able to include unintended effects as well as intended ones.

Permanence and Change (1935)
Pages 176-7 of the current edition contain Burke's assertion, "Speech in its essence is not neutral." This view of language is basic to Burke's method and derives from the view of meaning and language as its carrier being formed in the process of symbolic interaction. Burke in this section also shows how human groups are formed by sharing a common terminology representing a common moral focus.67

**Attitudes Toward History** (1937)

This book contains the beginnings of Burke's transmutations of Caroline Spurgeon's method of cluster analysis, developed in her study of Shakespeare, into his method of analysis. It also contains the clearest explanation by Burke of how his method gets past surface content of the writing to its less obvious messages (p. 233 ff.).68

**The Philosophy of Literary Form** (1941)

Pages viii, ix and x, from the new foreword by Burke to the second edition, give his own 1-2-3 outline of the book's contents. This is the philosophical foundation of his later methodological development, reaching back to Aristotle and mythology, progressing through his extensive studies of William Shakespeare and Samuel Taylor Coleridge to Sigmund Freud, John Dewey and George Herbert Mead. Mead is the founder of the theory of symbolic interactionism. In his Foreward to the first edition, reprinted in this one, Burke says of the work: "Its primary interest is in speculation on the nature of linguistic, or symbolic, or literary action—and in a search for more precise ways of locating or defining such action."69
Two key sections, for the purposes of this study, are: Burke's analysis, "The Rhetoric of Hitler's 'Battle,'" showing how his method works on nonfiction statements, and "Literature as Equipment for Living," which explains his central premise—that language, far from being an objective, neutral presentation of fact, is always "a strategy for dealing with a situation."70

Language as Symbolic Action (1966)

Again, Burke's preface states what the work contains:

All of these pieces are explicitly concerned with the attempt to define and track down the implications of the term "symbolic action," and to show how the marvels of literature and language look when considered from that point of view.71

Part I, Chapter Three, "Terministic Screens," deals with the ways in which terms act as switching points to direct the responder's attention one way or another. All of Part II contains Burke's own explications of various literary works.72

Terms for Order (1965)

This is a collection of previously unpublished essays, letters, and addresses by Burke, edited by Stanley Edgar Hyman. The essay "Fact, Inference and Proof in the Analysis of Literary Symbolism" gives a complete and precise, though somewhat complex, description of how Burke's method works. This is the "bible" of the methodologist.73
Burke deals with communication as a totality, according to Robert L. Scott and Bernard Brock, authors of *Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Perspective*.

The authors point out, "So successful is Burke in weaving all his concepts into a pattern and creating a feeling of Gestalt, that one cannot fully understand his method without familiarity with all his work."

The authors note that Burke has therefore gained a number of interpreters and translators, able to guide those interested in Burke's approach to and through the most important formulations of his thought. The *Armed Vision* by Stanley Edgar Hyman and *Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations* by William Rueckert, both cited below, are named by the authors as two of the most useful and understandable interpretations available.

The Scott and Brock text itself presents much helpful information on Burke, including one study of primary utility. In "War Message: December 8, 1941: An Approach to Language" by Hermann G. Stelzner, the author explicates his own analysis of Franklin Delano Roosevelt's radio speech to the American people following the bombing of Pearl Harbor. Stelzner's explication shows clearly how principles of Burkean analysis translate into practice when applied to shorter nonfiction works. The newsmagazine articles under analysis in this study are directly comparable to the Roosevelt text in length and in structure. This study will make direct use of Stelzner's insights.
The Armed Vision by Stanley Edgar Hyman is a comprehensive state-of-the-art book dealing with the full spectrum of literary criticism in America. "Kenneth Burke and the Criticism of Symbolic Action," pages 325-85, is an extensive, insightful discussion of Burke and of his contributions to the critical field by a fellow teacher who understands his perspective thoroughly. Hyman says of Burke as a critic:

"With a kind of limitless fertility Burke has done everything in criticism's bag of tricks, including several things he put there. His critical area, symbolic expression, is something no one else covers adequately." 77

Further on, Hyman says:

In recent years, it has become fashionable to say Burke is not actually a literary critic, but a semanticist, a social psychologist, or philosopher. A much more accurate statement would be that he is not only a literary critic, but a literary critic plus those things and others. The lifelong aim of Burke's criticism has been a synthesis of the fields covered by the various disciplines, the unification of every discipline and body of knowledge that could throw light on literature into one consistent critical frame. Opposing every pious or conventional view that would exclude one critical tool or another as "improper," Burke has insisted: "The main ideal of criticism, as I conceive it, is to use all that there is to use." 78

Though the book's publication date is 1948, the above list of Burke's works shows that his critical approach was substantially complete by that time. Hyman traces its development, points out its central features and indicates its worth and possible future directions. This essay is probably the best first-time introduction to Burke's thinking. 79

Communication and Social Order by Hugh Dalziel Duncan contains a long section on Burke's methodology and its sources in sociological
and rhetorical theory. Duncan quotes Burke's works extensively and explicates his statements. In the section "Burke's Dramatistic View of Society," Duncan provides a valuable description of how society designates persons as symbolic figures to rally around, especially in times of unrest. This book is basic to an understanding of Burke.

**Critical Moments: Kenneth Burke's Categories and Critiques** by George Knox contains the chapter "Cluster Analysis and the Sociological Critique," which deals with the process of indexing key terms in a work and making a concordance of these. It is helpful for seeing how Burke's method works in practice.

**Kenneth Burke and the Drama of Human Relations** by William H. Rueckert is probably the most comprehensive and most thorough critical study of Burke generally available. It deals with the history of Burke's method, cites and discusses Burke's own analyses and adds several more of Rueckert's own, utilizing Burke's method. "Imitation and Indexing," Section 1 of Chapter Five, is especially useful. Its breakdown of the procedure to be used is presented in the Methodology section of this study.

**BURKEAN DISSERTATIONS AND THESES**

A search of the Dissertation Abstracts International, A: The Humanities and Social Sciences, and of the Journalism Abstracts, January 1970 through May 1977 showed that most research using Burke's methodology to date has been done in the field of speech communications on topics not closely related to the problems of analyzing written language of news coverage.
One of these dissertations, however, was found useful for its insights into the application of the methodology. In "The Image and Character of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy: A Rhetorical-Critical Approach" Carol Ann Berthold studies Kennedy's attempts to control his media image and his friends' attempts to control it after he died. The analysis shows her use of Burke's methodology in some detail. Berthold explains her procedure in finding evidence and in drawing conclusions from it.83

The Abstracts show that a tradition of Burkean analysis is being formed in the field of journalism.

The dissertation "Romanticism and Rationalism: The Philosophical Tradition in Reporting" was completed in 1973 by Joseph M. Webb at the University of Illinois under the direction of James Carey, whose analysis of the need for literary criticism of journalistic writing introduced this study. Webb's work offers a demonstration of Burke's method applied to "new journalism" and offers a clear explanation of the applications to journalism in general. The work contains useful notes on handling the methodology.84

The following theses utilizing Burkean methodology were developed in the Department of Journalism at California State University, Northridge, under the direction of Joseph Webb who joined its faculty in 1969, and that of Prof. Samuel Feldman, adviser to the present study.

In "A Content Analysis of High School Underground Newspapers" completed in 1973, Diane Disse Kowalski defines the specific symbol systems used by the student authors of these newspapers to distinguish themselves from the standard-population mentality. Kowalski employs a
form of Burkean methodology suitable to locating repeated terms in the
course of a large body of writing.\textsuperscript{85}

The study "Agnew versus the Media" by Paul Kroll in 1975 is a
comprehensive study of Spiro Agnew's criticism of the media establish-
ment and the media's response to it. This study does discuss magazine
coverage of the issue factually but does not deal with the ways in
which the language operates to create and control meaning. Kroll's
study is useful for its overall procedure although the magazine section
parallels rather than leads to the present study. Kroll emphasizes the
symbolic interactionist perspective, which has a methodology closely
related to but not identical to Burke's.\textsuperscript{86}

Paul Taylor's study, completed in 1977, is closely related to
this one. "A Symbolic Content Analysis of President Richard M. Nixon
in a Conservative Periodical - 1968-72" provides insights into how
Burke's method works on essay-type articles with an information orien-
tation, though the study was done on a magazine of opinion which does
not claim objectivity in its writing. One excellent section deals with
the major flaw in standard content analysis procedures, showing how
Burke's approach solves this problem.\textsuperscript{87}

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Review of the Literature shows that no serious studies have
been done in the field of newsmagazine journalism over the past seven
years. As noted, though some studies included sections discussing
newsmagazine content within a larger purpose, none of these were inten-
sive studies of newsmagazine journalism as such. More particularly, in
no study were the dynamics of the language used in the newsmagazine articles analyzed to determine how the language operates to control and determine meanings. The two most similar studies, that of Kowalski on the high school underground press and that of Kroll on a magazine of opinion, did not enter the area of newsmagazine content. Though the distinction between the two types of information magazine may be shown here to be tenuous, there is an announced difference of purpose.

Yet the newsmagazines sustain a general readership numbering in the millions and serve as a consistent source of information for professional newspeople. And these newsmagazines, excluding only national television news, are the most extensive nationally oriented carriers of news in the country. Because their orientation and their readership are so widespread, their influence in forming a national consensus cannot be overlooked. The views they carry have great potential impact on the thinking of the nation.

They, like other news sources, should therefore receive constant critical scrutiny. This study will be a step in resumption of that scrutiny.

The articles surveyed on Gov. Edmund G. Brown, Jr. show a range of views on Brown as a person, politician and candidate for the presidential nomination of his party. While some discussion has taken place concerning news coverage given him, no thorough analysis has been done of that coverage in the print media generally or of that in the newsmagazines.

Such an analysis needs to be done not only to document what information was made available on this important figure but, more
significantly, under what aspect, from what viewpoint, that information was presented. The possibility of bias in reportage is of constant concern precisely because a view of the facts which is essentially arbitrary may be accepted by a reader with slight access to a different version as being completely accurate. In the case of a novel figure like Jerry Brown, one with a very brief executive-legislative record to look to, the public is more dependent than usual on current reportage for its knowledge of and impressions about the individual. It would seem to be incumbent upon the media generally and the large-circulation newsmagazines in particular to be especially careful concerning the attitudes they express toward such a person. Also, if bias is found present in coverage which requires more than usual care, it may well indicate that a newsmagazine guilty of slanting in such a case may be slanting other coverage as well.

The Review of the Literature on Kenneth Burke's methodology shows few works to date which have used it to analyze news coverage as such. Most studies to date have been done in the related field of speech communication on works where the rhetorical elements are more easily determined and in which rhetorical intent is evident.

Recognition that literary analysis is necessary and useful within the field of journalism is still evolving. Though there seems to be increasing acknowledgment that reportage is not strictly objective, the corollary—that reportage contains a great deal of rhetorical content, and its implications have to be carefully watched—is still far from being generally accepted.

However, the search of the literature shows that a tradition of
employing Burkean analysis in evaluating journalism is being estab­lished. As the growing body of dissertations and theses using Burke's methodology supplies further illumination to its principles and applications, it also serves to increase awareness that literary criticism is as validly applied to the language of news coverage as it is to all other forms of written expression.

The Department of Journalism at this University appears to be one of the centers for advancing the utility of Burke's method in this field. The present study, having benefited from those which preceded it, will clarify the use of Burkean analysis to show how language functions in works where rhetorical intent is supposedly minimized.

The body of literature cited here for Burke's methodology is for the most part that cited consistently by other researchers, with the notable addition of Hermann Stelzner's example of Burke's method as used on shorter nonfiction works. It forms a solid basis from which to proceed with its application to this study.
NOTES

LITERATURE SEARCH


3Ibid.


5Perry, Us and Them, p. 8.


7Introduction, Candidates '76, p. v.


9Ibid., p. 2.

10Ibid.


12Francis Carney, "California Politics: How the West was Lost," Ramparts, November 1974, pp. 27 ff.

13Ibid., p. 30.

14Ibid., p. 31.


17Ibid., p. 150.

18Ibid., p. 151.


20Ibid., p. 361.


24Ibid., p. 121.

25Ibid., p. 122.


28Candidates '76, p. 94.

29Mr. Mickey Kantor, 1976 presidential primary campaign adviser to Edmund G. Brown, Jr., in an interview with the author in Los Angeles, California, July 6, 1977. Kantor is an attorney with the law firm of Manatt, Phelps, Rothenberg, Manley and Tunney, located in Century City.


33Ibid., p. 250.

34Ibid.


42 James Perry, Us and Them: How the Press Covered the 1972 Elections (New York: Clarkson N. Potter, Inc.)

43 Ibid., p. 8.


49 Los Angeles Times article on Jerry Brown's first 100 days, April 20, 1975, I-1-1.


53Hulteng, Messenger's Motives, p. 213.

54Ibid., p. 222.


59Ibid., p. 232.


70Ibid.


72Ibid.


75Ibid., pp. 264-5.


78Ibid., p. 359.

79Ibid.


CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of Kenneth Burke, as defined in this section, will be applied to the nine Time magazine and eight Newsweek articles carried during the time when Edmund G. Brown, Jr. rose from relative obscurity to national prominence for the first time as a contender for the Democratic Party presidential nomination. This period encompasses the dates July 1974, when he won his party's California gubernatorial nomination, to July 1976, the month of the Democratic nominating convention in New York City.

Background of the Methodology

Kenneth Burke's methodology for getting at meaning in language is based on the theory of symbolic interactionism, one of the dominant theories in contemporary sociology.\(^1\)

In Sociological Methods: A Sourcebook, Norman Denzin notes that symbolic interactionism is strongly humanistic. The theory originated from the perspective of George Herbert Mead, incorporating the thinking and work of Charles Horton Cooley and John Dewey. Symbolic interactionism holds that human beings develop a differentiated and recognizably human personality, a functioning "self," by employing an inborn capacity for assuming the roles—seeing life from the viewpoints—of "significant others" with whom they interact. Through a process
of self-reflection, in which the individual is able to distinguish him or herself from these vicarious experiences of other persons' lives, the individual is able to form a separate consciousness, a unique identity. Thus, the formation of the human personality is seen to be dependent upon these interactions which furnish the basis for the individual's self-identification.²

Herbert Blumer, chairman of the Department of Sociology at the University of California at Berkeley, is the theory's chief spokesman at present. He explains its view of symbol-formation (including language):

Symbolic interactionism views meaning as arising in the process of interaction between people. The meaning of a thing for a person grows out of the ways in which other persons act toward the person with regard to that thing. Their actions operate to define the thing for the person. Thus, symbolic interactionism sees meanings as social products, as creations that are formed in and through the defining activities of people as they interact.

Burke's definition of a linguistic symbol is derived from this perspective. He says, "The Symbol might be called a word invented by the artist to specify a particular grouping or pattern of experiences."³

The entire field of literary analysis and exegesis attests to the fact that understanding the uniquely developed connotations of another's language and the central patterns of meanings underlying them is sometimes difficult. Achieving that understanding is what is meant by "communication," and symbolic interactionism explains how it takes place:

When a person uses a certain word, it is a significant symbol if it arouses within him approximately the same meaning (internal responses) that is aroused in the person toward whom it is directed. Two humans beings are in communication when these
sets of internal responses and experiences parallel each other rather closely.\(^5\)

It is with this process of empathy that symbolic interactionism is concerned and which furnishes the basis for Burke's analytic technique.\(^6\)

Burke's method is first of all a form of content analysis.

In his book on the subject Thomas Carney says the procedure "analyzes by objectively and systematically picking out characteristics in specified parts of communications. And it involves demonstrating how these characteristics are related to our inferences."\(^7\)

Though content analysis has long been used by students of literature as a procedure of logic and trained judgment employed to define and discuss elements in written works, the addition of quantification to the process has come about only within the past few decades.

Harold Lasswell, Bernard Berelson and others have applied scientific methods to the study of written materials, primarily by assigning numerical values to the terms they contain and by deciding on specific categories into which the work's elements will be sorted. The counts thus obtained can then be analyzed by statistical formulas to determine mathematical degrees of significance.\(^8\)

This assignment of numerical values, however, can result in overlooking meanings which do not lend themselves to quantification.

In Research Methods and Social Relations, the authors point out:

Concern with quantification has become so dominant that it may overshadow concern with the content of communication. Definitions of (quantitative) content analysis tend to emphasize the procedure of analysis rather than the character of the data available in recorded communications. In addition, they imply
a somewhat arbitrary limitation of the field by excluding all accounts of communications that are not in the form of the number of times elements appear in the material. We can see why quantification should not be regarded as a requirement in content analysis any more than it is the analysis of data obtained by interviews or observation.⁹

Paul Taylor, in his discussion of this flaw in quantitative content analysis, notes a study of editorials from various newspapers. In the analysis the word "peace" was scored identically whether it appeared in Pravda or in the New York Times.¹⁰ This illustrates that rigid quantification without regard for connotations and other variations in word meaning due to context may result in distortions of interpretation.

Quantitative content analysis, then, tends to overlook the fact that many words have several definitions, both those listed in the dictionary and connotations derived from unique and specific contexts. All of these meanings have been acquired through their continued and highly creative use by human beings. Nothing proscribes the work under study, old or new, from containing additional refinements of meaning which to date have evaded the dictionary. Assigning a numerical value to a term and ranking that term within a category allows for only a few meanings per term. In such procedures, it is possible that their definitions may be fixed in advance by the researcher by the process of establishing the categories. This process may not take fully into account the fact that the words under study need not mean exactly the same thing each time they are used.

It is possible, of course, for a study to be done where high precision of meaning is not necessary and broad categories for terms
will suffice. However, where such precision is required, these shifts in spectrum and changes in register in a word's meaning are difficult to quantify, and standard quantitative procedures, as Taylor notes, disregard these nuances almost completely.

In Burke's method, the definition of terms and the establishment of categories follows the initial analysis (the indexing) of the work. The terms are allowed to define themselves. Burke says:

To know what "shoe" or "house" or "bridge" means you don't begin with a symbolist dictionary already written in advance. You must, by inductive inspection of a given work, discover the particular contexts in which "shoe" or "house" or "bridge" occur. You cannot know in advance in what equational structure it will have membership.!!

Burke, then, disavows the mere counting of terms without reference to context, which he regards as primary.12

In using Burke's method the analyst's judgment is called on, as indeed it is in more strictly numerical procedures, to follow some leads and--with reason--to disregard others, to weight varying evidence, and to draw conclusions.

Burke defines rhetoric as "the use of words by human agents to form attitudes or to induce actions in other human agents."13 Burke maintains that the purpose of all language is rhetorical:

But speech in its essence is not neutral. Far from aiming at suspended judgment, the spontaneous speech of a people is loaded with judgments. Even a word like "automobile" will usually contain a concealed choice (it designates not merely an object, but a desirable object). Spontaneous speech is not a naming at all, but a system of attitudes, of implicit exhortations.14

Burke says speech--and its written forms--are "strategies for dealing with situations,"15 shorthand proverbs, as it were, intended to
guide attitudes, not to simply transmit cold, objective fact.

In connection with this intentional function of language, Burke introduces the concept of **identification**, which is defined in his *Rhetoric of Motives*:

A is not identical with his colleague, B. But insofar as their interests are joined, A is identified with B. Or he may identify himself with B, even when their interests are not joined, if he assumes that they are, or is persuaded to believe so.\(^\text{16}\)

Similarly, when the attitudes and ideas being expressed by a speaker or writer are accepted by a reader, identification is achieved. Since these are necessarily contained in the writer's language choices, the language itself can be studied in order to determine what these central attitudes and ideas are.

Burke states:

The concept of identification will help the critic structure his insight into a writer's sense of unity by grouping strategies—key terms used by the writer to express his theme and conjoined attitude—into attitudinal clusters until relationships indicate the speaker's concept.\(^\text{17}\)

This statement furnishes the guiding principle for the researcher who employs Burke's method. The concept of identification is the test according to which elements in a text are noted as key terms.

Burke presents a second principal concept for the search. He says:

We must believe above all in the reasonableness of "entitling." . . . We must keep prodding ourselves to attempt to answer the question: "Suppose you were required to find an over-all title for this entire batch of particulars. What would that be?" Such a question implies that all the disparate details included under one head are infused with a common spirit, or purpose. They are ultimately organized within relation to one another by their joint participation in a unitary purpose, or "idea."\(^\text{18}\)
The Methodology of Kenneth Burke

Burke's methodology, symbolic content analysis, is designed to lead the researcher by a systematic inductive-deductive process through the text until its central idea, or purpose, can be identified and substantiated. The procedure followed is that of the standard scientific method:

1. First observe. 2. Then deduce: draw a conclusion about what has been observed and state it as an hypothesis. 3. Next, test the hypothesis by making new observations. 4. Then improve the hypothesis by restating it more accurately if the further observations support it; or discard it if these observations show it to be false.19

In its working-out, Burke's methodology is relatively simple, though painstaking. The following outline of the procedure is adapted from William Rueckert's critical study of Burke.20 Each element is fully explained as it is presented. A summary of the process with examples follows this extended version.

1. Analyze the work's structure.

Study its basic arrangement. Burke refers to this as "what follows, what, and why." The inclusion of a separate heading for a structural analysis is more pro forma than indicative of a separate function, however. As Burke says:

When you begin to consider the situations behind the tactics of expression, you will find tactics that organize a work technically because they organize it emotionally. The two aspects of form and content are but modes of the same substance.21

Burke means that the rhetorical intent of the work governs how the work is put together. To explicate the rhetorical intent thus at the same time uncovers the work's structural arrangement. Therefore,
the structural arrangement is accomplished by the content analysis. This is especially so since the content analysis not only identifies the writer's choice of terms which carry the rhetorical intent, but leaves them in sequence and in context so the progression can be traced by checking the concordance.

2. Do a cluster analysis

This is a study of "what goes with what, and why." It is not to be confused with the mathematical process by the same name. This procedure groups terms which are interconnected by their participation in a common attitude or concept. These groupings, as stated above, also reveal the work's structure since the attitude they express determines the work's logical progression. The terms and the developments are two aspects of the same basic intent. To study the interrelationships among a work's terms, or key symbols, in order to arrive at a common title stating the work's central intent:

A. Make an index

List terms that are of:

1) high intensity (These are naturally charged terms such as love, sex, society, or those particularly significant in a given author, such as the rose garden in Eliot), or of

2) high frequency (These are terms or groups of terms which are repeated often in the work.)

The terms to be listed may be of three types. Though Burke describes in most detail the indexing of identical or closely related
forms for the same terms when it is repeated in the work, he notes: "Long forms (epics, dramas, novels or poetic sequences) offer the most viable material for the study of similar terms in changing contexts." He adds:

And even with the Joyce *Portrait of the Artist as Young Man* which abounds in factually related contexts repeated similar forms, we confront a notable place where we would obviously accept suicidal restrictions if we refused to take the generalizing step from particulars to principles (or, in this case, from particular words to the more general themes or topics that these words signify. Once you go from "factual" word to a theme or topic that would include synonyms of this word, you are on the way to including also what we might call "operational synonyms," words which are synonyms in this particular text though they would not be so listed in a dictionary.

Burke thus presents three aspects under which recurrent terms must appear:

1. As a word, or a short phrase, in the same or a closely similar form.

2. As a theme or topic, which may be in the form of a single word or longer verbal construct serving as a commonly recognized synonym for a term.

3. As an "operational synonym" for the word or verbal construct, a form which in the text acquires a synonymous function.

Examples for each of these three forms are shown by Burke in his sample indexing of Joyce's *Portrait* in "Fact, Inference and Proof in the Analysis of Literary Symbolism." These are presented below:
First aspect: "Weariness" appears again in the same or similar form many times. It is entered into the index, with its context, each time.

Second aspect: "Stillness" appears, not in the same form, but as "silence," another version of its overall concept or theme as defined in the work.

Third aspect: The concept of "stillness" appears again, carrying out the theme of "silence," in the word "gesture." This word in turn has been given its connotation placing it within this set by its modifying phrase, "vehicle of a vague speech."
The phrase itself is also included in the set as a repeated form of "silence."

Other examples:

Second aspect: "Loneliness" by the text's association is shown to be thematically linked with "departure," which is therefore categorized with it. It is tied systematically to "exile."

Third aspect: "Loneliness" is also connected to an "operational synonym": the theme of the flying bird. Each instance of a construct in which this theme appears is therefore also classified with "loneliness" in the index.

The index, then, contains all terms which the overall sense of the article at first reading suggests to the researcher as being possibly linked to each other in any way. All of this indexing is tentative; some elements listed in the index will later prove to be incidental to the article's main theme and will therefore not be entered into the groupings, or clusters, which form the work's concordance.
In practice, indexing includes almost everything in the article which is thus essentially reduced to a list, in sequence, of its words and larger constructs. Phrases and sentences are left intact when their meaning is so qualified by their constituent parts as to make them not further reducible.

In shorter works such as the magazine articles under study here, one seldom finds the same or similar forms of a term repeated. It is the second and third aspects of relatedness, thematic linkings and operational synonyms, as shown above, which are more likely to be found. Burke says:

Clearly, in the analysis of short lyrics where terms cannot be repeated in many contexts, one spontaneously looks for what the old rhetoric called "amplification," some theme or topic that is restated in many ways, no single one of which could be taken as a sufficient summing up.25

All of these variants do, however, add up to the overall theme itself. Terms such as these are connected to the concept they express as clock, studying, pen, exam, desk are related to the central concept "class." This form is the standard aspect under which key terms are likely to appear in short works.

Burke offers further practical suggestions for locating the first few key terms, which establish a possible line of further inquiry, when beginning the indexing process:

Note all striking terms for acts, attitudes, ideas, images, relationships. Not oppositions. Pay particular attention to beginnings and endings. Not characteristics defining transitional moments. Note breaks. Watch names, as indicative of essence.26

The elements and locations Burke points out here are the places in the work where the writer's motivating principle is likely to be "closest to the surface," so to speak. This is so because the orienting
principle must be brought directly into play at these locations in order to keep the work directed. This is perhaps especially true in nonfiction, where the topic is usually introduced in the first or second paragraph and summarized in some way at the conclusion. Often the underlying rhetorical intent is indicated at these places also.

The index is the "initial observation" step in the inductive-deductive process. It functions as a proto-analysis, a first attempt to sort out the elements and get a bearing on the underlying direction of the work.

The researcher keeps seeking, as Burke exhorts, to find the general principle or title for each set that appears to be forming. When the researcher can discern a possible title for a set of terms, a hypothesis can be formed.

To test the hypothesis, the researcher analyzes the work, forming the concordance in the process.

The final point in Rueckert's outline of Burke's method states: B. Make a concordance.

1) List every context in which a term either implicitly or explicitly appears.

It is the context, specific and general, that determines both which words are key terms and under which polarity of the main theme these terms will be grouped. How the context functions to give each term its meaning and valence must be determined by the researcher in order to verify whether the suggested term is a valid amplification of the hypothetical theme. In the Stelzner model, this evaluative process, which is based on the structure of the language, is written out. This
written analysis, then, contains the list of terms in their contexts (and in proper sequence) as well as the explication showing how the language operates to designate their meanings.

2) Make a list of equations, demonstrating associations among terms or sets of terms for this author.

As the evaluation proceeds and terms are found which their contexts show to be amplifications of the central theme, these terms are placed in the concordance. Stelzner makes explicit in practice Burke's assertion that terms are always in the form of a dialectic, a pattern of acceptances and rejections on which the writer hopes to win the mutual agreement or disagreement of his audience. A term, if for something, is opposed to something. Each term relates to the central concept positively or negatively, and has a stated or implied dialectical equivalent at the other valence of the continuum. Stelzner's analysis shows that some oppositions are implied. An implied opposing term or statement shows the impression the writer does not want the reader to get; hence the expressed statement of what the reader should adhere to. In either case, terms are listed under the correct valence, positive or negative, and across from their dialectical antithesis.

Listing terms in the concordance, then, is not a procedure separate and distinct from the analysis. Both are, in fact, manifestations of the same process of evaluation. The concordance is the analysis condensed to its essence and presented schematically; the analysis is the concordance in its fully explicated form.
Again: The purpose of the analysis is to show how the language operates to place each term into the concordance. The purpose of the concordance is to demonstrate in a graphic manner the associations among terms which are clarified and established by the analysis.

SHORT FORM OF BURKEAN ANALYSIS

The following is a summary presentation of the process explained above. Examples are taken from the article "California's Vote for Reform," the first Time magazine report analyzed in this study.

1. Read the story carefully for its overall apparent meaning.

2. Index the work: list all terms which may relate to the work's central attitude.
   a. List terms of high intensity: tarot cards; politics; experts; try to read; roiled year; problems of perception
   b. List terms of high frequency. These may appear as:
      1) repeated words or forms of the word (or phrase);
      2) common synonyms of the word or phrase;
      3) repeated "operational synonyms" of the word or phrase.

The following examples, left in their sequence in the work, are numbered to correspond to the above forms:

1) primaries (concept of choice)
2) incumbent (official)
3) by the bushel (concept of choice)

2) some other officeholders (officials)
3) out of hand

1) California primary

3. By the process of logical induction, use the information gained from the grammatical structure of the work and the patterns beginning to emerge from the indexing to form a hypothesis concerning the central attitude, or rhetorical intent, of the work.

This article opens: "Primaries are the tarot cards of politics."

Tarot cards are a means of foretelling the future.

Therefore, Primaries are a means of foretelling the future.

The title is: "California's Vote for Reform"

California's vote was a primary.

Therefore, California's vote was a means of foretelling the future.

Hypothesis: The article's central concept deals with California's election of Edmund G. Brown, Jr. as a sign of political hope ("reform") for the nation.

In nonfiction articles written in essay form, as are these newsmagazine stories, the title often carries a direct clue to the rhetorical concept when combined with a key statement from the first one or two paragraphs and/or from the final paragraphs of the story.

Though one's mental processes in associating terms are frequently neither so systematic nor so verbal as is shown in the syllogisms above, each assumption the researcher makes should be capable
of reduction to its logical elements in order for the analysis of the
work to maintain its validity. The hypothesis, however, must always
be explicit. It proposes the article's underlying/unifying theme. To
test the hypothesis,
4. Form a concordance by systematic logical analysis of the work.
   a. List every context in which a term either implicitly or
      explicitly appears.
      The sentence structure furnishes the basic definition of a
term. "Primaries" here is used in its political sense, not as "major
colors" or one of the other standard definitions possible for the word.
      Often direct equations can be found. The word "is" in all its
      forms means "equals." Checking the work for such direct associations
      (or direct negations: "is not") is highly useful in developing the
      analysis. Here, since primaries are identified with tarot cards, ref-
      erences to either cards or primaries belong in the same equational
      structure, which will be shown by listing them under the same title in
      the concordance.
      The text is thus systematically analyzed, studying each term in
      relation to its language structure in its immediate context and in re-
      lation to its general context in the paragraph or story as a whole.
   b. Make a list of equations, demonstrating the associations
      among terms or sets of terms for this author.
      The examination of the text shows the plus or minus relation-
      ship of the terms to other elements in the article. The title, "Cal-
      ifornia's Vote for Reform," shows that this primary is being considered
in the article as a good thing. Thus, by the linking of foretelling to this promising sign, the article's positive and negative equational pattern, a continuum, is established. Primaries as tarot cards are a means toward clarifying the mystery of U.S. politics after Watergate; hence, the statement belongs in the Relative Clarity/Winning set.

Each term is entered into the lists in the concordance as the explication for its placement is developed and stated in the written analysis.

The process of analyzing and listing continues until all important relationships in the article are made clear. If the proposed underlying theme is correct, the terms listed will be shown to be functioning as amplifications of that theme.

The list of equations is demonstrated in short form by the concordance, and in fully explicated form in the written analysis.

Thus, the word choices of the writer contain and can be analyzed to reveal the underlying rhetorical intent upon which he hopes to achieve unanimity with the reader.

The question, however, remains: If the writer's "significant symbols" are unique to his own experience, given their import and positive or negative weighting in the article only by this underlying motivation, how can he hope the reader will perceive these unique meanings? How can these original connotations become the means of achieving identification with a wide variety of readers who differ from him? Burke asserts, with the symbolic interactionists, that key terms do receive a new, special impact from the personal history of whoever uses
them, of which the present writing is one manifestation. Language, Burke holds, carries the writer's evaluations with it by the very fact of its roots in the personality. 27

How, then, is communication possible?

Part of the answer lies in the grammatical structure of the language. Methods of Rhetorical Criticism: A Twentieth Century Approach by Robert L. Scott and Bernard L. Brock, hereafter referred to as the Scott and Brock text, contains a chapter on grammatical-syntactical analysis. The section includes the essay "Some Rhetorical Aspects of Grammatical Categories" by Richard M. Weaver. He states:

All students of language concede to it a certain public character. Insofar as it serves in communication, it is a publicly-agreed-upon thing; and when one passes the outer limits of the agreement, one abandons comprehensibility. 28

Elsewhere he noted:

It has been impossible to show that grammar is determined by the "best people" or by the pedants, or by any other presumptive authority, and this is the more reason for saying that it incorporates the people as a whole. 29

Grammatical forms, then, furnish one consistent source of information on which an analysis can be based.

Even more important, the syntactical structure of a language provides a consistent underlying pattern which helps the reader to derive the meanings of unfamiliar elements. Weaver explains:

Because a sentence form exists in most if not all languages, there is some ground to suppose that it reflects a necessary operation of the mind. In this complete operation the mind is taking two or more classes and uniting them at least to the extent at which they share in a formal unity. 30

The principle of language formation is thus shown to be that of association. Naming words are linked to action words; qualifiers are
often associated with these two basic elements to compose the unit of meaning referred to as a sentence. Thus the mind, gathering verbal structures together to construct a coherent whole, moves from the "knowns" of grammatical forms, basic vocabulary and syntactical structure to the previously unformulated creation of the new statement. These "knowns" also furnish a basis for the reader to acquire these new meanings. As Weaver points out, "The features present of word classification and word position cause us to look for meaning along certain lines."31

Thus, if an unfamiliar term stands in the syntactical place common to a noun, it will at least tentatively be read as a noun. Similarly, words located in places common to other parts of speech will be assumed to be functioning as those parts of speech. The word "play," for example, can be a noun, verb or adjective, with several widely different meanings possible for each of these forms. Only its location plus the other verbal forms in its context, immediate and overall, can show its actual meaning in any given occurrence. Since many words in any communication have two or more possible previously defined meanings, plus a possible newly acquired meaning, the reader's ability to understand depends upon the mind's habitual tendency to identify the appropriate meaning of the word by its context. The sentence, too, means what it does only in relation to the meaning of the work as a whole.

As Burke points out, the phrase "He said 'yes'" means almost nothing unless the situation and remarks preceding it are known. Likewise, each composition is an answer to a question posed by the situation
which called for the creation of the work.\textsuperscript{32}

Thus, the work itself is produced by its context in the real interactive situation just as the next sentence is called forth by those that preceded it and the knowledge of those which will have to follow it. But the principle of deriving meaning from context is applicable to all these elements of linguistic communication.

This same pattern of thought makes it possible for the reader to identify ironic usages and connotations. It is our ability to use grammar and context in this manner, Weaver says, that makes it possible for us to understand modern poetry, where words are used in highly unique ways.\textsuperscript{33}

Yet another factor helps the person looking for connotations within the newsmagazine article under study here. By the principle of identification, the writer wishes his point of view to be shared by the reader. The strategies he chooses, then, must be accessible to the reader to some pronounced degree. Therefore, if the article's implications are to be recognized, implicitly or explicitly, by members of a widely disparate audience numbering in the millions, basic metaphors must be drawn from the common fund of symbols known to most members of the American culture. Only these common symbolic meanings—when used as a central concept—can be safely implied. Other less familiar comparisons have to be stated directly. Thus, if an article wants to refer to Jerry Brown as "Torquemada among the heretics," it must say so explicitly. If, however, it wishes to compare him to Don Quixote, it has chosen a familiar character, made so by a recent musical play
and a popular song. It need only refer to Brown's plans as "an impossible dream" and present him as "preparing to do battle" in sentences not far from each other on the same page. It can be assumed that the reader's common fund of symbols and his tendency to associate meanings will pull the implication together in his mind. Such common symbols, it should be noted, are also readily accessible to the researcher.

Weaver makes Burke's assertion about situational context specific to language: "It is arguable that the rhetoric of any piece is dependent upon its total intention, and that consequently no single sentence can be appraised apart from the tendency of the whole discourse."\(^\text{34}\)

This means the standard reader seeks the meaning of each factor within the work while searching, through the process of association, for the work's overall import, to which to relate and by which to verify the projected separate meanings by virtue of their "fittingness" within the whole.

This process is precisely what Burke's method says the researcher must do more systematically and more intensively in order to specify the total and associated meanings of a work. The method is thus seen to be based on what Weaver describes as the basic processes of language formation and meaning attainment. The ability to derive the new meanings in the articles under analysis here is thus available to some degree to any proficient reader of the language. The difference between casual reading and careful analysis is one of degree, not of kind.

A further point about forming the concordance can be included
here in relation to finding meanings by context. Since the terms of a work are qualified by all of what has preceded them and by all of what follows, the inclusion of other elements may substantially affect the meaning a term seemed to have when first encountered in the work. For instance, the term "forged" was used at the beginning of an article in the sense of "created something new," referring to Jerry Brown's forming of a "less-politics-is-better" presidential campaign. However, the implications built up by the article suggested by its end that Brown's campaign may have been carefully planned to seem less political than it was in fact. From this overall implication of the article the word "forged" thus takes on the sense of "fabricated," as in forging counterfeit money. Since the work forms a unit in the reader's mind, the secondary meaning can be attached to the word after the fact of reading.

As this example shows, there is clearly no way to tell in advance of the actual textual analysis what the full import of "forged," or of other terms, might be. This is an additional reason why the forming of the concordance and the writing of the full explication of the text must be parallel and reciprocal operations. One cannot pre­cede the other.

The Scott and Brock text presents an explication using Kenneth Burke's method as an example of grammatical-syntactical analysis.

Entitled "'War Message,' December 8, 1941: An Approach to Language," the analysis is written by its author, Hermann Stelzner, as a description of how Burke's method operates on short nonfiction works. His explanation provides the model for the approach to Burkean analysis employed in this study.
Stelzner clarifies Burke's assertion that language is, if rhetorical, necessarily dialectic. Thus, in his analytic structure, the terms of a work are arranged along a continuum, balanced by opposing terms either explicitly shown in the article or implied.

Stelzner emphasizes that this dialectical nature of any discourse is shown in the structure of the work itself:

The objective structure of a work is a composite of subtly balanced meanings; all language is weighted toward something, hence away from something; for something; hence opposed to something. An arrangement of the balanced meanings of an address describes the relationships of the topics discussed by the speaker.  

Stelzner points out that this arrangement in itself does not explicate this relationship. This explication is accomplished by discussing the dynamics of the language in the account, which reveals the relative weight of each pole in the balance of meaning as well as how the weighting and relationships among terms were rhetorically achieved.

Though Stelzner here speaks of the concordance and the written analysis as being performed in two operations, nevertheless the written analysis presents the mental process by which the researcher identifies which terms are to be placed in the concordance. This can be written down after the fact if the researcher so chooses.

Stelzner's pattern of explication closely parallels that of Burke in his analysis of Hitler's "Battle," also nonfiction. Most of Burke's analyses are of fictional works. Stelzner's analysis was prepared as a teaching model, and its procedure is therefore more explicit and more useful here. Burke's analysis of "Battle" does not include
his concordance.

Locating key terms in nonfiction, especially in short works written in a fairly straightforward style, is a much simpler task than seeking them out through the complexities of a longer fictional work. If searching for key terms in a novel is like tracking animals in a jungle, looking for key terms in shorter nonfiction is like tracking animals in a zoo. Since the ostensible purpose of nonfiction is to share information on a topic more or less directly, though its underlying attitude may be fairly subtle, at least part of its central theme is usually located in its title. Thus, if an article says it is talking about Jerry Brown, it is safe to assume that the symbolic pattern of the work will be grouped under a heading which includes his name. Since these articles are basically informal essays, as with any essay the article serves as an extended definition of its topic under one viewpoint. Therefore, the tentative title for each analysis could be shown as: "Jerry Brown is _______." The attributions provided by the text would then "add up" to the single attitude under which the article presented Brown to its readers.

Burke notes the advantage of being given an accurate title: "If a researcher is looking for some particular topic, of course there is no problem of selection."37

Elsewhere he comments: "When an author himself provides sub-title (and thus threatens to deprive the critic of certain delightful exercisings) at least the critic can experimentally shuttle, in looking for particular equivalents where the titles are general, and vice versa."38
Burke raises the question of whether these patterns of associations are to be found in all authors, and whether a writer could, if he chose, avoid getting his connotations into his work. He answers:

A man organizes an essay. He necessarily chooses certain pivotal verbalizations because they appeal to him. Though the words are, on their surface, neutral, they fit together into an organized, interdependent whole precisely because of their common stake in some unifying attitude of his. We may get cues prompting us to discern the underlying emotional connotations of words that even the user may consider merely "scientific" or "neutral." 39

Burke points out: "This analysis reaches, beneath an author's official 'front,' the level at which a lie is impossible. If a man's virtuous characters are dull, and his wicked characters are done vigorously, his art has voted for the wicked ones. 40

Joseph Webb, commenting on Burke's method, notes that in its ability to penetrate seemingly objective and factual writing for the connotations the writer has inevitably placed there, this methodology is highly useful for getting at meaning in journalistic compositions. 41

Burke's method, then, is addressed to the problem of unique meanings in language, but it is concerned with the patterns of relationships signified by the sets of terms which emerge from the study of the work rather than with the individual words. 42

Again: It is these patterns of relationship, the writer's unique formations of concepts and values, that generate the choice of terms used; and since the terms used spring from a common source in the writer's motivational system, the relationships among them can be identified and their generating concept determined. Recognizing meanings unique to the work necessarily relies on procedures governed by the basic rules of language formation and meaning attainment.
A person's concepts and values are formed by human experience. Changes in the human condition, especially strikingly new situations or events, correspondingly engender new concepts within persons. These then generate new language choices, designated in response to the new situation.

The unexpected advance of Jerry Brown to national prominence, the measuring of this highly unusual person as a potential President, is one such novel situation.

Burke's method, therefore, is ideally suited to an analysis of the selected magazine coverage. It can illuminate how these magazines conceptualized Jerry Brown and how they attempted, through their language choices, to achieve identification with their readers on these concepts.

Since Time and Newsweek present consistent, recognizable perspectives on national events to their readers, even though some of the articles being analyzed are written under the byline of a single person the method will operate to define the stance taken by each periodical in its efforts to portray Jerry Brown to the public.

Note on the Use of Quotation Marks

In the written analyses, standard double quotation marks are used where the text of the article employed them. To avoid confusion, the researcher's discussion of language elements are enclosed in single quotes.
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CHAPTER IV

ARTICLES, CONCORDANCES AND EXPLANATIONS

MAGAZINE ARTICLES TO BE ANALYZED IN THIS STUDY

*Time* published nine articles on Edmund G. Brown, Jr. from July of 1974 through July of 1976. *Newsweek* published eight during the same time period. These dates represent Brown's emergence as a nationally recognized public figure due to his running for the governorship of California to the end of the 1976 Democratic National Convention, by which time his status as a national figure was established. The articles, then, cover the period of this ascendance, during which the nation had its first chance to make up its mind about who and what kind of person he was and what his potential for national leadership might be.

The coverage of these newsmagazines has been chosen for study due to their extensive readership numbering in the millions, as has been noted, and because both are regularly read as news sources by other reporters covering national politics. Their potential for contributing to a widespread and possibly national viewpoint on Jerry Brown is therefore considerable. The articles to be analyzed are listed below:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California's Vote for Reform</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>17-18</td>
<td>6/17/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Key Contests Revisited</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>11/4/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reagan? Wallace? No, Brown</td>
<td>Jess Cook</td>
<td>33-4</td>
<td>4/14/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to Live with Our Limits</td>
<td>Jess Cook</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12/8/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Brown vs. The Schools</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1/28/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown: How the Guru Governs</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td>4/26/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown: Test by Rorschach</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>5/31/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Has Changed</td>
<td>Jess Cook, ed.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5/31/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stampede to Carter</td>
<td>none given</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6/21/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Brown Goes to Town</td>
<td>Shana Alexander</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11/25/74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Say-Nay Politics</td>
<td>Larry Martz</td>
<td>23,25</td>
<td>6/9/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful</td>
<td>Peter Goldman</td>
<td>47,50</td>
<td>12/15/75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Gerald C. Lubenow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry Brown Does His Thing</td>
<td>Susan Fraker</td>
<td>18,23</td>
<td>4/19/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>with Gerald C. Lubenow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Newest Face of '76</td>
<td>Tom Mathews, Stephan Lesher, Gerald C. Lubenow, Martin Kasindorf</td>
<td>23-25</td>
<td>5/31/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'I Have the Best Record in the Country'</td>
<td>Stephan Lesher</td>
<td>24-25</td>
<td>5/31/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit (Finally) Brown</td>
<td>Martin Kasindorf</td>
<td>21-22</td>
<td>6/28/76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End of the Road</td>
<td>Martin Kasindorf</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>7/26/76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CONCORDANCES

The words, phrases and sentences which appear in the concordance for each article are the key terms of the work. A key term is one which is used by the writer to signify the point of view on which he hoped to achieve identification with the reader.

Most of the terms found in these articles are amplifications of the central concept, that is, terms which while dissimilar are related by reason of their membership in a general pattern of meaning which "adds up" to the concept being expressed.

The fact that the work's key terms can be demonstrated as in use to support the writer's central attitude verifies that that viewpoint is in fact the central attitude of the work. Thus, a researcher who would propose a different central attitude and who would similarly analyze the work in order to locate key terms which function to carry out that attitude, would find few or none.

As Stelzner points out, for every positive term a negative term is either stated in the text or implied, and vice-versa. This balancing term may be stated in an equivalent manner. One shows the chosen attitude of the writer toward the topic, the other its opposite. The titles for these positive and negative aspects of the central image form the polarities of a continuum. Where no equivalent statement is present in the text, the implied balancing term is written in parentheses in the opposing position. Each concordance is read across the page, beginning with the positive or negative term and reading its opposite before continuing down the columns.
Because the key terms are left in the order of the occurrence in the text, the concordance also shows in graphic form the structural pattern of the work.

**THE EXPLICATIONS**

The written analysis of the article demonstrates how each term in the concordance is used in the text. It manifests the process of analysis by which each term was placed in the concordance. As such, it is the concordance in its fully extended form. Its purpose, clarifying the ways in which the context of each key term functions to give it its membership in the concordance and its positive or negative weighting, involves discussing how the language of the article functions in determining the membership and weighting.

**THE INDEX**

The index, listed by Burke and Rueckert as the first step in the analytic process, is a preliminary step toward the actual analysis. Its purpose is to sort out the words used sufficiently to get past various possible surface meanings, using the work's partial and total contexts as the bases for the search, in order to identify the first few clear groupings which point to the theme.

The index, then, lists any term which the language structure of the story seems to indicate may have symbolic significance. In effect, this includes nearly all the words in the story. Many of these words prove, in the course of further analysis, to be supportive of the key terms rather than key terms themselves, and are thus not entered into the concordance.
The index is then a scratchwork phase in the process. What is valuable in the index is selected out and placed in the concordance. Therefore, only one index, that for the first *Time* story analyzed, is included here as an example. The words and phrases are shown in a single undifferentiated list because of this preliminary stage of the analysis the central concept and its polarities have not yet been determined.

**Index for "California's Vote for Reform," Time, June 17, 1974**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primaries</th>
<th>youthful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>are</td>
<td>good-looking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tarot cards</td>
<td>enough experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of</td>
<td>lesser offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>politics</td>
<td>appear knowledgeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but</td>
<td>but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experts</td>
<td>sufficiently offbeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>to seem fresh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>try to read them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this roiled year</td>
<td>Brown now California's Secretary of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are having problems of perception.</td>
<td>17 Democratic opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voters</td>
<td>also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renominating</td>
<td>one large advantage -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incumbent</td>
<td>son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressmen</td>
<td>namesake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the bushel</td>
<td>of Edmund G. (&quot;Pat&quot;) Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while</td>
<td>popular former Governor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rejecting</td>
<td>&quot;If my name were Smith,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some other officeholders</td>
<td>the son</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>out of hand.</td>
<td>concedes,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California primary</td>
<td>&quot;I wouldn't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>probably</td>
<td>be in this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>most revealing</td>
<td>race.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so far.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gubernatorial races</td>
<td>Early polls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in both parties</td>
<td>show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-corruption referendum</td>
<td>some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unprecedented scope and complexity</td>
<td>Democrats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>actually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Californians seem to be saying standoffish toward all candidates. At the same time voters are enthusiastic about fundamental political reform. Candidates compete to succeed Ronald Reagan, Democrat Edmund G. Brown, Jr., 36, Republican Houston Flournoy, 44, and others are atypical politicians for atypical year.

Jerry Brown thought Jerry Brown was his father. Yet Jerry Brown hardly resembles his bluff, amiable father. Brown's son is a bachelor and cool, withdrawn and once a Jesuit seminarian. One rare flash of humor is Brown's best joke: "Who else in the race has had eight years of Latin and four years of Greek?"

Brown cracked that Jesuit schooling had given unique qualifications for office. After Yale Law School Brown became involved with civil rights movement and then the civil rights movement was his father's.
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California’s Vote for Reform

Primaries are the tarot cards of politics, but experts who try to read them in this roiled year are having problems of perception. The voters have been renominating incumbent Congressmen by the bushel while rejecting some other experienced officeholders out of hand. Last week’s California primary was probably the most revealing so far. With gubernatorial races in both parties and an anti-corruption referendum of unprecedented scope and complexity, Californians seemed to be saying that they are sickened toward all candidates. At the same time, the voters are enthusiastic about fundamental political reform.

The two candidates who will now compete to succeed Ronald Reagan (Democrat Edmund G. Brown Jr., 36, and Republican Houston Flournoy, 44) both have the advantage of being atypical politicians in an atypical year. Youthful and good-looking, they have enough experience in lesser offices to appear knowledgeable but are sufficiently offbeat to seem fresh.

Brown, now California’s secretary of state, had 17 Democratic opponents. He also had one large advantage—he is the son and namesake of Edmund G. (“Pat”) Brown, a popular former Governor (1958-66). “If my name were Smith,” the son concede, “I wouldn’t be in this race.” Early polls showed that some Democrats actually thought Jerry Brown was his father.

Yet Jerry Brown hardly resembles his bluff, amiable father. The son is a bachelor, cool and withdrawn, who was once a Jesuit seminarian. In one of his rare flashes of humor, Brown cracked that his Jesuit schooling had given him unique qualifications for office: “Who else in the race has had eight years of Latin and four of Greek?”

After Yale Law School, Brown became involved in the civil rights and peace movements of the early ’60s. He backed Eugene McCarthy in his bid for the presidency. Brown became secretary of state in 1970, the only Democrat to win the state level that year. He has transformed that obscure office into a political force by pushing young-voter registration and pressing enforcement of campaign-disclosure laws. It was at Brown’s urging that his staff, which is charged with supervising notaries, unearthed the fact that the deed of gift for President Nixon’s vice-presidential papers to the National Archives had been predated (and notarized) by Nixon lawyer Frank DeMarco.

Political pros considered Brown too inexperienced and unbending to survive a tough campaign against such presumed heavyweights as San Francisco Mayor Joseph Alioto and Assembly Speaker Robert Moretti. But Alioto got bogged down in municipal and marital strife while Moretti waged an inept campaign. Brown, talking vaguely about bringing a “new spirit” to Sacramento, campaigned on a safe liberal platform that stressed open government, campaign reform, and improved education and social benefits. In the end Brown won with 38% of the Democratic vote.

Easy Manner. When he entered the G.O.P. race last fall, State Controller Houston Flournoy was familiar chiefly to Californians who received tax refunds in envelopes bearing his name. Former Peace Corps Director Joseph Blatchford, Flournoy’s Los Angeles County campaign chairman, complained that many people thought the candidate “was a guy from Houston who wants to put Flournoy in the water.” Flournoy was actually born in New York City and educated at Cornell and Princeton, where he earned a doctorate in political science. He came to California in
1957 to join the political-science faculty at Pomona College and entered politics as a state assemblyman in 1960. In three two-year terms Flournoy allied himself with the liberal Republican minority. He never became part of the dominant Reagan faction, even after winning the controller’s post in 1966. Flournoy’s amiable grin and easy manner are assets, but even well-wishers acknowledge that his performance as a candidate has been bland. His aides attempted to make that a virtue, emphasizing his insistence on spending Sundays at home with his blonde wife Midge and their three children. But Flournoy was helped most by his opponents’ problems. A number of formidable early contenders decided not to run. Though a total of six remained in the contest, Flournoy’s main rival was Lieutenant Governor Ed Reinecke, who led the polls until his indictment earlier this year for perjury in connection with his testimony before the Watergate grand jury. Reinecke maintains that he is innocent, but the indictment was a fatal blow. Flournoy, campaigning mostly on his governmental experience, ended up with 63% of the vote.

One of the few important policy differences between Flournoy and Brown came over Proposition 9, the pioneering campaign-reform initiative that won by an overwhelming 70% majority despite fierce opposition from organized labor, big business and several politicians. Flournoy was against it while Brown supported the measure vehemently.

The new code, which becomes a part of the constitution in January, sets up tight registration and reporting requirements for lobbyists, prohibits them from contributing to political campaigns, and limits the amount they can spend entertaining any elected official to $10 a month—"enough for two hamburgers and a Coke," says Brown. In addition, the measure requires financial disclosure for all elected officials and sets limitations on campaign spending.

The drive for passage of Proposition 9 was spearheaded by the 65,000-member California chapter of Common Cause, which circulated 2.5 million pieces of literature and spent $425,000 on an advertising campaign. Said San Diego Lawyer and Chapter Chairman Mike Walsh of the victory: "I think it says that Common Cause is now a force that has to be reckoned with in Sacramento. We've shown we can go to the mat with the most powerful interests in the state on an issue where there is direct popular support and win."

Brown’s chief problem will be his own hypertense persona. Says one Democratic Party pro acidly, "He’s only 36. He still has time to develop a personality." Flournoy and his aides intend to push Brown into early confrontations, including a series of television debates, hoping that familiarity with Brown will breed opposition. Brown intends to push back by tarring Flournoy as a "recycled Reagan" and by forcing him to take a stand on impeachment, which Flournoy has so far avoided doing. At the moment, Brown seems to be ahead. But it will be a long campaign in the nation’s most populous state and the only sure bet is that the next Governor will be handsome.
Concordance: California's Vote for Reform

Central image: Jerry Brown as powerful, hard-to-read symbol of political change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative Clarity/Winning</th>
<th>Relative Mystery/Losing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primaries are tarot cards of politics</td>
<td>(Primaries not tarot cards of politics)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>renominating incumbents</td>
<td>rejecting other experienced officeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the bushel</td>
<td>out of hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last week's</td>
<td>(distant past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California primary probably most revealing</td>
<td>(nation's other primaries unclear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-corruption referendum</td>
<td>unprecedented scope and complexity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are enthusiastic</td>
<td>seem to be standoffish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atypical politicians</td>
<td>(typical politicians)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enough experience</td>
<td>lesser offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youthful</td>
<td>(not youthful)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good-looking</td>
<td>(not good-looking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seem fresh</td>
<td>sufficiently offbeat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one large advantage</td>
<td>17 Democratic opponents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son and namesake:</td>
<td>son hardly resembles father:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>father</td>
<td>bachelor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bluff</td>
<td>cool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amiable</td>
<td>withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continual light)</td>
<td>flashes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continually open)</td>
<td>cracks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Brown:)</td>
<td>(Flournoy:)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformed public office</td>
<td>known for tax envelopes bearing his name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political force</td>
<td>easy manner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressing, urging, staff charged</td>
<td>bland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relaxed person (of Flournoy)</td>
<td>hypertense persona (of Brown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>political pros considered Brown</td>
<td>too inexperienced, unbending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The tarot deck contains 22 cards with symbolic pictures. The cards are symbols for good or bad elements or possibilities in human life. The symbolic content of the cards the subject receives foretells his fate. In the tarot deck, some symbols, good or bad, are stronger than others. Several less powerful "good" cards may offset a single strong "bad" one—or perhaps not; perhaps it's a draw, or the negative sign has an edge. Only life itself will tell.

The direct equation given between the tarot game and primary elections establish the article's principal concept or theme immediately and clearly. Primaries are presented as a political game of divination, where symbolic "cards," ballots by implication, are cast to give clues—but not specific meanings—about the future of the nation's political life.

In June 1974 pressure was mounting on President Richard M. Nixon to resign. Transcripts of Presidential conversations in the Oval Office had been printed in the papers and condemned by a prominent clergyman, as a Time magazine article sharing the page with the primaries story shows. It was a confused period when all the normal judgments about American politics, especially those implying that its checks and balances made it fail-safe, seemed to many to be falling apart.

When the times are peaceful and well-ordered, answers to problems are relatively easy to see; no extraordinary methods are called
on to identify them. In times of general and deep-running confusion, sometimes the human psyche, tired of its efforts to sort out largely illogical problems, yearns for simple answers, and is willing to look for them in "magical" ways.

In 1974, the Presidential father-figure had failed the nation; the light on the mountaintop had dimmed. An almost palpable gloom was present in the country. In this atmosphere, the image of a tarot game to foretell the nation's political future was a highly apt figure.

An inductive study of the text shows that the key terms of the article are grouped around the concepts of relative clarity, equated with "winning," and relative mystery or concealment, equated with "losing" or "failing."

The first sentence continues, "but experts who try to read them in this roiled year are having problems of perception." This directly sustains the image of the card game, indirectly echoed in the second sentence. Voters, the players of this game of fortune, are "renomini­ning incumbents by the bushel"--symbolism of affirming, collecting, wanting to save what is seen as good--"while rejecting some other experienced officeholders out of hand"--the image of discarding.

Including the word "experienced" here creates a sense of puzzle­ment: Why reject experienced people? No reason is given; the choice is mysterious. In these primaries, the cards were unclear.

But the article offers hope for clarifying the political mystery. "Last week's California primary was probably the most revealing so far."

The use of "last week's" provides the reader with a sense of
proximate time, close enough to the present so its relevance can be projected into the future. Linked to the rest of the sentence which offers a way out of the political darkness, "last week's" implies a sense of, not just this one hopeful sign, but the beginning of a just-noticed momentum which indicates a series of them. That sense is continued in "the most revealing so far." "Probably" signals conviction and assurance that indeed this hopeful sign's implications can be depended upon.

The word "California," though used necessarily here, also carries connotations that reinforce the forecasting theme. California, the nation's microcosm. California, land of radical new ideas. California, land where hippies protest standard politics and use tarot cards for divination. California, home of Richard M. Nixon--now become California, land of hopeful revelation, pointing the way back to clarity and integrity. The writer invites this set of associations by placing "California primary" at the beginning of the sentence.

The concepts and structure imply here: if hope can spring forth in California, the rest of the nation may also receive enlightenment. The word "revealed" carries the strong connotation of light, especially with "California" juxtaposed with "primary"--meaning first, ahead of the rest, in its connotation here also. The image here is one of a Western sunrise in the national political darkness. The symbolism places the California primary well within the clarity/winning side of the key term structure.

In a tarot reading, there are, strictly speaking, no winners or losers. The signs are relatively clear and positive about the subject's
future, or relatively mysterious or negative. Beware, the tarot image says, of appearances. What seems to be a strong symbol may, if viewed from a different aspect, reveal a weakness. What seems to show difficulty may represent success in an unexpected way.

California voters, for instance, are confronted during this primary balloting with an issue of "unprecedented scope and complexity," terms heavily weighted toward confusion and hopelessness, mirroring the overriding mood of the nation. But they have transformed it into an "anti-corruption referendum." The phrase shows utmost simplicity. Identify evil, corruption. Say you're against it. Place it on a ballot. Mark the box. And corruption disappears. "Referendum" used rather than "issue" or "measure" stresses the voters' choice, the power of the people, to right wrongs and reform their government. Voting is here shown to be, since the ballot evokes the idea, a "card game"—whose exercise contains power.

That these voters, who are enthusiastic about fundamental political reform, "seem to be saying they are standoffish toward all candidates" during the final days of Watergate, is to be expected. The players, who have demonstrated such good sense, control the game; they invest what belief and trust they wish in those to whom they allow authority. These voters, as it were, have their fate within their own hands.

Note the definite "are enthusiastic" versus "seem to be standoffish." The negative is not absolute; the candidates still have a chance to win with the voters. They may prove worthwhile despite the general mistrust of politicians in general.
In this game of relative signs of the times, what would normally be considered a minus may become a plus.

Democrat Edmund G. Brown, Jr. and Republican Houston Flournoy, candidates of their parties for the California governorship, "both have the advantage of being atypical politicians in an atypical year." Since both have this dubious but here positive quality, nobody is ahead. Other elements of the political game are also equal. Both are youthful and good-looking; both have "enough experience from lesser jobs to appear knowledgeable" (these voters, the "appear" implies, will not be fooled by appearances); and, another minus-become-plus, both are "sufficiently offbeat to seem fresh." But they only "seem" fresh. California voter skepticism shown again. The game may be difficulty and tricky, but they won't be taken in.

The focus of the article now shifts directly to Edmund G. Brown, Jr. who is introduced here as the one winner against 17 Democratic opponents—the one powerful force against the many weak ones, his great political strength shown by the contrast.

But the next section of the article sharply qualifies Brown's apparent strength: he also had one large advantage—he is the son and namesake of Edmund G. ("Pat") Brown, a "popular former Governor." In fact, the article says, early polls showed that some Democrats actually thought Jerry Brown was his father. Using the term "Democrats" avoids using "voters," which would be awkward; consistently, the California voters are shown to be the wise ones who will lead the country toward the light by their illuminating performance in the primary balloting. The thought is not to be compromised.
Once again, however, appearances are misleading. The writer presents a set of contrasts, the revealing/winning set clearly opposed by the concealing/losing terms. The son/namesake neither is his father (negation of total identity) nor is he very like his father (negation of close identity); in fact, he "hardly resembles" his father, described as "bluff and amiable" against the son's "cool and withdrawn." The outward-going term "father" is contrasted with the inward-turning "bachelor." This impression of personal concealment applied to Jerry Brown is reinforced strongly in the next sentences.

Brown is a "former Jesuit seminarian." If the term "Jesuit" no longer carries the full sense of intrigue it once connoted, yet it holds a sense of esoteric secrets, unavailable to non-initiates. The next sentence contains the most powerful impression of Brown in this article.

It reads:

"In one of his rare flashes of humor, Brown cracked that his Jesuit schooling had given him unique qualifications for office. 'Who else in the race has had eight years of Latin and four of Greek?'

The word pair "one" and "rare" contain terms which strongly reinforce each other, emphasizing to the reader the writer's impression of Brown. This centers on another word pair, "flashes" and "cracks"—images of bright light allowed to escape for the tiniest of moments, only to be solidly shut in once again. "Cracks" connotes something hard and solid, which can be opened and shut again; perhaps a stone fortress. The word "flashes" connotes lightning—a suggestion of great energy and power, potentially dangerous: lightning can "crack" things.
The image is of a closed, tightly guarded personality who opens up very seldom and very briefly. It is especially powerful because juxtaposed with the straightforward description of Brown as "cool and withdrawn" which was deliberately drawn to clearly exclude "bluff and amiable."

Brown is, however, pictured as being filled with blinding light--the "inner Brown" is brilliant, and intense. Brown's "crack," about his study of Latin and Greek, while made semi-facetiously, does in fact show the presence of a high intelligence, a genuine qualification for public office.

The image used—with all its strong connotations of possibly dangerous power, revealing, concealing, mixed with the impression of benevolence from the humor—refers back to the tarot game. Brown becomes a powerful, hard-to-read symbol in the attempt to foretell his nation's political course by scrutinizing the results of the California primary.

The section on Brown concludes, "In the end, Brown won (the Democratic gubernatorial nomination) with 38 per cent of the Democratic vote." One round of the divination game was over, the major contest for the governorship yet to come, with the odd sense of Brown winning with less than a majority (he won a plurality out of a field of 18) reinforcing the concealment/clarity theme.

The section on Brown in the article precedes that on Houston Flournoy, his Republican opponent. Flournoy is described as "bland"—no easy to see, in an open way, contrasted to Brown's self-concealment—but not interesting. As state controller, the article says, "he was
familiar chiefly to Californians who received tax refunds in envelopes bearing his name. Hardly an impressive presence, even though associated with the power of taxation and money.

In contrast Brown, in his equivalent position as secretary of state, had "transformed that obscure office into a political force." The sentence continues, describing changes Brown brought about by "pushing," "pressing," "urging." His staff is "charged" with their duties—a reference to Brown's 'high voltage.' So is "transformed," with its suggestion of alchemy further enhancing Brown's power in the occult card game. Brown as Merlin?

Flournoy's "insistence" is limited to his determination to spend Sundays with his family. He "and his aides" "intend to push" Brown into early confrontations, including televised debates. Brown "intends to push back"—this is a real contest now, more than just allegorical divination—by "forcing" Flournoy to take a stand on the impeachment of Richard Nixon, "which Flournoy has so far avoided doing."

Brown's symbols here are all on the clarity/winning side of the article's key terms, Flournoy's on the obscurity/losing.

But the final description of Brown is a direct reference to the closed, guarded personality. The writer says, "Brown's chief problem will be his own hypertense persona." "Hypertense" conveys again concealed, restrained power. The unusual choice of "persona" instead of "personality" once more suggests Brown as a symbol, a figure of power in the divination game—perhaps more figure than person. Directly following, one of the article's few quotes bears out the negative connotation: "Says one Democratic pro acidly, 'He's only 36. He still has
time to develop a personality.'"

The article concludes:

"At the moment, Brown seems to be ahead. But it will be a long campaign in the nation's most populous state and the only sure bet is that the next Governor will be handsome."

The emphasis on Brown's momentary lead shifts the focus back to the primary as divination game, in conjunction with the reference to a "sure bet." The reference to the next Governor as handsome reinforces the connection: the youth-vitality-beauty theme is strongly present in the tarot deck's "good" symbols, and here--as in the earlier sharing of the same terms--it is shown to be the quality of both: two good men, each with the potential for leading the state out of the political darkness. Brown's winning the Democratic choice has already been the first glimmer of hope.

Describing the state here as "most populous" suggests it as representative of the country, giving the impact of its tarot game/primary contest national significance, which returns the article to its opening theme: the California primary is probably a sign of hope for the nation.

SUMMARY: "California's Vote for Reform"

Attitude toward Edmund G. Brown, Jr.: **qualified negative**

How Shown: clearly implied

In this article, the key terms used to describe Jerry Brown's personality are located within the negatively-weighted set under the heading "Relative Mystery/Losing." Among them are the terms "bachelor,
cool, withdrawn" and the phrase, "hypertense persona." The terms
"flashes" and "cracked," key words in a figure used to describe what
the article shows to be Brown's tightly closed personality, are also
located in the negative set. All the terms for Brown in the positive
set are terms for Brown's political ability rather than for positive
personality attributes. The general theme of the article has the
California voters choosing between two basically good men for the gov­
ernorship, but the evaluation concerning Brown, as the terms in the
"Relative Clarity/Winning" set show, is based on political qualities.
Nevertheless, this serves to qualify the negative view of his personal­
ity, which is the stronger of the two images of him in the article.

The article's direct statement, "Brown's chief problem will be
his own hypertense persona" clearly implies the article's overall nega­
tive attitude toward Brown. It is less than a completely direct state­
ment since the tone of political hopefulness in the article somewhat
obscures the full impact of the buildup of the negative connotations
attached to terms for Brown's personality. The use of the future tense
in the statement and the attribution of the idea to an acid remark by
an unnamed Democratic pro also serve to deflect the reader's attention
from the fact that this is the article's view as well.
THE ELECTIONS

Four Key Contests Revisited

Among the nation's political races, some, by reason of the stakes involved, or the personalities engaged, are particularly significant. Four of these critical contests are revisited by TIME on election eve, following an assessment earlier in the campaign (Oct. 21).

California

BROWN v. FLOURNOY In another year, facing an opponent with a less familiar name, Houston I. ("Hugh") Flournoy, 45, might have been a different candidate in a different kind of race. But in 1974, he has trouble arousing excitement in the electorate. "There hasn't been a passionate issue in this campaign," he declares. Nor does he display much passion himself except in infrequent face-to-face encounters with Edmund G. ("Jerry") Brown Jr., 36, in which he emerges as a match for the front runner. "Sometimes I wish I had an electric prod," says a Flournoy staffer. "Hugh is so good. But he comes on like Sominex."

His campaign style is leisurely, relaxed, almost diffident. "I don't have anything against passion," explains the former political science professor. "I just happen to be more committed to reason as a basis on which campaigns ought to be fought." Last week he invaded politically hostile territory: a medical center in Watts. Dutifully following the guided tour, he was wary of seizing many hands. Asked why he did not take the opportunity to press more flesh, he shrugged: "The patients were there for medical care, not political therapy."

Avoiding far-right positions on crime or welfare, he conceives of himself as a moderate Republican in the tradition of former Governor Earl Warren; he calls for a state land-use plan and a full-time state air-pollution control board. But the G.O.P. base in California has considerably contracted under the impact of Watergate. Flournoy has had to devote much of the campaign to separating his own candidacy from the national party, while Brown continues to link the two. In one of his television spots, Flournoy tells viewers: "My name is Houston Flournoy. Houston Flournoy. I repeat my name because Jerry Brown seems to be running against Ronald Reagan and Richard Nixon."

Brown, meanwhile, is coasting to what he expects to be an easy victory in November. Still well ahead in the polls, he schedules almost no appear-
ances before noon. Last week he was once again ignoring Flournoy as he attacked more inviting targets. With puritan outrage, he assailed as a modern-day Taj Mahal the new $1.3 million Governor's mansion that is being built at the same time that Reagan vetoed a $500 million housing bond issue. Flournoy supported the housing program, but his moderate views on the issues—not very far removed from Brown's—are all but lost in the general revulsion against Republicanism.
Concordance: Brown v. Flournoy

Central image: love-hate relationship

**Marital**
- facing an opponent
- Houston I. ("Hugh") Flournoy
- no passionate issue in campaign
- emerges as a match
- devote to separating image
- (not coasting)
- (many appearances)
- (not ignoring Brown)
- (former inviting target for Brown)
- (no puritan outrage)
- committed to reason
- Taj Mahal
- moderate views on the issues, not very far removed from Brown's

**Martial**
- opponent
- "with less familiar name"
- face-to-face encounters with Brown
- front runner
- continues to link the two
- coasting to easy victory
- no appearances before noon
- once again ignoring Flournoy
- attacked more inviting targets
- puritan outrage
- assailed
- governor's mansion as modern-day Taj Mahal
- (Brown ignores Flournoy's similar positions)

This four-paragraph section is part of a general article on gubernatorial races around the nation being held in November of 1974.

The imagery in this article, as a preliminary reading and analysis of key terms showed, is centered around the basic concept of, if not a marriage, then a long-term love affair. This is suggested even by the title (though by itself it conveys little) when read in context with the rest of the article, if one concedes the relative frequency of marital fights.

The Brown-Flournoy relationship is thus not wholly antagonistic, though it is certainly troubled.

The marital-martial article begins,

"In another year, facing an opponent with a less familiar name, Houston I. ("Hugh") Flournoy, 45, might have been a different candidate in a different race," which echoes, "If she had married a different man, she might have been an entirely different woman. . . ."

Flournoy is thus established as a good, decent person, enduring, with good grace, the unfortunate situation in which Fate has placed him. The "might have been" suggests it is already too late to change things. Flournoy is therefore shown in a passive role in terms of Jerry Brown. Referring to Brown as Flournoy's "opponent," and not naming him otherwise in the opening, casts him in the role of aggressor. But his power over Flournoy, though very real, nevertheless comes not from any intrinsic quality. He has this power only because of his "familiar name." A marital echo is invoked here also: a woman may
feel limited by being overshadowed by her husband's name. Suppressing Brown's name itself in this context has the effect of removing the good Flournoy from this overshadowing influence so he can be seen as he really is.

The article's second sentence reads:

"But in 1974, he has trouble arousing excitement in the electorate. 'There hasn't been a passionate issue in this campaign,' he declares."

The sexual imagery is clear enough. So are the 'implications' for the Brown-Flournoy relationship: It's breaking up. The unappreciated Flournoy seeks to woo the voters, but he is losing there, too: they are unresponsive to his advances.

The third sentence reads:

"Nor does he display much passion himself except in infrequent face-to-face encounters with Edmund G. ("Jerry") Brown Jr., 36, in which he emerges as a match for the front runner."

So the old relationship can still stir him. Note the use of "encounters" rather than other choices such as "exchanges" or "discussions." The use of "emerges" reinforces the image of Flournoy as the passive, oppressed member; yet his power is merely overshadowed, not eliminated. "Match" here fits both aspects of the marital-martial theme: match as quasi-marriage, match as equal opponent in a fight.

In the magazine, the same love-hate theme is reinforced by an accompanying photograph of the two candidates shaking hands after a debate.
It is also notable that throughout the article, Flournoy is quoted four times, each time speaking in the first person, as "'I don't have anything against passion,' explains the former political science teacher. 'I just happen to be more committed to reason as a basis on which campaigns ought to be fought.'" The effect is to make the reader Flournoy's confidant concerning this distressed relationship with Brown in the gubernatorial campaign. Brown is not quoted at all.

The imagery continues. "Flournoy has had to devote (marital image) much of the campaign to separating (martial image) his own candidacy from the national party." Flournoy is protesting his political purity against charges of being overly friendly with the disgraced Republican incumbent of the White House--while "Brown continues to link the two."

Again, Brown is pictured as oppressor, deliberately attempting to sully Flournoy's 'good name,' suggesting that the voters should reject him on the basis of his supposedly lost political virtue.

The next sentence about Brown reads:

"Brown, meanwhile, is coasting to what he expects to be an easy victory in November."

Brown, confident the voters will reject Flournoy, is pictured here as smugly sure of his own success in winning their favor. Brown can relax; he has made sure Flournoy has to do all the work, the article imples:

"Still well ahead in the polls, he schedules almost no appearances before noon."

The choice of "appearances" here rather than "speeches" or
"meetings" suggests not being around to be seen. Brown is the indolent spouse who sleeps late while the other toils.

"Appearances" also echoes the "familiar name" of the article's first sentence, suggesting Brown as relying on his 'celebrity' status for his success. Taken altogether, the image is one of a spoiled Hollywood star, used to being catered to by a loyal, neglected spouse.

The sentence following reads:

"Last week he was once again ignoring Flournoy as he attacked more inviting targets."

Brown's 'neglect' of Flournoy, as the article's imagery shows it, thus becomes even more studied and deliberate. To "ignore" someone, far from being passive unawareness, is an act of hostility. And Brown is doing it "once again."

The second independent clause, "as he attacked more inviting targets," reinforces the sense of Brown's 'hostile attitude,' which has been building throughout the article. The targets appeal to Brown—they are "inviting." Thus they are not necessarily genuine problems at all. And, since they are "more inviting," Flournoy has, until now, been the "inviting target" for Brown, the aggressor-without-cause. Thus, the image of Brown has been carefully prepared for the final view of him in the article:

"With puritan outrage, he assailed as a modern-day Taj Mahal the new $1.3 million Governor's mansion that is being built at the same time that Reagan vetoed a $500 million housing bond issue."

The previous paragraphs have already constructed the impression that Brown's "attacks" are groundless. The choice of "outrage" and
"assailed," both denoting anger at its extreme, serve, within the established love-hate imagery, to compare Brown to an hysterically angry spouse, emotional past what the objective substance of the disagreement called for.

The image refers back to Flournoy's quote on being "committed to reason as a basis on which campaigns ought to be fought," further reinforcing, by contrast, Flournoy as reasonable and good, Brown as aggressive.

The words "Taj Mahal" are Brown's own word choices in reference to the new Governor's mansion, used ironically to indicate his view of its extravagance. Since the Taj Mahal was in fact built by a Shah of Iran for a dearly loved wife, the choice of the term "puritan" here is a direct contrast, not to Brown's comment on state extravagance, but to the outpouring of love it--the real Taj Mahal--represents. "Puritan" suggests severity, absence of joy, frowning on pleasure--implying that Brown subscribes to this view of life and rejects the new building out of narrowness. Brown's criticism is shown as stemming from misplaced righteousness, and is therefore discredited.

This "assailing" of a symbol of extravagance motivated by "puritan outrage" also effectively casts Jerry Brown in the role of Don Quixote.

The reference to Reagan's veto of a "$500 million housing bond" next to the $1.5 million for the new Governor's mansion minimizes the mansion's cost, giving added weight to the implication that Brown is being unreasonable.

Houston Flournoy, however, "supported the housing program, but
his moderate view on the issues—not very far removed from Brown's—are all but lost in the general revulsion against Republicanism."

This statement implies that Brown, busy "attacking inviting targets," is ignoring the real issue of the campaign: where Flournoy stands on the issues. If these are "not very far removed from Brown's," Brown should be able to see them; but, the article suggests, he is too occupied expressing his "general revulsion against Republicanism" by his "assailing" of Reagan's Governor's mansion project.

Brown's 'emotional outburst' against the "Taj Mahal" as Flournoy stands patiently by with his "moderate views" also reinforces the image of the love-hate relationship: the beautiful symbol of married love is attacked while the 'real issues' of the Brown-Flournoy relationship in the gubernatorial campaign are ignored.

SUMMARY: "Brown versus Flournoy" (in "Four Key Contests")

Attitude: negative
How shown: implied

In this article the central marital-martial image parallels the announced campaign contest approach, the opposition between Brown and Flournoy in the race for the California governorship. Terms such as "no passionate issue" in the campaign, and "face-to-face encounters with Brown" are shown by the context to establish this love-hate image. Brown is pictured as an indolent star by terms such as "with a less famous name" used as a reference to Flournoy's having been overshadowed by Brown, and "no appearances before noon" regarding Brown's campaign schedule. Flournoy is "facing an opponent," pictured thus as the
passive member, "committed to reason" as opposed to Brown's "assailing" of the governor's mansion. The image of Brown here builds very subtly to a strongly negative one by the end of the article.

Because the overall context of the article is one containing reports of several governorship races and because the imagery works equally well for the article's announced topic, this negative image is hard to see.
GOVERNORS

Reagan? Wallace? No, Brown

Democratic Political Consultant Joe Cerrell was needling Donald Livingston, a member of former California Governor Ronald Reagan's cabinet. "Reagan must be ecstatic about his successor," joshed Cerrell. "No," Livingston retorted, "he thinks Jerry Brown has gone too far to the right."

If Democrat Brown, 37, bewildered people when he was running for Governor, he dumbsfounds them now. Considered by opponents to be an unpredictable sort who would promote all kinds of costly innovations, Brown preaches frugality and the limits of government as much as the conservative Reagan ever did. In part, dwindling revenues in a recession year have forced him to hold down the budget. The same dilemma confronts many other governors (see box following page). But Brown takes pride in his restraint, as if he were doing people a favor that they scarcely realize. Too much government, he maintains, has been bad for them. "I think you've got to focus on individual accountability," says the onetime Jesuit seminarian, "you just can't get everything without pain and suffering or without having to pay a price. There is no such thing as a free ride anywhere."

No Mansions. Brown's spare approach is most apparent in his life-style in office. The conservative Reagan had operated in rather sumptuous fashion; he traveled in a Cessna jet or in limousines guarded by a squad of highway patrolmen. Brown put the limousines up for auction; he flies commercial and rides in a 1974 Plymouth with one plain-clothesman. He vows never to move into the $1.3 million Governor's mansion that was started by his predecessor. Instead, he lives in a modest Sacramento apartment and pays the $250-a-month rent out of his own pocket. Gifts are invariably returned to the sender: a gold pass to Disneyland, a copy of The Tale of Peter Rabbit in Latin. Brown even rejected a volume commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Los Angeles Music Center, a gift from Buff Chandler, matriarch of the politically powerful family that publishes the Los Angeles Times. With that, his father, former Governor Edmund G. ("Pat") Brown, complained, "Jerry goes too far. He could have at least sent a personal note."

Brown demands similar restraint by the state. After scrutinizing every agency's spending proposal—a feat performed by no other California Governor in memory—he offered a supertight budget of $11.3 billion for fiscal 1976. This represented a 4.6% increase over the previous budget—scarcely enough to keep up with inflation and far less than the 12.2% average yearly boost in the Reagan administration. Tirelessly, Brown proselytizes for reduced spending, probing with Socratic questioning that leaves many listeners in a rage. He startled the University of California regents by dismissing their verbose academic plan as a "perfect example of the
squid process: ink spread across the page in unintelligible wordlike patterns that tell me absolutely nothing." He suggested that University President-designate David Saxon take a cut in his scheduled $59,500-a-year salary. Asked Brown: "Why in the world are salaries higher for administrators when the basic mission is teaching?"

Declaring that the "liberalism of the '60s is dead," Brown emphasizes the failure of many great-expectations programs. In an interview with TIME Correspondent Jess Cook, Brown said: "The fact that there's a problem doesn't mean that more government will make it better. It might make it worse. The interventionism that we've seen in our society is analogous to Viet Nam. With our money, power and genius, we thought that we could make the people over there be like us. Then we did the same thing to our cities. When problems don't go away, we escalate the attack until someone gives up. I'm rethinking some of that escalatory social interventionism. Inaction may be the highest form of action."

As a gesture to keep state employees from acting more than they have let, he has even stopped the practice of giving them free attache cases (savings $153,355 a year). Says Brown: "Too often I find that the volume of paper expands to fill the available briefcases."

To instill a new spirit in jaded government, Brown has made most of his appointments outside the political parties. Many of his appointees are associates from environmental or antiwar crusades. Prominent among them are blacks, Mexican Americans and women. Claire Dedrick, 44, secretary of resources, was a vice president of the Sierra Club. The secretary of health and welfare, Mario Obledo, 42, a former Harvard law instructor, was once on welfare.

Making Enemies. Pollster Mervin Field recently found that 86% of Californians expect that Brown will do either a good or at least a fair job in office. Brown is attempting to forge a new constituency that will cut across traditional liberal-conservative lines and gather support from both ends of the political spectrum. He aims to attract people who are discontented with the established institutions of business, labor and government, and who are moved by his calls for a return to individual initiative.

But Brown is rapidly making enemies among special interest groups and in the Democratic-controlled legislature. A top California Democratic organizer calls him "a cleaned-up George Wallace." In fact, Brown's anti-Establishment stance is not too far removed from Wallace's attacks on "pointy-headed" bureaucrats, though Brown is more cerebral and lacks the Alabaman's folk venom. The California Governor is not so much concerned with the "little man" as with Everyman. With a slight twist on Spiro Agnew's "rad-libs," Brown's supporters might be called "rad-cons."

For the moment, the talk of last fall that he might run for President has died down. Asked about his presidential ambitions, he replied: "Are you kidding? I think even the governorship is a pain in the ass." Politics is obviously not the Governor's overriding interest, and for that reason he may prove to be less than a skilled politician. Still in the seminary in many ways, he argues that "government isn't a religion. It shouldn't be treated as such. It's not God; it's humans, fallible people, feathering their nest most of the time."

Central image: Brown: enigmatic as prideful preacher

**Ascetic goodness**
- Jerry Brown on the right
- preaches frugality, limits of government
- dwindling revenues force him to hold down budget
- restraint
- have to pay a price
- onetime Jesuit seminarian
- sparse life-style in office
- vows never to move into mansion
- modest apartment
- pays the rent out of own pocked
- returns all gifts
- rejects gift of Buff Chandler
- similar restraint by the state
- proselytizes
- probing
- liberalism of '60s is dead
- attempting to forge a new constituency
- moved by his calls
- disclaims Presidential ambitions
- government not a religion

**Prideful power**
- "too far to the right"
- as much as Reagan
- dilemma
- pride in restraint
- "I think"
- (Jesuitical use of power)
- Reagan's sumptuous approach
- (Reagan's building of mansion)
- (elegant life-style)
- (Accepts no state payment of rent)
- rejects gifts
- (rejects Pat Brown's view)
- demands restraint
- listeners in a rage
- Socratic questioning (probing)
- emphasizes failure of programs
- aims to attract disenchanted
- "cleaned-up George Wallace"
- talk of Presidential ambition
- (Brown as preacher of new style of government.)
This article appeared in the April 14, 1975 edition of Time. Four months after his inauguration, Jerry Brown was being presented by the nation's major newsmagazine as a potential presidential candidate, in the same sense as Ronald Reagan or George Wallace had to be considered: as one of those waiting in the wings, with enough potential power to make a difference, perhaps even win the nomination, given the right set of circumstances.

The title thus suggests the article will concern itself with Brown's surprising power. The title indicates the element of surprise by its phrasing as answers to a guessing game.

The first few sentences establish, as background for the main part of the article, how very different Brown is from the standard political 'type.' An aide to former California Governor Ronald Reagan is quoted as saying facetiously that Reagan "thinks Jerry Brown has gone too far to the right."

The second paragraph opens, "If Democrat Brown, 37, bewildered people when he was running for Governor, he dumbfounds them now." The primary reasons for the deepening puzzlement about Brown after four months of visible performance as Governor follow in the article:

"Considered by opponents to be an unpredictable sort who would promote all kinds of costly innovations, Brown preaches frugality and the limits of government as much as the conservative Reagan ever did."

"Considered" suggests reasoned judgment, which was: Brown is
unpredictable, in that he will sponsor spending on undefined novelties. "All kinds of costly innovations" suggests a contrasting lack of judgment on Brown's part, implying the opponents expected him to be frivolous in his intentions to spend the public money.

The independent clause contains the key concept of the article: Brown preaches. And his sermon consists of two points of asceticism: frugality, on the personal level, and the limits of government, on the political. Brown has controverted the considered judgment of the "opponents"; he is surprisingly nonfrivolous, to a pronounced degree.

His message, the article says, does stem from pragmatic realities to a degree:

"In part, dwindling revenues in a recession year have forced him to hold down the budget. The same dilemma confronts many other governors." Though Brown, like the other governors, is constrained by the "force" of events beyond his control, he is not simply responding to pressure. Whatever the pragmatic element, it is a thought-out response to a "dilemma," handled in the same manner by the others. Brown's judgment on this level is shown to be as good as theirs.

The article continues:

"But Brown takes pride in his restraint, as if he were doing people a favor that they scarcely realize."

The preacher is thus shown to take pride in his sermon. A puzzle indeed: a proud ascetic, aware of the fact that his comprehension of what people need far outreaches their own view. And the "favor" consists of "restraint"--a gift given by not giving. The presentation of Brown-as-puzzle increases.
The contrast between terms of prideful power and terms of ascetic goodness is shown throughout the article.

The article proceeds to cite the ways in which "Brown's sparse approach is most apparent: in his life-style in office," contrasted with the "sumptuous fashion" displayed by Ronald Reagan.

Brown, instead, "put the limousines up for auction; he flies commercial and rides in a 1974 Plymouth with one plainclothesman."

The simplicity of the words chosen here--flies, rides, plain-clothesman--echoes and reinforces the picture of Brown's own asceticism, shown as even more "conservative" than that of the "conservative Reagan."

Brown "vows" never to move into the $1.3 million Governor's mansion that was started by his predecessor. Instead, he lives in a modest Sacramento apartment and pays the rent out of his own pocket.

The "vows never" and "modest" reinforce the ascetic image.

The article continues to build on the theme, pointing to Brown's policy of returning all gifts:

He even rejected a volume commemorating the tenth anniversary of the Los Angeles Music Center, a gift from Buff Chandler, matriarch of the politically powerful family that publishes the Los Angeles Times. With that, his father, former Governor Edmund G. ("Pat") Brown, complained, "Jerry goes too far. He could have at least sent a personal note."

The ascetic Jerry Brown becomes the prideful lesson-teacher, with such assurance of power that he can disdain ("rejected") the personification of political power wielded by the press in the form of Buff Chandler.

More: in disdaining the "matriarch," he has offended also the
Too much government, he maintains, has been bad for them. "I think you've got to focus on individual accountability," says the one-time Jesuit seminarian. "You just can't get everything without pain and suffering or without having to pay a price. There is no such thing as a free ride anywhere."

The Brown-as-preacher connection is made here directly and specifically. Brown's point is made in clearly moral terms. Too much is "bad" for them, which carries also the sense of a wiser paternal guidance which Brown will provide. Referring to Brown as a "onetime Jesuit seminarian" here rather than somewhere else in the article, if at all, firmly establishes the article's basic perspective on him, and this includes the original image of Brown-as-puzzle.

The term "Jesuitry," according to Webster's Third Unabridged, is not yet archaic. It still means "principles or practices ascribed to the Jesuits (as the practice of mental reservation, casuistry, and equivocation) — usu. used disparagingly."

Though the term seems to have lost much of its pejorative sense in recent times, and is not intended negatively in the article's context, even the general idea of membership in a strict religious community noted for its stress on high intelligence and personal discipline carries the sense of participation in an arcane, esoteric lifestyle, whose motivations and principles are puzzling to many people. Brown-as-Jesuit is that much more an enigma.

To restate the article's central image, now established:

Brown the former Jesuit and present preacher uses his high intelligence and esoteric knowledge to lead the people to a better life—and he is proud of it.
"patriarch," Edmund G. Brown, Sr., his father.

It is Pat Brown who "complains" that the young ascetic "goes too far"—too far to 'the right.' From Brown's father, the assertion carries added authority.

In this context, by the article's line of associations, Brown's action in thus rejecting the book also becomes a rejection by the younger Brown of his father.

The power-goodness opposition continues:

"Brown demands" (power) "similar restraint by the state." (His asceticism extended to the workings of government.)

Further on:

"Tirelessly, Brown proselytizes for reduced spending, probing with Socratic questioning that leaves many listeners in a rage."

Those Brown "proselytizes" are to "listen." His view is to be propounded, not opened to democratic give-and-take; the questioning is Socratic, the work-them-into-your-corner variety, with the point to be arrived at established in advance by the questioner. It is monarchic; it is "Jesuitical," equivocating, seeming to ask while in fact telling. "Prober" continues the sense of deliberate antagonist, needler, who assumes the power to penetrate others more deeply than they themselves choose.

In the section referred to as an interview, the article in effect continues, interjecting quotes from Brown to illustrate the text. The article maintains the sense of Brown as one claiming vision and authority far beyond the ordinary.

"Declaring that the 'liberalism of the '60's is dead,' Brown
emphasizes the failure of many great-expectation programs."

Brown here is shown as exercising final judgment, with no qualifiers, over a highly complex decade. The great expectations of others have failed. Brown again is shown as claiming to be wiser than those who thought they knew.

Presenting his era-of-limits philosophy, Brown says:

"When problems don't go away, we escalate the attack until someone gives up. I'm rethinking some of that escalatory social interventionism. Inaction may be the highest form of action."

Brown's statement is the reverse image of that previously created: Brown the Socratic needler, escalating the attack on faulty ideas has replaced the social interventionism on the physical level—more money, new programs—with an escalation of his own spiritual prodding for change.

The opposition in the images continues. The heading "Making Enemies" runs above the paragraph reporting Brown's attainment of an 86 percent popularity rating in California's respected Mervyn Field poll.

The article says:

Brown is attempting to forge a new constituency that will cut across traditional liberal-conservative lines and gather support from both ends of the political spectrum. He aims to attract people who are discontented with the established institutions of business, labor and government and who are moved by his calls for a return to individual initiative.

Brown is presented again as a crusader leading a new religious revival movement. The section's title suggests that this crusade, like many others, generates its share of irritation—directed at its leader:
"But Brown is rapidly making enemies among special interest groups and in the Democratic-controlled legislature. A top California Democratic organizer calls him 'a cleaned-up George Wallace.'"

It is noteworthy that this anonymous expression of antipathy is one of the few quoted opinions on Brown in the article, the others being that which opened the article, the other being that by his father.

The article hastens to soften the blow:

"In fact, Brown's anti-Establishment stance is not too far removed from Wallace's attacks on pointy-headed bureaucrats, though Brown is more cerebral and lacks the Alabaman's foe venom."

But while taking away the sting, it leaves an impression: by association with George Wallace, Brown is compared with the image of a self-appointed preacher, out to oppose the devil "Establishment."

The article concludes:

"For the moment, the talk of last fall that he might run for President has died down. Asked about his presidential ambitions, he replied: 'Are you kidding? I think even the governorship is a pain in the ass.' Politics is obviously not the Governor's overriding interest, and for that reason he may prove to be less than a skilled politician. Still the seminarian in many ways, he argues that 'government isn't a religion. It shouldn't be treated as such. It's not God; it's human, fallible people, feathering their nest most of the time.'"

Here, the article seems to minimize the suggestion that Brown will try for the presidency. "The talk of last fall" was done by others; now it has "died down"—but it has done so only "for the moment." The title of the article has already made the strong suggestion
that Brown is a contender strongly present in the reader's mind.

Brown's statement with its pithy Anglo-Saxon seems to be a complete disclaimer. Brown's anti-Establishment stance seems to confirm it. Yet Brown's final statement, "Government isn't a religion," conflicts with the image created by the article. Brown is presented as preaching a new style of government, actively proselytizing for a political following among those who are "moved by his calls for return to individual initiative," which echoes 'personal salvation.'

The article's final assessment of Brown, "Still the seminarian in many ways," while seeming to deny the government-religion link, paradoxically reminds the reader of Brown's 'moral' approach in presenting his ideas on government.

Thus, the pattern of opposition between what seems to be said and the impression it creates, between prideful power and ascetic goodness, is the most consistent image in the article. Brown is shown here to display a prideful asceticism, a contradiction in terms.

SUMMARY: "Reagan? Wallace? No, Brown"
Attitude: negative
How shown: implied

In this article Time pictures Jerry Brown as a prideful preacher, an enigmatic blend. Brown, though proclaiming the limits of government, located under the positive "preacher" heading, reveals personal pride in so doing. These terms are listed under the negative "Pride" heading. For the image here to be considered positive, the elements of personal pride would have to be absent. As it is, the set of negative
terms in the article's continuum serves to qualify the positive set, showing that many of the positive points have to be seen as aspects of the negative ones.

Even though at the beginning of the article, a Reagan aide is quoted as saying facetiously that "Jerry Brown goes too far to the right," this is presented as a view from the opposing camp, not the article's own view. It is also never clearly connected by direct statement or overt implication to the preacher element, or to Brown's 'pride' as the article attributes it to him. It is subtly connected to Brown, Sr.'s "Jerry goes too far" later in the article. The accumulated, but not stated, sense is that Jerry Brown's "right" is wrong.
INTERVIEW

Jerry Brown: Learning to Live with Our Limits

Jerry Brown, onetime Jesuit seminarian, believes that sin is original and selfish instincts natural, and he also suspects that America is experiencing a "counterreformation"—against the expansive governmental policies of past years. What makes these views especially striking, of course, is that Brown, 37, is the Democratic Governor of California. In his first year in office, he has curbed growth in his state's burgeoning governmental employment and spending. He has admonished Californians to lower their sights, prepare to make needed sacrifices instead of slaking the urge to consume, and accept unaccustomed notions of inherent limits instead of boundless growth.

That dialectic has made Brown, for the moment at least, the most popular Governor in California history. By a margin of more than 7 to 1, voters polled recently by Mervin Field approved his performance—a level of support well above Ronald Reagan's at his peak. Brown was interviewed by TIME Managing Editor Henry Grunwald and Los Angeles Bureau Chief Jess Cook in Los Angeles at El Adobe, an unpretentious restaurant featuring the Jerry Brown special (arroz con pollo). His thoughts on a variety of topics:

AMERICA'S LIMITATIONS: There is a limit to the good things we have in this country. We're coming up against those limits. It's really a very salutary exercise to learn to live with them. Everybody looks for politicians to come up with the solutions to the society's problems. It really is a rather totalitarian urge if you analyze it. Maybe the answer is the Ten Commandments.

DEFINING PRIORITIES: We're still going at things the way we went at Vietnam. We haven't clearly defined our goals. Take the schools. If we funded all the proposed programs in California, we would be spending $5.4 billion more on education than we spend right now. You want a liberal program to deal with that? I'll give you one. Double the income tax. Watch the tax base decline as people move to Kansas.

STATE SPENDING: I'm doing everything that's been suggested other than spending money we don't have. I'm just not giving off a barrage of propaganda to make people think we're doing more. We'll take whatever the revenue is, spend it—and that's it, folks.

HIGHER STATE SUPPORT FOR THE ELDERLY: In our society, the level is completely inadequate. But the assumption is that by moving their incomes up a grand or so, you can make a big splash. I wonder about that because it's a qualitative more than a quantitative problem. The income supplement is never going to be enough if people are estranged from society. But if you have children to take care of you, friends, a nice community, it's a winner.

RONALD REAGAN: Reagan was anti-intellectual. I'm not. His rhetoric doesn't match his reality. He was Governor for eight years. He didn't slow anything down. He raised taxes three times. The difference between this and other states was imperceptible.

CREATING JOBS: How to create full employment—that's the big question. Unless private enterprise can put people to work, the Government is going to have to hire them. It's best to do it indirectly, but I don't really know how. Government could invest, as it did with the space program. Or Government could loosen the money supply, use tax policy or public works. There is no one thing, but Government has to play a major role.

GOVERNMENT PLANNING: It's like setting up a commission. It just buys time and treads water. Unless you know where you want to go, it's an illusion.
Run a plan out of a Washington computer as they do in Russia, and you get a monster. We have our own tradition that combines both governmental intervention and a very diverse private sector. It should be respected.

**CONSENSUS POLITICS:** The political need right now is for clear definitions and statements about where we're going. To speak clearly about what you're doing is already a major accomplishment. The questions in my mind are the same as those in the minds of the people. The real need is to find the consensus that binds a large enough group together and articulate it. The last time that happened was in 1932, I guess.
Concordance: Jerry Brown: Learning to Live with our Limits

Central image: Brown as sensible parish priest, leading flock to era of limits

New limited government
selfish instincts natural
suspicion of change
counterreformation
admonishments:
lower sights
prepare to make sacrifices
accept unaccustomed notions of inherent limits
dialectic
most popular Governor in California history
(long-range movement)
unpretentious
limit to good things
salutary exercise to learn to live with limits
(need to) clearly define goals
qualitative
money not enough
Reagan's rhetoric
government should create jobs indirectly
"I don't really know how"

Old expansionist government
(generosity natural)
(unawareness of change)
expansive government policies
(no admonishments)
(no lowering of sights)
slake urge to consume
boundless growth
(no dialectic)
(less popular California governors)
"for the moment at least"
(pretentious)
(no limit to good things)
(no need to live with limits)
have not clearly defined goals
quantitative
income supplement solves problems of elderly
Reagan's reality
(government should create jobs directly)
(officials know answers)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Limited Government</th>
<th>Old Expansionist Government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>government planning: illusion without goals</td>
<td>(planning effective without goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>government should involve private sector</td>
<td>(government should solve entire problem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>questions same as people's find, articulate consensus</td>
<td>(unaware of people's questions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>failure of spirit, insight</td>
<td>(allow consensus to remain vague)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dangerous to assume there is a final solution</td>
<td>(no failure of spirit, insight)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(assume there is a final solution)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Interviews, like other materials, are edited. What is left in is selected on the basis of a particular principle, the viewpoint or theme, on which the responses are seen as hinging.

In *Time*'s presentation, this interview is cast under its thematic or intentional aspect by the introductory text.

Here the theme is set by the article's opening sentence:

"Jerry Brown, onetime Jesuit seminarian, believes that sin is original and selfish instincts natural, and he also suspects that America is experiencing a 'counterreformation'—against the expansive governmental policies of past years."

The use of the present-tense "believes" links Brown's seminarian past with the two religion-oriented views attributed to him here. The "also" ties this to his "suspicion" concerning the "counterreformation," a religion-connected concept, which America is "experiencing"—a religious "experience."
If Brown "suspects" this spirit of renewal, he becomes its prophet, the one who will announce it and preach its doctrine to those who have not yet seen.

The article presents Brown's activities as governor of California during the preceding year as evidence that he has begun to spread the word.

In his first year in office, he has curbed growth in his state's burgeoning governmental employment and spending. He has admonished Californians to lower their sights, prepare to make needed sacrifice instead of slaking the urge to consume, and accept unaccustomed notions of inherent limits instead of boundless growth.

Brown is here presented as helping his flock to clarify and define the "experience" they have begun to feel, in the terms of religious mortification in preparation for renewal. This is a Lenten sermon.

The article continues:

"That dialectic has made Brown, for the moment at least, the most popular Governor in California history."

"Dialectic" connotes a degree of fervor in the rhetoric, and the "for the moment at least" suggests that over the long haul the religious enthusiasm so generated—and its sociopolitical equivalent here—tends to diminish. Time implies some skepticism about the long-range effectiveness of Brown's 'revivalism.'

The final piece in the thematic picture is placed:

"Brown was interviewed by Time magazine Managing Editor Henry Grunwald and Los Angeles Bureau Chief Jess Cook in Los Angeles at El Adobe, an unpretentious restaurant featuring the Jerry Brown special (arroz con pollo)."
"El Adobe" means "the mud house"; "arroz con pollo," rice with chicken, is a casserole-like dish. Both are "unpretentious." By association, so is Jerry Brown.

A picture accompanying the text reinforces this: Brown is shown walking along a street, head turned a little, with a relaxed smile, jacket slung easily over a shoulder. Under his name, the caption reads: "Sensing a counterreformation."

The unpretentious, one-of-the-people Jerry Brown is cast, through this pattern of compounded associations, as the sensible, far-seeing parish priest. He will show his people how to bring about the changes in their lives they have begun to realize are necessary.

The "counterreformation," as the article states, is based on rejecting "boundless growth" and the concepts associated with it, and learning how to "accept notions of inherent limits."

These are the polarities under which the key concepts of Brown's statements fall.

Brown's thoughts are captioned but reported without intervening dialogue or comment. Illustrative samples of each statement follow here.

America's Limitations

"There is a limit to the good things we have in this country. It's really a very salutary exercise to learn to live with them. Everybody looks to politicians to come up with the solutions to the society's problems. It really is a rather totalitarian urge if you analyze it. Maybe the answer is the Ten Commandments."

"Solutions" to problems are here presented by Brown as
"totalitarian"; the acknowledgement of limits means, more than the fact that the politicians don't have the answers, perhaps there are no final answers at all, and seeking them is an "easy out," an avoidance of "learning to live with them." Solutions then fall into the "boundless growth" category--part of the faulty, old-style way of viewing political effectiveness. The Ten Commandments are part of the "inherent limits," the new way of approaching political-social reality, which accepts "limits" as a principle. They are general guidelines, not specific answers. In advocating the "salutary exercise" of learning to live with limits, Brown is clearly presented as 'religious' leader.

Other views:

Defining Priorities

"We haven't clearly defined our goals. Take the schools. If we funded all the proposed programs in California, we would be spending $5.4 billion more on education than we spend right now."

Projects, actions, are to be viewed in terms of an overall philosophical perspective, not evaluated as individual entities. Brown advocates a principle of restraint.

Higher State Support for the Elderly

"It's a qualitative more than a quantitative program. The income supplement is never going to be enough if people are estranged from society."

Money in the absence of the new spirit is ineffective.

Ronald Reagan

"His rhetoric doesn't match his reality. He didn't slow anything down. The difference between this and other states was
imperceptible. Reagan's policies, while seeming to belong to the era of limits, in fact belong to the era of expansion, and are therefore erroneous.

Creating Jobs
"It's best to do it indirectly, but I don't really know how. Government has to play a major role."

Again, with a sensible admission of his own limitations, Father Brown illuminates the general direction of the solution.

Government Planning
"Unless you know where you want to go, it's an illusion. We have our own tradition that combines both governmental intervention and a very diverse private sector. It should be respected."

Again the stress is on the need for goals rather than specific solutions, associated with rigidity of the 'old politics.'

Consensus Politics
The political need right now is for clear definitions and statements about where we're going. To speak clearly about what you're doing is already a major accomplishment. The questions in my mind are the same as those in the minds of the people. The real need is to find the consensus that binds a large enough group together and articulate it.

Here Brown identifies himself with the people, but presents himself as speaking their mind for them--the secular priest of the new political 'community,' gathering his people. Here also it is the consensus that is presented as the goal, not a specific state of material prosperity.
America's Future

"This is still a very wealthy country. The failure is in spirit and in insight. I don't know what's going to happen. I think we're up for grabs. All I can promise is to go to work early and stay very late. It's very dangerous to assume there is a final solution."

This statement makes more definite the sense of the preceding question: the consensus, the attainment of shared spirit and insight, is the important thing. Salvation is never fully achieved—there is no "final solution"; it is the process of working toward it with a shared purpose that matters, in Time's presentation of Brown's views. Brown here pictured as leader of the "counterreformation" offers the process of renewal to his political followers, not the fixed and final answers proffered by the old-style politics now being left behind.

SUMMARY: "Jerry Brown: Learning to Live Within our Limits

Attitude: positive

How shown: clearly implied

In this article Jerry Brown is immediately identified as a former seminarian, and key terms such as "admonishments" to "lower sights, prepare to make sacrifices, accept the notion of inherent limits" are in a clearly religious vein. All of these terms are given positive weight by the article's context.

The use of these directly religious terms also makes the central image easy to see.
Brown v. the Schools

Ever since he took office last January, Edmund G. ("Jerry") Brown has shocked California’s education establishment by posing irreverent and hostile— but basic—questions. "Why is it better to have a smaller number of students in each class?" he demanded of the University of California regents. He frequently asks: "Why are administrators paid more than teachers if the business of schools is teaching?"

This attitude does not endear him to administrators of California’s schools or colleges. Indeed, a few are wondering if Brown, who they thought was a liberal Democrat, is more anti-education than was his conservative Republican predecessor, Ronald Reagan.

Before his election, Brown blasted Republicans for their stingy education budgets. (California spent $244 per capita on education in the 1973-74 school year, compared, for example, with Delaware’s $407 and New Mexico’s $338). He promised smaller classes, bilingual education and better career training.

When the California Teachers Association donated $25,000 to Brown’s campaign fund, he rewarded the group with pledges of bigger paychecks, expanded research grants and more state money for poor school districts. Educators looked forward to a new era presided over by a friendly, intellectually oriented Governor.

They were swiftly disenchanted.

Not long after his inauguration, Brown began a series of belt-tightening measures. The sprawling University of California system (nine campuses, 128,000 students, 6,000 faculty members) was awarded only $587 million of the $610 million it requested in 1975. "We’re breeding a new class of mandarins at the University of California," Brown said. "Belt tightening should begin with those with the biggest belts."

When local school districts pleaded near bankruptcy, the legislature approved an emergency supplemental appropriation of $115 million; Brown cut it by $27 million. He also drastically reduced the legislature’s 1975 appropriations for bilingual education and special reading and math programs. "The halcyon days of rapid and painless growth in this state are over," he said by way of explanation. Actually, his proposed budget for 1976-77, while it does not give educators everything they want, includes a slim 6.3% increase for state colleges and a 5.4% increase for U.C.

In fact, Brown has not singled out education. Faced with declining revenues and determined to make good on his campaign promise to avoid any general tax increase, he has also slashed away at spending for health care, the arts and other programs. California’s voters are apparently willing to go along with Brown’s economies; recent polls show that only 7% disapprove of his performance in office.

Many educators, however, are still suspicious of Brown’s motives. Says Wilson Riles, state superintendent of education: "Jerry’s still in the learning process. His prime motivation during this first year has been not to raise taxes. When he begins to realize what the implications are, I hope he comes down on the side of the children."

Macrame and Esalen. That is precisely where Brown feels he is. Convinced that students are badly served by the wide—and expensive—variety of nonacademic courses offered by the state’s schools and colleges, he has taken a back-to-the-basics approach. "If people want to do other things, we have Esalen," he says. "Maybe we should all take macrame, but I’m really concerned about the fact that kids can’t read."

His philosophy is shared by at least some California educators. Says Michael Kirst, a member of the state board of education: "Perhaps these multiple shocks from Brown will be helpful to public education. If an institution tries to do too much, it may end up doing nothing well."

CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR BROWN
Concordance: Brown v. The Schools

Central image: Brown as Therapist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correct viewpoint</th>
<th>Distorted thinking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>posing irrevent and hostile, but basic, questions</td>
<td>shocked education establishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attitude</td>
<td>does not endear him to administrators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seems anti-education</td>
<td>thought of as liberal Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>series of belt-tightening measures</td>
<td>pro-education campaign statements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$37 million more than in 1974</td>
<td>&quot;only 587 million of $610 million&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breeding mandarins</td>
<td>(not breeding mandarins)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cut emergency appropriation</td>
<td>districts pleaded their bankruptcy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rapid and painless growth over</td>
<td>halcyon days (not over)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said by way of explanation</td>
<td>(requires explaining)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education not singled out for cuts</td>
<td>(education singled out for cuts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only 7% of voters disapprove</td>
<td>apparently willing to go along</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motive: not to raise taxes</td>
<td>many educators suspicious of Brown's motives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown feels he is on the side of children</td>
<td>(not on side of children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy shared by some California educators</td>
<td>(philosophy opposed by some California educators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Perhaps multiple shock will be helpful to public education.&quot;</td>
<td>(multiple shocks perhaps not helpful to public education)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This article appeared when Brown had been Governor a full year. It is in one sense retrospective, assessing Brown's performance through his actions regarding one segment of his governance: his decisions concerning the state's schools.

It begins:

"Ever since he took office last January, Edmund G. ("Jerry") Brown has shocked California's education establishment by posing irreverent and hostile - but basic - questions."

The elevated style of "California's education establishment" rather than "the state's school officials" presents the group referred to with an aura of dignity. If Brown "shocks" them by "posing" (an element of pretense suggested) "irreverent and hostile" questions, he is shown to be an iconoclast.

But he is an iconoclast destroying illusion by asking "basic questions," "shocking" the establishment back to reality.

Thus Brown is presented here in the aspect of a therapist, applying unpleasant 'shock treatment' to remove distorted thinking, which is so firmly 'established' that it is assumed to be beyond question.

His therapy has been persistent: "Ever since he took office." And it is not always received well by his patients:

"This attitude does not endear him to administrators of California's schools and colleges. Indeed, a few are wondering if Brown, who they thought was a liberal Democrat, is more anti-education than was his conservative Republican predecessor, Ronald Reagan."
The administrators "wonder if"; though unhappy, they are not ready yet to accuse. "Endear" suggests a personal relationship, as that between patient and therapist.

The article contrasts Brown's pro-education statements during the gubernatorial campaign with the "series of belt-tightening measures" which followed it. The University of California received "only $587 million of the $610 million" it had requested.

An asterisk follows the statement in the magazine. It refers to the following footnote: "Actually $37 million more than UC received in 1974."

In the text, the use of "only" to describe the amount granted emphasizes the view being presented: Brown as belt-tightener. The conflicting image of giving more than Reagan had given the previous year, controverting the "wondering" about Brown's "being more anti-education than Reagan," is not allowed into the text.

A quote from Brown follows:

"We're breeding a new class of mandarins at the University of California. Belt-tightening should begin with those with the biggest belts."

"Breeding" suggests a spawning ground. The biological image reinforces Brown's credentials as therapist for unchecked financial growth in education.

The quote's second sentence states Brown's intent to trim the fat from the budget. This is immediately overridden by a more powerful image:

"When the local school districts pleaded their bankruptcy,"
and the legislature approved an emergency appropriation of $115 million to meet their request, "Brown cut it by $27 million."

The local school districts are here personified as starving waifs holding their bowls for more gruel--only to be met by Brown's "cut" of their begged-for money.

The harsh metaphor, "cut," again reinforces the central image. Brown the therapist performs the necessary--but here nevertheless pictured as unfeeling--task.

"The halcyon days of rapid and painless growth in this state are over," he said by way of explanation.

The final phrase suggests Brown's explanation is too weak to excuse the "harshness" of his act.

Growth will now be therefore slow, painful, controlled. The therapist helps the patient to understand the harsh measures are all for the best.

The article concedes that the education system was in fact given modest increases by Brown for the year, and that the area was not singled out for cutbacks:

"Determined to make good on his campaign promise to avoid any general tax increase, he has also slashed away at spending for health care, the arts and other programs."

The article notes most of California's voters "... are apparently willing to go along with Brown's economies; recent polls show that only 7% disapprove of his performance in office." These patients have accepted the medicine.

But, the article points out,
Many educators, however, are still suspicious of Brown's motives. Says Wilson Riles, state superintendant of education, "Jerry's still in the learning process. His prime motivation during this first year has been not to raise taxes. When he begins what the implications are, I hope he comes down on the side of the children."

A clear dichotomy exists here between the contents of the quote and the framing contents of the article. Wilson Riles declares Brown's intentions, straightforwardly, as "not to raise taxes." The opening line, however, implies that Riles is among the "many educators" who are "still suspicious" that Brown's motives are something different. The quote chosen has Riles "hope Brown comes down on the side of the children." By the pattern of association constructed by the article, the children are connected with the earlier personification of the local school districts: waifs at Brown's dubious mercy.

The article counterbalances the image:

"That is precisely where Brown feels he is."

"Feels" stresses the idea that the seemingly hard-hearted Brown is truly the kindly therapist.

The article concludes:

His philosophy is shared by at least some California educators. Says Michael Kirst, a member of the state board of education, "Perhaps these multiple shocks from Brown will be helpful to public education. If an institution tries to do too much, it may end up doing nothing well."

The article thus offers a second opinion, presented in a tone of wise reflection by the "perhaps."

The article thus sustains the basic image of Brown as attempting to cure the ills of the state's educational system. The question of Brown's motives and wisdom is left open, however, by the same "perhaps."
SUMMARY: "Brown vs. The Schools"

Attitude: qualified positive

How shown: clearly implied

In this article, the title announced a dichotomy of views. Those held by Jerry Brown concerning the educational establishment are contrasted with the views the educational establishment holds, and the conflict between the two is the article's topic. The attitude of the article is shown in a quote near its end: "Perhaps these multiple shocks from Brown will be helpful to public education." The weighting of terms in the article's context bears out the fact that Jerry Brown is here presented as a therapist. Though his measures seem harsh, the key terms for them are weighted by the article as positive, and form the list under "Correct Viewpoint." Key terms showing the educators misinterpret Brown's beneficial therapy as damaging to education are given negative weight by the article. However, the harshness of words chosen for Brown's actions, such as "cut" and "shocks" as well as the "perhaps" in a quote, qualify the article's positive view of him.
CALIFORNIA

Brown: How the Guru Governs

"I represent a new political generation," says Governor Jerry Brown, "and I have struck a chord here in California. The question is how deep it is, and can it sound everywhere else?" In search of an answer, Brown, who once described the governorship of California as "a pain in the ass," is seeking the mortification of the presidency.

Already he is mortifying those aspirants who hoped to win the pot in California's 280-delegate June 8 primary. The California Poll last week found 47% of the state's Democrats leaning to Brown, v. only 15% for his closest active opponent, Jimmy Carter. The results pleased Hubert Humphrey's strategists, who count on dispersion of delegates. But the numbers did little for the Senator's ego. Brown swamped him, too.

Thus the former Jesuit seminarian with the classical world view who has been known chiefly for his studied Spartan life-style and talk about lowering expectations must be taken a bit more seriously in the Democratic scramble. TIME Los Angeles Bureau Chief Jess Cook herewith examines the Governor's record and his chances:

Brown's "native son" bid conforms to his press notices as the most distinctive politician at large. At 38, he is also one of the youngest presidential candidates of the century. Moreover, since he is one of the least seasoned, with a bare 15 months in office, a more realistic goal might be the vice-presidency. But the heady polls have persuaded him that the longer shot is well aimed.

Staffers are weighing the risks of personal appearances in other primary states where Brown is on the ballot—Maryland, Kentucky, Nevada, New Jersey—while building a skeletal national organization from such bones as Cesar Chavez's far-flung boycott network and activist church groups. Brown is considering a nationwide tour; the better to disseminate his "lower expectations" dicta, woo uncommitted delegates and influence the polls during the pregnant preconvention lull.

Own Mold. To begin to judge Brown, one must ask how he has performed as Governor. He can claim a number of credits. He recruited young, toughly inquisitive, well-schooled officials cast much in his own mold—administrative inexperience included. (It also helped if a person had been a classmate of Brown's at Berkeley or Yale Law.) He hotly pursued affirmative action: the Governor's seven-person cabinet includes two women and one Chicana; one of his California state police bodyguards is Penelope Cravens, 27, a former stewardess. Helped mightily by

GOVERNOR JERRY BROWN
"The yeast hasn't risen yet."

a $768 million black-ink bequest from Predecessor Ronald Reagan, Brown honored his pledge to hold the line on taxes for individuals while keeping state spending growth to sub-Reagan rates. He signed into law a backlog of Reagan-blocked measures: new business taxes, a liberalized marijuana law, a so-called Gay Bill of Rights.

But losses and lapses are also piling up. Last spring he maneuvered deftly among growers, Teamsters and Chavistas to win passage of the nation's first Farm Labor Relations Act, which established a board to manage peaceful, ranch-site union elections. The board, however, is currently in limbo. Growers and Teamsters developed second thoughts as Chavez won most of last year's 400 elections. Brown abetted their disgruntlement with ill-considered appointments.

Foot Dragging. Early this year, Brown failed in protracted attempts to solve the state's medical malpractice in-
surance problem, dramatized by a lengthy doctors’ strike. Unaccountably, he also neglected to staff the state agency charged with weeding out incompetent physicians. With 150 other state jobs remaining vacant, many of them important, he is under fire for foot dragging on appointments.

Brown claims to bide his time selecting bureaucrats because “I have lots of doubts about the need for these jobs,” only to spend hours interviewing prospects on the theory that “It’s important to find people to share my philosophy about where the country is going.” State senators joke that “Jerry would need two terms in the White House just to finish choosing his Cabinet.” Responds Brown, nothing if not literal minded: “I selected my cabinet very promptly.”

A friendly associate concedes: “As a conventional administrator Jerry is a disaster.” Brown trusts few aides, often delegates by default, concentrates on the flap of the moment, and ignores matters lacking crisis or deadline pressure, explaining “the yeast hasn’t risen yet.”

Clearly, Brown’s forte is as political educator rather than executive. He has successfully communicated—through dialectical questioning of every program, proposal and unexamined assumption—his own sense of diminishing resources, harder choices and the need to reduce reliance on government.

Lately, however, he has found that national health insurance and Government-generated “full” employment can be squared with his “era of limits.” There is also rising skepticism about Brown’s blend of Socratic method and Taoist detachment. “The rhetoric isn’t translated into policy,” complains Democratic State Senator Anthony Beilenson, who generally backs Brown. “He hasn’t been an innovative governor in terms of proposing real alternatives.”

Snipes a Democratic official: “We need a Governor, not a guru.” Brown’s refreshing admissions that he lacks answers in major public policy areas help restore public faith in the integrity of government. Yet critics dismiss the results as “positive nonperformance.”

The “common vision” that he promises to sketch during the campaign stresses “leaner life-styles with reduced dependence on fossil fuels and conservation of natural resources.” But he has not explained how he would accomplish this goal. He has not yet taken a stand on a California ballot initiative that would effectively block future nuclear-power plants. “It’s complex. I don’t know if I will,” he shrugs.

Not Risen. An early Viet Nam opponent, Brown is just now toeing immediate international issues. Not with-
Concordance: Brown: How the Guru Governs

Central image: Jerry Brown's Presidential aspirations on trial

**Defense (for the affirmative)**
- struck a chord
- governorship "pain in the ass"
- ahead for California's 280 delegates
- must be taken a bit more seriously
- native son bid
- (youth not a detriment)
- (some experience in office)
- (15 months of executive experience)
- longer shot well-aimed
- weighing risks of personal appearances
- other primary states where Brown on ballot
- considering nationwide tour
- credits as Governor
- claims to bide time selecting bureaucrats who share philosophy
- (Brown competent as administrator)
- "yeast hasn't risen yet"
- (forte as executive)

**Prosecution (for the negative)**
- struck
- seeking mortification of the Presidency
- mortifying aspirants who had hoped to win pot
- (overdone description of Brown)
- most distinctive politician at large
- one of youngest presidential candidates of century
- one of the least seasoned candidates
- bare 15 months
- heady polls have persuaded him
- risks of personal appearances
- (Brown may find he's not wanted),
- the better to disseminate dicta
- losses and lapses piling up
- only to spend hours interviewing prospects
- "As a conventional administrator, he's a disaster"
- ignores matters lacking crisis, deadline pressures
- forte: political educator rather than executive
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(consistent principle)</th>
<th>&quot;lately, however&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no contradiction)</td>
<td>programs can be squared with era of limits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blend of Socratic method, Taoist detachment</td>
<td>rising skepticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rhetoric matches policy)</td>
<td>&quot;Rhetoric isn't translated into policy&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(does not complain)</td>
<td>complains</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (teaching function deserves respect) | snipes Democratic official: "We need a Governor, not a guru."
| refreshing admission | lacks answers |
| results (less government action) | critics dismiss as "positive non-performance" |
| no stand on nuclear-power initiative | (contradicts with less reliance on fossil fuels) |
| "complex"              | shrugs |
| formidable in California | (others not formidable) |
| current supporters     | think "yeast hasn't risen yet" |
| 47% of Democrats polled leaning to Brown | two-thirds agreed Jerry should get more experience |

Presented in this article are the elements of a court scene. The question before the court: Should Governor Jerry Brown of California run for the nation's presidency?

In the background are seen Brown's campaign advisers as lawyers for the defendant. Spokesmen for the prosecution are present, seeking a negative verdict. Also in attendance are various interested parties, who comment on the action.

Presiding: *Time*'s Los Angeles Bureau Chief Jess Cook, who "herewith examines the Governor's record and his chances."

The article starts with Brown's opening statement:

"'I represent a new political generation,' says Governor Jerry Brown, 'and I have struck a chord here in California. The question is how deep it is, and can it sound everywhere else?'"

Brown has "struck" something—a chord which seems to indicate he is qualified to be President. The court will determine whether that "striking" was right or wrong about his qualifications.

The following sentence can be read as the opening statement by the opposition:

"In search of an answer, Brown, who once described the governorship as 'a pain in the ass,' is seeking the mortification of the presidency."

Brown is thus shown as basing his right to aspire to the presidency on the resonance he has found with California voters. The article, speaking in the voice of the opposition, counters with Brown's
expressed lack of resonance with the executive job he now holds. The ironic "is seeking the mortification of the presidency" suggests that maybe Brown's disaffection for political power is not quite so deep as his earlier expression seemed to indicate--in light of his present intentions.

However, the question raised is not frivolous.

"Already he is mortifying those aspirants who hoped to win the pot in California's 280-delegate June 8 primary. The California Poll last week found 47% of the state's Democrats leaning to Brown, v. only 15% for his closest active opponent, Jimmy Carter."

Yet the article's tone does imply a degree of frivolity, implicitly asking the question answered by the next sentence:

"Thus the former Jesuit seminarian with the classical world view who has been known chiefly for his studied Spartan life-style and talk about lowering expectations must be taken a bit more seriously in the Democratic scramble."

The extended description of Brown given here, featuring his unusual background, is somewhat overdone. It echoes the opening lines of a soap opera ("Thus the small-town girl from the Midwest . . ."). The underlying whimsicality ends with the insistence--"must" becoming "now stop this silliness"--"must be taken a bit more seriously"

A bit.

Brown's record, then--his political record--will be reviewed by this court.

Cook's evaluation, as judge, begins:

"Brown's 'native son' bid conforms to his press notices as the
most distinctive politician at large."

The "at large" reinforces the notion of Brown as defendant here, and implies that his dangerous idea of trying for the presidency ought to be hauled in, at least for close scrutiny. The image presented here is interesting, containing more whimsicality. Brown is referred to as a "native son" from California. An old-fashioned Western trial is going on here; already it has been seen that a certain degree of levity is present in the courtroom. Now the reference to "press notices" for Brown "at large" conjures up the image of "wanted" posters.

But Brown is, if somewhat misguided (as the implication has begun to build) in his ideas for higher office, still "distinctive"--a colorful character from the Far West, even if suspect.

"At 38, he is also one of the youngest presidential candidates of the century" is offered as evidence for the opposition. The word "century" also evokes again the sense of old times, and the reference to Brown's youth after the "wanted" posters bring to mind the image of one of the young, famous "bad guys" like Jesse James.

More evidence for the opposition:

"Moreover, since he is one of the least seasoned, with a bare 15 months in office. . . ."

"Seasoned" is again from the Old West imagery: a seasoned cowhand Brown is not. In fact, he is one of the "least seasoned"--at a "bare 15 months." Clearly, Brown is not just a little green: politically, he's a baby.

"But the heady polls persuaded him that the longer shot is well-aimed."
More Old West imagery surrounding the trial. "Heady" suggests having had too much to drink; thus 'under the influence,' Brown is more likely to believe his "longer shot is well-aimed"—with the clear implication that, no, it's not. Brown will miss his mark.

Counsel requests a conference to plan strategy:

"Staffers are weighing the risks of personal appearances in other primary states where Brown is on the ballot"—evoking again the picture of Brown on a "wanted" poster, with an ironic twist: the fear he will find out that he isn't "wanted."

Therefore,

"Brown is considering a nationwide tour, the better to disseminate his 'lower our expectations' dicta."

Here, more whimsey emerges from the article.

First, the choice of "dicta" for 'views' or 'philosophy' gives the impression of staginess—as in a traveling medicine man show. Brown's messages are 'contrived.'

"Disseminate," especially in the Traveling Medicine Show context, evokes "dissimulate."

And since the storytelling mode is firmly established throughout this tale of the Old West, another story line fits right in. "The better to" is straight out of Little Red Riding Hood: 'The better to dissimulate'; 'the better to fool you, my dear.'

This in fact, the article suggests, parallels Brown's perplexity: how to gain nationwide exposure without being viewed as ludicrous, running on such a thin record and with so little experience.

The case finally gets down to an analysis of the defendant's
record:

"One must ask how he has performed as Governor. He can claim a number of credits."

Brown's pluses include his choice of "young, toughly inquisitive" officials "cast much in his own mold--administrative experience included." The defendant from the Old West leads a pretty good gang, even if they are all green.

Brown "hotly pursued" affirmative action by placing two women and a Chicano in his cabinet; he "honored his pledge" to hold the line on taxes--though "helped mightily" by a surplus left by Ronald Reagan.

With two of the five previous successes qualified, the article proceeds:

"But losses and lapses are piling up." Cited are Brown's failure to keep the Agricultural Labor Relations Board functioning after his initial success in passing the legislation for it. Brown, the article states, contributed to its difficulties with his "ill-considered appointments." He "failed to solve the state's medical malpractice insurance problem," and "With 150 other state jobs remaining vacant, many of them important, he is under fire for foot dragging on appointments."

The article says,

"Brown claims to bide his time selecting bureaucrats because 'I have lots of doubts about the need for these jobs,' only to spend hours interviewing prospects on the theory that 'It's important to find people to share my philosophy about where the country is going.'"

The "claims" and "theory" along with the apparent contradiction present Brown's defense in an increasingly skeptical light.
A witness for the defense is called, but under questioning offers comfort to the prosecution:

"A friendly associate concedes: 'As a conventional administrator Jerry is a disaster.'"

Pressing the point, the article states, "Brown trusts few aides, often delegates by default, concentrates on the flap of the moment, and ignores matters lacking crisis or deadline pressures, explaining 'the yeast hasn't risen yet.'"

Brown is here again presented as the young leader of a Western gang, and not doing very well at it. The summary also offers a series of conclusions based on evidence the reader has not been shown. This is post-trial gossip, perhaps based on the facts, perhaps not.

"Clearly," the article states, citing this unseen evidence, "Brown's forte is as political educator rather than executive."

The statement is categorical.

The article points to other evidence against Brown's candidacy: "Lately, however," (the phrase suggests pragmatism) "he has found that national health insurance and Government-generated "full" employment can be squared with his 'era of limits.' There is also rising skepticism about Brown's blend of Socratic method and Taoist detachment. 'The rhetoric isn't translated into policy,' complains Senator Anthony Beilenson, who generally backs Brown. 'He hasn't been an innovative governor in terms of proposing real alternatives.'"

A second witness for the defense aiding the prosecution. The use of "complains" strengthens the negative aspect; "reflected" would have minimized it.
The prosecution calls its own witness:

"Snipes a Democratic official: 'We need a Governor, not a guru.'"

The negative impact of the statement is reinforced by the earlier presentation of Brown's "forte as political educator" as a second-best to his suggested shortcomings as an administrator. Now even his teaching function is 'shot down.'

It is notable that the article's title makes use of the term "guru" from this quote, the most negative impression of Brown in the article, placing the article under the aspect of this quote.

The pros and cons of the statement are argued:

"Brown's refreshing admission that he lacks answers in major public policy areas helps restore public faith in the integrity of government."

This is the most positive statement about Brown in the article, following the most negative, and it provides some balance. Yet it cites an admission of ignorance as a major virtue—not the most compelling of reasons to choose Brown as Chief Executive, especially superimposed as it is on the image of the green gang leader.

The positive statement is quickly compromised:

"Yet critics dismiss the results as 'positive nonperformance.'"

The article notes Brown's lack of explanation on the conflict implicit in reducing the consumption of fossil fuels as it points to the fact that "He has not yet taken a stand on a California ballot initiative that would effectively block future nuclear-power plants. 'It's complex. I don't know if I will,' he shrugs."
The "shrugs" suggest lack of concern on a basically important issue—again evidence for the prosecution, at least part of it by innuendo.

The article concludes that Brown is so "formidable" in California today that delegate-hungry Jimmy Carter, Scoop Jackson and Mo Udall must think twice "before committing their resources to a contest against him."

Old West imagery again with its suggestion of a political shootout with the rivals. Yet Brown's "long shot" has been shown to be off target, and the article again cites his inexperience as the reason:

"But there are signs that even many of Brown's current supporters suspect that the yeast has not risen yet."

Brown is not a seasoned hand, not a 'sourdough'—and the final evidence against taking his candidacy seriously is provided by the very group ("47% of Democrats leaning to Brown") as the reason for "a bit more" seriousness in considering his campaign:

"While currently preferring him to the alternatives (the bandit you know is better than the bandit you don't'), two-thirds of Democrats polled agreed that Jerry should get more experience before contemplating the presidency."

The use of Brown's first name here reinforces the idea of the young inexperienced gang leader.

Since the voters currently "prefer Brown to the 'alternatives,'" it is implied that their interest lacks depth or conviction. The reference to the earlier poll places the numerical values together here; whereas 47% "lean" to Brown, "two-thirds agreed" that "Jerry should get
more experience."

As the article's closing statement, it reads as a jury verdict on the question of whether Brown should seek the presidential nomination. The article, through the voice of the "Democrats polled," answers in the negative.

SUMMARY: "Jerry Brown: How the Guru Governs"

Attitude: negative
How shown: implied

This article has as its central image a trial where Brown's presidential aspirations are being evaluated. The key terms are shown to group under the headings "Defense (for the Affirmative)" and "Prosecution (for the Negative)." The article, as the analysis shows, is structured like a trial. It presents opening statements for each position and concludes with a "jury verdict," the results of a poll indicating a large majority of Californians think Brown needs more experience before seeking the Presidency. Brown himself is presented, in a whimsical image that parallels the serious one of young presidential contenders, as a young Western outlaw on trial. Many of the key terms showing Brown's lack of superior executive ability, in the article's presentation, have a double meaning: the young outlaw can't manage his gang and territory effectively. This secondary image serves to poke fun at Brown's aspirations. The concordance shows that the evidence favors the prosecution. The image of Brown in this article is negative.

At no point in this article is either the Brown-as-President Aspirant-on-Trial image nor the Brown-as-Young Outlaw image directly stated or clearly implied.
Andy Warhol once predicted that "in the future everybody will be world famous for at least 15 minutes." That McLuhanesque pronouncement comes uncannily close to what is happening to the Democratic candidates in this political season. After shuffling through a dozen presidential contenders in the first 18 primaries, the party focused much of its attention last week on California Governor Jerry Brown. He single-mindedly pushed for maximum exposure in Maryland for three weeks, stirred enormous excitement among voters and gave Jimmy Carter his worst licking since the New York primary.

Though Brown, 38, regards himself as the exemplar of a new generation in politics, his strategy had old-fashioned aspects. He eagerly embraced every stop-Carter machine politician who offered help, notably Governor Marvin Mandel and Baltimore County Executive Ted Venetoulis. Observing that Carter also welcomed organization support, Brown quipped, "You've heard the old biblical expression, 'In my father's house there are many machines.'"
defined with a hook that is faintly fierce. His mouth, unlike Jimmy Carter's, does not rest in a smile. Relax, it is the mouth of a tennis player who is psyched up and poised, waiting for the serve. He speaks in lean sentences, quoting Aristotle, the Bible, and Dylan Thomas. He tosses erudite quips over the heads of his listeners and so appreciates precision of language that he once signed a well-written petition for Soviet Jews, "as much for the syntax as the substance."

"On the campaign trail, he is a political Rorschach test. People see in him what they want to see. In Maryland, realpolitik Campaign Worker Ellen McCarthy views him as the candidate most like her father Eugene McCarthy. But Brown's Rhode Island vice chairman, State Senator Guido Canulla, who describes himself as a "hard-core conservative," sees Brown as someone whom conservatives could rally round." Perel Rapoport, Brown's vagueusness on the issues—he has spelled out far fewer specifics than Carter—appeals to people who are suspicious of politicians' promises. He proclaims, "All I guarantee is a lot of hard work and to tell you what is working and what is not." Still, he has given a general indication of some of his views. He would support stricter conservation laws because "we need a more benign relationship with the planet." He vows to end unemployment ("a paycheck in every pocket"), both through public employment and by stimulating private employment; he would loosen the money supply in hopes of helping housing and other industries.

Promises such as these conflict with Brown's preoccupations of frugality and the limits of Government, raising questions in some people's minds about whether his liberal-conservative mixture of ideas is a sophisticated attempt to find a new synthesis, a ploy to win votes—or just plain confusion. Brown insists that there is really no contradiction (see box following page). Thus, without skipping a beat, he says he would be tight-fisted as President, boasting that as Governor of California he has opposed tax increases and held the line on the number of state employees and the state budget. Says he:

"I'm not conservative—I'm just cheap."

He regards the controversy over the Panama Canal as "the big macho symbol of the '70s." He rails against the "Faustian bargain" by which the U.S. sells arms overseas to offset the costs of oil imports. In dealing with the Soviets, he says, "I will be a tough bargainer. I would certainly use wheat, technology, everything to get the Russians to limit this mad rush to destruction." But he refuses to take specific stands on defense spending.

Brown is more specific on what he perceives to be his differences with Carter. He insists that his 17 months as a Governor and four years as secretary of state in California—"bigger than many countries"—give him better qualifications than Carter's single term as Governor of Georgia. In making that claim, Brown ignores the mixed reviews he has

---

MEETING AND GREETING POTENTIAL VOTERS AT A SUPERMARKET IN PIKESVILLE, MD.
received as Governor (TIME, April 26) and the criticism of some Californians that he has recently spent too little time on state business. But Brown claims a further advantage over Carter: the fact that as a child he absorbed politics by observing his father Pat Brown, who served two terms as Governor.

**Not Cold.** Despite that boast, Brown has not used his father as a close counselor in this campaign. Pat Brown told TIME Correspondent Leo Janos, "We confer by phone. I offer advice, but Jerry never indicates whether he's going to take it or not." Then, a bit poignantly, he added. "Well, you know, those seminary years change a person. Hell. I remember so well. I was the Governor of California, and I could visit with my son only two hours a week, on Sunday afternoons. The seminary experience has to make you more introspective than other people. They say Jerry is a cold personality. That's nonsense. He's warm and really cares about people, but he is introspective."

Jerry Brown claims he is following no campaign master plan, but he does have a strategy for the next few weeks. He is expanding his efforts to raise funds, which so far total about $600,000. Last weekend he attended a $25-a-plate fund-raising party at Hugh Hefner's fortress-like mansion in Los Angeles. This week he was campaigning in Nevada and mounting an aggressive write-in campaign in Oregon. But to block Carter he must surge in California on June 8.

Brown is also urging votes for uncommitted delegates who are running under his banner in Rhode Island next week and New Jersey on June 8. His staff has hopes of picking up delegates from Delaware, North Dakota, Utah and Colorado in the coming weeks. A realistic expectation is that he will arrive at the convention with something over 200 delegates—and then, who knows? He insists that he has a chance of beating back Carter some time after the first ballot at the convention. Says Brown: "If I do, I see no reason why I shouldn't be the nominee. So I just work back from that and run it through. That's my Jesuit thinking and Talmudic logic." In the eyes of most Democrats, it is also an impossible dream this year—but wait till 1980 or 1984.
Concordance: Brown: Test by Rorschach

Central image: Brown as enigmatic, provocative symbol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Illusion</th>
<th>Reality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stirred enormous excitement</td>
<td>single-mindedly pushed for maximum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gave Jimmy Carter his worst licking</td>
<td>(same)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regards himself as exemplar</td>
<td>embraced every machine politician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style certainly fresh</td>
<td>(style shown as 'macho')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evokes emotional, visceral reaction</td>
<td>bachelor who rarely dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(anthracite hardness in behavior)</td>
<td>anthracite hardness in appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liberals think him liberal; conservatives, conservative</td>
<td>political Rorschach test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeals to people suspicious of politicians' motives</td>
<td>vagueness on issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;all I promise&quot;</td>
<td>promise hard work, tell what is working, what is not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>general indication of some of his views</td>
<td>indication of views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support (some government programs, expenditures)</td>
<td>his promises conflict with preachments on frugality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(three possible answers)</td>
<td>raising questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insists there is &quot;really no confusion&quot;</td>
<td>just plain confusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceives to be differences</td>
<td>more specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignores mixed reviews</td>
<td>more experience than Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Not Cold&quot;</td>
<td>(implied coldness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(cold personality)</td>
<td>introspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claims he is following no master plan</td>
<td>has strategy for next few weeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
almost impossible dream (in 1976) but wait till 1980 or 1984


The Rorschach test is a series of ink-blot cards presented to a viewer undergoing psychiatric evaluation. The designs on the cards have no intrinsic meaning; the viewer projects his own ideas onto what he sees. Since the blots were formed by folding the paper down the center, the dual images produced often call forth sexual associations. The tester decides what the viewer's response patterns indicate about his mental and emotional health.

The slight alteration in the article's title—"Brown: Test by Rorschach" rather than "Brown: Rorschach Test"—suggests not only that Brown is a powerfully evocative figure onto which people project their own views. More than that, the "by Rorschach" indicates Brown's similarity to the ink-blot card itself: undefined, mysterious, a strange pattern, perhaps a little unsettling.

The key terms in this article are centered on the concepts of illusion vs. reality.

In the Rorschach test, the subject's responses are illusions in the sense that the card does not contain what he says it does: it contains only ink in a random pattern. Yet the responses communicate the reality of the subject's true mental state. One can describe what the ink blot looks like; one can also report the various projected responses it called forth; the subject's mentality can be described. All of these parts of the test's 'reality', and each has parallels in the article.

The article thus reports what Jerry Brown is like, and how
people respond to him, as he campaigns.

The illusion vs. reality pattern is introduced immediately by references to two people famous for their assertions that in some ways the illusion is the reality:

Andy Warhol once predicted that "in the future everybody will be world famous for at least 15 minutes." That McLuhanesque pronouncement comes uncannily close to what is happening to the Democratic candidates in this political season. After shuffling through a dozen presidential contenders in the first 18 primaries, the party focused much of its attention last week on California Governor Jerry Brown.

Though the article points out that each contender has had his moment of glory, the term "shuffling," while suggesting the Rorschach cards, also connotes dullness. The voters, the subjects in this test, did not respond strongly to these other candidates. The "focused much of its attention" suggests heightened interest, moving forward, figuratively, in the chair to look more closely at this new 'card' presented to view.

Discussing Brown's appearance on the scene, the article says:

"He single-mindedly pushed for maximum exposure in Maryland for three weeks, stirred enormous excitement among voters and gave Jimmy Carter his worst licking since the New York primary."

Brown as Rorschach test generates strong response. But in the context of emotional excitement, the theme of the article suggests, not on the level of intelligent judgment. This projective technique does not test intelligence (i.e., the actual Rorschach test). But thus tacitly eliminating the factor of intelligence, the reality level of informed choice, the article implies that the emotional response to Brown as presented here is in the realm of illusion.
Brown, however, is "single-minded." A set of connotations is involved in the article's choice of this description. First, Brown is using his mind; his approach is not random or thoughtless or emotional. Instead it is planned, with a suggestion in the phrase of intensity and calculation, to "stir" the "enormous excitement." Second, the use of "single" reminds the reader that Brown is unmarried, and brings in echoes of the sexual associations often evoked by the Rorschach test.

Seen in that context, "pushed for maximum exposure" comes across as directly sexual. But on the part of someone who is "single-minded," it becomes an image of calculated sex with no intention of effecting unity, only of "stirring enormous excitement" among voters, for the sake of beating out a rival:

"... and gave Jimmy Carter his worst licking since the New York primary."

The article continues:

"Though Brown, 38, regards himself as the exemplar of a new generation in politics, his strategy had old-fashioned aspects. He eagerly embraced every stop-Carter machine politician who offered help."

The impression again is the illusion-reality opposition of seeming to be sincere when anything but: getting all the help possible, even if shady, in order to "make it" with the voters. The article contrasts the connotations thus developed with the word "exemplar." Its suggestion of high virtue underscores the impression of seaminess by the contrast. And if "Brown regards himself as the exemplar," perhaps, it is implied, Brown isn't facing his own reality as a wheeler-dealer.
The next section heading, "Emotional Reactions," makes the sexual imagery clear.

The opening, "His style is certainly fresh," is followed by a series of macho images: "He declines Secret Service protection, rides in a rented van and brusquely turns down little gifts."

It continues:

He evokes an emotional, visceral reaction from many voters. He created pandemonium: men pressed forward to shake his hand, women squealed and virtually swooned. For many women, his appeal was frankly sexual. Gushed one: "He's got the greatest eyebrows I've ever seen." Comparisons with the Kennedy brothers are obvious yet only add to the enigma of the bachelor who rarely dates, lives in a sparsely furnished apartment and seems most comfortable talking about philosophy. So what has turned on voters?

Again the article presents Brown as Rorschach card: a sexual symbol with no real sexual content present (note the "eyebrow": not the most overpowering aspect of human sexuality), inexplicably drawing out strong reactions from the crowds.

Since Brown's words to the crowds are neither quoted nor referred to in this section, and the images are all of direct personal contact, again the strong impression is conveyed that the voters' reactions to Brown are only emotional, without thought content.

"So what has turned on voters?"

Time here identifies the woman correspondent whose report on Brown's appearance and manners is presented as explanation—a sample 'feminine reaction' documenting Brown's 'turn-on' ability:

Reports Time correspondent Bonnie Angelo: "He is brushed with star quality - it is almost tangible as he races through a factory or strides down a street. In appearance, there is about this taut, intense, self-sufficient man an anthracite hardness. His nose is bony and defined with a hook that is faintly fierce."
His mouth, unlike Jimmy Carter's, does not rest in a smile. Relaxed, it is the mouth of a tennis player who is psyched up and poised, waiting for the serve. He speaks in lean sentences, quoting Aristotle, the Bible, and Dylan Thomas. He tosses erudite quips over the heads of his listeners and so appreciates precision of language that he once signed a well-written petition for Soviet Jews 'as much for the syntax as the substance.'

The article's word choices here carry the assertion about Brown's "anthracite hardness" in appearance to hardness in behavior as well: "races," "strides," "speaks in lean sentences," "tosses" erudite "quips" "Over the heads"—all connote aggressiveness. In this context, "brushed with star quality" becomes associated with the shine of "anthracite hardness"—darkness glittering, cancelling out the sense of soft brightness emanating. The comment about his signing the petition out of appreciation for its syntax reinforces the sense of personal coldness and hardness.

The report continues:

"On the campaign trail he is a political Rorschach test. People see in him what they want to see."

The report cites liberals who think Brown is liberal, conservatives who think he is conservative.

Following the heading "Hard Work," the article continues:

"Brown's vagueness on the issues . . . he has spelled out far fewer than Carter--appeals to people who are suspicious of politicians' 'promises.'"

Again, the illusion turns into reality: vagueness becomes the positive content voters want.

"Brown proclaims: 'All I guarantee is a lot of hard work and
to tell you what is working and what is not.'"

"Proclaims" emphasizes that Brown is citing his absence of specifics as a plus. The article suggests that by doing so, he is holding up a Rorschach card into which the voters can and will read whatever they like—to Brown's advantage.

The article then cites Brown's specific statements, introducing them with a sentence stressing how few they are, and how nonspecific, which serves to underline the vagueness while seeming to offer a balancing view:

"Still, he has given a general indication of some of his views."

"He would support stricter conservation laws, and unemployment, loosen the money supply. Promises such as these," the article continues, "conflict with Brown's preachments about frugality and the limits of government, raising questions in some people's minds about whether this liberal-conservative mixture of ideas is a sophisticated attempt to find a new synthesis, a ploy to win votes or just plain confusion."

"Preachments" recalls the earlier use of "exemplar" in a context suggesting its application to Brown was misplaced. Here also, if the "promises" and the "preachments" conflict, then no matter which of the two carries Brown's real position on the issues, Brown is proved false, in a "Have you stopped beating your wife?" arrangement.

The "some people" referred to now become the analysts in this Rorschach test. For only the second time in the article "questions" are raised in "minds"; scrutinizing Brown's statements to decide what they indicate about his "mixture of ideas." All the alternatives are objectively considered—except that the next sentence shows which of
the possible views is favored:

"Brown insists there is really no confusion."

The tone is that of protesting too much; especially by using the word "confusion" again in Brown's denial, the article suggests confusion is indeed present. More subtly, the denial is followed by the parenthetical "See box following page," referring the reader to a *Time* interview with Brown. Its evidence, whether supporting or negating Brown's denial, is thus moved away from the article's assertion, and the denial is left hanging, adding to the sense of its falseness.

That sense is increased:

"Thus, without skipping a beat," (which evokes 'without blinking an eye,' the folk allegation for studied untruthfulness) "he says he would be tight-fisted as President, boasting that as Governor of the State of California he has opposed tax increases and held the line on the number of state employees and the state budget."

"Boasting" denotes exaggeration, untruthfulness.

The article's presentation of Brown as a real illusion is reinforced:

"Brown is more specific (reality) on what he perceives to be (implied illusion) his differences with Carter. He insists that his 17 months as a Governor (reality) and fours years as secretary of state in California--'bigger than many countries'--(implication of self-delusion) give him better qualifications than Carter's single term as Governor of Georgia. In making that claim," ("claim" here qualifies "insists," reinforcing the impression that one is as erroneous as the other) "Brown ignores (illusion) the mixed reviews (reality) he has
received as Governor and the criticisms of some Californians that he has recently spent too little time on state business."

*Time* notes, as a further Brown advantage, that "as a child he absorbed politics by observing his father, Pat Brown, who served two terms as Governor."

Now the Rorschach test probes the father-child relationship.

The next section's heading reads "Not Cold," and its presence just after the sentence about Pat Brown makes the reader think about possible coldness in that relationship. The opening sentence does not dispel the thought:

Despite that boast, Brown has not used his father as a close counselor in this campaign. Pat Brown told *Time* Correspondent Leo Janos, "We confer by phone, I offer advice, but Jerry never indicates whether he's going to take it or not." Then, a bit poignantly, he added, "Well, you know, those seminary years change a person. The seminary experience has to make you more introspective than other people. They say Jerry's a cold personality. That's nonsense. He's warm and really cares about people, but he is introspective."

But the article has managed to convey that Brown is cold toward his father.

The 'real illusion' image again:

"Jerry Brown claims he is following no campaign master plan, but he does have a strategy for the next few weeks."

The article appears on May 31; the Democratic National Convention will be held in mid-July; the campaign has only a "few weeks" to run. The article suggests, with "claims," that Brown is not being straightforward.

It then details his plans until the Convention:
A realistic expectation is that he will arrive at the convention with something over 200 delegates—and then, who knows? He insists that he has a chance of beating back Carter some time after the first ballot at the convention. Says Brown: "If I do, I see no reason why I shouldn't be the nominee. So I just work back from that and run it through. That's my Jesuit thinking and Talmudic logic."

But the article has built up a pattern of skepticism by disclaiming in some way each of Brown's earlier statements, suggesting, through the Rorschach imagery, that Brown's thinking is "just plain confusion."

The article ends by invoking this idea strongly:

"In the eyes of most Democrats, it is also an impossible dream this year—but wait till 1980 or 1984."

The use of the dates here seem innocuous enough; they refer to the next two presidential election years, in which Brown may have a "real" chance, as opposed, the article suggests, to his "illusory" chance this time. However, 1984 has connotations given it by George Orwell, and the "wait till 1984" thus has the ring of a threat. The article suggests that the idea of Brown's becoming President in 1984 has an uncomfortably Orwellian reality about it.

The "impossible dream," while clearly saying that Brown's ideas about becoming President in 1976 are an illusion, also leaves a final impression of Brown in the reader's mind. At the beginning of the article, Brown was an undefined symbol whose appeal to the crowds was undetermined. As the article proceeded, Brown's attracting attributes were defined: his striking appearance, his intensity, his highmindedness, his novel ideas—even if these were impractical, illusory. The final impression of Brown created by the article is offered to the
reader at its end by the phrase "impossible dream": Jerry Brown is
Don Quixote.

SUMMARY: "Brown: Text by Rorschach"
Attitude: negative
How shown: stated

The article presents Jerry Brown as being as enigmatic a figure
as is a Rorschach ink blot. The title itself presents the article's
theme and defines its polarities. Since the test is a projective de-
vice, calling forth statements from the person being tested as to im-
agined contents of the card, the opposition between illusion and real-
ity is clear here. Illusion is given negative valence by the article;
reality, positive. Under the "Illusion" heading is placed the asser-
tion that "Liberals think him liberal; conservatives, conservative."
His lack of definition on the issues is also shown under the "illusion"
heading: he offers a "general indication of some of his views." The
article concludes that, for 1976, Brown's presidential aspirations are
an "almost impossible dream" (negative valence). Under "Reality" the
balancing term states, "But wait till 1980 or 1984." Though Brown
might, the article says, realistically win in the future, he is too
personally and politically enigmatic to win the nomination in 1976.
For instance, while politically he "regards himself as an exemplar," he
"embraces every machine politician" who offered help.

Even the "Reality" personality qualities, "Anthracite hardness
in appearance, bachelor who rarely dates, implied coldness, introspec-
tive," are less than 100 per cent positive. All elements considered, the article's view of Brown is negative.
As Jerry Brown got ready to do battle in Oregon and Nevada, he discussed his campaign and his views with TIME's Jess Cook. Highlights:

Q. Why have you said politics requires a sense of the absurd?
A. Did I say that? Well, there is a sense of going through a programmed ritual. Each person plays a role—the press, the candidate. It’s repetitive. It is absurd to be saying the same thing over and over. There seems to be a premise that a good candidate can produce the Holy Grail. All you can really do is say your piece, which isn’t all that different from anybody else’s. But I can’t come up with a better substitute [to campaigning]. It’s a testing process that brings out what people are like.

Q. You recently remarked that you represent the future, meaning what?
A. I said that too? I suppose I have a sense that my own thinking is more contemporary than Carter’s. The world is changing. We need to be open to that. I think my candidacy stands for a renewal in the political process. If I were nominated and elected, that in itself would symbolize the vitality and energy of the country, that we were putting the era of Viet Nam and Watergate behind us and going on to work on constructive problems. But I’m not trying to oversell what I can do. Our social fabric is rather tattered. There’s been a lot of flimflam. The role of the President is to describe what’s possible and what isn’t.

Q. What changes would you bring about that Carter would not?
A. I’m more willing to question assumptions in a more relentless way. I’m sympathetic to the critique of technology, even though I recognize that technology is the engine of a modern economy. That’s the lesson of Viet Nam and the Great Society. People in the ’60s felt very good about systems analysis. They missed the ability of some people to inspire others.

Q. Is that what your success boils down to—inspirational ability?
A. That’s part of it. You either do it, or you don’t. I try to be myself, to be fairly straightforward. There are elements of surprise and openness that people feel are very genuine. I’m trying to prepare people for difficult days ahead, while at the same time trying to inspire some hope.

Q. You have endorsed the Humphrey-Hawkins full-employment bill and national health insurance, but you talk of “lowering our expectations.” Isn’t there a conflict?
A. I want to get off that phrase [lowering expectations]. Overheated rhetoric ought to be deflated a bit. Humphrey-Hawkins is a symbol, a commitment. Commitments are important. Everybody wants specifics, and when you articulate them, you get clobbered.

Q. Some of your comments, your call for “a new spirit,” for example, have a mystical ring.
A. What does that mean? I have to say something.

Q. How do you evaluate the impact of Maryland?
A. There is a momentum or thrust in these things. [Maryland] indicates that my campaign has potential. But I just take it one week at a time. I don’t have any plan other than trying to make an impact on the Democratic Party throughout the country. The importance of timing is an axiom of politics. You can’t control everything, but my course is on an ascending trajectory. Carter’s has slowed.

Q. What do you have to do to push the trajectory higher?
A. The plan isn’t on a computer printout. I have to keep moving. The battle now is to keep the process open. But the Tuesday primaries demonstrated that people aren’t entirely satisfied with the front runner. I think the chemistry of the campaign has changed.

Q. Do you rule out the vice-presidential nomination?
A. I haven’t yet, but it isn’t likely.
Concordance: "The Chemistry Has Changed"

Central image: Jerry Brown as Don Quixote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence for Quixote Image</th>
<th>Evidence against Quixote Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Did I say that?&quot;</td>
<td>(ironic: can be read either way)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each person plays a role</td>
<td>(remembers statements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repetition absurd</td>
<td>(no role-playing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>testing process brings out what people are like</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good candidate can produce Holy Grail</td>
<td>seems to be a premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I said that too?&quot;</td>
<td>(remembers statements)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense that thinking is more contemporary</td>
<td>(knowledge, not sense, re: thinking)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>world is changing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nomination, election would symbolize vitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to work on constructive problems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to question assumptions in more relentless way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sympathetic to critique of technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technology is engine of modern society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>missed ability to inspire others</td>
<td>People in '60s felt very good about systems analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That's part of it</td>
<td>You either have it, or you don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I try to be myself, to be fairly straightforward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm trying to prepare people for difficult days ahead and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the same time trying to inspire some hope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lowering expectations</td>
<td>overheated rhetoric ought to be deflated a bit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for Quixote Image

Evidence against Quixote Image

(ironic: can be read either way)

symbol, commitment

national health insurance, full employment

specifics get you clobbered

(specifics necessary)

(Questioner: Some of your statements have a mystical ring.)

What does that mean? I have to say something.

There is a momentum or thrust in these things.

(Maryland) indicates that my campaign has potential.

But I just take it one week at a time.

I don't have any plan other than trying to make an impact.

I have to keep moving.

The battle now is to keep the process open.

I think the chemistry has changed.

(Do you rule out the vice-presidential nomination?)

I haven't yet, but it isn't likely.
Explication of "The Chemistry Has Changed," an interview with Jerry Brown conducted by Time magazine's Los Angeles Bureau Chief, Jess Cook.

This interview was referred to in the preceding article, "Brown: Test by Rorschach," in Time's May 31, 1976 issue.

The reader's attention was directed to it by the sentence, "Brown insists there is really no confusion" following the discrediting pairing of promises—preachments in conflict with each other. The interview thus should be read as an answer—prepared by Time—to the charge of confusion in Brown's thinking about running the Government.

Since interviews, like other materials, are edited, the interview remains the magazine's presentation of Brown.

The interview is prefaced with:

"As Jerry Brown got ready to do battle in Oregon and Nevada, he discussed his campaign and his views with Time's Jess Cook." Highlights:

The interview follows. Here it will be analyzed one question-and-answer set at a time. Its opening sets the structure of its pattern of implications; the "highlights" suggest these were selected from a longer interview.

The phrase "got ready to do battle," with its archaic diction, invokes at once the Don Quixote image, especially following directly, as it does, the "impossible dream" allegation which ended the article beneath which it appears in the magazine. Thus, the questioner's theme is established: it is Jerry Brown as Don Quixote whose thoughts and actions are being explored here.
The structure of Brown's answers is different from that of the interviewer. An inductive reading of his statements shows them to be arranged along a static-dynamic continuum, with static concepts having negative weight.

The questioner's theme is thus superimposed over Brown's pattern of answers, in effect qualifying their meaning within the Quixote alignment.

The first question and its answer provide the interface for the two patterns:

Q. Why have you said politics requires a sense of the absurd?

A. Did I say that? Well, there is a sense of going through a programmed ritual. Each person plays a role -- the press, the candidate. It's repetitive. It is absurd to be saying the same thing over and over. There seems to be a premise that a good candidate can produce the Holy Grail. All you can really do is say your piece, which isn't all that different from anybody else's. But I can't come up with a better substitute (to campaigning). It's a testing process that brings out what people are like.

Note that Brown's responding question, which might have been dropped, is left in. It implies, as did the article preceding, and the opening "to do battle," that he is an "impossible dreamer" who does not keep track of his own thoughts.

Brown's answers here show his static-dynamic concept: roles and repetition are absurd (static, unchanging); seeking final, definitive answers ("the Holy Grail") is absurd. The dynamic "testing process" of campaigning is seen as worthwhile.

Though Brown presents a search for a "Holy Grail" as absurd, rejecting the concept of himself as a knight in shining armor, its mention here within the Quixote context serves to reinforce the impression that
while Brown may not be Sir Galahad, he is nevertheless Don Quixote—a counterfeit "knight in shining armor." Brown's words then become ironic: no, he cannot produce the Holy Grail; a Quixote never could.

Ending the response with Brown's statement that the campaign process "brings out what people are like" invites the reader to evaluate what Brown is "really like"—against the Quixote framework.

As the Quixote story explores one aspect of human nature, so the interview is a study of human nature also. It studies Jerry Brown in a Quixote aspect, more than his campaign strategy or his ideas.

The dual patterns of questioner and respondent continue:

Q. You recently remarked that you represent the future, meaning what?

A. I said that too? I suppose I have a sense that my own thinking is more contemporary than Carter's. The world is changing. We need to be open to that. I think my candidacy stands for a renewal in the political process. If I were nominated and elected, that in itself would symbolize the vitality and energy of the country, that we are putting the era of Viet Nam and Watergate behind us and going on to work on constructive problems. But I'm not trying to oversell what I can do. Our social fabric is rather tattered. There's been a lot of flimflam. The role of the President is to describe what's possible and what isn't.

Again, Brown's responding question is retained, the repetition stressing the original implication of lack of reflection on Brown's part as the article in effect says, "See? He did it again."

Brown's word choices here—"thinking," "changing," "going on to work"—are dynamic, as the description of "the role of the President"—an ongoing process of evaluation. However, read in the Quixote framework, Brown's pattern of actions comes across as overly idealistic, the process involved becoming part of Brown's quest.

Q. What changes would you bring about that Carter would not?
A. I'm more willing to question assumptions in a more relentless way. I'm sympathetic to the critique of technology, even though I recognize that technology is the engine of a modern economy. That's the lesson of Viet Nam and the Great Society. People in the '60's felt very good about systems analysis. They missed the ability of some people to inspire others.

Read in the Quixote framework, the question implies that Brown "sees" more things to be changed than other concerned, sensible persons, specifically Carter, recognize.

Brown's answer contrasts the static dimensions of technology with its "systems analysis" answers--fixed, exact numerical values--to the non-numerical dynamics of the human condition, such as "the ability of some people to inspire others." Again, within the Quixote pattern, the archaic-sounding "engine" and talk of "inspiring" others makes Brown seem less than realistic.

The following question reinforces this:

Q. Is that what your success boils down to - inspirational ability?

A. That's part of it. You either do it, or you don't. I try to be myself, to be fairly straightforward. There are elements of surprise and openness that people feel are very genuine. I'm trying to prepare people for difficult days ahead, while at the same time trying to inspire some hope.

In Brown's response framework, the "You either have it, or you don't," reads, "You either have that dynamic ability, or you lack it." This and the words "try" and "fairly" minimize the messianic sense of having the ability to inspire, as does Brown's focusing on the country's problems, removing the attention from his 'charisma' to the reality of practical things to be done. This attempt to change the perspective may indicate an awareness on Brown's part that the question was somehow leading, that it contained a loaded element in its latching onto
"inspirational ability" when the movement of the questioning had seemed to be on policy--his vs. Carter's.

The allegation of Quixotic tendencies is a hard one to beat. Don Quixote, for all his delusion, maintained his intelligence and integrity throughout. Whatever the misguided contents of the conversations, he communicated sensibly with Sancho Panza, who was wise enough to humor him. Similarly, Brown's statements about his "inspirational ability" can sound perfectly reasonable, as they do, even if somewhat pedantic: but once placed under the aspect of the Quixote metaphor, even their tone of sobriety and realism sounds like it is being uttered by someone wearing gleaming armor.

Question 5 focuses on the apparent conflict between Brown's "visions" and the hard realities:

Q. You have endorsed the Humphrey-Hawkins full-employment bill and national health insurance, but you talk of "lowering our expectations." Isn't there a conflict?

A. I want to get off that phrase (lowering expectations). Overheated rhetoric ought to be deflated a bit. Humphrey-Hawkins is a symbol, a commitment. Commitments are important. Everybody wants specifics, and when you articulate them, you get clobbered.

Brown here accuses himself of "overheated rhetoric" in disclaiming his "lowering our expectations" position. Consistently, in the Time analyses done in this study, the magazine uses the device of having a sympathetic or friendly person make a final, damaging comment--i.e., of placing these comments where they appear as clinchers to a line of thought. Here, though Brown's self-reflection ought to demonstrate otherwise, the admission itself serves to reinforce the impression created by leaving his responding questions in: "He doesn't know
what he's saying." Brown becomes his own "worst witness."

Referring to the full-employment bill as a "symbol," a "commit-
ment," rather than as a firm policy to take a stand on is in line with
Brown's static-dynamic frame: the principle at issue is the dynamic
element: its specific formulation may be static, limiting. Clinging
to the static "specifics" may place a person in an untenable position
in which "you get clobbered." But in the Quixote frame, Brown's avoid-
ance of specifics implies a wish to keep dreaming, and the "clobbered"
evokes directly the sense of a knight in the fray.

Question 6 is a non-question with a non-answer:

Q. Some of your comments, your call for "a new spirit," for example,
have a mystical ring.

A. What does that mean? I have to say something.

The Quixote pattern is so firmly established at this point that
it is easy to see the question as directly baiting another "Quixote"
response from Brown. Once more, as with the switch in direction from
discussing differences with Carter to "inspiration," the questioning
has shifted from discussion of a specific program to "comments" with a
"mystical ring."

In the interests of fairness, it is important to note here that
the emerging pattern does not necessarily indicate deliberate intent on
the part of the interviewer. As Burke maintains, it is completely pos-
sible—in fact, the methodology's basic assumptions hold, human beings
do so constantly as an integral part of linguistic interaction—to fol-
low a pattern of intent derived from our perceptions of the need of the
conversation without being aware that this is happening.
It is harder to make the same assumption about the editing process, but this aspect will be dealt with in the conclusions of the study.

Brown, whose responses to the "inspiration" question seemed to indicate some wariness, is clearly wary here, and ducks the question entirely. Again, within the Quixote framework, his answer fits in: another example, Brown's own words, showing his "inattention" to the contents of his own speech. The fact that this question, such as it is, and its response are left in the "highlights" of this interview is strong evidence that the Quixote pattern was intentional. The question and response seem to serve no other real purpose.

Question 7:

Q. How do you evaluate the impact of Maryland (where Brown won a surprise victory over front-runner Jimmy Carter)?

A. There is a momentum or thrust in these things. (Maryland) indicates that my campaign has potential. But I just take it one week at a time. I don't have any plan other than trying to make an impact on the Democratic Party throughout the country. The importance of timing is an axiom of politics. You can't control everything, but my course is on an ascending trajectory. Carter's has slowed.

Here, "thrust" and "timing" suggest a knightly bout; the "ascending trajectory" is the idealistic quest; and the "I just take it one week at a time. I don't have any plan" serves again to make Brown sound like an idealistic dreamer.

In Brown's frame, all these elements are the choreography of a dynamic process, a "momentum" in which "you can't control everything." The "but" which follows indicates Brown thinks some things can be controlled, as does his statement about the importance of timing; but
these factors are overridden by the dominant image.

Q. What do you have to do to push the trajectory higher?

A. The plan isn't on a computer printout. I have to keep moving. The battle now is to keep the process open. But the Tuesday primaries demonstrated that people aren't entirely satisfied with the front runner. I think the chemistry of the campaign has changed.

Here, Brown's static-dynamic continuum appears clearly. "The plan isn't on a computer printout," it isn't fixed and static, set in advance of the dynamic "process." The need to "keep moving," the word "battle," and the reference to "chemistry" (which, for Brown means the dynamic mix of elements has shifted to his favor) all sound like Don Quixote talking--the last, a reference to his 'magic potions.'

Q. Do you rule out the vice-presidential nomination?

A. I haven't yet, but it isn't likely.

The final question and answer here leave the reader wondering what Brown means. Is he saying "It isn't likely" that he will rule out the vice-presidential nomination, which he hasn't ruled out yet; or does he mean "It isn't likely" that he will accept it if it is offered?

Brown could of course have been asked to clarify; or the question could have been dropped; or an alternate question might have been included. However, printing it in this way leaves the reader with what seems to be "clear evidence" of Brown's lack of attention to his words and thoughts, a Quixote-like "dreamer."
SUMMARY: "'The Chemistry Has Changed'

Attitude: negative

How shown: implied

Here Brown is presented in the image of Don Quixote. This interview is boxed on the page with the story that in its conclusion referred to Brown's presidential aspirations as an "almost impossible dream." "The Impossible Dream" is the popular song from the musical version of Don Quixote. The boxed interview begins, "As Jerry Brown got ready to do battle in Oregon and Nevada..." These two statements of the same image furnish a link which suggests it to the reader as applying to Brown. As the concordance of the interview shows, once the Quixote image is established, Brown's answers take on an ironic character. They can be considered as straightforward statements explaining his approach to government but under the Quixote aspect they have an overly idealistic, impractical ring. In picturing him to readers as Don Quixote, the interview's attitude concerning Brown is negative.

The Don Quixote image is implied by the connected statements as applying to the interview in a subtle and not easily recognized manner.
Only Hubert Humphrey could hope to stall the stampede to Carter. But just before an 8 a.m. speech on Wednesday, Humphrey made clear to reporters that he would be a no-go. Said he: “I’ve never been a spoiler in my life.” Still, he was urged to hold out by the two leaders of the latest Humphrey-for-President movement, Erie County (Buffalo) Democratic Chief Joseph Crangle and Illinois Congressman Paul Simon. At 1:30 p.m., Humphrey showed them a withdrawal statement. Crangle and Simon asked him to tone it down, to keep the door open a crack. As the three men met, Humphrey got a phone call from unpredictable Jerry Brown. He wanted to join Humphrey in a ninth-inning drive to stop Carter. Humphrey turned him down. At 3 p.m., before TV cameras, Humphrey declared that since Carter “is virtually certain to be our party’s nominee, I will not authorize any presidential political activity on my behalf.”

Exhortedly, Brown continued to fight. Said he: “Jimmy Carter, wherever you are, I’m looking for you. I want to debate you.” He improvised plans to travel the country in search of uncommitted delegates—for how long was anybody’s guess. As he told reporters before leaving Los Angeles to court support in Louisiana: “This is a campaign that emerges as it flows forward, and each day I’ll assess what the realistic possibilities are.... It’s hard to tell just what all this means.” Then he accused Carter of “all of a sudden doing a flip-flop” because he had accepted endorsements from Wallace and Daley. Asked recently whom he would vote for in November if he were not a candidate, Brown said laconically: “Oh, I don’t know. I might not vote at all.” Frank Mankiewicz, a Carter fan, cracked that Jerry Brown’s performance was “an exercise in gracelessness without pressure.”

The vanquished Democrats will be heard from in the future. Many of Carter’s confidants speak warmly of Frank Church as prospective Vice President (see story, page 15). Scoop Jackson yearns to be Veep but stands much less of a chance. Humphrey would like to succeed retiring Mike Mansfield as Senate majority leader; but Senate Whip Robert Byrd of West Virginia campaigned tirelessly for that job and has a long lead. Udall would like to compete for the Senate in 1980. The brightest future seems to belong to Jerry Brown, whose lower-than-expected lines turn on the voters. Unless they weary of his above-average vagueness, he may well run for President in 1980 or 1984, in which case he will be only 46.
Concordance: "Stampede to Carter"

Central image: Brown as Don Quixote

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence for Quixote Image</th>
<th>Evidence Against Quixote Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(ironic: can be read either way)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;It's hard to tell just what all this means.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quixotically, Brown continued to fight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;gracelessness without pressure&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;lower-thy-expectations&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;line&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turns on the voters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above-it-all-vagueness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(continuing campaign efforts practical for Brown)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>crack by Carter supporter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brightest future seems to belong to Jerry Brown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(realistic philosophy)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>may win in 1980 or 1984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The front-cover article on Jimmy Carter, who in this issue is presented as having the Democratic presidential nomination assured, contains *Time*'s last words on Jerry Brown before the convention.

The section on Brown follows:

... as the three men met, Humphrey got a phone call from unpredictable Jerry Brown. He wanted to join Humphrey in a ninth-inning drive to stop Carter. Humphrey turned him down. At 3 p.m., before TV cameras, Humphrey declared that since Carter "is virtually certain to be our party's nominee, I will not authorize any presidential political activity on my behalf."

Quixotically, Brown continued to fight. Said he: "Jimmy Carter, wherever you are, I'm looking for you. I want to debate you."

He improvised plans to travel the country in search of uncommitted delegates — for how long was anybody's guess. As he told reporters before leaving Los Angeles to court support in Louisiana: "This is a campaign that emerges as it flows forward, and each day I'll assess what the realistic possibilities are. . . . It's hard to tell just what all this means."

Then he accused Carter of "all of a sudden doing a flip-flop" because he had accepted endorsements from Wallace and Daley. Asked recently whom he would vote for in November if he were not a candidate, Brown said laconically: "Oh, I don't know. I might not vote at all."

Frank Mankiewicz, a Carter fan, cracked that Jerry Brown's performance was "an exercise in gracelessness without pressure."

The article does a quick retrospective on other contenders for the nomination, now cancelled out by Carter, and returns for a final comment on Brown:

The brightest future seems to belong to Jerry Brown, whose lower-thy-expectations lines turn on voters. Unless they weary of his above-it-all vagueness, he may well run for President in 1980 or 1984, when he will be only 46.

Here *Time* makes the Don Quixote reference openly, and stresses the sense that Brown's moves are lacking in organized thought: "It's hard to tell just what all this means." In Brown's context, to define
a process is to freeze it, to remove it from the dynamic—and, specifi-
cally, to appear to give up before all the possibilities have been
checked out.

The comment by Frank Mankiewicz, identified as a "Carter sup-
porter," which 'separates' the antagonism it contains from the appro-
bation of the magazine, is presented as a "crack." Brown's "Quixotic"
continuance of his campaign has been presented as directly in conflict
with the wish of Hubert Humphrey, by implication, though Humphrey's
statement pertained directly to activity on his own behalf. The
"crack" serves as a commentary on Brown's choice. Its effect is to
render Brown's actions, aside from their actual merits or demerits,
petty. It removes the idealism and nobility from the Don Quixote
image while leaving its negative implications intact.

The 'last word' on Brown by *Time* concludes that his 1976 bid
for the nomination is over, but points to the coming years.

"Brightest future" echoes the Quixote idealism, as does the
directly sarcastic "lower-thy-expectations lines." "Lines" suggests
again that Brown, realizing it or not, is playing a role, and the im-
plication of phoniness reinforces the Mankiewicz lines noted above.

"Turns on the voters" again stresses that Brown's appeal is
emotional rather than based on thought. In "Unless they weary of his
above-it-all vagueness," *Time* suggests that it has already wearied, and
offers its view of Brown for adoption by its readers.
SUMMARY: "Stampede to Carter"

Attitude: negative

How shown: implied

This article has a 24-sentence segment on Jerry Brown which begins, "Quixotically, Brown continued to fight." The article's analysis places in the negative list terms such as "lower-thy-expectations line" and "above-it-all vagueness." The quote, "It's hard to tell just what all this means," is ironic in its reflection on Brown in light of the announced image. The attitude of the article toward Jerry Brown is clearly negative; it is also the magazine's last word on him at the conclusion of the presidential primary period in 1976.
Mr. Brown Goes to Town

SHANA ALEXANDER

The political process is like a piece of ice on a hot stove. It rides on its own melting.
The trouble with the drunk-driving laws is that drunk and sober are metaphysical concepts.
Humani nil a me alienum puto [Nothing human is alien to me]. That's why I can sit with millionaires at the Bohemian Grove one day and George Meany the next.

These are not the remarks of a Zen monk or barefoot mystic, but ordinary living-room conversation of the country's most interesting new political figure, Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr., 36, who has just been elected governor of California.

California is where everything good or bad, trivial or important seems to happen first in America, perhaps because its people tend to be more rootless, restless and various than elsewhere, more open to the future, less bound to the past. So when the people of California elect a fellow who talks to them in abstractions, parables and Latin; when they elect him practically over the dead bodies of the Democratic establishment (a number of party regulars still view their gangly, intense new governor as the Steve Weed of politics); when the volatile California electorate appears to hear something the old politicians don't or can't, my own ears go up. I want to knock at that door.

ZEN AND THE ART OF POLITICS

I found it in a secluded Hollywood hillside eucalyptus grove, to which was attached a small plaque: Age quod agis.
"It means, do what you are doing," said the handsome, wary young man who opened the door and invited me into a large, simple room where logs crackled in the fireplace and thirteenth-century Moorish flamenco music thurmed on the hi-fi. Coffee table, floor and couches were heaped with books and papers--Camus, Hesse, Conrad, Frost, "Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance." Buddhist tracts, Latin poets, all mixed in with government reports, multivolume budgets, sewage proposals, energy-flow charts, highway bonds.
"You seem to have begun doing it," I said.
He almost allowed himself a grin.
"Nothing to it. You spend a year making five speeches a day, fall over the finish line, answer 100 accumulated phone calls--and there's nothing left to do between now and January but think about land use, prisons, the arts commission, the right to strike, the farm workers, the budget, pollution, mass transit, energy schools, rising unemployment, inflation and zero confidence in government. This job needs a mystic. There's no other way to solve it."

The weightiest volume of them all was a 3-inch-thick looseleaf black notebook listing every government job in California, from alcoholic beverage control chief to youth authority board director--more than 1,900 jobs in all.

"The biggest problem in government today is lack of trust," said Brown. "What appears to be, isn't. So, we don't want any behind-the-scenes stuff." Instead, he plans a broad-based citizens' committee that will screen applicants and recruit nonapplicants. "I want people who have something to offer because of who they are, not what they are," Brown says.

"PICK THEM GRAPE'S"

Like much of his utterance, the remark is tantalizingly abstract, but attractive in moral tone. During the campaign, he often used a mysterious but appealing phrase, "the political will," I asked what it meant.

"The political will is a symbol for recognizing the right moment and having the willingness to move, to fight inertia. Grace is the energy that allows you to do things. In that sense age quod agis means: do the work, pick them grapes."

The grapes were a reference to earlier days when he had himself picked grapes for Cesar Chavez. Brown also fought for civil rights in Mississippi and against the Vietnam war. Finally, in his last four years as California's secretary of state, he fought to clean up political corruption.
Brown's pet scheme put a $10 limit on the amount a lobbyist could spend winning and dining a legislator--"enough for two hamburgers and a Coke"--and required legislators to report any gift worth more than $25.

"Can you imagine what that means to a politician?" Brown exclaimed. "It means you can't spend money in Sacramento any more to influence legislation. When each man up there is getting his own way, who's looking out for general interest, the public's interest? Nobody."

Brown's sensitivity to political corruption must go back to his boyhood as the son of California's attorney general and later two-term governor, "Pat" Brown.
Not that the father was in any way corrupt; he was one of the best and best-loved public servants the state has known. But he functioned in the world of "traditional politics," and, as his son says, that world is "full of free suits, free dinners, free loaders; it creates a whole privileged class of Pooh-Bahs, with wrong expectations of what they're entitled to.

This is where the state's Democratic Party regulars misperceived Jerry Brown. They thought his early, 20-point lead over the other Democratic contenders merely meant that voters couldn't tell the difference between a father and son with different personalities and political styles, but the same name. It appears now that once more the professional party regulars underestimated the electorate, and that what Californians were responding to in Jerry Brown was the reincarnation of a nearly extinct American figure—the high-minded, Arrow-collared, short-haired, highly scrupled young legislator hero of 1930s movies like "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

SACRIFICE THE SAUNA

Although he is a proven politician, by both birthright and a modest term of public office, young Brown is also a man not overburdened by experience, which this season may be the most overrated of political virtues. The devaluation of experience in contemporary politics has less to do with Watergate, I suspect, than with the growing recognition by the electorate that it is experience in a world that is rapidly ceasing to exist.

Brown recently astounded legislators by opposing a bill to raise the governor's salary from $49,000 to $60,000. "Sacrifice should start at the top," he explained. "If the governor is getting a 20 per cent pay raise, and moving into a new $1.6 million mansion 20 miles out of town with a swimming pool and a sauna, it's a little hard to get ordinary people to tighten their belts."

Brown rejects the suggestion that he allowed his early lead over Republican Houston Flournoy to erode by playing safe, saying little, failing to do. "Flournoy maybe gave people a more secure feeling," said Brown. "But I gave them a more adventurous feeling." If Jerry Brown is right, this may be the best political news of 1974.
Concordance: Mr. Brown Goes to Town"

Central image: Jerry Brown as "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington": Idealistic, Right-Minded Political Figure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence for &quot;Mr. Smith&quot; image</th>
<th>Evidence against &quot;Mr. Smith&quot; image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(three opening quotes) not remarks of Zen monk or barefoot mystic, but ordinary living-room conversation</td>
<td>(quotes not idealistic, visionary on practical level)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the country's most interesting new political figure</td>
<td>(not interesting; veteran political figure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California: more open to future, less bound to past</td>
<td>(less open to future, more bound to past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people of California elect fellow</td>
<td>(people of California reject)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talks to them in abstractions parables, Latin</td>
<td>(alien: not-fellow)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>elect him practically over the dead bodies of the Democratic establishment</td>
<td>(talks in normal modes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>volatile California electorate</td>
<td>(elect with concurrence of Democratic establishment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appears to hear something the old politicians don't or can't</td>
<td>(non-volatile electorate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my own ears go up</td>
<td>(fails to hear)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to knock at that door</td>
<td>(disinterest)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>found (door) in a secluded Hollywood hillside eucalyptus grove</td>
<td>(not worth seeking out)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attached plaque: &quot;age quod agis&quot; &quot;It means: 'Do what you are doing.'&quot;</td>
<td>(not found in secluded grove)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>said the handsome, wary young man</td>
<td>(no motto)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(unattractive, unguarded, old; masculinity/humanity not designated)
Evidence for "Mr. Smith" image

who opened the door
large, simple room
logs crackled in the fireplace
thirteenth-century Moorish flamenco music
thrummed on the hi-fi
coffee table, floor and couches heaped with books and papers
Camus, Hesse, Conrad, Frost, "Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance," Buddhist tracts, Latin poets
all mixed in with government reports

You seem to have begun doing it
almost allowed himself a grin
"This jobs needs a mystic"
"biggest problem in government is lack of trust"
"I want people who have something to offer because of who they are, not what they are."

Like much of his utterance
tantalizingly abstract but attractive in moral tone
often used mysterious but appealing phrase, "the political will"
"symbol for recognizing the right moment and having the willingness to move, to fight inertia"

Evidence against "Mr. Smith" image

(door opened by another)
(small, elaborate room)
(no fire)
(modern music)
(no hi-fi)
(few books, papers)
(these titles not read)
(no government business home; separate from philosophic, aesthetic interests)
(no voluntary work)
(grins easily)
(job does not need a mystic)
(biggest problem not lack of trust)
(people wanted for what, not who, they are)
(unlike much of his talk/plain speech)
(remark concrete but unattractive in moral tone)
(phrase not used)
(phrase not a symbol; no recognition of right moment, no willingness to fight inertia)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence for &quot;Mr. Smith&quot; image</th>
<th>Evidence against &quot;Mr. Smith&quot; image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He had himself picked grapes for Cesar Chavez, fought for civil rights in Mississippi and against the Vietnam War</td>
<td>(no social or moral cause involvement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as California's secretary of state, fought to clean up political corruption</td>
<td>(no fight to clean up corruption)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sensitivity to political corruption must go back to boyhood</td>
<td>(sensitivity to political corruption does not go back to boyhood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>son of California's attorney general and two-term governor Pat Brown</td>
<td>(not son of attorney general/governor Pat Brown)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;traditional politics&quot; -- &quot;a whole privileged class of Pooh-Bahs, with wrong expectations of what they're entitled to&quot;</td>
<td>(expectations of traditional politics accepted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Californians were responding to in Jerry Brown the reincarnation of a nearly extinct American figure -- the high-minded, Arrow-collared, short-haired, highly scrupled young legislator hero: &quot;Mr. Smith Goes to Washington&quot;</td>
<td>(Californians not responding to Jerry Brown as &quot;Mr. Smith&quot; figure)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proven politician by birthright and modest term in public office</td>
<td>(not proven politician)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young Brown</td>
<td>(absence of youth)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also a man</td>
<td>(absence of manliness)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not overburdened with experience</td>
<td>(overburdened with experience)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recently astounded legislators</td>
<td>(does not astound legislators)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by opposing a bill to raise governor's salary</td>
<td>(does not oppose raise for self)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rejects suggestion that he allowed early lead to erode by playing safe, failing to do</td>
<td>(accepts playing safe)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
"Mr. Brown Goes to Town" begins with three of Brown's 'wise sayings' in italics above the body of the article. These are followed by the observation: "These are not the remarks of a Zen monk or barefoot mystic, but ordinary living-room conversation of the country's most interesting new political figure, Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown, Jr., 36, who has just been elected governor of California."

The author implies that, if these remarks could have been made by a Zen monk or a barefoot mystic, the person who did make them shares some of their qualities: one who thinks esoteric good thoughts, and lives according to them. The "ordinary living-room conversation" implies that these are the normal statements of Brown's daily life.

Brown also endeavors to share that illumination with others—in this case, with the interviewer. Brown, then, is presented here as something of a modern prophet, a "most interesting new political figure."

He has been elected governor by the people of California, "where everything good or bad, trivial or important, seems to happen first in America, perhaps because its people tend to be more rootless, restless and various than elsewhere, more open to the future, less bound to the past."

Here the people of California are themselves cast in a prophetic
mode: like Zen monks and barefoot mystics, they are not rooted, settled, and easily categorized like ordinary people elsewhere (the "more" in the sentence shows the contrast).

These opposing qualities show the negative weighting in the article. They are terms for the political Establishment with its set way of doing things in political life. Californians, and Jerry Brown whom they elected, are "open to the future, less bound to the past." That is, they are oriented toward a political future now in process and are loosening their connections to the political past.

The article continues:

So when the people of California elect a fellow who talks to them in abstractions, parables and Latin; when they elect him practically over the dead bodies of the Democratic establishment, when the volative California electorate appears to hear something the old politicians don't or can't, my own ears go up. I want to knock at that door.

The reference to Brown speaking in "abstractions, parables and Latin" restates the central image of the article: Brown as modern political prophet, a reincarnate "Mr. Smith." So do "gangly" and "intense"; prophets are, historically, supposed to be lean and driven. This new prophet, like the old ones, reaches the people over the strong opposition of those in power, who "don't or can't" recognize his prophetic qualities. The "volatile electorate," however, "easily kindled," is able to 'catch' his esoteric political message.

The writer who presents herself as alert to this new political note says, "My own ears go up. I want to knock at that door." This is the image of one seeking out a guru. The location reinforces this: "I found it in a secluded Hollywood hillside eucalyptus grove." The
description suggests the dwelling place of a prophet at least, if not a minor deity: the Hollywood hillside has replaced Mt. Olympus, and eucalyptus the olive trees, but the setting is clearly the same.

The one who has been to see the prophet reports back to the outside world the contents of this arcane world:

To the door was attached a small plaque: "Age quod agis." It means, "Do what you are doing," said the handsome, wary young man who opened the door and invited me into a large, simple room where logs crackled in the fireplace and thirteenth-century music thrummed on the hi-fi. Coffee table, floor and couches were heaped with books and papers—Camus, Hesse, Conrad, Frost, 'Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance,' Buddhist tracts, Latin poets, all mixed in with government reports, multivolume budgets, sewage proposals, energy-flow charts, highway bonds.

In the light of the established prophetic context, the inscription on Brown's door evokes "open sesame." It becomes the password to Brown's inner sanctum. Brown, who himself opens the door, is immediately shown to possess the arcane knowledge the password/plaque contains. The prophet, in person. He is described as "handsome"—an attractive prophet, not repellant or strange; and as "wary"—a prophet for all his youth and good looks, guarding himself and his dwelling against unwarranted entry.

"Wary" serves to moderate the 'worldly' effect of "handsome" and returns the reader quickly to the sense of the separation between Brown-as-prophet and the 'outside world.'

The 'hi-fi' establishes the prophet's modernity. Except for this, the room with its books and papers (though the titles also tie Brown to the present), its "thirteenth-century Moorish flamenco music," its "logs crackling in the fireplace," might be out of the Middle Ages.
Brown is shown here to be an aggregate of all these varying elements: they are all "mixed in" with another form of arcane knowledge, known to daunt many highly intelligent persons: government reports, in great variety and quantity.

Commenting on the presence of these, the writer observes, "You seem to have begun doing it," and reports, "He almost allowed himself a grin."

The writer's comment here echoes Brown's motto: "Do what you are doing." His response indicates pleasure at the writer's recognition that he is indeed practicing what he preaches--working at bringing the new political future into reality. His holding back the grin reflects the person who was "wary" on opening the door. A grin is an opening of oneself, and again Brown is wary about doing so. The picture here is of one who guards himself tightly. Again, the image fits well within the framework of Brown-as-prophet, protecting himself against intrusion.

But Brown responds with an ironic, yet somewhat cocky, "Nothing to it." He lists the overwhelming demands made on him by a year of campaigning followed by his intensive preparations to come to grips with the highly complex social problems he will have to deal with as governor after his inauguration the following January. He concludes, "This job needs a mystic. There's no other way to solve it."

Brown, thus, also sees himself as a prophetic figure, and cites his role as mystic as the prime qualification for his new office. The cockiness, and his claim to mysticism, indicate that, while wary, Brown is not shy about acknowledging his own gifts.
He tells his visitor: "The biggest problem in government today is lack of trust. What appears to be, isn't. So, we don't want any behind-the-scenes stuff." He refers to the process he will establish in recruiting for government positions in his administration. He concludes: "I want people who have something to offer because of who they are, not what they are."

Again, the prophet image: he will restore trust, eliminate illusion, perform his task openly for all to see. The writer comments, "Like much of his utterance, the remark is tantalizingly abstract, but attractive in moral tone." Brown's explanation of the phrase "the political will" is in the same mode.

Brown's ties to the present as prophet reincarnate are cited: participating in movements for social and civil rights, opposition to the Vietnam War, and as secretary of state his $10 limit on lobbyists "wining and dining" legislators. The old political style, "wining and dining," is contrasted here with the new spirit—"two hamburgers and a Coke," symbolic of freedom from not only bribery, but from attraction to such forms of influence.

There is in the phrase also a sense of gleeful balloon-puncturing, a suggestion of self-righteousness on the part of the modern prophet.

The writer states:

This is where the state's Democratic Party regulars misperceived Jerry Brown. They thought his early 20-point lead over the other Democratic contenders merely meant the voters couldn't tell the difference between a father and son with different personalities and political styles, but the same name. It appears now that once more the professional party regulars underestimated the electorate.
The prophet is here presented as being confirmed by his following.

The writer then directly states the central image of the article: "What Californians were responding to in Jerry Brown was a reincarnation of a nearly extinct American figure--the high-minded, Arrow-collared, short-haired, highly scrupled young legislator here of 1930's movies like "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington."

So Jerry Brown is a prophet reincarnate, a Messianic figure from a simpler, clearer past in American political life.

The writer points to Brown's absence of extensive experience in politics as a plus: "The devaluation of experience in contemporary politics has less to do with Watergate, I suspect, than with the growing recognition by the electorate that it is experience in a world that is rapidly ceasing to exist." Brown, then, is free of past encumbrance, able to carry out his prophetic task of renewing government. Brown's final statement confirms this: "Flournoy maybe gave people a more secure feeling, but I gave them a more adventurous feeling." The people are ready to move with their new prophet into the purer, cleaner political future.

The writer concludes, "If Jerry Brown is right, this may be the best political news of 1974." The statement both embraces the concept Brown is shown to represent and includes a note, however brief, of diffidence--"If Brown is right"--which prevents the prophet image from becoming absolute.
SUMMARY: "Mr. Brown Goes to Town"

Attitude: Positive

How shown: stated

In this article the attitude expressed toward Jerry Brown is wholly positive. This "most interesting new political figure" is presented as a "reincarnation of the highly scrupled young legislator hero in 'Mr. Smith Goes to Washington,'" and thus a modern prophet figure whose vision of politics is uncorrupted. Brown's "reincarnation" is California-style, under the aspect of "Zen prophet/barefoot mystic," and terms throughout the article sustain his modern prophet status. The positive weighting could be no stronger; the concordance contains no direct negative terms at all.
A current is stirring in America. Call it post-imperial politics—a sobered theme for a diminished time. After Vietnam, after Watergate, after the heady, credulous '60s and their withered promises, the nation has a shrunken view of itself and its prospects. The new mood has yet to have much effect in Washington, but on a recent trip around the country I found it running strong in the city halls, the statehouses and the talk of both major parties. What the politicians sense in the people is a feeling of failure, a misgiving that they have paid too much for too little, a mistrust of government itself and a doubt approaching despair that the nation’s problems can be solved at all. And while nobody can predict where this current will lead, the outcome could be a change in American politics as basic as the upheaval of the Depression years, defining the terms of debate for a generation and forcing both parties to campaign on a new set of issues.

The new politics has already spawned a new breed of mayors and governors, who won their offices on traditionally liberal Democratic platforms and promptly began repudiating traditionally liberal programs. Their stylistic figurehead is California Gov. Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr., the onetime Jesuit seminarian who refuses to live in the governor’s mansion and rides in an unpretentious Plymouth, and their slogan was proclaimed by Gov. Hugh Carey of New York: “The days of wine and roses are over.” But if this seems just a conventional turn to the right, the conventional terms are misleading. In both parties, the new politicians are questioning not the goals of liberal politics, but the means to achieve them. “Action has been the catchword,” Brown told me, sipping a coffee in his Sacramento office. “But people feel that things are being done to them, not for them. Sometimes non-action is better. Sometimes we need fewer programs, less planning, more space to live our lives.”

That theme touches a resonant chord in politicians, educators, industrialists and officeholders across the country. “People think the government is doing them wrong,” said Lyn Nofziger, veteran Republican, over lunch in Sacramento.
"N.z.," said pollster Mervin Field in San Francisco, "it's not so much that as they don't think the government can help them." "As they see it," said Angelo Geocaris, a Democratic fund raiser in Chicago, "there's no way of making the system work." "Our major institutions are in trouble," concluded Dr. Lisle Carter, chancellor of the struggling black Atlanta University Center. "People are undergoing a crisis of trust."

Alienation is worst among the broad middle class—the "unyoung, unpoor, unblack" voters, with incomes variously estimated between $6,000 and $15,000 a year, whom Richard Scammon and Ben Wattenberg identified as "the real majority" in the 1968 election. "It's a frame of mind that says, 'Government is taking care of them, but not me,'" said Illinois Gov. Daniel Walker, one of the first of the new breed to reach high state office. "If you don't recognize their problems, you're in trouble."

But the disaffected stretch across the social spectrum, showing increasing resentment not only at the inadequacies of government but at its intrusion into their lives—whether in heavy-handed regulation of business, intervention in a community's choice of school textbooks, forced busing to achieve integration or the maddening imposition of auto seat-belt interlocks. Atlanta lawyer David Gambrell is promoting "Wait-a-Damn-Minute," a movement aimed at fending off nearly all government action, with a nostalgic motif from Willie Rogers: "There is good news from Washington today. The Congress is deadlocked and can't act."

In part, this sour mood reflects economic reality: inflation has eroded the average family's real income to less than it was ten years ago, while the progressive income tax has been taking ever-growing bites of what's left. The result is an unprecedented awareness of the damage done by inflation; at the depth of the worst recession in 40 years, a Gallup poll recently found three times as many people worried about inflation as were afraid of recession... Perhaps worse, the exaggerated rhetoric of the optimistic '60s has come back to haunt today's officeholders. Whatever the good the War on Poverty did—and it did a lot—it is inevitably seen as a failure in its own grandiose terms.

"We've raised expectations too high," said Henry Ford II. "There were a lot of wild promises, and nobody wants to believe anybody any more." Jerry Brown made the same case: "Taxes are too high, and the programs they buy don't deliver enough. It's very disturbing when you can't walk the street safely and your money is going for nothing."

Inflation and the growing burden of Federal debt are finally breaking up the coalition of interests that has supported most government programs ever since the New Deal. "As long as the pie was expanding," said Atlanta educator Carter, "the deal was that you could have yours as long as I got mine. But that was very expensive, and the problem is you can't keep expanding the pie indefinitely." "We've reached the limit of the national debt," said June Degnan, a Democratic contributor and fund raiser in San Francisco. "That's what the liberals have learned. For every new dollar of spending, something is going to have to be cut. It's exactly like dealing with a case of cancer—either amputate or die."

Not all old-line liberals are willing to concede that point. "Our members think taxes are inequitable, but they're not much concerned with the level of spending," said a California labor official. "Economy in government is always a popular issue, but it's a transitory thing. Minority groups tend to fight the trend as another excuse for delaying long-overdue reforms. "Poor folk and black folk," said Willie Brown, a California state legislator, "are now going to pay a high price for programs that were designed to fail in the first place."

Even when politicians agree that the political wind is changing and must be accommodated, they don't agree on how to do it. "The approaches have to be completely new, not traditional liberal or traditional conservative," said fund raiser Geocaris in Chicago. But lawyer William Singer, the man who ousted Mayor Richard Daley from the 1972 Democratic convention, retorted: "You shouldn't stress the word 'new.' A lot of people are
thinking that solutions should look to the old ideas.” “You might start with the work ethic,” said Atlanta Constitution editor Reg Murphy.

Republicans speak this language far more fluently than Democrats, and it is the GOP that has come closest to a programmatic approach to the new politics. The spokesmen are a group of lapsed liberals—neoliberal social thinkers headed by Irving Kristol, Daniel Patrick Moynihan and Daniel Bell. Writing in The Public Interest quarterly and on the editorial page of The Wall Street Journal, they have coined the new cliche that throwing dollars at problems had not solved them and concluded that government can best intervene not by direct action, but by identifying the problems and then setting rules and incentives to encourage private enterprise to work on them—for instance, by changing tax law and depreciation rules to favor maintenance of urban housing rather than its abandonment. Not all Republicans are ready to adopt this approach, but it’s a natural step for the GOP to take from its traditional stance.

The Democrats have found no such easy progression, and the party is far more divided. On the radical left, a few actually support the neoliberal line in such proposals as transferable school vouchers and direct money payments in lieu of welfare services. While many old-line liberals remain dubious that any new policy is necessary, the new politicians are groping for ways to change without abandoning the party’s traditional activism. But even they are more concerned with pragmatic answers than unified theories. “I don’t have a programmatic laundry list,” Jerry Brown said. “I’m trying to identify what’s going on, raise the important issues and make people think more clearly about them. Run a taut ship, that’s all you can do.”

In practice, Brown, 37, has been accused of outdoing his predecessor Ronald Reagan in pinchng the state’s pennies, preaching austerity and demanding sacrifices. Since taking office in January, Brown has taken a 7 per cent cut in his own salary and asked his Cabinet to follow suit. His social attitudes are even tougher; as one example, he declares flatly that prisons are for punishment, not rehabilitation. That’s a reflection of Brown’s seminarian years, said Don Livingston, a Reagan aide who worked with Brown during the transition and is still bemused by the new governor’s rectitude. “The worst thing that can happen to you,” says Livingston, “is to have given too much money to his campaign. He’ll bend over backward not to do you any favors.”

Jerry Brown’s unconventionality has made it a parlor game in California to debate his sincerity and the extent of his political ambition—a question that became even more intriguing recently when word got out that he had hired former New York congressman Allard Lowenstein, an early mover in Eugene McCarthy’s 1968 Presidential campaign, as a vaguely defined consultant. Brown himself once shrugged off the Presidential question with a memorable throwaway line—“Are you kidding? Just being governor is a pain in the ass”—but now he says primly that it would be “presumptuous and not very useful” to look beyond Sacramento. As for Lowenstein, Brown told me not too convincingly that he was just a congenial soul with a taste for long hours, and it would be useful to have him around.

Illinois’s Dan Walker, 52, who has had two years longer than Brown to settle into his job, has worked out more substantive techniques to carry out his belief that “more often than not, it’s better for government to stay out of problems.” Walker is faulted by critics for his messianic style and transparent ambition, but nobody denies that he has cut the number of state employees by 10 per cent, held the line on taxes and installed “zero-base” budgeting—a process, pioneered in Georgia by former Gov. Jimmy Carter, that demands renewed justification each year for every job and every program, not just the new ones.

As Walker sees it, most officials tend to be overly responsive to special-interest groups, reasoning that most voters don’t notice such favors. But as the special pleaders proliferate and narrow their focus, he says, the majority feels increasingly left out and resentful. To represent most voters, says Walker, an official should remember that they aren’t part of the pressure groups—and “If you take care, what comes through after a while is what you are.” A few warts on the image don’t hurt at all: “If you don’t know the answer, say so. Just say, ‘I don’t know. You got me there.’”
The voters seem to like the new style. Despite a feud with the statehouse press and the long-standing enmity of Daley's machine, Walker seems a good bet for re-election next year; as for Brown, Field's latest California Poll found approval of the governor outweighing disapproval 10 to 1. And the style is catching on. Among the latest crop of governors, Carey of New York, Jerry Apodaca of New Mexico, James Longley of Maine, David Boren of Oklahoma and Colorado's Richard Lamm are all taking cautiously frugal lines—as are such big-city mayors as Thomas Bradley of Los Angeles and Coleman Young of Detroit.

The new politics may not be easily applied to national campaigns, where the voters' notion of a candidate's character tends to overshadow most individual issues. For Democrats especially, said political scientist Paul Halpern of UCLA, a platform of frugality and social retrenchment would be a handicap; to be nominated, "a Democrat has to promise programs, activist programs, to get the backing of the kids, the idealists, the intellectuals and the minorities."

But that's conventional wisdom, and it may no longer be wise. If character will be the crucial factor in 1976, the question is what kind of character the voters want—and the people I talked to spoke wistfully, time and again, of candor, honesty and directness. That in turn raises the question of what the voters will find credible—and it's worth noting that Gerald Ford, no mean politician and one whose biggest asset is his forthright image, is busily tailoring his own programs to fit the modest new fashion.

"The most believable guy will win, even if it's the one who says, 'I can't do anything for you,'" predicted Sandy Weiner, a West Coast political consultant. "They'll believe the guy who says, 'You shouldn't expect very much.' That's a little sad, like the end of adolescence, but it's probably realistic. It fits the nation's diminished view of itself."
Concordance: "Say-Nay Politics"

Central image: Jerry Brown As Stylistic Figurehead for New Politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evidence for Brown as Figurehead</th>
<th>Evidence against Brown as Figurehead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>current is stirring in America</td>
<td>(current not stirring)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post-imperial politics</td>
<td>(politics not post-imperial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nation has shrunken view of itself and its prospects</td>
<td>(no shrunken view)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new mood running strong in city halls, statehouses and talk of both parties</td>
<td>(no need mood)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt approaching despair that nation's problems can be solved at all</td>
<td>(no doubt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Jerry Brown:) stylistic figurehead</td>
<td>(not stylistic figurehead)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new breed of mayors and governors</td>
<td>(no new breed of mayors, governors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>onetime Jesuit seminarian</td>
<td>(not onetime Jesuit seminarian)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refuses to live in governor's mansion</td>
<td>(accepts governor's mansion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rides in unpretentious Plymouth</td>
<td>(rides in pretentious car)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disaffected stretch across social spectrum</td>
<td>(Disaffected do not stretch across social spectrum)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>showing increased resentment at government inadequacies, intrusion into their lives</td>
<td>(no increased resentment at govt. inadequacies, intrusions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sour mood reflects economic reality</td>
<td>(sour mood not a reflection of economic reality)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a prime cause</td>
<td>(not a prime cause)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;exaggerated rhetoric&quot;</td>
<td>(no exaggerated rhetoric)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evidence for Brown as Figurehead

"There were a lot of wild promises, and nobody wants to believe anybody anymore."

political wind is changing
and must be accommodated
more concerned with pragmatic answers
than with unified theories
accused of outdoing Ronald Reagan in pinching pennies
bemused by new governor's rhetoric
"will bend over backwards not to do (campaign donors) any favors"
taking a populist leaf from Gov. Wallace's book
gadfly of his own bureaucrats
(no ambition to be President)
once shrugged off Presidential questions: "Just being governor is a pain in the ass."
many voters seem to like new style
Field Poll found approval of the governor at 86 per cent

Evidence against Brown as Figurehead

(no wild promises; general belief)
(political wind not changing)
(no need to accommodate change)
(not concerned with pragmatic answers)
(concerned with unified theories)
(not accused of outdoing Reagan)
(not bemused by Brown's rhetoric)
(does favors for campaign donors)
(no populist leaf taken from Wallace)
(not a gadfly of bureaucrats)
(hired Allard K. Lowenstein, an early mover in Eugene McCarthy's 1968 presidential campaign, as a vaguely defined consultant
says primly that it would be "presumptuous and not very useful" to look beyond Sacramento
(few voters seem to dislike new style)
outweighing disapproval
Explication of "Say-Nay Politics," *Newsweek*, June 9, 1975

This article is an overall description of the new politics in America, "post-imperial politics--after Vietnam, after Watergate, after the heady credulous '60's."

Jerry Brown is referred to as "stylistic figurehead" for "a new breed of mayors and governors, who won their offices on traditionally liberal Democratic platforms and promptly began repudiating traditional liberal programs."

This seeming to be one thing, proving to be otherwise presents a Trojan Horse image, especially with the reference to a "new breed" (and with the whimsical and possibly wholly unintentional 'whinney' in the article's title, which may demonstrate how strongly one's basic images act to control one's word choices). Insofar as the figure applies to Jerry Brown the article shows him to have plenty of company. The group of new officials is presented here as signalling the future, by the word "new."

In fact, they and Brown are introduced in the second paragraph of the article after the new politics has been defined at length in the first. Its connection with Jerry Brown, as the article states that connection, should be made clear, however. Since Brown is its "stylistic figurehead" also by standing for its group of advocates, the article's definition of the new politics serves, by direct association, as an extended definition of Jerry Brown's own policies. The article's view of Brown is thus presented to the reader by way of its view of the movement it links him to.
The article begins, "A current is stirring in America." The evident alliteration in these opening words helps to carry the meaning. It 'sounds like' a motor running or wheels turning, conveying through the language an additional sense of awareness that movement and dynamism are present. The choice of "current" also suggests electric power and/or a breeze beginning, adding to the overall sense of energy. America is beginning to move.

The post-imperial politics has been formed "after the heady, credulous '60's and their withered promises." In their wake, "the nation has a shrunken view of itself and its prospects." The author says, "The new mood has yet to have much effect in Washington, but I found it running strong in the city halls, the statehouses and the talk of both major parties."

The statement presents a grassroots phenomenon of reawakening and renewal in the outlying clusters of power as the "current" is responded to while Washington, the center of the nation, is unaware, unresponsive—as yet.

What the politicians sense in the people is a feeling of failure, a misgiving that they have paid too much for too little, a mistrust of government itself and a doubt approaching despair that the nation's problems can be solved at all. And while nobody can predict where this current will lead, the outcome could be a change in American politics as basic as the upheaval of the Depression years, defining the terms of debate for a generation and forcing both parties to campaign on a new set of issues.

A dichotomy is present here. The mood of the nation is pictured both as "a doubt approaching despair" and as a "current" with the power to "lead," to "define the terms for debate," and to "force" the facing of "new issues." Somehow the "shrunken view of itself and its
its prospects," instead of leading to a collapse of energy, has generated a kind of renewal.

At this point in the article Jerry Brown is introduced as "stylistic figurehead" for the "new breed" of officials who advance the cause of the new politics.

"The onetime Jesuit seminarian who refuses to live in the governor's mansion and rides in an unpretentious Plymouth," demonstrates the spirit of the new politics: the refusal of privilege and ostentation. This ascetic orientation, in the context of the article, is extended to being also willing to do without big government programs, seen by this group as another form of public ostentation.

The article points out:

The disaffected stretch across the social spectrum, showing increased resentment not only at the inadequacies of government but at its intrusions into their lives—whether in heavyhanded regulation of business, intervention in a community's choice of school textbooks, forced busing to achieve integration or the maddening imposition of auto seat-belt interlocks.

The tone of "increased resentment" makes the transition between the mood of "despair" and the "current" of change. Resentment is active, not passive; Brown and the others, then, are seen as voicing, sharing in, the voters' resentment.

The article continues: "In part, this sour mood reflects economic reality: inflation has eroded the average family's real income to less than it was ten years ago, while the progressive income tax has been taking ever-growing bites of what's left."

Also cited as a prime cause: the "exaggerated rhetoric" of big government programs like the War on Poverty, which,
...is inevitably seen as a failure in its own grandiose terms. "We've raised expectations too high," said Henry Ford II. "There were a lot of wild promises, and nobody wants to believe anybody anymore." Jerry Brown made the same case: "Taxes are too high, and the programs they buy don't deliver enough. It's very disturbing when you can't walk the street safely and your money is going for nothing."

Brown and the conservative industrialist are shown in agreement—symbolizing the new politics' reach beyond traditional political boundaries.

The article articulates a basic principle of the new politics:

"'We've reached the limit of the national debt,' said June Degnan, a Democratic contributor and fund raiser in San Francisco. 'That's what the liberals have learned. For every new dollar of spending, something is going to have to be cut.'"

But, the article says,

Not all old-time liberals are willing to concede that point. "Our members think taxes are inequitable, but they're not much concerned with the level of spending," said a California labor official. "Economy in government is always a popular issue, but it's a transitory thing."

Other countering views are offered: minorities see the spirit of limitation as a threat to programs they are waiting for; one official suggests, "A lot of people are thinking that solutions should look to the old ideas," perhaps to the work ethic. The weight of the article's development, however, seems to be on the side of genuine popular discontent and a real search for new answers. The contrary views here seem too little and too late to have much impact in the argument as the article presents it.

Rather, as it continues, the article explores practical efforts of members of both parties who "agree that the political wind is
changing and must be accommodated." They are, the article states, "more concerned with pragmatic answers than unified theories. 'I don't have a programmatic laundry list,' Jerry Brown said. 'I'm trying to identify what's going on, raise the important issues and make people think more clearly about them. Run a taut ship, that's all you can do.'"

Brown is thus placed on the side of practicality as opposed to that of abstract theorizing.

This view is expanded:

In practice, Brown, 37, has been accused of outdoing his predecessor Ronald Reagan in pinching the state's pennies, preaching austerity and demanding sacrifices. Since taking office in January, Brown has taken a seven per cent cut in his own salary and asked his Cabinet to follow suit. His social attitudes are even tougher: as one example, he declares flatly that prisons are for punishment, not rehabilitation. That's a reflection of Brown's seminarian years, said Don Livingston, a Reagan aid, who worked with Brown during the transition and is still bemused by the new governor's rectitude. "The worst thing that can happen to you," says Livingston, "is to have given too much money to his campaign. He'll bend over backward not to do you any favors."

The word "accused" is here used ironically. In the article's context, Brown's "practice" of what he preaches is regarded favorably. The use of "bemused" modifies Brown's "bend over backward" policies, strengthening the article's growing presentation of him as balanced, even though showing him as strongly in opposition to the old, established governmental forms:

"Taking a populist leaf from Alabama Gov. George Wallace's book, Brown governs as the gadfly of his own bureaucrats, deriding their attache cases, deploiring their jargon and very nearly calling them pointy-headed."

The description fits in well with the sense of resentment shown
to be central to the mood of the new politics. Brown clearly shares it, stress-
ing his being "one of the people," not one of the old liberal Democrats they resent. Here again, the edge is removed by the use of "very nearly."

Up to this point, the article has presented Brown as being in harmony with the philosophy to the point of identification, or, conversely, identified the new politics almost completely with what it presents as being Brown's philosophy. The final section moves the two apart to a degree.

The article says:

Jerry Brown's unconventionality has made it a parlor game in California to debate his sincerity and the extent of his political ambitions—a question that became even more intriguing recently when word got out that he had hired former New York congressman Allard K. Lowenstein, an early mover in Eugene McCarthy's 1968 Presidential campaign, as a vaguely defined consultant. Brown himself once shrugged off the Presidential question with a memorable throwaway line: "Are you kidding? Just being governor is a pain in the ass"—but now he says primly that it would be "presumptuous and not very useful" to look beyond Sacramento. As for Lowenstein, Brown told me not too convincingly that he was just a congenial soul with a taste for long hours, and it would be useful to have him around.

Both Brown's "sincerity and the extent of his political ambition" are shown here to be called into question by the hiring of Lowenstein. His earlier seemingly spontaneous expression of distaste for the Presidency has now become a "prim" demurrer, the contrast underscored by Lowenstein's presence. What then, the article suggests, of his professed distaste for big government? Maybe other of his strongly expressed views are also open to change, toward what he has professed to disavow.

Moving on to discussion of another new governor, the article
leaves its description of Brown there, adding only that the "voters seem to like the new style," and pointing out, "as for Brown, Field's latest California Poll found approval of the governor outweighing disapproval by 86 per cent."

The final comment thus to a degree separates Brown himself from the new political movement. Perhaps, the article's pattern of associations suggest, as the new group of officials seemed to be liberal but proved to be something else, Brown seems to be the group's representative while planning to use the new "current" to his own advantage. The new group then becomes a Trojan Horse for Jerry Brown's presidential aspirations. Brown is then "stylistic figurehead," at least at present, but possibly more by analogy than by substance.

SUMMARY: "Say-Nay Politics

Attitude: qualified positive

How shown: stated

The article presents a qualified positive view of Jerry Brown by presenting him as the "stylistic figurehead" of a new politics it shows approvingly in the text. However, Brown is dissociated from complete identification with this high-minded group by his hiring of Al­lard K. Lowenstein, a political consultant with experience in running presidential campaigns.

By directly calling Brown the representative of the new political current the article makes its positive attitude clear. By directly questioning Brown's sincerity, contrasting the hiring of Lowenstein with Brown's pithy disclaimer concerning presidential ambitions, the article also shows its qualification of that positive view.
Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful

He slouched in the back seat of his ostentatiously plain blue Plymouth, his taut body loosening after twelve hard hours on the state budget, his restless mind running on to the next problem in the limits of power. In his lap were fat manila dossiers on two recently paroled convicts, and as he riffled through their rap sheets, he meditated aloud on the futility of trying to reform them. The prisons, said California’s supercool Gov. Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr., were failing at rehabilitation—were in fact only spilling criminals back into the streets. “Then what can you do about crime?” somebody asked at length. An impish smile fluttered over Brown’s thin lips as he answered: “Stay low, move fast and don’t carry a lot of money.”

Brown, 37, was kidding on the square: he has turned his year-old stewardship over the nation’s most populous state into a kind of revolution of falling expectations—and has made California like it. He came to power a liberal Democrat by bloodline—his father, Pat, had been governor before Ronald Reagan—and, as far as anybody knew, by personal predilection. But Brown has since mounted a one-man guerrilla war against the old liberal orthodoxy that no public
problem, however sticky, is beyond solution by money, technology and six-point programs. No officeholder anywhere has better captured the new small-is-beautiful ethos of American politics in the middle 1970s. Brown’s positive rating in the latest California poll was a staggering 84 per cent—and his name has begun to attract the respectful attention of the President-makers of the Democratic Party.

The governor has won his way to these heights by the revolutionary device of promising to do less—or even, where it seems to him appropriate, nothing at all. The core of his antipolitics is that there are limits to what government can achieve even in flush times, and that now the cornucopia of programing and spending is running low. “We’ve been popping out the dough,” he says, “like there’s no tomorrow—and there is.” Brown accordingly has roamed Sacramento like Torquemada among the heretics, questioning every assumption, deflating every claim of success, bleeding the budget more than even Reagan dared. Once, when he announced a yearlong moratorium on freeway construction, an angry highway worker asked him at a public Q & A session whether the resulting 2,000 layoffs didn’t bother his conscience. Said antipolitician Brown: “All government bothers my conscience.”

Brown’s conscience was formed in three and a half years in a Jesuit seminary, an interlude that still shows in his own ascetic life-style and in his prickly demands on the young disestablishmentarian lawyers and cause people who work for him. But his schooling in the possibilities and impossibilities of politics came largely from his father. Pat Brown was an old-school pol, bluff where his son is wallflowery, prodigal where his son is penurious; young Jerry moved lean and silent at his elbow, watching, listening and learning. Once, Brown père took Brown fils along to a meeting with some Kennedy Administration officials on the financing and construction of fallout shelters. No one asked if the shelters were really needed—not until young Brown got his father to whisper the question to Kennedy’s man Arthur Schlesinger, sitting beside him. “Sure, Pat, sure,” Schlesinger answered, and that was that.

That is never that for Jerry Brown, until the last question is answered and the last dollar justified. He is almost theatrically Spartan, about himself and his work. He refused the keys to the new $1.4 million governor’s mansion, bunking instead on a mattress on the floor of a $250-a-month bachelor apartment. He turned back a Cadillac limousine. He blocked a $15,500 raise for himself, and cut his staff’s salaries 7 per cent. He said no to the most innocent gifts—even a glass of vin ordinaire sent to his table last week at a Sacramento restaurant. He instituted the morning-to-midnight workday, for himself and his senior staff. He cut out ceremonial meetings and governors’ conferences as a waste of his and the taxpayers’ time. He flogged his major agency heads regularly out to their field offices, to see what really happens at the receiving end of government programs.

And he demanded a slowdown, if not a dead stop, in the more-is-better programing that has dominated American politics since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal. Brown inherited a $450 million budget surplus from Reagan; he set out to top it and did, holding the growth of spending at
7.5 per cent (to an average 12 per cent in the Reagan years) and came out $463 million in the black. He achieved what he was after at least partly by hawkeying every line in the budget himself, squandering as much as an hour on as little as $3,500. He found and struck a $153,000 item for free briefcases for state officials. He discovered one state bureaucracy draining off 15 cents on the dollar in Federal law-enforcement aid by simply (and uncritically) reviewing grant applications; the offending staff was slashed from 219 to 38. He held up a bill providing learning centers for autistic children until he could find and quiz a real-life family who had one—and then vetoed the measure when they told him that autistic children are hard to separate from the mentally retarded at early ages.

Some of the results have dismayed those Old Democrats who had assumed that Brown was Pat's kid; they grouse among themselves that the governor is better at questions than answers—and that budgetwise, at least, he is a closet Reaganite. The latter charge particularly stings Brown and his people. Reagan, growls staffer Paul Halvonik, "was not interested in economy, he was interested in screwing poor people."

Brown by contrast insists that he is only recognizing the new realities—that the times are tough, the taxpayers rebellious and the problems quite possibly insoluble by government intervention. His own theology of politics is that man and all his works, including government, are limited, and that the proper object of power is thus only "to reduce the sum of human misery a bit"—not try to program it away altogether.
with money and data readouts and systems analyses.

That, Brown insists, was the old politics—the distilled wisdom of America's best and brightest until Vietnam brought home the lesson that solutions cannot always be bought and hard times cut back on the money available to buy them. "People," says the governor, "used to think that all you had to do was get a liberal elected and the money would be there—that the mean old conservatives had just tightened the screws." That milieu, in his view, encouraged overpromising by government and inflated expectations among the governed. Programs were brainstormed into being whether or not they worked, then kept alive by their own bureaucratic inertia and by the constituencies of demand they created. "There's been a lot of income transfer in the name of conquering disease and poverty and ignorance," says Brown with toneless sourness. "A lot of people are getting paychecks, but I don't know what they're doing about disease, poverty and ignorance."

Washington, Brown believes, has only compounded the problem by its distance from the governed and by its own proliferating web of rules and regulations. It galls the governor that Federal highway officials have threatened to withhold funds from the state unless it requires motorcyclists to wear safety helmets. "Where," he snorts, "do compulsory safety helmets fit in with the Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy tradition?" He still counts himself part of that tradition—"I guess"—but at the cooled-off remove of the post-Vietnam, post-Great Society generation. His credo begins with the premise that there is "no free lunch"—that liberal government must promise less, deliver better, spend within its means and contain its own runaway growth imperative. "We're working sixteen hours a day here," says his chief of staff, Gray Davis, "just to slow government down."

The public affection for Brown is by no means wholly shared by the professionals of government and politics in California. His tense, cerebral urgency sets them on edge. So does his disregard for the social graces—he rarely says thank you—and his plain unease in a crowd; the pros liked Pat better, and have noted the arm's-length distance at which his son the governor has kept him. Brown's absorption with minutiae has kept people with pressing business waiting, sometimes past the boiling point. His capacity for coping with real problems remains suspect—particularly so in a state with 1 million people unemployed.

And yet the polls seem to support his heresy—that less, politically speaking, may be better. The message and the numbers have begun to intrigue party elders shopping for an incandescent new face in a low-watt Presidential field; the prevailing view is that Brown is a bit previous for the top spot but might make an attractive running mate for somebody else. The governor, though intrigued, is diffident about saying so; just now, he says, "I have a government to run, so I think about that." Yet even some old adversaries have begun looking at him as an idea whose time has come. "He's verbalizing what a whole lot of people feel, including all my liberal big-government friends," says
Bob Moretti, the sometime assembly speaker who lost to Brown in a bitter 1974 primary. "They're saying we've been trying this philosophy of government for 40 years, and it's time to admit that a lot of it isn't worth a damn."

The jury is still out on Jerry Brown, and on the counter-revolution he represents as well. The governor is surely onto something with his personal antistyle and his public antipolitics; he and a whole new wave of politicians, of both parties and all ages, have tapped into an authentic vein of citizen discontent with the spread and cost and clumsinesses of big government. "A lot of the intractable problems are being seen as just that—intractable," Brown argues. "The idea that you can buy out of unemployment, pollution and world responsibility on the cheap just isn't so." Yet it is likewise true that big government remains a given in a world in which those problems exist and fester, and sometimes explode. The first question on the American political agenda now is whether those problems are in fact insoluble, or whether the Jerry Brown generation has simply found more elegant ways of saying that it cannot solve them.

—PETER GOLDMAN with GERALD C. LUBENOW in Sacramento

Newsweek, December 15, 1975
Concordance: "Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful"

Central image: Jerry Brown as Revolutionary Leader of New Antipolitics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revolutionary Leader</th>
<th>Standard Liberal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slouched</td>
<td>(dignified posture)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the back seat</td>
<td>(not driver)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ostentatiously plain blue Plymouth</td>
<td>(standard govt. limousine)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve hard hours on state budget</td>
<td>(less time, effort on budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meditated aloud on futility of trying to reform (prisoners)</td>
<td>recently paroled convicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as far as anybody knew</td>
<td>came to power a liberal Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>revolution of falling expectations</td>
<td>stewardship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has made California like it</td>
<td>(resistance to revolutionary change)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one-man guerilla war against old liberal orthodoxy</td>
<td>(follows old liberal orthodoxy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no politician anywhere has better captured new small-is-beautiful ethos</td>
<td>(politicians not seeking to capture new ethos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive rating in latest Californias Poll staggering 84 per cent</td>
<td>his name has begun to attract respectful attention of President makers of Demo. Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promising to do less</td>
<td>(promising to do more)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;We've been popping out the dough like there's no tomorrow--and there is.&quot;</td>
<td>(no need to economize)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has roamed Sacramento like Torquemada among her heretics</td>
<td>(not fanatic about reforming big government)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;All government bothers my conscience.&quot;</td>
<td>(accepts government without question)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>young Jerry moved lean and silent at his elbow</td>
<td>schooling in politics came largely from his father, Pat Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Revolutionary Leader

Spartan
refused
turned back
blocked
cut
instituted morning-to-midnight workday
cut out as waste of time
flogged major agency heads out to their field offices
results have dismayed
grouse among themselves
budgetwise
theology of politics
man and all his works, including government, are limited
toneless sourness (re programs)
"I guess"

Standard Liberal

almost theatrically
keys to governor's mansion
limousine
raise for himself
staff's salaries
(follows standard workday)
ceremonial meetings, governor's conferences
(allowed agency heads to not go to field offices)
Old Democrats who assumed Brown was Pat's kid
governor better at questions than answers
closet Reaganite
(standard view of politics)
try to program (human misery) away altogether
"a lot of income transfer in the name of conquering disease, poverty, ignorance"
part of Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy tradition
(Brown not supercool)
(no public affection for Brown)
(professionals share affection for Brown)
(relaxed, noncerebral calm)
Revolutionary Leader

disregard
plain unease in a crowd
(has kept Pat Brown) at arm's-length
absorption with minutiae
kept people with pressing business waiting--sometimes past the boiling point
incandescent new face
(not intrigued by Presidency)
even old adversaries have begun looking at him as an idea whose time has come
on Jerry Brown and the counter-revolution he represents
surely onto something with personal antistyle, public antipolitics
tapped into authentic vein of public discontent
spread and cost and clumsiness of big govt.
"A lot of the intractable problems are being seen as just that--intractable."

Standard Liberal

social graces
(comfortable in a crowd)
his son the governor
(not absorbed with minutiae)
(keeps appointments on time)
low-watt Presidential field
diffident about saying he is intrigued just now
(standard politicians do not regard his ideas as timely)
jury is still out
(not onto something)
(standard politicians do not regard his ideas as timely)
likewise true that big govt. remains a given

Question remains: "whether problems insoluble, or whether Jerry Brown generation has found more elegant ways of saying it cannot solve them."
Explication of "Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful," Newsweek, December 15, 1975

The article begins,

"He slouched in the back seat of his ostentatiously plain blue Plymouth, his taut body loosening after twelve hard hours on the state budget."

The use of "slouched" shows at once the contrast between Brown's official position, which allows him to be chauffeured, and the article's presentation of Brown's sense of self as shown by the slouch. Its connotations place Jerry Brown out of "noblesse oblige" range. It is not a dignified posture. Brown is not the typical kind of governor.

Mention of Brown's "taut body" and his spending "twelve hard hours" on the state budget also contribute to the sense that he is not the liberal Democrat he was assumed to be. The article emphasizes his differences with that position:

"He had turned his year-old stewardship of the nation's most populous state into a kind of revolution of falling expectations--and has made Californians like it."

In this article, then, Brown is shown as advocating an about-face from, not just the conservative governance of Ronald Reagan, but from the liberal philosophy of his father and the pattern of big government he and his fellow political colleagues represent. Jerry Brown has "mounted a one-man guerilla war against the old liberal orthodoxy that no public problem, however, sticky, is beyond solution by money, technology and six-point programs."
Jerry Brown is then a political revolutionary representing a new concept:

No officeholder anywhere has better captured the new small-is-beautiful ethos of American politics in the middle 1970s. Brown's positive rating in the latest California poll was a staggering 84 per cent—and his name has begun to attract the respectful attention of the President-makers of the Democratic Party.

The article says Brown has "captured" the new ethos; he is thus presented as its advocate, but not its founder. There is also present a suggestion of aggression, taking away title from general use by others and claiming it as his own.

His acquisition has given him a claim to power. Though the new philosophy controverts the party line, his high popularity rating has won him the "respectful attention" of his estranged Party's power brokers.

The article explains Brown's advance:

"The governor has won his way to these heights by the revolutionary device of promising to do less—or even, where it seems to him appropriate, nothing at all."

The "revolutionary" is here shown again, as in "captured," in the martial image of "winning the heights." But "device" connotes insincerity. This impression is seconded by the phrase, "where it seems to him appropriate." The sequence brings in a note of coolly independent, even calculating judgment, perhaps slightly arrogant; a euphemism for the power it reveals—the power to hold back the momentum of established challenge. Thus, Brown has achieved prominence in the political game in a clear atmosphere of rivalry and conflict with the
established forces in the field.

The article clarifies Brown's less-is-better position:

"The core of his antipolitics is that there are limits to what government can achieve even in flush times, and that now the cornucopia of programming and spending is running low."

Brown and the revolutionary, who has "captured" the prevalent popular mood, now has the new ethos characterized as "antipolitics." It does not only differ from the established Party lines; it is instead alien to politics altogether controverting the until-now prevalent view that government is basically powerful, needing only to have its power oriented by the "proper" political ideology. Brown—and the popular mood he represents—hold instead that government lacks power; that its previous pretensions of power have been, therefore, largely illusion.

The article has built its image of Jerry Brown firmly by this point.

Brown has sensed and captured the popular antipolitics mood. Brown announces to the people what all the old political hands, older and supposedly wiser, could not see. Brown as revolutionary has a more acute vision that the rest. "We've been popping out dough," Brown says, "like there's no tomorrow—and there is." Brown as seer and spokesman for the new era of limits now proclaims that the day of com­uppance is upon us.

Thus, the article's pattern of associations presents to the reader Jerry Brown as leader of the new politics in the aspect of a religious crusader.
The image immediately becomes highly specific:

"Brown accordingly has roamed Sacramento like Torquemada among the heretics, questioning every assumption, deflating every claim of success, bleeding the budget more than even Reagan dared."

This is not a religious revival, with its emotional elevation and communal spirit. Rather, if it is not quite a religious persecution, it is a prosecution. Torquemada, a Spanish monk, defended that country's official faith against the inroads of the Protestant Reformation. Appointed official chief prosecutor against heresy, his high office gave him great power to counter the encroaching doctrine with legendary singleminded ferocity.

Jerry Brown, then, is the equally dedicated leader of a political counterreformation, uprooting the 'heresy' of big government.

Brown is being presented as a revolutionary quasi-religious fanatic in the pursuit of his views.

The article makes Brown's moral stance more clear:

"Replying to a challenge by a worker his cutbacks had laid off, Brown said, 'All government bothers my conscience.'"

The article continues:

"Brown's conscience was formed in three and a half years in a Jesuit seminary, an interlude that still shows in his own ascetic lifestyle and in his prickly demands on the young disestablishmentarian lawyers and cause people who work for him."

The Jesuit associations reinforce the religious crusader image; but Brown's "conscience" is here characterized, by the article's portrayal of his answer to the construction worker and Brown's treatment
of the ostensibly dedicated people who work for him, to be more concerned with the patterns of government per se than with the human beings affected by his stringencies. The fanatic image is reinforced.

Another image corroborates these two:

"His schooling in the possibilities and impossibilities of politics came largely from his father. Pat Brown was an old-school pol, bluff where his son is wallflowery, prodigal where his son is penurious; young Jerry moved lean and silent at his elbow, watching, listening, learning."

The description evokes Cassius in *Jusius Caesar*, with his "lean and hungry look." It also suggests that Jerry early on was plotting the overthrow of the old liberal philosophy, even before his seminary days a "Jesuit Torquemada" in the making.

Brown, the article says, is "almost theatrically Spartan." This befits one who lives for his cause—or, in the implication here, who seems to. Brown has "refused the keys" to the governor's mansion, bunking instead on a mattress on the floor of a $250-a-month bachelor apartment." He "turned back" a limousine. He "blocked" a raise for himself. He "cut" his staff's salaries, "said no to the most innocent gifts," "instituted the morning-to-midnight workday for himself and his senior staff," "cut out ceremonial meetings and governors' conferences as a waste of his and the taxpayers' time," "flogged his major agency heads regularly out to their field offices to see what really happens at the receiving end of government programs."

The severity of the verbs chosen here carry out the Torquemada image. However, the "almost theatrically" indicates possible
insincerity in Brown's motives and suggests there may be a twentieth-century politician here in action as well.

The sense of an almost grim intensity in pursuit of his beliefs continues:

"And he demanded a showdown, if not a dead stop, in the more-is-better programming that has dominated American politics since the days of Franklin D. Roosevelt and the New Deal."

The article makes it clear that to many of those who had served faithfully under those policies, Jerry Brown's adamant opposition was more than a surprise:

"Some of the results have dismayed those Old Democrats who had assumed that Brown was Pat's kid; they grouse among themselves that the governor is better at questions than answers--and that budgetwise, at least, he is a closet Reaganite."

Several oppositions come together here.

First, the Old Democrats "assumed"; but did not see, what Jerry Brown stood for. They are by this fact shown as imperceptive. They "grouse among themselves," lacking the power to make their opposition to his policies effective. Both terms show the old-style government they represent, with a capital O, as greatly diminished, at least in Jerry Brown's California.

If Brown is "better at questions than answers," the Torquemada image suggests that he has The Answer, from which the questions, in the tradition of Jesuit-Socratic-Scholastic thought, proceed. Brown's Answer, which the article refers to as a "theology of politics," holds that "man and all his works, including government, are limited, and
that the proper object of power is thus only 'to reduce the sum of
human misery a bit'—not try to program it away altogether with money
and data readouts and systems analyses"

The contrast between Brown's view and that of the Old Pols is
made explicit and clear.

However, the Old Pols have one charge left that "particularly
stings Brown and his people": the charge that Brown is a "closet
Reaganite."

Reagan, growls staffer Paul Halvonik, "was not interested in
economy, he was interested in screwing poor people." Brown by
contrast insists that he is only recognizing the new realities—that
the times are tough, the taxpayers rebellious and the prob-
lems quite possibly insoluble by government intervention.

Brown, therefore, is doing the same thing Reagan did, only more so.
The contrast here is not in their actions. Ostensibly, Brown has bet-
ter motives: the motives of the counterreformation. Brown saves the
people from the illusion that big government will solve their problems.
But, in the Torquemada frame, there is a suggestion by association that
those who see him as a "closet Reaganite" think it is the mean old Jerry
Brown who is now tightening the screws.

The article further specifies what Brown's 'theology' holds:
the old idea that enough money solves all problems, a distinctly un-
religious concept, "encouraged overpromising by government and inflated
expectations among the governed. Programs were brainstormed into being
whether or not they worked, then kept alive by their own bureaucratic
inertia and by the constituencies of demand they created."

Indeed, the very picture of the spawning, the growth, and the
entrenchment of a heresy.
The article further articulates Brown's countering 'credo' 
"which begins with the premise that there is 'no free lunch'--that liberal government must promise less, deliver better, spend within its means and contain its own runaway growth." Brown himself is quoted: "'There's been a lot of income transfer in the name of conquering disease and poverty and ignorance,' says Brown with toneless sourness. 'A lot of people are getting paychecks, but I don't know what they're doing about disease, poverty and ignorance.'"

Here the revolutionary acknowledges that the people themselves have been taken in by the heresy. Brown's "toneless sourness" indicates his sentiment toward this absence of the True Faith and toward the programs he considers ineffective.

Brown, the article says, "still counts himself part of the Roosevelt-Truman-Kennedy tradition--'I guess'--but at the cooled-off remove of the post-Vietnam, post-Great Society generation."

The first full naming of Brown in the article referred to him as "California's supercool Gov. Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown, Jr." The repetition of "cool" here stresses again the image of Brown as an intense, cerebral advocate of the new political credo, with a marked absence of personal warmth. The article proceeds, building on the "supercool" image, to round out its portrait of Jerry Brown.

Though the public has responded to Brown's new "theology" with "affection," the article now focuses again on the Old Pols, who have not, and shows Brown from their perspective:

His tense, cerebral urgency sets them on edge. So does his disregard for the social graces--he rarely says thank you--and
his plain unease in a crowd; the pros liked Pat better and have noted the arm's length distance at which his son the governor has kept him. Brown's absorption with minutiae has kept people with pressing business waiting--sometimes past the boiling point.

The picture here reflects the earlier image of the asocial ascetic, supercool himself perhaps, but evoking contrasting feelings in others. Brown here is shown to be, in his own way, as imperceptive as the Old Democrats who misperceived him. The article thus subtly invites mental comparisons of Brown's motives for cutting back on social programs. Perhaps, the associations imply, Brown's motives are, like the tenor of his actions, more similar than his staff cares to admit to those attributed to Ronald Reagan. In any case, the article here presents Jerry Brown as distinctly lacking in 'good vibes' with the "crowds" and with some among his constituents.

The article continues,

"And yet the polls seem to support his heresy that less, politically speaking, may be more."

The "and yet" suggests a negative judgment on Brown's "suspect capacity" for coping with real problems. Also, now it is Brown who has become the heretic. The position this sentence shows is that of the Old Democrats. It is their Faith that is being subverted. The tone of the article perceptibly shifts here against Brown, especially with the suggestion of surprise that the public has been taken in by what is now presented as Brown's heresy.

Despite all of this,

The message and the numbers have begun to intrigue party elders shopping for an incandescent new face in a low-watt Presidential
field. The governor, though intrigued, is diffident about saying so; just now, he says, 'I have a government to run, so I think about that.' Yet even some old adversaries have begun looking at him as an idea whose time has come.

The repetition of "intrigued" here suggests that Brown, beneath it all, shares the political outlook of the party elders his views seem to repudiate, calling his sincerity into question. The "diffident" disclaimer about interest in the Presidency repeats this sense. Nevertheless, Brown here stands very much alone. Those considering him as a candidate in the Presidential field are those who oppose him: Old Pols, old adversaries, the "old" stressing longstanding disaffection overridden here only in the interests of political expediency, which Brown is presented as sharing.

The article concludes:

The jury is still out on Jerry Brown, and on the counter-revolution he represents as well. The governor is surely onto something with his personal antistyle and his public antipolitics; he and a whole new wave of politicians, of both parties and all ages, have tapped into an authentic vein of citizen discontent with the spread and cost and clumsiness of big government.

The article here suggests that what Brown and the others are "surely onto" is merely a negative symptom of discontent—the sort of sentiment in a population which makes them ripe for heretical ideas. The statement points to an absence of thought or conviction on the citizens' part that Brown's new credo is logical and right. This negative sense is strengthened by "antistyle and antipolitics." The jury here, evidently, is deciding whether Jerry Brown's credo is or is not a heresy.

The article, nearing its end, quotes Jerry Brown once more:
"A lot of the intractable problems are being seen as just that - intractable,' Brown argues. 'The idea that you can buy out of unemployment, pollution and world responsibility on the cheap just isn't so.'"

Brown here "argues" against the negative stance taken by the article. He argues that the people do indeed realize The Truth: That big government's promise of rapid, easy solutions has been proven false, that social problems are difficult to solve.

The article, in concluding, strengthens its contravening position:

Yet is is likewise true that big government remains a given in a world in which problems exist and fester, and sometimes explode. The first question on the American political agenda now is whether those problems are in fact insoluble, or whether the Jerry Brown generation has simply found more elegant ways of saying that it cannot solve them.

But "intractable" does not mean "insoluble." What Brown's assertion pointed to was difficulty, not impossibility. Thus, the article's final statement, while upholding the position of the Old Democrats, has at the same time directly misrepresented the position of Jerry Brown to its readers.

**SUMMARY:** "Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful"

**Attitude:** negative

**How shown:** clearly implied

The article presents Jerry Brown as a fanatic revolutionary with quasi-religious fervor in his attempts to bring about his "revolution of falling expectations," comparing him to "Torquemada among the
heretics," an image strongly sustained throughout the article.

The full weight and implications of this image are not readily apparent on a single reading. Also, the full weight of the article's negative view of Brown is contained at its close, masked in the phrase "the Jerry Brown generation" which serves to deflect the reader's attention from its import which is to negate Brown's views. The article also misrepresents Brown's "intractable" to "insoluble" in reference to the world's problems.
Jerry Brown
Does His Thing

In a primary season filled with unexpected and unorthodox Presidential campaigns, probably none is stranger than that of Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr. The 38-year-old Democratic governor of California who espouses less-is-better government, seems to be forging a less-politics-is-better campaign. He did not announce his candidacy for the June 8 California primary until a month ago—and even then it was almost an afterthought following his appearance at a student art show in Sacramento. Since then he has developed only the most casual of Presidential strategies, and when he discusses his campaign at all, it is often in terms more poetical than political. "Robert Frost had an image of a piece of ice on a hot stove," Brown ruminated last week. "It rides on its own melting. It begins in wonder and ends in surprise. That was his description of what a poem was. It's the way I'd like to describe my campaign."

So offhand is Brown about his Presidential plans that skeptics wonder if he is serious about a national candidacy. His campaign manager, former anti-poverty lawyer Mickey Kantor, opened the first Brown for President office in Los Angeles just two weeks ago; Kantor only recently completed hiring staff and arranging for telephone service. A Sacramento office opened last week, but no out-of-state committees have been formed and no one has made much effort to raise money. Brown has been biding his time in Sacramento and has no plans to do any campaigning until May. "Politics in California is basically a media phenomenon," says one state Democratic leader. "There's no organization that can deliver anything. Brown thinks the rest of the country is like that, too. He thinks he can go on '60 Minutes,' do an interview with Playboy and then head for New York to pick up the nomination."

Popular: Brown's attitude may baffle and distress more conventional politicians, but the fact is that despite his cool-hand-Jerry style, Brown is a very hot political commodity. He appears to be California's most popular governor ever,
It's just that simple.” Others argue it is not at all just that simple, and that however casual his campaign, Brown could vastly complicate the Democratic race. Some party leaders believe that because of his popularity in California, other candidates may simply concede a majority of the state’s 280 delegates to him. That would practically assure Brown of a powerful bargaining position at the convention, and give him a primary shot at the Vice Presidency on almost anyone’s ticket—something he says he doesn’t want. “There’s no question he’s shooting for the big banana,” asserts a California labor leader. And as Brown himself put it recently, “If you look at the field, it makes as much sense for me to be President as anyone else.”

There have been a few signs lately that Brown is beginning to heat up his campaign. He made a trip to San Francisco last week for an uncharacteristically rousing speech before a regional conference of the AFL-CIO Council on Political Education (COPE). After California COPE director John Henning introduced him to the cheering, table-thumping crowd, Brown sounded a call for “people before profit” and summoned the assembled labor dons to join him in a “coalition for the future.”

Deadlock: The governor is under pressure to enter a few out-of-state primaries—possibly Oregon, Kentucky and Nevada—and to do some stumping in Maryland, the only state besides California so far where his name is on the ballot. His difficulty there—and in many other states—is that much of his support may come from Humphrey backers who hope Brown can slow Carter enough to deadlock the convention for their man. Even in California, says one Brown operative, “Jack Henning has no great love for Jerry Brown. He just wants to tie it up for Humphrey.”

Brown’s people seem well aware that their strategy, based as it is on a conven-
tion deadlock, could turn out to help Humphrey. Their hope is that the party, given a choice between the two, would opt for youth and freshness. "Those folks who have their own agenda for Hubert underestimate Jerry Brown," says one California politician. "He can use them as well as they can use him." Few Democrats underestimate Jerry Brown's political ambitions, but given his late entry, his unstructured campaign and his nonchalant style, they still believe a Humphrey-Brown ticket is more likely than the other way around.

—SUSAN FRAKER with GERALD C. LUBENOW in Sacramento
Concordance: "Jerry Brown Does His Thing:

Central image: Jerry Brown as insincere in less-politics-is-better philosophy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sincere: Unorthodox Political Approach</th>
<th>Insincere: Orthodox Political Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>probably (no campaign) stranger</td>
<td>(campaign not strange)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>espouses less-is-better govern-ment</td>
<td>(espouses standard campaign)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"seems to be forging" (ironic)

less-politics-is-better campaign (standard campaign)
did not announce candidacy until a month ago (announced candidacy early)
almost as an afterthought (careful planning)
poetical practical
so offhand about Presidential plans skeptics wonder if he is serious
Brown's attitude may baffle and distress more conventional politicians
despite cool-hand Jerry style Brown is very hot political commodity
California's most popular governor ever appears to be
hardly surprise him Brown's popularity based on fresh face, anti-Washington biases
however casual his campaign Brown could vastly complicate the Democratic race
"There's no question he's shooting for the big banana:" (more formal statement re Presidential aspirations)
"If you look at the field, it makes as much sense for me to be President as anyone else." (convincing of superior qualifications)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Sincere:</strong> Unorthodox Political Approach</th>
<th><strong>Insincere:</strong> Orthodox Political Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>uncharacteristically rousing speech</td>
<td>(normally gives rousing speeches)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown is beginning to heat up his campaign</td>
<td>(campaign intense from beginning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jack Henning (AFL-CIO) has no great love for Jerry Brown&quot;</td>
<td>He just wants to tie it up for Humphrey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their strategy (Brown's people)</td>
<td>(Brown plans own strategy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;(Brown) can use (Humphrey people) as well as they can use him&quot;</td>
<td>Few Democrats underestimate Jerry Brown's political ambitions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Explication: "Jerry Brown Does His Thing," Newsweek, April 19, 1976

The connotations of the article's title define the aspect under which Jerry Brown is presented here, though cryptically. "Doing his thing" is a phrase of the youth culture, hip and hedonistic, often identified with California's lifestyle. "Doing one's thing" is generally used in the sense of performing an activity in an individual and unique manner, usually one different from expected or standard behavior, for reasons based on one's own preference—often with disregard for the preferences or judgments of others. The terms also implies youthful unreality, since an action, to be so designated, is usually one not regarded as highly valuable or useful by the standard society.

The use of Brown's nickname in the title reinforces the article's identification of him with this perspective.

In the article, Brown's "thing" is his approach to campaigning for the presidential nomination. In standard political practice candidates, no matter how varied their approaches, take such campaigning with the utmost seriousness, marshalling their most thorough and intensive efforts. In 1976, Jerry Brown approached the national contest differently:

In a primary season filled with unexpected and unorthodox Presidential campaigns, probably none is stronger than that of Edmund G. (Jerry) Brown Jr. The 38-year-old Democratic governor of California who espouses less-is-better government seems to be forging a less-politics-is-better campaign.

Brown's campaign is even stranger, the article says, than other unusual approaches. Thus its idiosyncratic quality is stressed. The paragraph also contains all the standard references to Brown's age and "Jr." status, which here reinforce the article's view that his approach
to politics is youthful and nonserious.

"Forging" adds to this sense, in its meaning as "forming something out of raw material." The others' approaches may be unusual; Brown is brand new, which is to say, not at all the tried and true approach.

The article by its end gives to "seems to be forging" a second implication, making its use in the article ironic. This will be discussed at the end of this analysis.

The article continues:

He did not announce his candidacy for the June 8 California primary until a month ago and even then it was almost an afterthought following his appearance at a student art show in Sacramento. Since then he has developed only the most casual of Presidential strategies and when he discusses his campaign at all, it is often in terms more poetical than political.

"Did not announce . . . until, . . ." "afterthought," "developed only the most casual" all reiterate the sense of Jerry Brown "doing his thing," suggesting a whimsical rather than intentional approach. The contrast "more poetical than political," again stresses the unorthodox-orthodox opposition in the article: though the statement of Archibald MacLeish which opened this study show a differing perspective, poetry is traditionally considered to be highly unique and less than practical while politics is supposedly carefully organized and calculated, the public art par excellence.

The article quotes Brown quoting poetry:

"'Robert Frost had an image of a piece of ice on a hot stove,' Brown ruminated last week. 'It rides on its own melting. It begins in wonder and ends in surprise. That was his description of what a poem
was. It's the way I'd like to describe my campaign."

Whatever else "It rides on its own melting" may mean, at base it shows movement emerging out of an actual situation, a verbal figure for process. Brown says here that he is conducting a similar campaign, not one with movements fixed in advance of situations. Jerry Brown is treating politics poetically, and is maintaining that this is practical. The article's dichotomizing of the two maintains, in effect, that such joining is impossible. Brown's actions in attempting to do so, then, are clearly whimsical in the article's view.

But another charge is added to that of Brown's nonseriousness:

So offhand is Brown about his Presidential plans that skeptics wonder if he is serious about a national candidacy. His campaign manager, former anti-poverty lawyer Mickey Kantor, opened the first Brown for President office in Los Angeles just two weeks ago; Kantor only recently completed hiring staff and arranging for telephone service. A Sacramento office opened last week but no out-of-state committees have been formed and no one has made much effort to raise money. Brown has been biding his time in Sacramento and has no plans to do any campaigning until May.

The singulars, negatives and diminutives all through the paragraph carry a sense of disbelief. They convey the impression that, while those who "wonder if he is serious about a national candidacy" are identified as "skeptics," the article itself here tends to adopt their view.

"Politics in California is basically a media phenomenon," says one state Democratic leader. "There's no organization that can deliver anything. Brown thinks the rest of the country is like that, too. He thinks he can go on '60 minutes,' do an interview with Playboy and then head for New York and pick up the nomination."

Through use of the quote to summarize the section of Brown's "offhand" approach to the campaign, the article again contrasts Brown's
political view with that of a "state Democratic leader" who, it is implied, understands national politics where Brown does not. Brown is thus shown as misunderstanding political realities; i.e., operating within an unrealistic, and unworkable, frame.

The article resumes:

Brown's attitude may baffle and distress more conventional politicians, but the fact is that despite his cool-hand-Jerry style, Brown is a very hot political commodity. He appears to be California's most popular governor ever, with an approval rating exceeding 84 per cent. A Gallup Poll released two weeks ago, a fortnight after Brown declared his candidacy, showed him the top Presidential choice of 9 per cent of the nation's Democratic voters—which placed him fourth, ahead of long-distance runners Scoop Jackson and Morris Udall (and behind Jimmy Carter, Herbert Humphrey and George Wallace). Among California Democrats alone, Brown holds a commanding lead over all other candidates.

Previously in the article, "skeptics wondered" about Brown's candidacy, a moderated statement of disapproval. Here, however, Brown's attitude "baffles and distresses more conventional politicians." Brown is presented as controverting the pros. And not just some of them: all of them, so long as they are among those who hold conventional views. The phrase is not qualified. The impact of these statements is to isolate Brown's view from the traditional wisdom of the country's political establishment. Brown "does his thing" very much alone.

The "despite" in the sentence makes it clear that it is not due to Brown's "cool-hand-Jerry style" that he has been so successful, but in spite of it. Somehow, the article says here, his approach has not been able to prevent his attainment of considerable popularity. This evident reluctance to credit Brown's approach to politics with having widespread popular appeal in and of itself continues: his highest-ever
popularity rating in the California poll only means, according to the
article, that he "appears to be" the state's most popular governor.

The article proceeds:

"In a year when fresh faces and anti-Washington biases have
widespread political appeal, Brown's popularity hardly surprises him."

The "skeptics wonder," the "conventional politicians" are "baffled and distressed"; Brown's being "hardly surprised" is in distinct
contrast with the collective buildup of viewpoint on the opposing side.
Also, by connecting Brown's lack of surprise to two factors unrelated
to his antipolitics (different from being anti-Washington), the article
seems to draw Brown himself into support for the article's position:
that the apolitical philosophy is naive and unimportant with the
voters.

Again, Brown is presented here as alone in his expression,
stressing his isolation from the rest of the political world.

Continuing, the article says:

"However casual his campaign, Brown could vastly complicate the
Democratic race. Some party leaders believe that because of his popu-
ularity in California, other candidates may simply concede a majority of
the state's 280 delegates to him."

The article's basic contrast continues here. While Brown is
presented thinking of his campaign as poetically simple, "some party
leaders" believe Brown could "vastly complicate" the race. So does the
article, by making the statement directly, as its own, at the head of
the paragraph before the party leaders' opinion is offered. The para-
graph also suggests that other, wiser, heads are worrying over aspects
of Brown's bid that he has either not noticed or not cared about. The implication: Brown's frivolousness is thoughtless, a mark of youth "doing its thing" at the expense of others, the people in the race who are really serious.

The article's pattern of associations has by now indicated strongly that it believes Brown is playing a private game in his bid for the nomination, not conducting a serious campaign. It at least overtly presents a balancing view in the next paragraph:

"'There's no question he's shooting for the big banana,' asserts a California labor leader. And as Brown himself put it recently, 'If you look at the field, it makes as much sense for me to be President as anyone else.'"

The "and" here juxtaposes Brown's observation with the slang phraseology ahead of it, associating that phrase with Brown also, especially since the speaker's name is not used. The impression further serves to trivialize, thus to lessen, Brown's claim to authenticity in his efforts, as does the suggestion in Brown's statement that a stronger field of opponents would lessen the legitimacy of his claim. Brown's quote here, with no further context, does not state what aspects of "the field" are being evaluated in his statement.

After citing an "uncharacteristically rousing speech" to an AFL-CIO conference in San Francisco as evidence that "Brown is beginning to heat up his campaign"—again the stress on the singular—the article continues:

The governor is under pressure to enter a few out-of-state primaries—possibly Oregon, Kentucky and Nevada—and to do some stumping in Maryland, the only state besides California so far
where his name is on the ballot. His difficulty there—and in
many other states—is that much of his support may come from
Humphrey backers who hope Brown can slow Carter enough to dead-
lock the convention for their man. Even in California, says one
Brown operative, "Jack Henning has to great love for Jerry Brown.
He just wants to tie it up for Humphrey."

Henning, the ALF-CIO leader who had introduced Brown at the
speech, is the only organization leader mentioned in the article as
supportive of Brown. Here his support is seen, instead, to be for
Humphrey, once more reinforcing the sense that Brown stands essentially
unseconded in his bid for the nomination.

The article concludes:

Brown's people seem well aware that their strategy, based as
it is on a convention deadlock, could turn out to help Humphrey.
Their hope is that the party, given a choice between the two,
would opt for youth and freshness. "Those folks who have their
own agenda for Hubert underestimate Jerry Brown," says one Cali-
ifornia politician. "He can use them as well as they can use
him." Few Democrats underestimate Jerry Brown's political ambi-
tions, but given his late entry, his unstructured campaign and
his nonchalant style, they still believe a Humphrey-Brown ticket
is more likely than the other way around.

Here, the "strategy" is that of "Brown's people," not Brown,
just as he is being "pressured" to enter other contests. Both suggest
that Brown's "unstructured campaign and nonchalant style" are his own
while his staff does the planning. The indication of calculation in
"He can use them as well as they can use him" is in the next sentence
brought under the heading of political ambition, cancelling out the
suggestion of forethought on Brown's part. It is also presented as a
possibility only, since a Humphrey-Brown ticket is presented as a likely
outcome.

Thus the final quote, which also ends the article, suggests
that Brown is not the user but the used, since Humphrey is presented as
being the probable winner. The context also ties this impression to Brown's unorthodox campaign procedures, suggesting them as cause of Brown's impending failure. Not only the realism but the reality of the campaign is thus called into question by this contrast of Brown's "political ambitions" and his "nonchalant (i.e., ineffective) style." The weight of the article's pattern of associations suggests that perhaps the "less-politics-is-better" political campaign Jerry Brown "seems to be forging" may indeed be a forgery, a fake.

SUMMARY: "Jerry Brown Does His Thing"

Attitude: negative

How shown: clearly implied

In this article the magazine presents an assertion that Jerry Brown is not fully committed to running for President and is needlessly complicating the race for the serious Democratic contenders. Brown's less-politics-is-better approach is treated as unworthy of being taken seriously. The article's position of Brown's lack of seriousness is strongly suggested by the implications of the title, the expressions of worry by party leaders and the assessment concerning Brown's chances in light of his "late entry, unstructured campaign, nonchalant style."

What is not clear before careful scrutiny is the intensity of the negative attitude. Phrases like "none is stranger" than Brown's campaign, "seems to be forging less-politics-is-better campaign," the fact that everyone but Brown is credited with handling practicalities, and the series of statements and associations that shows Brown as very much isolated in his approach—all of these contribute to a not obvious
deepening of the article's negative stance which gives the "forging" quote the sense of "fake" when all the article's implications are pulled together.
The Newest Face of '76

The ballroom was redolent of beer—and California champagne. Out on the floor young men with droopy mustaches and young women with political fervor in their eyes bumped against matrons with beehive hairdos and middle-aged husbands downing rye.

Maryland's Presidential beauty contest was over, and for a moment the riffs of a Dixieland band playing "Who's Sorry Now?" blared over the oddly assorted crowd. Then suddenly the trombone slid into "California Here I Come," and the winner swept in. He wore a neat three-piece suit and a grin of amused detachment as he took the mike. "Everybody take a deep breath—okay," Jerry Brown said softly. "Let's just let all the vibrations settle down a sec."

It sounded more like the beginning of an exercise in transcendental meditation than a victory speech. But political cool flows easily from Calif. Gov. Edmund G. Brown Jr., a master of the politics of lowered expectations. Seven years ago Brown was just a restless young lawyer parlaying the name of his popular father, ex-Gov. Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, into a seat on the Los Angeles Community College Board. Last week, the 38-year-old politician emerged as the freshest, brasziest—and certainly farthest-out—face in the Democratic Presidential primaries. "I can really win," he mused over a 2 a.m. post-primary plate of linguine in Baltimore's Little Italy. "It's amazing."

AN OFFBEAT VISION

Brown has only an odds-off chance, if that, of winning the Democratic Presidential nomination. But by whipping Jimmy Carter he has become at least an intriguing Vice Presidential prospect and a probable power at his party's convention. And he has demonstrated that his offbeat vision of "planetary realism"—of smaller government, tightly husbanded resources, skinflint budgets, full employment and a new generation of political leadership—is something more than "Star Trek" material. "If Jerry Brown decides to run for President," observes Frank Damrell Jr., an old friend who once shared a Jesuit

Brown campaigning: 'I can really win. It's amazing.' instead of the standard-issue Cadillac limousine; he gobbles Granola bars and pizza between stints at the office; and he has compiled a thumping, 85 per cent good-to-fair job rating from his constituents in the latest California poll.

Using his phenomenal home-state popularity as a base, Brown decided last March to enter the primaries. His timing was dictated in part by a March 15 deadline for running as a favorite-son
candidate—and in part because he detected a threat to his own, long-range hopes of the Presidency in the lengthening shadow of Jimmy Carter. "He would have preferred to wait until 1980—but if Carter is the standard bearer he'll be around four years from now, win or lose," says San Francisco's shrewd State Assemblyman Willie Brown. So Jerry Brown resolved on a tardy campaign experiment based on his own political faith, hope and eccentricity.

Brown's triumph in Maryland came as a tribute to his skill as a crowd pleaser, his sound media sense in working the backyard of Washington's national press corps—and the help of the scandal-splattered political machine of Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel, as well as the reform movement of Baltimore County Executive Ted Venetoulis. The victory made Brown a bright point of light in the anybody-but-Carter firmament. Brown's campaign was not a last-ditch Humphrey blockade, insisted Brown's campaign manager Mickey Kantor, 36. But closet Humphreyites, sensing yet another stalking horse, were eager to fill halls for Brown in states where uncommitted delegates were still wondering which way to jump, a gesture that drew a chuckle or two in California. "Those folks who have their own agenda for Hubert Humphrey underestimate Jerry Brown," noted one legislator in Sacramento. "He can use them as well as they can use him."

HONEST CYNICISM

Despite his initial success, even some of his friends wondered whether Brown has overreached himself this time around. He entered the primaries too late to win enough delegates to mount a credible, first-ballot challenge at the convention—and his debut last week made him look rather like a spoiler to some unimpressed Democrats. He possesses no national or international credentials that measure up to traditional White House standards. He sounds rather gauzy on many issues—particularly in the field of foreign policy. "A little vagueness goes a long way in this business," he concedes with honest cynicism—and perhaps a touch of relief.

Not everyone has been amused by his wit—or his pretensions. "I think you ought to lower your expectations," said one nettled California state legislator when Brown asked him for his support not long ago.

No one who knows Brown well expected him to trim his dreams—or his ego—to such warnings. Brown was born in San Francisco in 1938, and he came by his political ambition naturally—at the feet of his father, who served as state Attorney General and two terms as governor. The rivalry and strain between father and son—the one an unreconstructed gladhander, the other aloof and sometimes disdainful—is a legend in California. Pat Brown recalls with a chuckle a day when he and Jerry, then a teen-ager, were hiking in the Sierra Nevada Mountains. "See you at the top," chortled the boy, heading cheerfully upward. "The hell you will," humphed Brown, taking off in hot pursuit. "I practically had a heart attack," Pat said, "but I beat him."

Jerry has been bucking authority most of his life. Against Pat's protests, he entered a Jesuit seminary in 1956 to prepare for the priesthood. With an impassioned telephone call he persuaded his father to stay the execution of convicted rapist Caryl Chessman, a cause célèbre that some believe contributed to Pat Brown's defeat later at the hands of Ronald Reagan. Rejecting the rigidity of Jesuit life, he dropped out of the seminary after three and a half years and wound up with a classic set of credentials as a vintage liberal of the early '60s: the University of California at Berkeley, Yale Law, the civil-rights and anti-Vietnam War movements and the 1968 campaign of Sen. Eugene McCarthy.

A SHARE OF INK

His political career flourished mainly because of—and in spite of—his father's patronage. In 1969, the family name propelled Brown to the Los Angeles Community College Board, an unlikely base, but one he used to win election as secretary of state a year later. Ordinarily, the post is a political backwater. But Brown quickly won his share of ink and built a statewide reputation by sponsoring the country's toughest campaign-financing law. He campaigned for governor in 1974 by running against the kind of liberal big-spending programs that Pat Brown backed during the California economic boom of the early '60s. And after a harrowingly close race, Jerry stood on the victor's platform election night and told Pat with a smile: "I almost lost because of you."

As governor, Brown lost no time in making his own mark with a monkish work-style and an image for stinginess with money, time and words. His inaugural address ran seven minutes, and his
State of the State message this year was only slightly longer. During his first nine months on the job he spent only $750 of his $12,500 budget for office entertainment. Startled legislators who turned out for his first governor's prayer breakfast found themselves confronted with yogurt, a Sufi choir, bare-chested male dancers—and a sermon by a lay anthropologist.

In the early days of his administration Brown was fond of wandering incognito among his constituents, pausing along the road from Sacramento to San Francisco to chat with a filling-station attendant, slipping into a Union Street pub for a quiet beer, catching country music at the Palomino and enchiladas at El Adobe in Los Angeles. He still reads Camus and Hesse, drops Zen riddles and walks San Francisco's chilly beaches, speculating about space colonization and the social implications of Ivan Illich's latest book, "Medical Nemesis." To escape the pressure of the governor's office he sometimes retreats to a Trappist monastery in Northern California.

All this had led some critics to wonder whether the governor is a bit strange. Some enemies have dropped hints that he is a closet homosexual—a charge that he flatly denies. His aides, a bit defensively, have sometimes resorted to pointing out women they say the boss has dallied with on the sly. In public, Brown has dated "to the front door" such celebrities as actresses Candice Bergen and Liv Ullmann. And the consensus among his associates is that he is less absorbed with any kind of sex than he is with the inner promptings of the mind and the outer perimeters of government. "He's not flaky," shrugs Robert Gnaizda, a former aide. "He's just not interested in a lot of things politicians like."

What fascinates—and appalls—Brown most is the spectacle of a guzzling consumer culture gorging itself to death on an ever-dwindling store of resources. His basic approach to correcting the excess is a Socratic one of posing brilliant questions—and mourning the death of concrete answers. "Jerry has no operative principles," says one former state economist. "He's incredibly pragmatic."

A SOLID RECORD

Pragmatism has led Brown to avoid taking a stand on such controversial measures as California's current anti-nuclear power initiative. But it has also spurred him to sign laws stiffening criminal penalties for heroin possession while liberalizing them in such sensitive areas as gay rights for consenting adults. And while Brown's stingy economic policies have won him the support of conservatives and big business, his solid record for progressive labor legislation, including a landmark bill establishing collective-bargaining machinery for the state's farm workers, has won him...
Backing of the state's AFL-CIO.

For all his press notices, some staffers charge that Brown delegates authority badly, tolerates competition poorly and laughs at unfunny economic dilemmas. Reportedly, during one meeting on job policy, he lectured aides on the virtue of a Zen commune in California. One solution to the problem of youthful unemployment, he said, would be to "take 10,000 white kids and 10,000 black kids and put them in Camp Roberts. The white kids could teach the black kids how to read—and the black kids could teach the white kids how to fight."

It will take something more than a nimble wit for Brown to be taken seriously at the Democratic National Convention. To pay the bills, he has raised $650,000 through a string of $1,000-a-plate dinners, concerts by the rock group the Eagles and country singer Linda Ronstadt (page 44). Playboy's bunny-master Hugh Hefner has offered to help out and so have more traditional money men in San Francisco, Los Angeles and New York City.

Getting delegates is another matter. With Carter all but conceding California, Brown will likely garner about 180 delegates there. By picking up scattered delegates in the Nevada primary this week, by hustling support from the ranks of uncommitted delegate slates in New Jersey, Rhode Island, and elsewhere and from the columns of already fallen Democratic candidates, Brown hopes to have between 300 to 400 delegates by convention time. He has set up a national headquarters in Los Angeles, enlisted a fervent crew of volunteers, and hired 30 paid staffers including press secretary Fred Epstein, 27, an ex-McGovernite, and his traveling secretary, Leroy Chatfield, a onetime Christian Brother.

If the long odds against him trouble him, Brown doesn't show it much. At a campaign stop in Providence, R.I., last week he trotted out his favorite description of his campaign, a quote from Robert Frost who once compared a poem to a piece of ice on a hot stove: "It rides on its own melting. It begins in wonder and ends in surprise." There is no question that he hopes, perhaps a bit naively, to surprise his Democratic peers in New York City this July. But even if his come-from-California strategy sputters out in the face of Jimmy Carter's inevitability, it seems likely that the country will see good deal more of Jerry Brown.

—TOM MATHEWS with STEPHAN LESHER on the Brown campaign and GERALD C. LUBENOW and MARTI KASINDORF in California
Concordance: The Newest Face of '76

Central image: Jerry Brown as politically naive
(Jerry Brown as beauty contest winner)

Political Naivete

ballroom
Maryland's Presidential beauty contest
the winner swept in
He wore a neat three-piece suit and a grin of amused detachment
(Brown's approach to quieting the crowd) sounded more like the beginning of an exercise in transcendental meditation
(Political cool does not flow easily)
(not a master of politics of lowered expectations)

Political Realism

(not a ballroom)
(not a beauty contest)
(winner did not sweep in)
(no description of grin, suit)
than a victory speech
Political cool flows easily
master of the politics of lowered expectations

Seven years ago Brown was just a restless young lawyer parlaying the name of his popular father

Last week the 38-year-old politician emerged as the freshest, brassiest, farthest-out face

"It's amazing."
offbeat vision
odds-off chance, if that
(not whipping Jimmy Carter)
probable power at his party's convention

"I can really win."
more than "Star Trek" material
of winning Democratic Presidential nomination
whipping Jimmy Carter
at least an intriguing Vice Presidential prospect
Political Naivete

"it's because he thinks he can be President"

(has not been thinking over the subject)

to outdo gubernatorial record of his father and his father's successor, Ronald Reagan

would have preferred to wait until 1980

resolved on a tardy campaign experiment based on his own political faith, hope and eccentricity skill as crowd pleaser, sound media sense

—and the help of scandal-splattered political machine of Gov. Marvin Mandel

in the anybody-but-Carter firmament insistence that Brown's campaign was not a last-ditch Humphrey blockade

ev an some of his friends wondered whether Brown had overreached himself

entered primaries too late

his debut last week a little vagueness touch of relief

No one who knows Brown well expected him to trim his dreams—or his ego—to such warnings

Political Realism

"If Jerry Brown decides to run for President"

Brown has been thinking over the subject for some time

for the past nineteen months he has been working fifteen-hour days, six days a week

will be around four years from now, win or lose timing for entrance into primaries dictated in part by March 15 deadline for running as a favorite-son candidate—and by the lengthening shadow of Jimmy Carter

triumph in Maryland

as well as reform movement of Baltimore County Executive Ted Venetoulis

Brown is a bright light

"Brown can use the Humphrey forces as well as they can use him"

initial success

to mount a credible, first-ballot challenge

made him look like a spoiler to some unimpressed Democrats

goes a long way in this business

concedes with honest cynicism

"I think you ought to lower your expectations."
Political Naivete

at the feet of his father rivalry and strain Jerry has been bucking authority most of his life fond of wandering incognito among his constituents whether the governor is a bit strange Socratic approach to correcting the excess: posing brilliant questions, mourning the dearth of concrete answers no operating principles pragmatism has led Brown (pragmatism) has also spurred him (pragmatism as motive) ex-staffers charge that Brown delegates authority badly, tolerates competition poorly and laughs at unfunny economic dilemmas will take more than a nimble wit has raised $650,000 Brown doesn't show it much

Political Realism
came by political ambition naturally between father and son (not bucking authority) in early days of his administration has led some critics to wonder Brown is fascinated and appalled by guzzling consumer culture incredibly pragmatic to avoid taking a stand on many controversial measures to stiffen laws on heroin, liberalize them on gay rights stingy economic policies won support of conservatives and big business; farm labor legislation won support of AFL-CIO for all his press notices for Brown to be taken seriously at the Democratic National Convention getting delegates is another matter if long odds against him trouble him
Political Naivete

perhaps a bit naively
come-from-California strategy
(country will not see more of Jerry Brown)

Political Realism

hopes to surprise Democratic peers in New York City this July
sputters out in the face of Jimmy Carter's inevitability
seems likely that the country will see a good deal more of Jerry Brown

Explication: "The Newest Face of '76"

The article's opening paragraph describes the scene inside a ballroom of the celebration following Jerry Brown's surprise victory in the Maryland primary. Referring to the primary as "Maryland's Presidential beauty contest," the article then describes Brown:

"The winner swept in. He wore a neat three-piece suit and a grin of amused detachment as he took the mike."

The description parallels that given to bathing beauties appearing onstage in a contest. Brown is presented here as a beauty contest winner both by the article's direct statement and by its descriptive comparison.

However, this original reference contrasts with the description that follows it, of Brown's approach to quieting the crowd:

"'Everybody take a deep breath--okay,' Jerry Brown said softly, 'Let's just let all the vibrations settle down a sec.'"

The article continues:

It sounded more like the beginning of an exercise in transcendental meditation than a victory speech. But political cool flows easily from California Governor Edmund G. Brown Jr., a
master of the politics of lowered expectations. Seven years ago Brown was just a restless young lawyer parlaying the name of his father, ex-Governor Edmund G. (Pat) Brown, into a seat on the Los Angeles Community College Board. Last week, the 38-year-old politician emerged as the freshest, brassiest--and certainly farthest-out--face in the Democratic Presidential primaries. "I can really win," he mused. "It's amazing."

The paragraph sustains the beauty-contest image by its reference to Brown as the "freshest, brassiest, farthest-out face" and by quoting his "I can really win. It's amazing." But the article's emphasis changes here also, picking up the fact that this person so described has after all just won a startling political victory.

Brown is presented as displaying "political cool"--"parlaying his father's name" into the beginnings of a political career, now come to fruition in the Maryland victory. The implication here is strong that his success is therefore still based on his father's name. In this light, the reference to him as "freshest, brassiest, farthest-out face" one who manifests surprise at his capacity to win, suggests that the "cool" is more a youthful mastery of the handling of the appearances of power than of its substance. Though crediting him with being "master of the politics of lowered expectations," the article thereby limits his expertise to that aspect of politics only.

Thus the article moves away from its opening comparison of Brown to a beauty contest winner and develops its major theme: Brown is a youthfully naive political newcomer, one adept at playing the game and presenting the appearances, but not genuinely a full-fledged, i.e., powerful, politician on the national level. This clearly derogatory opening image sets the tone of the article and points to the more serious charges which follow it. Though it is weakly echoed elsewhere...
in the article, it does not serve as integrating image throughout. Rather, the article's direct assertion of Brown's naivete in political life dominates the article overtly. It moves into an open discussion of Brown's political strengths and weaknesses.

The next section heading reads:

"An Offbeat Vision"

Assessing the impact of Brown's primary victory in Maryland, the article says:

Brown has only an odds-off chance, if that, of winning the Democratic Presidential nomination. Buty by whipping Jimmy Carter he has become at least an intriguing Vice Presidential prospect, a probable power at his party's convention. And he has demonstrated that his offbeat vision of "planetary realism"--of smaller government, tightly husbanded resources, skinflint budgets, full employment and a new generation of political leadership--is something more than "Star Trek" material.

The article states flatly that Brown's political chances for the Democratic Presidential nomination are slim, a direct contradiction to Brown's statement about being able to "really win." The polarities of the article--political naivete vs. political realism--are shown clearly. The article concedes that Brown is "at least an intriguing Vice Presidential prospect and a probable power" at the convention. Both statements are qualified; even a clear chance at real power is shaky, the article implies, for one so new to the game. While recognizing that the campaign has confirmed Brown's philosophy as somewhat other than totally unrealistic, it compares his ideas to "Star Trek" material--which says that, if they are not such, they still come close to belonging in the same category.

The article continues:
"'If Jerry Brown decides to run for President,' observes Frank Damrell, Jr., an old friend who once shared a Jesuit seminary cell with Brown back in the late 1950s, 'it's because he thinks he can be President.'"

By placing this quote in juxtaposition with the "Star Trek" comparison, the article gives it also the impact of seeming to confirm Brown's expectations as visionary.

The following paragraph begins with a reference to those aspirations:

"Brown has been thinking over the subject for some time. For the past nineteen months he has been working fifteen-hour days, six days a week, to outdo the gubernatorial record of his father and his father's successor, Ronald Reagan."

The paragraph goes on to list the other Brown stringencies—the turning down of the governor's mansion and the rest—and ends, "and he has compiled a thumping, 85 per cent good-to-fair job rating from his constituents in the latest California poll."

Thus Brown's efforts are characterized as being impelled by one motive only: to outdo the gubernatorial record of his father and (secondarily) that of Ronald Reagan. Brown's popularity rating is also presented here as a "good-to-fair" rating, diminishing its impact.

Since this paragraph begins with the statement about Brown's thinking over the subject of the Presidency, this too is cast under the aspect of trying to best his father.

The article continues, referring to Brown's late entry into the primaries as being "dictated in part" by the deadline for California's
primary, and also "because he detected a threat to his own, long-range hopes of the Presidency in the lengthening shadow of Jimmy Carter."

Yet the article shows Brown as entering into "a tardy campaign experiment based on his own political faith, hope and eccentricity."

Brown is both cool and naive in this section. He is aware of the overall political scene, yet governed by its exigencies. At the same time, the reference to the "late entry" and "tardy campaign" imply a lack of planning and foresight. The article here states clearly that Brown's campaign is based more on personal aspirations which are unreal --"eccentricity"--than on hard fact and realistic knowledge of politics.

This sense is strengthened: His success in Maryland comes because he is a "crowd pleaser" with "sound media sense"--again, the youthful pol who knows how to play at playing the game. A corrupt political machine is credited with delivering the goods to an accepting Brown, "as well as the reform movement of Baltimore County Executive Ted Venetoulis." Brown here is shown by the article as not immune to standard political shrewdness, accepting help from whatever powers are available; but it reinforces its verdict concerning his naivete by noting, "The victory made Brown a bright point of light in the anybody-but-Carter firmament. Brown's campaign was not a last-ditch Humphrey blockade, insisted Brown's campaign manager, Mickey Kantor, 36."

Disclaimers from one's own camp seldom carry much impact; the impression is clear that the Maryland pols may well have used Brown for their own stop-Carter, help-Humphrey purposes.

The article continues this sense:
Despite his initial success, even some of his friends wondered whether Brown had overreached himself this time around. He entered the primaries too late to win enough delegates to mount a credible, first-ballot challenge at the convention—and his debut last week made him look rather like a spoiler to some unimpressed Democrats.

The article again presents Brown's sure loss as an accepted fact, and by contrast stresses the sense that Brown doesn't really know what he's doing. The use of "overreached," "too late," and "debut," with its connotations of youth, contribute to this sense.

The article points to Brown's lack of solid experience, and quotes Brown: "'A little vagueness goes a long way in this business,' he concedes with honest cynicism—and perhaps a touch of relief."

Thus, Brown is politically shrewd enough to recognize his own inexperience and the need not to let it show; the article's suggestion that he is "relieved" at his admission again states its view that he is too green, under too much pressure, for his real abilities.

The article points out, concerning a legislator's suggestion to Brown, "I think you should lower your expectations":

"No one who knows Brown well expected him to trim his dreams—or his ego—to such warnings."

The article returns to the "rivalry and strain" between Brown, Sr. and Jr., a prime source, the article says, of those ambitions. Reporting on a mountain-climbing competition between them—which Brown, Sr. "almost had a heart attack" to win—the article shows the rivalry is not all the son's side; in fact, his father provides an example for that drive. Again, however, it is Brown, Sr. who is in a sense responsible for his son's 'ego-trip' in search of political heights, and it
is to this somewhat naive impulse that Jerry Brown responds.

The article stresses its judgment:

"Jerry has been bucking authority most of his life."

In this category the article lists his entrance into the Jesuit seminary and his plea to his father to spare convicted killer Caryl Chessman—to which the elder Brown, then governor, consented, to his political loss.

Once again, the article is explicit:

"His political career flourished mainly because of—and in spite of—his father's patronage."

Citing his political victories, the article points out that Brown ran against his father's kind of liberal big-spending programs. It reports that "Jerry stood on the victor's platform election night and told Pat with a smile: 'I almost lost because of you.'

The clear picture of rivalry remains despite the smile.

Continuing, the article says:

"As governor, Brown lost no time in making his own mark" with a "monkish work style and an image for stinginess with money, time and words."

Following the section on the father-son conflict, this pattern too is seen again as motivated by the rivalry, as is the picture of the unusual prayer breakfast featuring "yogurt and a Sufi choir."

The pattern of Brown's highly out-of-the-ordinary style is continued:

In the early days of his administration, Brown was fond of wandering incognito among his constituents, pausing to chat with a
filling-station attendant" and others. "He still reads Camus and Hesse, drops Zen riddles, and walks San Francisco's chilly beaches, speculating about space colonization and the social implications of Ivan Illich's latest book, 'Medical Nemesis.'"

There is an echo of the "Star Trek" allegation here, and of starry-eyed political naivete restated.

The article makes this clear:

"All this has led some critics to wonder whether the governor is a bit strange." The homosexual allegation is raised and squelched, with the report that "a consensus among his associates is that he is less absorbed with any kind of sex than he is with the inner promptings of the mind and the outer perimeters of government."

The assertion that Brown focuses on the outer perimeters of government and on his own thoughts both suggest less than a full grasp of present political realities.

The article says:

"What fascinates--and appals--Brown most is the spectacle of a guzzling consumer culture gorging itself to death on an ever-dwindling store of resources."

The consumer culture is pictured as a monster. Brown's approach to this monster?

"His basic approach to correcting the excess is a Socratic one of posing brilliant questions--and mourning the dearth of concrete answers. 'Jerry has no operative principles,' says one former economist. 'He's incredibly pragmatic.'"
Pragmatism without practicality. Naively political, as the article continues to stress:

"Pragmatism has led Brown to avoid taking a stand on such controversial measures as California's current anti-nuclear power initiative. But it has also spurred him to sign laws stiffening criminal penalties for heroin possession while liberalizing them in such sensitive areas as gay rights for consenting adults." Brown's widely heralded support for migrant farm workers is also set in this pragmatic frame:

And while Brown's stingy economic policies have won him the support of conservatives and big business, his solid record for progressive labor legislation, including a landmark bill establishing collective-bargaining machinery for the state's farm workers, has won him the staunch backing of the state's AFL-CIO. Brown has been able, by operating pragmatically, the article says, to win support from the full range of ideologically different groups.

This presentation of political achievements is then further undercut: "For all his press notices, some ex-staffers charge that Brown delegates authority badly, tolerates competition poorly and laughs at unfunny economic dilemmas."

Referring to his accomplishments, at least by inference, as "press notices" again stresses the sense of appearance of political success as more substantial than Brown's reality. The fact that "ex-staffers" cite examples of what are presented as Brown's less-than-masterful executive ability serves to concede tacitly that the view of Brown may be too harsh; but with these and with the other ex-staffer assertion concerning Brown's pragmatism, no counterbalancing view is presented and the article's own words second the accusations.
The article observes:

"It will take something more than a nimble wit for Brown to be taken seriously at the Democratic National Convention." While it cites his success at raising funds, it states, "Getting delegates is another matter."

The article's tone in this section has acquired more than a trace of bitterness and sarcasm.

The article continues:

"If the long odds against him trouble him, Brown doesn't show it much." It quotes Brown quoting Robert Frost's poem about melting ice, which he says reflects his campaign: "It rides on its own melting. It begins in wonder and ends in surprise."

The association here: Jerry Brown continues to be "cool" by his untroubled acceptance of the odds. Brown's "coolness" juxtaposed with the Frost poem suggests that Brown is the melting ice, beginning his campaign "in wonder" and seeing it "end in surprise."

This is clarified:

There is no question that he hopes, perhaps a bit naively, to surprise his Democratic peers in New York City this July. But even if his come-from-California strategy sputters out in the face of Jimmy Carter's inevitability, it seems likely that the country will see a good deal more of Jerry Brown.

The assertion of Brown's naivete is here stated explicitly, and reinforced by the "come-from-California" with its implication that Brown is a green newcomer to the big time. Brown's "Newest Face of '76" is contrasted with "in the face of Jimmy Carter's inevitability," suggesting that novelty is not enough: one needs real power as well.
The article, while it suggests that Brown is too new this time around, indicates its belief that the young pol will at least not fade out like the piece of ice but will continue to be a political presence in the future.

SUMMARY: "The Newest Face of '76"

Attitude: negative

How shown: stated

This article clearly asserts that Jerry Brown:

1. is a political pragmatist who accepted the help of a corrupt political machine as well as whatever other support he could find;

2. discusses problems Socratically instead of solving them;

3. makes what judgments he does on problems—nuclear power, farm labor—pragmatically, on the basis of the support he will gain thereby;

4. derives a great deal of his ambition for prominence from a conflict with his father, though his father's "patronage" has won him what power he has;

5. has worked hard in office and turned down prestige items in order to outdo his father;

6. handles his government responsibilities poorly (on the statements of "ex-staffers");

7. has a very slim chance at the nomination, in flat contradiction to Brown's statement that he can "really win";

8. is too green and naive politically to have any real power of
his own.

There is no subtlety or guessing to this negative view. If any of the articles analyzed in this study deserve to be called "opinion," this does. It is hard to see how it could be classified as anything but an extended and highly negative editorial statement on the part of Newsweek.
After his primary victory in Maryland last week, California's Gov. Jerry Brown gave Newsweek's Stephan Lesher an inflight interview en route to Oregon. Excerpts:

LESHER: What makes you believe you should be President?

BROWN: Well, when I look at the people who are running now, I think I have something to offer that they don't. I represent another generation of leaders... I have been chief executive of the largest state, with a budget of almost $13 billion and 200,000 employees. I've been around politics all my life, I understand it. I know its limits and its potential. And I see the need of coming to terms with the era of limits—economically, ecologically and even humanly—that we're entering into.

Q. You've said you support the Humphrey-Hawkins bill and will make full employment your first goal. Yet you support "fiscal frugality" to prevent inflation. Aren't those positions contradictory?

A. No, I don't think so. Humphrey-Hawkins sets out... a target and commits government to policies and planning. It leaves a great deal of flexibility and discretion to a President and Congress which they can handle in different ways. Economists differ among themselves on whether full employment is inflationary. But at the rate we're going now, the social problems created by unemployment are unacceptable.

Q. You've said your approach to solving the Middle East crisis would be to get the two sides to sit together and discuss their differences. Isn't that everybody's goal?

A. What is critical is the recognition of Israel. I don't see a solution until the Arabs are willing to sit down and talk about it and that hasn't been done. The other alternative is for the U.S. to be a super-intermediary and to guarantee an agreement.

Q. Would you substantially reduce military spending?

A. If you had to put it on a spectrum, the military budget is one that has to be very, very carefully reviewed... I want a strong defense... but I'm definitely putting domestic policy as a priority... A President has to project a vision, something I call planetary realism, to combine foreign policy and ecological problems, to make people understand that we all drink water out of the same well and breathe the same air. You won't need to spend as much militarily if you could promote this idea—and there's power in ideas and ideals.

Q. You've said that your achievements as governor in California give you a positive record. What are some of those achievements?

A. I have the best record of achievements in the country.

Q. That's very modest.

A. But it's true. I've kept state salaries at a reasonable level; last year I put through a 6.9 per cent raise but I got it down from the 8.5 per cent that had been proposed. This year I've recommended an across-the-board, $70-a-month raise for everyone—from judges to janitors... I put through mandatory prison sentences for the sale of heroin, heavier sentences for the commission of crimes with guns, lowered the marijuana penalty for possession of 1 ounce or less to a $100 misdemeanor... I've slowed the freeway program by reducing from 16,000 to 13,500 the number of highway-department employees... And I've appointed a woman to head the department... I provided unemployment insurance to farm workers, abolished the fair-trade laws, provided collective bargaining for schoolteachers. And there have been no new general taxes or income taxes or sales tax or liquor tax. We've increased the surplus that existed when I took office... I don't think that's a bad record so far.
The gospel according to Jimmy and Jerry

I AM PURER THAN BROWN!

I AM PURER THAN CARTER!
Concordance: "I Have the Best Record in the Country"

Central image: Jerry Brown as politically naive

**Political naivete**

believe

that they don't (something to offer)

I represent

Humphrey-Hawkins is a target for planning; economists differ on whether full employment is inflationary; the social problems caused by unemployment are unacceptable.

(nothing new in Brown's proposal) on Middle East

I want a strong defense . . . but I'm definitely putting domestic policy as a priority. . . . A president has to project a vision, something I call planetary realism. There's a power in ideas and ideals.

I have the best record of achievements in the country.

But it's true.

"so far"

**Political Realism**

(not believe; i.e., judge, evaluate)

I think I have something to offer

another generation of leaders

Aren't those positions contradictory?

Isn't that everybody's goal?

Would you substantially reduce military spending?

You've said that your achievements as governor in California give you a positive record. What are some of those achievements?

That's very modest.

"I (Brown) don't think that's a bad record"

Interlandi cartoon: "The Gospel According to Jimmy and Jerry": stained-glass "saints" saying respectively: "I am purer than Brown!"

"I am purer than Carter!"
Explication of "I Have the Best Record in the Country:

The interview begins with a preliminary statement:

"After his primary victory in Maryland last week, California Governor Jerry Brown gave Newsweek's Stephan Lesher an inflight interview en route to Oregon. Excerpts:"

The interview, then, is edited. This makes a difference: because meaning is derived from the total context of the interactive situation, sections of a conversation which are later left out might be relied upon in the situation to offer background or clarification for later statements. Without these balancing parts, the sections presented may have nuances or emphases the sections originally modified.

The overall context of the interview's presentation in the magazine also controls to a large degree the impact of its contents. Once a frame of reference is established by a preceding article, statements which otherwise might be evaluated from a variety of views are apt to be read within the established categories. Here the preceding article is strongly negative toward Brown, stating that he is politically naive and egotistic for attempting what was presented by the magazine as an almost hopeless bid for the Democratic nomination. The interviewer's questions as well take on, in this frame of reference, a quality of attack; they read as if aiming for exposure of Brown's naivete. In another context, they might sound different.

The interview, with commentary:
Lesher: What makes you believe you should be President?

Brown: Well, when I look at the people who are running now, I think I have something to offer that they don't. I represent another generation of leaders. . . . I have been chief executive of the largest state, with a budget of almost $13 billion and 200,000 employees. I've been around politics all my life, I understand it. I know its limits and its potential. And I see the need of coming to terms with the era of limits—economically, ecologically and even humanly—that we're entering into.

In this context, Lesher asking Brown "what makes you believe" you should be President sounds like an accusation that Brown alone has that farfetched idea, one based on "belief" rather than thought.

Brown's response does contain the word "think" but under the aspect of the "accusation," the answer sounds defensive. The frequently-repeated "I" in Brown's response strengthens this sense, and seems to stress that his views of his qualifications are his alone, as the import of the question suggests. This direct listing of qualifications at the beginning of the interview also ties the interview directly into the preceding article's "naive-realistic" continuum, and makes it difficult to evaluate the answer from aspects different from that. All elements here taken into consideration, the context seems to give Brown's answer a naive, cocky tone.

Q.2: You've said you support the Humphrey-Hawkins bill and will
make full employment your first goal. Yet you support "fiscal frugality" to prevent inflation. Aren't those positions contradictory?

A. No, I don't think so. Humphrey-Hawkins sets out ... a target and commits government to policies and planning. It leaves a great deal of flexibility and discretion to a President and Congress which they can handle in different ways. Economists differ among themselves on whether full employment is inflationary. But at the rate we're going now, the social problems created by unemployment are unacceptable.

Again, the question takes on a more accusative character due to its association with the foregoing article. Rather than being only a request for clarification of a possible contradiction, it seems to present the contradiction as established, suggesting that Brown is naive for holding both views at the same time.

In this context, Brown's explanation sounds very much like a dodge. Minus the negative weighting, it might be read as reasonable.

Q.3: You've said your approach to solving the Middle East crisis would be to get the two sides to sit together and discuss their differences. Isn't that everybody's goal?

A. What is critical is the recognition of Israel. I don't see a solution until the Arabs are willing to sit down and talk about it and that hasn't been done. The other alternative is for the U.S. to be a super-intermediary and to guarantee an agreement.
Within the established context, this is a damned-if-you-do, damned-if-you-don't question. In "The Newest Face of '76" Brown was criticized for being out of touch with the thinking of the political establishment. His political views were condemned for their novelty. Now the question implies he is to be taken to task for not having a new idea on the Middle East.

Brown in his answer states the obvious, then offers "the other alternative," for the U.S. to guarantee an agreement.

The "alternative" is one discussed previously also but seldom because of its unpalatability in risking direct U.S. involvement in a Middle East war. It is possible to see in the question something of an attempted trap.

Q.4: Would you substantially reduce military spending?

A. If you had to put it on a spectrum, the military budget is one that has be be very, very carefully reviewed. . . . I want a strong defense . . . but I'm definitely putting domestic policy as a priority. . . . A President has to project a vision, something I call planetary realism, to combine foreign policy and ecological problems, to make people understand that we all drink water out of the same well and breathe the same air. You won't need to spend as much militarily if you could promote this idea--and there's power in ideas and ideals.

This question plays off the implied threat of war in the preceding answer. Since the interview was edited, there is no way to know whether this was during the interview itself the next question in
sequence. The question also presents Brown with a direction for his answer rather than leaving all options open. Again, in the frame of reference, phrasing the question in this way seems to imply that it may be a 'typically naive' Brown view.

As it is, Brown presents suggestions on both sides of the issue of reducing military spending, and backs these up with his views on "planetary realism," which if understood would lead, he says, to a reduction in military spending. His view that "there's power in ideas and ideals" ties in to the "naive" category of the previous article, and makes it difficult to read the statement without having to evaluate whether or not this may be an example of naivete.

Q.5: You've said that your achievements as governor in California give you a positive record. What are some of those achievements?
A. I have the best record of achievements in the country.

Q.6: That's very modest.
A. But it's true. I've kept state salaries at a reasonable level; last year I put through a 6.9 per cent raise but I got it down from the 8.5 per cent that had been proposed. This year I've recommended an across-the-board, $70-a-month raise for everyone—from judges to janitors. ... I put through mandatory prison sentences for the sale of heroin, heavier sentences for the commission of crimes with guns, lowered the marijuana penalty for possession of 1 ounce or less to a $100 misdemeanor. ... I've slowed the freeway program by reducing from 16,000 to 13,500 the number of highway-department employees. ... And I've appointed
I provided unemployment insurance to farm workers, abolished the fair-trade laws, provided collective bargaining for schoolteachers. And there have been no new general taxes or sales tax or liquor tax. We've increased the surplus that existed when I took office. . . . I don't think that's a bad record so far.

The interviewer's interpolation, "That's very modest" separates Brown's "I have the best record in the country" from the rest of his statement, for which it was evidently to serve as prelude. Singled out like this, it takes on an added dimension of vanity even without the interviewer's direct statement that (by ironic reversal) it is a vain thing to say. Again, the previous article's assertion that Brown is politically naive and egotistically ambitious for political power seem confirmed by a statement which might be seen in other lights in a different context. And this statement is the one chosen, further separated from the rest of Brown's answer which serves to offer some reasonable support for the claim, as the interview's title.

Brown's answer listing his accomplishments is most certainly interspersed with "I." Especially read next to the Interlandi cartoon showing Jimmy and Jerry as stained-glass saints claiming to outdo each other in purity, but again due to the context, it is the element of personal vanity which is stressed, making Brown's list of achievements read like a litany in praise of Jerry Brown. The substance of the achievements themselves seem diminished in the process, and in spite of them the tone of the interview under its aspect seems to confirm the
preceding article's assessment of Jerry Brown.

SUMMARY: "I Have the Best Record in the Country"

Attitude: negative

How shown: stated

This interview presents Brown's answers under the aspect of political naivete, previously established by the story appearing ahead of this boxed interview on the same pages. The questions point up aspects of Brown's views which take on a naive ring: a stress on his "belief" that he "should be" President, pointing to his Mideast policy as nothing new. Brown's own statements such as those on "planetary realism" and the featured "I have the best record in the country" also take on the added onus of being heard within the naive/realistic dichotomy.
Exit (Finally) Brown

Jerry Brown finally packed it in last week. Though he remained a declared candidate, the California governor conceded that Jimmy Carter will almost certainly be the Democratic Presidential nominee, and Brown's remaining campaign activities will be limited almost exclusively to his home state. Brown had held out longer than any other challenger, and his seven-week, all-out campaign had wrought some interesting changes in his style, his rhetoric, his outlook and perhaps even his hopes for the future. Newsweek's Martin Kasindorf was with Brown on the last hectic days of the governor's national campaign. Kasindorf's report:

He picked up the phone in his New York hotel room and was put through to Sen. Edward Kennedy in Washington. Could he, Jerry Brown asked, drop down to the Capital to call on the senator? No, Teddy said, he was sorry but his schedule wouldn't allow it. Brown tried to recover. "Well, I'm moving forward in a responsible manner," he said, speaking too quickly and a bit pompously. "I just wanted you to know where I'm at. I really want to spend some time with you. And let's push the issues!" Brown hung up and reported to his assembled staff: "He was telling me he was not going to support somebody who may not win." (Brown did later meet with Kennedy for twenty minutes, to discuss issues.)

For Edmund G. Brown Jr., a man of undeniable vanity and inbred competitiveness, Kennedy's message was hard to take, but harder to ignore. Still he resisted the idea of quitting; only losers quit and he was a winner, claiming six primary victories over Jimmy Carter in six tries. Brown had reveled in the public adulation the campaign had brought him, shedding his seminarian's shyness and even appearing relaxed with women. Aboard a plane bound for Los Angeles, he chatted easily with a stewardess about planes and life in Larchmont, N.Y. Suddenly she broke in: "You like campaigning, don't you?" Brown gushed, "I love it." Then almost visibly pulling back from too much revelation, he said self-mockingly, "Somebody's got to save the country."

Brown loved every minute of it—nor was Brown so much the abstract thinker of his own near past. He drifted week by week away from the politics of limits, of inaction and of lowered expectations that had made him famous. He began sounding like the traditional liberal, with talk of full employment through massive economic intervention by government. Taken on a guided tour of the burned-out South Bronx slums of New York City last week, his ascetic soul seemed scarred by the close look at urban rot, and he hardly spoke of anything else for the next 24 hours. "I hope I've expanded," he said. "I grow."

Schooled by his lifelong rivalry with his politician father to question the authority of elders, Brown refused to believe that Carter's endorsements by the likes of Richard Daley or George Wallace could drive him out of the race. But he had always said he wouldn't "push reality any faster than it wanted to go," and Carter's devastating delegate count forced him inexorably toward the exits. With $250,000 in Federal matching funds, he did still plan to make a 30-minute nationwide television speech this Friday. His campaign had not been without its rewards. He had one-upped his father, who may have been governor but never made a national run for President. And his new stock of national recognition—he climbed from nowhere to the Presidential favorite of 15 per cent of Democrats in the latest Gallup poll—might still prove useful in another run, at another time.

*Brown won in Maryland, Nevada, Rhode Island, California, was second in Oregon delegates; shared the victory of an uncommitted slate in New Jersey with Humphrey.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brown Onstage: Acting as Contender</th>
<th>Brown Offstage: Conceding Defeat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>finally</strong></td>
<td><strong>packed it in</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remained a declared candidate</td>
<td>but conceded to Jimmy Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had held out longer than any</td>
<td>seven-week, all-out campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>challenger</td>
<td>wrought some interesting changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his style, his rhetoric, his</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outlook, perhaps even his hopes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the future</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could he, Jerry Brown asked, drop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>down to the Capitol to call on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Sen. Kennedy)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Well, I'm moving forward in a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsible manner,&quot; he said,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speaking too quickly and a bit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pompously. &quot;I just want you to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>know where I'm at.&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(support achieved)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Edmund G. Brown, Jr., a man</td>
<td>Kennedy's message was hard to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of undeniable vanity and inbred</td>
<td>take but harder to ignore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitiveness,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Still he resisted the idea of</td>
<td>(accepts reality of quitting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quitting: only losers quit and he</td>
<td>(did not revel in public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was a winner</td>
<td>adulation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown had revealed in the public</td>
<td>almost visibly pulling back from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adulation the campaign had</td>
<td>too much revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brought him</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shedding his seminarian's shyness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>even appearing relaxed with women</td>
<td>self-mocking response to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stewardess</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brown Onstage: Acting as Contender
not so much the abstract thinker
drifted away from politics of lowered expectations that had made him famous
began sounding like traditional liberals
his ascetic soul seemed scarred by the close look at urban rot
grew by his lifelong rivalry with his politician father to question the authority of elders
Carter's devastating delegate count forced him inexorably toward the exit
He had one-upped his father who never made a national race for President
new stock of national recognition

Brown Offstage: Conceding Defeat
of his own near past
(held to earlier policies)
maintained nontraditional stance
"I hope I've expanded. I grow."
Brown refused to believe that Carter's endorsements by the likes of Richard Daley or George Wallace could drive him out of the race
He had always said he "wouldn't push reality any faster than it wanted to go"
His campaign had not been without its rewards
might still prove useful in another run, another time
Explication: "Exit (Finally) Brown"

The stage-direction title presents this short article's theme: Jerry Brown at the end of the play.

It also suggests the relief of the stage manager of a vaudeville playhouse: he didn't have to haul him offstage after all. There is a clear indication that the magazine thinks Brown overstayed his welcome.

The article shows Brown performing his role, briefly still onstage. Then it switches to a study of the offstage Brown, one who has conceded his part, his chance at the nomination, is over.

These two aspects of Brown "in action" are the polarities of the article.

An opening italicized preface serves as a prologue to the reading audience:

"Brown had held out longer than any other challenger, and his seven-week, all-out campaign had wrought some interesting changes in his style, his rhetoric, his outlook and perhaps even his hopes for the future."

The character, then, has developed in the course of the play, this introduction says. The article presents Brown interacting with a variety of people in different situations, allowing the reader to see for him/herself how the article presents Brown as acting.

The first scene: Brown's telephone call to Senator Edward Kennedy, a formalized way of requesting a conference in order to claim his support. Kennedy turns down the request, and the article pictures
Brown's reaction:

Brown tried to recover. "Well, I'm moving forward in a responsible manner," he said, speaking too quickly and a bit pompously. "I just want you to know where I'm at. I really want to spend some time with you. And let's push the issues!" Brown hung up and reported to his assembled staffers: "He was telling me he was not going to support somebody who may not win." For Edmund G. Brown, Jr., a man of undeniable vanity and inbred competitiveness, Kennedy's message was hard to take, but harder to ignore.

Brown's need to "recover" and his forced manner of doing so, as shown by the article, support the author's assessment of Brown's "undeniable vanity and inbred competitiveness." Yet Brown's report to his staffers shows he understood Kennedy's implied message and had faced it. The phone call here is Brown onstage; the report to his staff, the offstage Brown. Interestingly, the subject matter he must deal with is the same—the substance of the phone call. The contrast is in his manner: pomposity, prompted by the pressure of the refusal; direct honesty instead with his staff. The use of "reported" notes this difference.

The article continues:

"Still he resisted the idea of quitting: only losers quit and he was a winner, claiming six primary victories over Jimmy Carter in six tries."

The article presents an "inner monologue" here, sharing what it shows as Brown's thoughts with the readers. Their content echoes the assessment of vanity and competitiveness as strong elements in Brown's character, keeping the sense of honesty from being fully operative. The word "still," introducing the sentence, presents the contrast.

Developing these two attributes further, the article states:

"Brown had reveled in the public adulation the campaign had
brought him, shedding his seminarian's shyness and even appearing relaxed with women."

The onstage Brown "sheds his shyness" and "appears relaxed" with women. The use of "even" stresses the unusual aspect of this behavior in the eyes of the writer, while "appears" maintains the sense of doubt; the shyness and guardedness with women are still qualities of the offstage Brown, as the article demonstrates:

"Aboard a plane bound for Los Angeles, he chatted easily with a stewardess. Suddenly she broke in, 'You like campaigning, don't you?' Brown gushed, 'I love it.' Then almost visibly pulling back from too much revelation, he said self-mockingly, 'Somebody's got to save the country.'"

Thus the onstage Brown nevertheless maintains a watch on himself, maintained by his offstage personality, in order to guard against "too much revelation." Yet, the article says, his "love" of campaigning has served to make him more open, at least at times. But the article had included the scene also as a commentary on Brown's vanity.

The article continues:

Nor was Brown so much the abstract thinker of his own near past. He drifted week by week away from the politics of limits, of inaction and of lowered expectations that had made him famous. He began sounding like the traditional liberals, with talk of full employment through massive economic intervention by government.

The article reports on Brown's reaction to a tour of burned-out slums:

"His ascetic soul seemed scarred by the close look at urban rot, and he hardly spoke of anything else for the next 24 hours. 'I hope I've expanded,' he said. 'I grow.'"
By contrasting Brown's new, more traditional views with his former positions labeled as "abstract," the article presents the traditional liberal positions as realistic. Thus this change in Brown is presented as sensible. His confrontation with the reality of slum life, and its deep impression on him, are also contrasted with his former "abstract thoughts"; however, the comment, "I hope I've expanded. I grow," reflect his tendency to abstract even this experience.

The article cites another reason for Brown's reluctance to leave this political scene:

"Schooled by his lifelong rivalry with his politician father to question the authority of elders, Brown refused to believe that Carter's endorsements by the likes of Richard Daley or George Wallace could drive him out of the race."

This "schooling" is presented as an obstacle to admitting reality, and it is here shown clinging tenaciously in Brown's changing character. Yet, the article says, its grip is not absolute:

"But he had always said he 'wouldn't push reality any faster than it wanted to go,' and Carter's devastating delegate count forced him inexorably toward the exits."

Nevertheless, Brown is pictured as moving out with the greatest possible reluctance, even though the clear evidence has convinced other candidates to end their campaigns much earlier. Reality comes hard to Jerry Brown, thought it does come.

The article concludes:

His campaign had not been without its rewards. He had one-upped his father, who never made a national run for President. And his new stock of national recognition—he climbed from
nowhere to the Presidential favorite of 15 per cent of Democrats in the latest Gallup Poll—might still prove useful in another race, at another time.

The first reward, with "one-upped" being equivalent to 'up-staged,' stresses again Brown's tendencies to vanity, competitiveness and rivalry with his father, all qualities of the onstage Brown. The second indicates that the lessons learned in the playing out of the campaign, on both the public and private levels, may be put to practice at a future time.

Brown thus has played his part to the hilt. Though the article indicates he stayed on stage too long due to his vanity, the overlong performance did not destroy his welcome with the audience. This time it was as much play as reality for Brown, the article implies; his powers remain intact, ready perhaps for another appearance in 1980.

SUMMARY: "Exit (Finally) Brown"
Attitude: qualified negative
How shown: stated

In this article, the "interesting changes" shown in Brown deal with his moving away from what earlier Newsweek articles, and this one, considered to be 'radical' and offbeat political ideas toward the standard liberal position, notably here his acceptance of government intervention in support of employment. The article also presents Brown as modifying his personal, unrealistic, ambitions in terms of political reality in accepting the inevitability of Carter's victory. However, Brown is pictured as barely controlling both his vanity and his unreal political views in the article's presentation. Though he has grown in
it, the article suggests, Brown is still playing a role.

The article states its negative attitude toward Brown in the sense of relief shown by the article's title at Brown's departure, and by singling out his having "one-upped" his father as a noteworthy reward of the campaign seconds this with a clear implication. The tone of the article's disapproval is moderate, with strong parallel elements in the positive column of the concordance consistent throughout, lessening the impact of the negative view.
END OF THE ROAD

When Jerry Brown arrived in New York last week, it seemed that he intended to make a last stand against Jimmy Carter—a futile exercise that had many party veterans wondering about the political realism of the California governor. But Brown’s grip on reality proved stronger than they thought and, on Carter’s victory night, the pair stood side by side in Madison Square Garden. Newsweek’s Martin Kasindorf, who has covered Brown’s campaign from start to finish, filed this report on the governor’s convention week:

Jerry Brown didn’t bat an eye when a mouse scurried across his $28-a-day room in New York’s seedy McAlpin Hotel. He was concluding his campaign the way it began, on a note of threadbare hauteur and neither the McAlpin—“It was cheap, and it was close to the Garden,” explained his press secretary—nor the operations headquarters, a rent-a-trailer with a single Brown bumper sticker, could dampen the enthusiasm of Brown and his followers. In the convention hall, Brown deployed eighteen floor leaders and no fewer than 180 “whips,” who gathered 465 signatures for his nomination (only 50 were needed), wooed disaffected Morris Udall and Henry Jackson delegates and dissuaded his own supporters from slipping away.

Brown’s own schedule was a curious mix of frantic days and cloistered evenings when, a self-styled “prisoner of the McAlpin,” he watched the convention on black-and-white TV. He conferred with Louisiana’s anti-Carterite Gov. Edwin Edwards, party chairman Robert Strauss and Hubert Humphrey. He led a small motorcade to address the California delegation, disclosing that he would be nominated from the podium by United Farm Workers leader Cesar Chavez and seconded by Edwards and California Rep. Yvonne Burke. He lobbied the Washington delegates released by Jackson, winning one convert, and drew an SRO crowd to his standard campaign spiel on “planetary realism.”

But his efforts produced no “Brown-swell,” as aides put it, and Brown soon gave up his delegate hunt. “I mean, it’s all over,” he said evenly. “This was just getting acquainted, running through the process.” He put out feelers to Carter’s people and met with Carter senior aide Charles Kirbo. He even offered to make the grand gesture and declare the convention “in unamity”—but Kirbo, perhaps fearing an attempt to upstage Carter, quickly turned him down.

Brown, in turn, bristled at the rebuff—and at the suggestion that he wanted the stage at all. “I didn’t want to give a withdrawal speech from the podium, that’s for sure,” he declared. “The next time I go to the podium, I’m going to have something to say.” The rift was soon papered over, however, and Brown entered the hall on cue to throw his 205 California delegate votes to Carter. On the morning after, Brown met with the nominee for fifteen minutes, then introduced him to a California delegation suddenly awash in green Jimmy buttons. “I’d like to thank the people of California for keeping Governor Brown at home so long,” said Carter graciously. “I’d hate to think what would have happened to my campaign if he had been unleashed in New Hampshire instead of Maryland.”

Brown withdrew at the weekend to a Trappist retreat in Vina, Calif. “This is only the beginning,” he insisted. “This is only the beginning. I’ve learned a great deal.” He would probably stump for Carter in the West, and he was being pressed to cam-
paign for other candidates as well. His brash stab at the nomination was thus proving an asset, even within the Carter circle—Miss Lillian approvingly pronounced him “the runniest man I ever saw”—and among party regulars. “He’s a young man with his whole future in front of him,” said a rarely forgiving Chicago Mayor Richard Daley. “You can’t blame anyone for being a candidate.”

Such approbation could make Brown the party’s newest star, if Carter fails in November; if Carter wins, it is less clear whether Brown can sustain his momentum for four or eight years. As governor, he might lose his popularity and certainly some of his luster in the drudgery of Statehouse chores, while other party luminaries outshine him; furthermore, his politics of limitation and Star Trek rhetoric might eventually pall with voters. Still, “Jerry’s awfully smart,” says one Los Angeles political columnist. “He’ll always be one step ahead of us with new phrases and new ideas.” At 38, Brown was already a step ahead, with more time to spare than most—and more raw ambition, too.
Brown Onstage: Acting as Contender
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Brown Offstage: Conceding Defeat

when a mouse scurried across his
  $28-a-day room

McAlpin / rent-a-trailer

50 signatures needed

dissuaded his own supporters from slipping away

curious mix

conferred with officials

address California delegation

nominated by Chavez

winning one convert

SRO crowd

produced no "Brown-swell"

"it's all over"

declare convention "in unanimity"
  for Carter

fearing attempt to upstage Carter

rift soon papered over

met with nominee

(Carter's acknowledgement of
  Brown's strength)

Trappist monastery

"I've learned a great deal."
The article begins with a preface:

When Jerry Brown arrived in New York last week, it seemed that he intended to make a last stand against Jimmy Carter—a futile exercise that had many party veterans wondering about the political realism of the California governor. But Brown's grip on reality proved stronger than they thought and, on Carter's victory night, the pair stood side by side in Madison Square Garden.

The opposition in the article is thus between form and substance, posture and realism. Written by the same author, this article has the same polarities as "Exit (Finally) Brown": the onstage Brown, posing as active contender for the Democratic nomination though the delegate counts are firmly against him; the offstage Brown, demonstrating a concrete understanding of the political realities. These are the contrary aspects of Brown that the party veterans were concerned with, the article announces at its head; and the evidence for and against Brown on each aspect is presented in the article.

The article begins:
Jerry Brown didn't bat an eye when a mouse scurried across his $28-a-day room in New York's seedy McAlpin Hotel. He was concluding his campaign the way it began, on a note of threadbare hauteur and neither the McAlpin nor the operations headquarters, a rent-a-trailer, with a single Brown bumper sticker, could dampen the enthusiasm of Brown and his followers.

The contrast here between Brown's composure and the appearance of the mouse, the physical shabbiness of his campaign operation and the enthusiasm of its members, show the basic theme: Brown presents a posture of savoir-faire in politics which has some elements of phoniness and some elements of truth. The article points to the shabbiness as "threadbare hauteur," suggesting that at least in part it is a pose: Brown's headquarters could, the article states, have been better than that. The enthusiasm despite the shabbiness also has elements of truth, elements of pose: for all its genuine spirit, it was being maintained for a candidate the delegate counts a week before had declared to be out of the running.

The article's presentation of Brown's extensive efforts on the convention floor repeat the theme: Brown deployed "eighteen floor leaders and no less than 180 whips, who gathered 485 signatures for his nomination when only 50 were required, wooed disaffected delegates and dissuaded his own supporters from slipping away."

Brown is clearly shown to be overdoing it, while his efforts to hand onto his own delegates reveals a sense of the reality: his power at the convention was not growing.

The reference which follows, to Brown's "curious mix of frantic days and cloistered evenings," echoes the reality vs. illusion theme, the daytime activity representing an interaction with reality, the
the nighttime, a withdrawal from it.

The article reports converences with convention leaders, which represent reality; then a "small motorcade to address the California delegation, disclosing that he would be nominated by Cesar Chavez." Since his nomination is for a lost cause, the performance here, in the article's setting, is presented as posturing.

The article continues:

"He lobbied the Washington delegates released by Jackson, winning one convert, and drew an SRO crowd to his standard campaign spiel on "planetary realism."

The lobbying is "real" but the results show it to be illusory; the SRO crowd is real, but the article's quotes around "planetary realism" indicate an attitude of skepticism.

"But," the article points out, in the fact of these examples of Brown's failure to admit defeat, "his efforts produced no 'Brown-swell,' as aides put it, and Brown soon gave up his delegate hunt. 'I mean, it's all over,' he said evenly."

As the preface indicated, Brown's unwillingness to face reality had limits. The control of tone—"he said evenly"—is further indication of his genuine acceptance that the words he says are true, though difficult to pronounce.

Nevertheless, Brown's conversion to reality is not regarded by all as being complete:

"He even offered to make the grand gesture and declare the convention 'in unanimity'—but Kirbo, perhaps fearing an attempt to upstage Carter, quickly turned him down. Brown, in turn, bristled at the
rebuff—and at the suggestion that he wanted the stage at all."

Charles Kirbo, of Carter's staff, here reads Brown's offer as a pose—and Brown's anger and response restates, at least overtly, that he meant it realistically.

The article reports, "The rift was soon papered over, however."

Here the appearance of reality becomes the reality in the formal sense of surface accommodation—followed by Brown's called-for carrying-out of campaign procedures, throwing his delegate votes to Carter.

The day following the convention is characterized, from Brown's perspective, as "the morning after"; yet he introduces Carter to the California delegation and the nominee pays tribute to Brown's real political strength by thanking "the people of California for keeping Governor Brown home so long. I'd hate to think what would have happened to my campaign if he had been unleashed in New Hampshire instead of Maryland."

The article continues:

"Brown withdrew at the weekend to a Trappist retreat in Vina, California. 'This is not an end,' he insisted. 'This is only the beginning. I've learned a great deal.'"

In the light of the pain signified by the connotations of 'the morning after,' "Brown withdrew" can be read as pulling back from a painful situation in order to mend in Trappist "retreat."

If Brown is in "retreat" he is still reluctant to admit it: he "insists" it is only the beginning, he has learned a lot.

Yet there is some substance in his refusal to concede
completely:

He was being pressed to campaign for other candidates as well. His brash stab at the nomination was thus proving an asset, even among the Carter circle—Miss Lillian approvingly pronounced him "the runningest man I ever saw"—and among party regulars, "He's a young man with his whole future in front of him," said a rarely forgiving Chicago Mayor Richard Daley. "You can't blame anyone for being a candidate."

Jerry Brown had, the article indicates, made a not altogether negative impression far beyond the boundaries of California, in areas that might be important some other time. The formal loss acquires elements of substantive gain.

The problematic aspects continue, however:

Such approbation could make Brown the party's newest star, if Carter fails in November; if Carter wins, it is less clear whether Brown can sustain his momentum for four or eight years. As governor, he might lose his popularity and certainly some of his luster in the drudgery of Statehouse chores, while other party luminaries outshine him; furthermore, his politics of limitation and Star Trek rhetoric might eventually pall with voters.

The article here presents, speculatively, what it sees as Brown's possible continuing strengths and weaknesses, realities and illusions. Brown's present popularity may not last; his present political star status may be eclipsed; his policies, now attracting SRO audiences, may pall with voters. The reality of Brown's present strong position despite his loss of the nomination may give way to a different sort of reality in his future.

Still, it may not:

"'Jerry Brown's awfully smart,' says one Los Angeles political columnist. 'He'll always be one step ahead of us with new phrases and new ideas.' At age 38, Brown was already a step ahead, with more time
to spare than most—and more raw ambition, too."

Time and raw ambition to spare are both on Jerry Brown's side—in the qualified sense established by the preceding paragraph. But in presenting Brown's "raw ambition" as its final point, the article makes it clear what dimension of Jerry Brown's reality it considers most significant.

SUMMARY: "End of the Road"
Attitude: qualified negative
How shown: stated

"End of the Road" presents a qualified negative view of Jerry Brown's performance at the 1976 Democratic National Convention in phrases such as "threadbare hauteur" describing Brown's hotel and in a series of statements and descriptions showing what the article presents as Brown's unwillingness to accept his cause as lost. Qualifying this are statements of Brown's growing sense of personal and political realism, as the article shows this, as he admits defeat and appears at the convention with Carter.

Carter's cheerful acknowledgment that Brown's power had been indeed a threat to his campaign, requests from other candidates for Brown to campaign for them, and the article's calm assessment of where Brown stands at the end of the campaign add to the positive counter balance which keeps the article from being wholly negative.

Brown's anger when a Carter staffer reads his offer as a pose and the article's ending reference to Brown's "raw ambition" sustain the negative view as Brown "retreats" from the national scene.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

From June of 1974 through July of 1976, Edmund G. Brown, Jr. rose from relative anonymity to national notice. Brown first came to the attention of Time and Newsweek as the young successor to the California governorship vacated by Ronald Reagan. His newsworthiness was highlighted by the fact that his father, Pat Brown, had also been governor of the state.

Jerry Brown's emergence into national notice coincided with the final period of Watergate. The event itself, a new governor taking office in California during that time in California, state of the fallen Richard Nixon, would likely have served to cast any such person into a comparative symbolic relationship with the disgraced President in the public mind. The uniqueness of Jerry Brown acted powerfully to intensify that comparison and to attract the attention of the nation via the media.

Hugh Duncan noted, as stated in this study's Introduction, that in unsettled periods disaffected people need new leaders, symbolic figures with whom to identify. Logically, people must at least implicitly recognize such a person as a symbol, that is, a representative of values and potentials they will then either accept or reject.

Duncan pointed out that information concerning such a figure takes on the character of exhortation as the writer, by the selection of language used, invites the reader to share the writer's perception of the symbolic figure.
These *Time* and *Newsweek* articles, then, are "strategies for encompassing a situation," as Kenneth Burke asserts all historical documents are (*Philosophy of Literary Form*, p. 109). The situation: the emergence of Jerry Brown, not only as a symbol of the new antipolitics but as a possible presidential candidate. Its implicit question: Should the nation accept Brown as its symbolic leader? Provocative enough even under its basic circumstances in the wake of Watergate, the question was given additional weight since Brown was also asking to be invested with the chief executive authority of the nation through which to exercise his symbolic potential as a leader. Further, the decision had to be made over a very short period.

These newsmagazine articles on Jerry Brown do, in fact, present him to their readers as a symbolic figure. The first *Time* story, "California's Vote for Reform," presents Jerry Brown as a powerful, hard-to-read personage who nevertheless may be a sign of hope for the nation. *Newsweek's* "Mr Brown Goes to Town" offers its readers a virtual identification between Brown and the ideal type portrayed in "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," showing Brown as a highly principled politician upon whose moral uprightness the nation can depend.

The chart below lists for each article the image to which Jerry Brown was compared, and its type:
### Time Magazine: Images Representing Jerry Brown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Analogy</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;California's Vote for Reform&quot;</td>
<td>powerful, hard-to-read-symbol</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Four Key Contests Revisited&quot;</td>
<td>love-hate relationship</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reagan? Wallace? No, Brown&quot;</td>
<td>prideful</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>preacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jerry Brown: Learning to Live with Our Limits&quot;</td>
<td>sensible parish</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>priest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Brown v. The Schools&quot;</td>
<td>therapist</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Brown: How the Guru Governs&quot;</td>
<td>young leader</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>on trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Brown: Test by Rorschach&quot;</td>
<td>enigmatic, provocative</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>symbol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Chemistry Has Changed&quot;</td>
<td>Don Quixote</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stampede to Carter&quot;</td>
<td>Don Quixote</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Newsweek: Images Representing Jerry Brown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image</th>
<th>Analogy</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mr. Brown Goes to Town&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;Mr. Smith Goes to Washington&quot;</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Say-Nay Politics&quot;</td>
<td>stylistic figurehead</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for new politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful&quot;</td>
<td>fanatic revolutionary</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jerry Brown Does His Thing&quot;</td>
<td>insincere on anti-politics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Newest Face of '76&quot;</td>
<td>politically naive</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I Have the Best Record</td>
<td>politically naive</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the Country&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Exit (Finally) Brown&quot;</td>
<td>actor growing in role</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;End of the Road&quot;</td>
<td>actor growing in role</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only three articles, all in *Newsweek*, were built around assertions about Brown instead of centering on an extended analogy. Each of the other 15 articles compare Brown to figures which are in themselves symbols of authority and/or power, even though misguided (Don Quixote) or not fully achieved (actor growing in role).

This acknowledgment on the part of *Time* and *Newsweek* that Jerry Brown was a symbolic figure, and as such possessed considerable potential for becoming the center of a widespread public consensus, increases the obligation for fairness on the part of the newsmagazines in their coverage of Brown. It also intensifies the importance of determining whether or not that coverage was fair.

To that end, four hypotheses were proposed for this study.
These are shown below, with the results of the analysis pertaining to each. The first two hypotheses, because closely related, are dealt with together.

HYPOTHESIS 1: That a definite bias concerning Edmund G. Brown, Jr. is present in each of the *Time* and *Newsweek* articles under study.

HYPOTHESIS 2: That in most of the articles for each magazine, the attitude shown is positive.

The concordance and explication for each of the *Time* and *Newsweek* articles demonstrates that the key terms of the article support, as amplification of it, a single central concept presented as an image attributed to Jerry Brown.

The article's point of view concerning Brown is contained in this central image and in the identifying headings of the positive-negative continuum, when Brown is the article's main topic. When references to Brown are made within the context of a different main topic, such as in the article "California's Vote for Reform" or "Say-Nay Politics," the key terms concerning the references take their places within the positive-negative structure of the work, as shown by the concordance. In this case, it is by examining these that the article's view of Brown can be determined.

Charts of the articles show whether the image of Jerry Brown each article contains is positive or negative. The charts also show whether the attitude was clearly stated or implied; this aspect will
be discussed concerning the third hypothesis of the study.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>How Shown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;California's Vote for Reform&quot;</td>
<td>qualified negative</td>
<td>implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Four Key Contests: Brown v. Flournoy:</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Reagan? Wallace? No, Brown&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jerry Brown: Learning to Live with our Limits&quot;</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>clearly implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Brown v. The Schools&quot;</td>
<td>qualified positive</td>
<td>clearly implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jerry Brown: How the Guru Governs&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Brown: Test by Rorschach&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;'The Chemistry Has Changed'&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Stampede to Carter&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>How Shown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mr. Brown Goes to Town&quot;</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Mr. Small-Is-Beautiful&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Say-Nay Politics&quot;</td>
<td>qualified positive</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Jerry Brown Does His Thing&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>clearly implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The Newest Face of '76&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;I Have the Best Record in the Country&quot;</td>
<td>negative</td>
<td>clearly implied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Exit (Finally) Brown&quot;</td>
<td>qualified negative</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;End of the Road&quot;</td>
<td>qualified negative</td>
<td>stated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown by the charts above, the first hypothesis is established: each of the Time and Newsweek articles on Jerry Brown does contain a definite bias.

As shown, the second hypothesis is not established: the majority of articles for each magazine show a negative or qualified negative bias rather than a positive bias.

HYPOTHESIS 3: That in most of the articles in Time and in Newsweek, the attitude contained in the article is implied rather than stated.

In the five Time articles listed as having an implied image, the concordance and the explication show that the image is difficult to specify from any one statement in the text. Clues for the central image, under which the attitude is presented, are located throughout the text, and require a definite and extensive effort in order to be first identified and then "added up" to see what image or concept is being referred to. Two other articles have images which are fairly accessible to the reader without much special effort. The articles state their central concepts and concomitantly identify their attitude.

In the two Newsweek articles for which the attitude is listed as clearly implied, the text of the articles furnishes sufficient clues for the reader to recognize fairly easily the negative attitude. However, the attitude is stated directly nowhere in the text. The attitude is directly stated in the remaining six articles.

Therefore, the third hypothesis is established for Time magazine: the attitudes for most of the articles are implied rather than
stated.

The third hypothesis is not established for Newsweek: in most of the Newsweek articles, the attitude is directly stated.

HYPOTHESIS 4: That the factual content in each article is woven into the language structures which present the attitude, so that the reader is offered the factual content under the aspect of the attitude.

This hypothesis can be established by showing its opposite. If the factual content is now interwoven, it must appear in a section of the work different from that which carries the attitude. It must also be presented in strictly neutral terms which carry no expression of attitude.

That is clearly not the structure of these articles. There is no separate neutral statement of facts concerning Jerry Brown in any of them. The concordances for each article show factual information presented within the cluster of positive and negative terms. The fact that Brown is a bachelor, for instance, is negatively weighted in "California's Vote for Reform." In "Brown v. Flournoy," the fact that Brown disapproved of the new California governor's mansion is entered into the negative set with the term "assailed." In Newsweek's "Mr. Brown Goes to Town," Brown's short term in office is placed within the positive set by being phrased as "not overburdened with experience." The facts of Brown's lifestyle, his manners and his views are similarly weighted positively or negatively in each article, and are found within the contexts which present the attitude of the article.
Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is established: it follows from the above that whatever factual content is presented must be found within the article itself.

**Implications of the Study**

This study was designed to determine whether a definite attitude as distinct from objective reportage could be found in the articles analyzed. The study found such an attitude in all of the articles in each magazine. It also determined that in just over half of the seventeen stories, the attitude was implied, clearly or subtly, rather than stated.

It is fault enough that bias should be present in magazines which profess to be factual and unbiased. More serious than its existence, however, is its partial concealment. If an attitude is held by the magazine and is presented in its articles, at the very least it should be capable of being easily perceived by readers, not slipped to them on the sly. That is what is taking place in the articles when the attitude is implied; the contents of the story communicate the bias to the reader along with the factual content, so the reader cannot avoid encountering it.

It is also notable that in only two of the *Time* stories carrying a negative attitude was that attitude stated; in four other negative articles the attitude was implied. That is nearly half of *Time*'s coverage of Brown. The attitude was clearly implied for both the positive and the qualified positive stories. The attitude was also clearly implied for one qualified negative story.
A distinct difference is apparent between *Time* and *Newsweek* on this issue. Though the two articles where the bias is clearly implied are both negative, the magazine's attitude was stated directly for two negative articles. One of these was the most severely negative article on Brown among the 17 articles studied. The three qualified negative stories also had their attitudes stated clearly. In no case in a *Newsweek* article was a negative attitude subtly implied.

This analysis, to restate, does not mean to argue that subtle implication is blameworthy only if an article is negative. It does seem, however, less fair to subtly imply criticism than to subtly imply praise.

Kenneth Burke does not maintain that a writer knows nothing at all about his own motivations. He maintains that the writer cannot realize as he writes exactly how that intention is getting into his word choices in every instance. It is possible to control one's implications within limits. In any case, each of these stories passed through the hands and minds of editors, who ought to be concerned about getting rid of subtle inferences, not engendering them.

That a "slant" of some kind should exist in a story is, in Burke's view, inevitable. That it should be allowed to remain all but hidden in order to influence the reader without his full awareness, as seems to be the case here with the *Time* reportage, is journalistically—and otherwise—unethical. The facts concerning Jerry Brown's objective qualifications for high public office remain, of course, open to debate. The issue is the fact of concealment.
This study has shown that biased reporting was standard practice for both of these magazines in their coverage of Jerry Brown. It has also shown that subtly implying its bias while presenting it throughout an article is standard practice for *Time*. It should be stated again that the *Newsweek* coverage is notable for its honesty in stating or clearly implying its biases, positive or negative.

The results of this study also show that the term "newsmagazine," insofar as that term is understood to mean balance and objectivity, is a misnomer for at least the issues of those publications that carried the articles about Jerry Brown analyzed here.

In the light of this analysis, it is unsettling to realize that these articles were looked to as sources, according to James Perry's survey, by other members of the national press and other media responsible for reporting on Jerry Brown.

**Recommendations for Further Studies**

1. This study indicates that further analysis should be undertaken on the performance of the major newsmagazines to determine:
   a. whether other individuals are also being covered in a biased manner, and if so, whether the bias is evident to the readers;
   b. whether issues and policies are being given biased coverage in a similar way. The researcher noted elements of criticism toward Jerry Brown's antipolitics views, for example, which seemed to be implied rather than stated in the articles examined here.

2. *Time* and *Newsweek* were analyzed in this study in part because they
are news sources for the members of the national political press corps. It is recommended that other sources among those listed by James Perry in *Us and Them* be evaluated to determining whether these also show bias. Specifically, the publications of Congressional Quarterly, Inc., evidently considered a prime source by editors and station managers as well as by reporters, should be examined to determine what kind of attitudes are being presented to the decisionmakers thereby.
COMMENTARY ON KENNETH BURKE'S METHODOLOGY

Most literary criticism carefully avoids dealing with the question of the author's motives for writing a particular work. The work is studied in and of itself, generally with the intention of clarifying its contents, its meaning and the means by which these are produced.

In Kenneth Burke's view, not only is the writer's motivation accessible since locked into the words chosen for the composition; this motive furnishes the central organizing principle for the work itself. In Burke's approach the written work is not treated as a static piece of art but as an act in a social setting, part of a dialogue in which the writer hopes to engage the reader. The writer intends, by Burke's principle of identification, to win the reader over to the viewpoint the article expresses.

Burke's view of the function of literature is one important difference between his critical approach and other methods. This dynamic approach makes it highly suitable for analysis of news stories with their clear communicative intent.

Another important difference between Burke's approach and more traditional forms of criticism is that Burke's methods are not esoteric. Though persons who attempt to approach it through his work may well think otherwise, the analytic process in its essential perspective and workings is, in this researcher's view, awesomely clear. This is in contrast to standard literary criticism which often seems to be
presented as an arcane profession, the province of the few masters, a fine art with a specialized terminology requiring a precise technique for its application. There are comparisons here also with other forms used in social scientific research.

The intent of Burke's method is "to make the analysis of literary symbolism as systematic as possible, while allowing for an experimental range required by the subtle and complex nature of the material." (Terms for Order, p. 145.) Its function is to provide a way into the work itself. Its effect is to make explicit and specific the sequence of judgments and evaluations which comprise the standard reading process, identifying the work's unifying motivational theme and the means by which it is presented by so doing. There are no categories to set up in advance of the analysis; the dialectical polarities of the work and its theme emerge from the analysis as terms begin to cluster. The analysis itself demonstrates the relationship among the units of meaning as given by the text. The story is left whole and dealt with as a total symbolic structure.

Hermann Stelzner's model demonstrates a straightforward procedure for utilizing language structures to locate the key terms and the underlying theme of a work. It is hoped that the clarifications added in this study present Stelzner's approach to Burke's method in a simplified, explicated form. The researcher considers it likely that any person capable of reading with comprehension and reasonable insight should be able to grasp the process as it is explained here and utilize it without much difficulty. It remains true that Burke's perspective must be understood to provide direction for the search; perhaps the
presentation of his views offered here will also prove useful for shortening the apprehension process for future researchers.

The Stelzner model of Burkean analysis has proven in this study to be highly useful in identifying attitudes in shorter journalistic writings. Once the principle of amplification is understood, especially in shorter nonfiction, it is relatively easy to detect groupings of terms which point to the work's central attitude. In lengthy collections, this dialectic arrangement of presenting sets of counterbalanced terms is not necessary; its function is to make clear the direction of the work in a highly explicit way since the terms taken singly do not point directly to the theme. In longer works, the same terms often are found a number of times, and such clusters form a direct line to the central viewpoint.

Kenneth Burke's method of analysis, as demonstrated in this study, shares with other forms of content analysis the ability to identify bias present in journalistic writing. Comparatively speaking, however, standard analytic forms tend to operate at the macro level where Burke's method approaches the microscopic in its penetration of language.

Where standard content analysis assumes the same word will maintain a consistent meaning throughout a single report or a series of reports over a period of time, Burke's method not only allows but is designed to catch subtle shifts in meaning from one instance of usage to the next.

Where standard context analysis relies on numerical quantity as an index of a term's importance, Burke's method allows for considering
a possible single instance of a term's use as sufficiently significant
to outweigh other terms, even if these are frequently repeated.

Where standard content analysis gathers terms irrespective of context, Burke's method leaves the terms in the context which is the primary determiner of their meaning.

Burke's method, then, is able to allow into evidence much more of the writer's expression than do the standard forms of analysis. It is also able to pinpoint linguistic usages often excluded by quantitative methods: implications, association, subtle assertions which might be classified as poetic elements. As this study's opening quote of Archibald MacLeish pointed out, "objective" reportage has been widely assumed to be strictly prosaic, all but the antithesis of poetry. Perhaps this belief in itself has served to distract researchers from recognizing such element and their import in the works they have studied. In fact, these elements are frequently present in reportage, and it is precisely these shifts of usage and colorings of meaning which can turn a seemingly straightforward account into a subtly biased one. The *Time* magazine articles analyzed in this study offer abundant evidence in support of this point.

Burke's method is capable of exposing this type of verbal maneuvering. Thus, a great deal more of the actual content which reaches the reader can be analyzed.

If this increase in range and depth is important in the analysis of any account of human activity, it has special significance for political reporting.
As accounts of the contemporary elective process show, information on candidates and issues now reaches the electorate primarily through the media rather than at meetings, rallies, and discussions of political parties. If media persons have, de facto, the ability and power to bring to the voters the primary information on which they will base their choices, they must be held much more closely to account for fairness as well as for accuracy in their reportage. More precise analytic instruments are needed, capable of discerning subtleties of treatment. This is especially necessary in the midst of a campaign, while issues are being debated and impressions of candidates are being formed.

This version of Kenneth Burke's methodology is one such approach. It is capable of being effectively employed on short individual reports as they appear, since an analysis can be performed on a single story in a brief period of time. This makes it possible to monitor the flow of impression, implications and attitudes on a consistent basis, while the events being reported are still current and while misrepresentations can be effectively corrected.

This is a first attempt at so using this form of Burkean analysis on shorter journalistic writings, and further refinement and developments are both possible and likely as new insights into Burke's thinking and procedures are found. The researcher has been encouraged by the adaptability of this procedure to these articles and with the results obtained. It is hoped that future use will be made of the method employed here, and that improvements on it will be developed.
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