To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Gordon T. French entitled "A Rhetorical Analysis of the Image and Ethos of Julian Bond." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts, with a major in Speech and Theater.

G. Allan Yeomans, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

# A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF THE IMAGE AND ETHOS OF JULIAN BOND

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Arts

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Gordon T. French

August 1975

1545424

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The accomplishment of this thesis, and the degree attached, is a very important achievement in my life. It has taken me six years of stopping and starting, turmoil and triumph to reach my goal. I could not have done it without the encouragement, assistance, friendship and love from the people who have cared about me. I feel compelled to attach to this paper a statement of thanks to those who deserve so much credit for its existence.

My mother and father have made it a project to see me through. It took them six years, but they were successful. With love like that how could I have avoided success?

Carolyn Jefferies and Malcolm McAvoy have given me unhalting support. Your encouragement and friendship have played a significant part in my life and this degree.

Dr. Yeomans was there when I needed him--over and over and over. If God were to create the perfect teacher, he would give him the heart of Al Yeomans. Thanks also to the other members of my committee, Norma Cook and Sandra Fish, for their incisive criticism and swift consideration of the thesis. Mention must also be made of Dr. John Jellicorse who struggled with me through my first and unsuccessful thesis.

I also thank those who helped me with the mechanics of this research; Carolyn for typing it and Jessica for giving up of her mother's time; Mrs. Cohrs and the staff of the Maud M. Burris Library in Decatur; Mr. Pilkington and the staff of the Vanderbilt Television News Archives. And Julian Bond for his assistance, interviews and sincere efforts to help me.

Others who contributed in their own way were Jim Bartlett, Patricia Powell, Susan Fields, John and Carolyn Carson.

To you all I pledge myself to the pursuit of understanding and the causes of humanity. I pray that I will forever hold your trust.

ABSTRACT

In the field of rhetorical criticism the concept of ethos has been a cardinal tenet for centuries. Ethos is understood to mean the elements of persuasion that originate with the character of the speaker. It was discovered in researching the public speaking of Julian Bond that his ethos was the primary ingredient of the public speaking situation. Not just his ethos, but, specifically, a distinct variation of ethos which is herein called image. It was the audience's preconception of Julian Bond that most affected his ethos and the public addresses he delivered. It was the purpose of this research to examine the image of Julian Bond and its effects on the public speaking situation.

Bond has risen to the heights of leadership and fame within the black community. Two events catapulted him to national attention. In 1966 he was refused his elected seat in the Georgia House of Representatives for statements opposing the policies of the United States government in Vietnam. In December of that year, following three special elections in which he triumphed, the Supreme Court, in a landmark free speech decision, ruled that the House had violated his rights. Two years later Bond led a challenge delegation to the 1968 Democratic convention which won a share of the Georgia votes. Later, he delivered a seconding speech for the nomination of Eugene McCarthy. The following evening he was placed in nomination himself for Vice President in an unsuccessful effort by dissident forces to protest the convention.

Primarily through television coverage of the event, Bond emerged as a national figure who at once symbolized the struggle of blacks, the anti-

war movement and the increasing influence of the young. As the result of that symbolic role, he commenced a successful career as a lecturer, mostly on college campuses.

The image of Bond was created by a confluence of several factors. His age, personality and physical attractiveness appealed to many people. During the period of the sixties, and particularly during the fight over his House seat and at the 1968 convention, his juxtaposition to others of less desirable qualities helped create the impression of one who was thoughtful and moderate. His unique capacity to represent the three major social movements of that period--civil rights, peace and youth--combined with his stirring performance on television at the convention, obtained a devoted constituency, especially in the black community.

Bond scorns the personality cult, and his public speaking reflects that attitude. He purposefully underplays himself in an effort to focus attention on his message. He under-emphasizes vocal projection, uses little physical animation and spices the text with numerous stylistic devices to focus attention on the subject. It is because of his image and popularity that he is able to use these techniques to the exclusion of most forms of ethical proof.

Changes in society have wrought changes in the image of Bond. He has maintained his popularity and exposure in the black community, but is less well-known among white Americans than he once was. His decision not to run for President will have a profound effect on his future image, possibly reducing his exposure and, consequently, his national fame.

# PREFACE

During the writing and research of this paper, it was expected that Julian Bond would announce his intentions to enter certain of the 1976 Presidential primaries. As writing reached a final stage, he decided otherwise. The decision required minor editing, but, more significantly, may have altered the import of the research. At this point it seems unlikely that Bond will reach the level of national leadership as soon as many had predicted. His recent decision may have been the ultimate guarantor of that delay. However, his life and career have been meaningful fragments of an era in American history, and the very fact of his seeming slide into oblivion may be a powerful statement in itself of the eventual conclusion of those causes and events he so uniquely symbolized.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| CHAPTER | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Justification | 1 |
| | Scope of Study | 5 |
| | Image | 6 |
| | Ethos | 10 |
| | Sources | 11 |
| II. | JULIAN BOND - A BIOGRAPHY | 13 |
| | A Family Heritage | 13 |
| | Childhood and Education | 15 |
| | The Movement | 17 |
| | Battle Over House Seat | 20 |
| | The Chicago Convention | 22 |
| | Countdown to 35 | 25 |
| | Profile of Julian Bond | 29 |
| III. | THE GROWTH OF THE IMAGE OF JULIAN BOND | 32 |
| | Exclusion from the Georgia House of Representatives | 33 |
| | 1968 Democratic Convention | 41 |
| | The Portrayal of Bond in Print | 53 |
| | The Role of Television in the Development of Bond's Image | 65 |
| | Additional Factors | 75 |
| | Constituency | 76 |

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. ETHOS IN THE PUBLIC SPEAKING OF JULIAN BOND . . . . . 81

Audience . . . . . 82

Bond's View of Ethos . . . . . 85

Intrinsic Ethos . . . . . 86

Extrinsic Ethos . . . . . 99

V. CONCLUSIONS . . . . . 103

Image . . . . . 104

Ethos . . . . . 107

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 110

APPENDIXES . . . . . 117

VITA . . . . . 139

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

He is the most popular black politician in America, but he maintains a following among whites. He is radical, but seeks change within the white's own system. He speaks militantly, but does so in coolly modulated language that reflects the presence of reason. He is popular, but shuns demagoguery. He has been touched by the black experience, yet refuses to face racism with more racism. He is the product of an oppressed culture, yet conducts himself with casual ease in the company of even the most powerful. He is successful, yet advocates the cause of those who are not. His name is anathema in Georgia politics, but he is today the most popular politician to rise from that state. He is Julian Bond, a private man with a sizable public following.

Julian Bond's paradoxical image, his fascinating experiences, captivating personality and intriguing rhetorical style all combine to urge a study of the public's impression of Bond and the role that impression plays in the rhetorical setting. This study will inquire into the nature of the man, his image and his advocacy.

### Justification

In the past, Julian Bond has been a significant national figure, particularly in black America, and some predict he will rise to positions of greater influence in the future. Bond has also been a major personality on the national speaking circuit. These factors justify him as the subject for a rhetorical study.

Bond is the latest of a family that has produced three generations of distinguished leaders in the black community. As a college student he was instrumental in organizing the early sit-ins and demonstrations that desegregated many of Atlanta's public places and business establishments. Bond was communications director for the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC) during the early sixties, and in that capacity was listed among the important Negroes in America.

The young activist first came to national attention for being excluded from his seat in the Georgia House of Representatives. His case before the United States Supreme Court provided for a landmark decision on the right of elected officials to express unpopular opinions. He played an important role at the historic 1968 Democratic convention. The challenge of his delegation to the hand-picked delegation of Governor Lester Maddox resulted in the abolition of such practices. Later that week he became the first black ever to be nominated by a major party for Vice President.

In subsequent years his popularity has remained consistently high. In 1970 a Maryland research organization reported that Bond would be the choice among blacks if they could select a black President (Atlanta Journal, 9 February 1970). In a November, 1974 Gallup Poll to determine the choice among Democrats for the 1976 Presidential nomination, Bond ranked sixth of thirty potential candidates suggested by Gallup. Those ranking higher, all previous contenders for the office, were George Wallace, Hubert Humphrey, Henry Jackson, Edmund Muskie, and George McGovern. In a similar poll of independents Bond rated tenth (New York Times, 5 December 1974).

Julian Bond is a person who has participated in the "black experience." His greatest importance today is as a leader and spokesman for black Americans. In the late sixties when militancy was the tone of the rhetoric and violence was the strategy for social change, the Georgia state representative was one of but few young blacks advocating the use of the political process. He was called a "pig" by Eldridge Cleaver and denounced by the Black Panthers (Meehan, 1974). Cleaver is today seeking re-entry into the United States and is advocating peaceful solutions to the problems of blacks. Former head of the Black Panthers Bobby Seale is a politician in Oakland and has run for mayor of that city. Bond believes his role as political pilgrim to have been one of his most significant:

> I was a forerunner and I take credit for a great deal of today's political activism among black people. Not sole credit, by any means. But I take partial credit for the politicization of a generation of young, black political activists and politicians with whom I have either met or who have, so they tell me, been inspired by my example (Bond, 1975c).

Bond has been an important person in the development of black political power in Atlanta, a city viewed by many blacks as an American Mecca, a shining example of what can be done by and for black people. Since his entrance into politics, he has developed increasing influence in the politics of Atlanta and the state of Georgia. As a pioneer elected official, and as a symbol of what independence from the white power structure can accomplish, he has paved the way for the election of black Congressman Andrew Young and black Mayor Maynard Jackson.

Beginning in the late sixties Bond became a major personality on the national lecture circuit. His agent, the American Program Bureau, rated him with Ralph Nader and Dick Gregory as the most demanded speakers on the circuit. He was receiving fees as high as $5,000 per day with as

many as 80 to 120 engagements a year (Williams, 1972, p. 257). He spoke chiefly to college audiences, conventions, or the kind of groups which could afford his fee. Today he is still being demanded more than his capacity to meet those demands.

Although the events that catapulted him to national prominence are nine and seven years removed, Bond has nevertheless maintained popularity on the speaking circuit. Biographer Roger Williams (p. 277) commented: "As a speaker, perhaps he can maintain his standing. His thoughts are so fresh and provocative, his manner so attractive, that college students may well be as anxious to hear him several years from now as they are today." Bond is now billed as the "Apotheosis of the New Politics" (American Program Bureau, 1975). His schedule within a three month span in 1975 had him appearing in fifty-nine cities in the United States and Greece.

Bond's speaking is significant in historical terms. He is among the latest in a long line of black leaders who rose to ascendency in part because of their rhetorical abilities. Indeed, a positive correlation has existed in black America between the articulateness of the speaker and his position in the hierarchy of black leadership. Through the darkest days of black history, men like Frederick Douglass and Booker T. Washington led and inspired their people. Martin Luther King, Jr. rose to the pinnacle of national leadership through his rhetorical abilities. The glib revolutionaries like Stokely Carmichael created massive upheaval in the social structure. Now there is Julian Bond, who is different from the others in style and message, representing the thrust of the "new movement," the emergence of black political power.

Scope of Study

This study has three components designed to discover the ethos of Julian Bond. The first is oriented toward giving the reader some knowledge of his life and the influences that have molded him. Secondly, the study focuses on his public image. The final section examines Bond's ethos in the rhetorical situation.

A rhetorical study requires knowledge of the person being studied and the factors which have influenced his life. Chapter II of this thesis begins with Bond's origins and leads the reader through the events of his life into 1975. Emphasis is placed on the development of the rhetorical figure and on the origins of his verbal ability, style and personality.

Chapter III develops Bond's image and Chapter IV deals with his ethos. For the purposes of this study a distinction is being drawn between "ethos" and "image." Gary Cronkhite (1969, p. 173) has called ethos a "linguistic wastebasket" for rhetoricians. To clarify ethos for this study it will be considered the influence originating with the speaker's person that affects persuasion within the rhetorical setting. Ethical proof refers to the strategies designed to build the speaker's ethos. The operational definition of image is that given in the American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language: "(a) The concept of someone or something that is held by the public. (b) The character projected by someone or something to the public."

The term "image" is used to escape the multitude of connotations associated with "ethos." "Image" will be considered the public profile and, therefore, not confined to the rhetorical setting. "Image" is a more widely used term specifically applying to the needs of part of this

research. With the popularly understood term serving well, it is unnecessary to employ the term "ethos" as a blanket description when it comfortably suits the purpose as a limited, rhetorical concept.

## Image

Humans live by images--images of themselves, of others and of their relationship to their environment. William Kuhns (1969, p. 115) asserted the importance of images: "Man makes himself not in his own image, but what he understands to be his best image . . . images invariably tend to become major foundations for the ways we perceive each other, and in effect, perceive ourselves."

The building blocks of images are symbols. The problem with symbols, and therefore the compounded problem with images, is that they are often illusive and temporal, constantly undergoing revision and change. Kenneth Boulding (1966, p. 86) in his essay The Image expressed the difficulty of analyzing images:

> The image of man is rich and complex beyond expression. It is a curious paradox that although this very richness is a result of its symbolic character, symbols and language are incapable of expressing it to the full. There is always something in the image of man, even of the most intelligent and sophisticated person "beyond what words can utter."

This idea suggests one of the handicaps of this study; it can present no authoritative or definitive conclusions. It is, rather, the purpose to suggest some shadows for the cave, to borrow from Plato. Ernest Bormann (1965, p. 37) offers some consolation to the precisionist: "No matter what the particular focus of his study is, the scholar, like the scientist and unlike the artist, is tied to his observations." With that in mind, this is a record of the observations of this scholar.

Before outlining the specific categories of image created for this study, some brief theoretical concepts about images are helpful to the understanding of this research.

Images are constantly changing. "We have all changed our images often enough to know that few of them can be regarded as sacred or unchangeable," wrote Boulding (pp. 167-168). Changes within society affect our images. Julian Bond emerged in the late sixties as a symbol for the civil rights, peace and youth movements. Since that period the emphasis on those causes has faded as other concerns have taken primacy; Bond's image has changed as a result. Historical hindsight also changes images, as with Bond's early opposition to the Vietnam War. When he initially advocated that position it was unpopular, but subsequent events have shifted opinion. Thus, as people exercise retrospection, they see Bond as an early anti-war leader and in the vanguard of opinion change.

Changes in images also occur because people change and forget. But people tend to cling to previous beliefs until there is reason to change them. "We will believe what we did yesterday," wrote Boulding (p. 86), "unless there are very good reasons to believe otherwise." Thus, first impressions are important in the formation of images. Revision of prevailing impressions results from dissatisfaction. If a totally new image is to evolve, the original image must be unstable. Instability may result from the input of new information, or may result from the original image having faded into entropy.

Research has revealed that memory alters mental constructs as an event becomes less immediate. Hovland and others (Hovland, Irving, Janis, and Kelley, 1953; Hovland and Weiss, 1951) introduced the sleeper effect

into social psychology. The sleeper effect names the phenomenon whereby a source and his message become disassociated with the passage of time. Perhaps this theory could be applied to a theory of images, as follows: people tend to remember the emotion, or image, of an individual while forgetting the origin of the image. Assuming the certitude of that concept, then people could have virtually forgotten a person and the events surrounding him but still have a residual image of him. It is postulated that many people have a residual image of Julian Bond. Among many white Georgians he is not well regarded because of initial unfavorable exposure. Nationally, that residual image is favorable because of the 1968 convention. The image, unless reinforced, will become less and less well defined with the holder of the image becoming less and less committed to it. Since it has been several years since Bond vaulted to national attention, it is probable that many have forgotten the reasons they feel about him as they do. However, given an "image memory effect," it could be assumed that there is a residual image of Bond remaining from those events, supplemented by occasional exposure through the media.

Boulding suggested categories for defining images, some of which are borrowed and amplified to provide a framework for this study. These categories need to be qualified to some degree. They are not iron-clad, and an effort to fit characteristics of an image into exclusive categories may not be successful. Secondly, one dimension may be more significant to the overall image of Bond than another. Finally, there are other components to an image involving certainty and uncertainty, clarity and vagueness, reality and unreality, consciousness and subconsciousness. The dimensions for analysis are as follows.

Personal dimension. This category encompasses the perception of Bond as an individual. Included in this dimension is the Aristotilian ethos--intelligence, character and good will. Some questions suggested by this category are: Is he perceived as intelligent? Is he perceived as an attractive individual? Is he trustworthy? Does he exhibit good will toward others? How has his personality contributed to the growth of his image?

Historical dimension. Analysis in this area will seek to determine the effect of the historical and social milieu on Bond's image. How has the era in which he has lived contributed to his image? What has he come to symbolize? How has his image evolved through historical changes? How have his stands on issues affected his image?

Relational dimension. This involves the image that is developed as the result of interaction with and relation to others. Of concern are Bond's roles and his juxtaposition with less desirable figures and events. How have his roles affected his image? Is he perceived as a leader? How has his relationship to those who are opposed to him affected his image? How has his relationship to those he has chosen as enemies altered his image? Where is he perceived to be on the political spectrum?

Affectional dimension. Not only do people form opinions, but they attach emotional meaning to those opinions. Analysis of this dimension will seek to determine the emotional significance of Bond and his image. Is he a charismatic person? Is there a Bond mystique? How popular is he? What made him a hero? Are people still as enamoured of him as they once were?

Ethos

The concept of ethos has undergone considerable revision and addition since Aristotle. From Aristotle's limited view of ethos as an appeal within the text of the speech to today's interdisciplinary research into source credibility, the concept of ethos has been broadened and enriched. It has come to include more than just the speaker's specific efforts to develop credibility. Ethos can reasonably be considered all the influence originating with the speaker's person that affects persuasion. This includes what J.A. Hendrix and Jerome Polisky (1968, p. 145) call intrinsic and extrinsic ethos. Intrinsic ethos is that which the speaker does within the text of the speech to influence his credibility. Extrinsic ethos would be the factors outside the actual speech which affect the auditor's perception of the initiator. The two level approach of Hendrix and Polisky is used as a framework for the analysis of Bond's ethos, with expertness and trustworthiness being considered under intrinsic ethos, personal characteristics and personal dynamism being extrinsic ethos.

Expertness. Aristotle wrote of sagacity; others have used the term authoritativeness. This category deals with Bond's command of his subject. Was he thoroughly familiar with his subject? Did he present supportative data? Did he try to reinforce his own authoritativeness? Did he evidence moderation?

Trustworthiness. This was described by Aristotle as high character and good will. Did Bond demonstrate his personal integrity? Did his choice of words create the impression of sincerity? Did he show his own belief in what he was advocating? Did he build his arguments on the values of the audience? Did he associate himself with the virtuous and attach evil to his enemies? Did he identify with his audience?

Personal characteristics. Analysis is needed to determine the effects of Bond's appearance, age, voice, manner and the like. How was he dressed? Was his delivery natural? Did he maintain eye contact? Did his age or sex have bearing on his ethos? What influence did his voice have? Was his overall presence congruent with his message and image?

Personal dynamism. The advocate tries to add the element of action and power to his message. Did he make the subject come alive? Did he exhibit enthusiasm? Was his delivery consonant with his message? How did the dynamic qualities of the message and person affect his ethos?

## Sources

Much of the material for this paper was obtained first hand. On several occasions this writer was able to talk with Bond, including one extensive interview which was transcribed. Interviews were also conducted with Senator Birch Bayh of Indiana and David Snell, southeastern correspondent for ABC News. Bond was observed during the 1975 session of the Georgia legislature, which included two speeches. Also witnessed were Bond's addresses to the Southern Policy Conference on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in Atlanta, 13 January 1975, and the Southeastern Council on Family Relations in Chattanooga on 23 March 1975. Coverage of the 1968 Democratic convention was viewed through the facilities of Vanderbilt University's Television News Archives.

A good deal has been written about Julian Bond, including two book-length biographies. Feature articles and interviews have appeared in most of the major magazines. Bond himself has authored two books and several articles. Chapter III contains a survey of the publicly disseminated material on Bond. For the purposes of that survey the New York

Times was selected to illustrate newspaper coverage. An exhaustive bibliography of articles in the Times relating to Bond is included as Appendix B, and is arranged in chronological order to facilitate its use and understanding.

Two graduate papers have been written on Bond's speech making. Jane Couch wrote a traditional rhetorical study for her Master's thesis at the University of Georgia. Frank J. Lower wrote a Ph.D. dissertation at Florida State University entitled "A Content Analytic Comparison of Julian Bond's Speeches Before Predominantly Black Audiences and Before Predominantly White Audiences."

## CHAPTER II

## JULIAN BOND - A BIOGRAPHY

Julian Bond is a paradox. Even aspects of his life story have two sides. His biographers leave the impression that much of his fame is the result of good fortune and happenstance. Douglas Kiker (1970) described him as one of those people who "always get invited, is always counted in, always comes to mind." Bond takes exception to this interpretation of his rise to national prominence, saying that he exercised his own judgment: "I took advantage of the situations as they arose" (Bond, 1975c). Whatever the analysis, it is clear that many factors over which he had no control have united to form a distinct and compelling personality on which his national fame is largely based. One of these factors is his heritage.

### A Family Heritage

"The phenomenon of . . . Julian Bond can best be understood within the context of his family heritage, a singularly important one in the history of black America," says Roger Williams in promoting his book, The Bonds: An American Family. Although Williams overstates his case, an awareness of Julian Bond's roots adds perspective to the role he plays in the history of black America, a role of which he is keenly aware.

The family name originates with Preston Bond, a white Kentucky slave holder and rural minister. He was the father of two sons born to "Aunt Jane," who was one of his slaves. Primarily through his mother's effort and sacrifice, the eldest son, James, received an education from

Berea College and Oberlin Seminary, culminating with his entering the ministry.

As a Congregational minister in Nashville, James Bond preached the social gospel of education, self-improvement and brotherly love to his Negro congregation. He never rose to heights of leadership in Negro America because of an unwillingness to compromise his principles to get ahead. "My father was a very militant fellow," said his son Max (Williams, p. 64). He served on the faculty at Fisk University and Berea College. As a member of the Berea College Board of Trustees he was involved in a 1908 Supreme Court case that unsuccessfully attempted to end segregated education in Kentucky.

James' youngest son was Horace Mann Bond. His whole life involved education. Horace earned his Ph. D. from the University of Chicago. From teaching positions he rose to become president of Fort Valley State College in Georgia and Lincoln University in Pennsylvania, his alma mater. Dr. Bond concluded his career as a dean at Atlanta University where he retired in 1971. His wife Julia earned two Master's degrees and presently is a librarian at Atlanta University.

Horace Mann Bond achieved a level of leadership that his father never did. He was recognized throughout the Negro community as a leading educator and scholar. He helped to write the brief that culminated in the landmark Supreme Court decision, Brown vs. Board of Education. His work was published widely in both professional and popular journals. He authored two books--Negro Education in Alabama and The Education of the Negro in the American Social Order. Julian Bond modeled his own speaking after his father's academic style. Howard Romaine (1970) also traced certain of Julian's qualities to his father. "The seeds of the

younger Bond's incisive speech, his sardonic humor and gentlemanly demeanor can all be found here."

Horace Bond believed, as did his grandmother and father before him, that education would be the saving of the Negro in America. It was a source of dismay to both Horace and Julia that none of their children chose to pursue their education with any vigor. Education has not produced a panacea for the ills of society, but Horace Bond was the product of a culture that allowed achievement for the Negro in very few areas outside of education. In a philosophical moment before his death in 1972, the elder Bond reflected with pride on his famous son: "I never hit any real blows for the cause, but my boy is out there doing it now" (Williams, p. 178).

## Childhood and Education

Horace Julian Bond was born the second child of Julia and Horace Mann Bond on 14 January 1940 in Nashville, Tennessee. He had an older sister, Jane, and a younger brother, James. In 1945 his father left Fort Valley to assume the presidency of Lincoln University, a prestigious black school in Chester County, Pennsylvania. Lincoln is in an area of woods and rivers providing an ideal setting for the growth of a boy. Despite racial segregation and subsequent tensions, Julian was largely unaware of his blackness. He recalls a time when he and his little brother were at a segregated swimming pool. Upon looking around, Julian's brother wryly observed, "Funny thing, you know: everybody here is colored, except me and you!" (Neary, 1971, p. 41).

The academic community produced an insulated environment that protected the Bond children from some of the harsher realities that usually

confront blacks quite early in life. The emphasis in the Bond home was on learning. Julian entered school early and before long was impressing his teachers with an ability to read and write. At age twelve he was sent to a privately owned Quaker boarding school, George School, from which he eventually graduated. He was the only black student in the school, but he seemed largely unaware of the distinction, becoming better known for his social activities than for his scholarship. He pursued academics with little interest and got by with a "C" average.

The George School provided the backdrop for that first incident that black children seem always to remember, when, in their innocence, they are stabbed with the awareness of what the color of their skin means in a racist society. Julian had been dating a white girl for some time. There seemed to be no visible objection until the day he took her to the movies in nearby Newtown, while wearing his George School warm-up jacket. He was reprimanded by the dean and instructed not to wear his prized jacket to town again while escorting his girlfriend. "That," Bond recalls, "was really a blow to me; that was like somebody just stopping you and slapping you in the face" (Neary, p. 44).

The incident occurred in Julian's senior year at George School. Until that time the school had served as another outpost of insulation, and his memories of that time are of a pleasant period in his life. Julian's graduation coincided with the departure of his parents from Lincoln to Atlanta where his father was to become the Dean of Education at Atlanta University. Having lived seventeen sheltered years chiefly in the North, Julian felt much trepidation as he and his family moved South. All he knew about the South was what he read in the papers. He

believed that any white person could walk up to a black and assault him on the street. He now says, "I thought that race as a problem didn't exist in the North, but that it existed viciously here, much more viciously than it really does, and that it all tended to be physical" (Neary, p. 45).

The move to Atlanta resulted in not so great a change for the Bond family lifestyle as Julian had feared. They moved into the Atlanta University community in one of the better sections of black Atlanta. Julian enrolled at Morehouse College as an English major. The insulated environment within which he had grown up was being perpetuated.

His curriculum included a course in public speaking. It was taught by an English teacher and involved the performance of specific speech forms. He recalls one anecdote from that class. "I had to give a speech to eulogize and we disagreed as to whether I should say 'died' or 'passed away.' He favored 'passed away'" (Bond, 1975c).

Julian still showed little personal ambition in college. The school work came to him more easily than to the average Morehouse student. Many of his classmates were highly motivated to achieve, since many came from rural or poverty environments. Julian was popular, but he stood out from the rest because of his refined eastern dialect and casual demeanor. He wrote poetry and was published. He pursued girls and was successful. He lived undisturbed and liked it. Julian was a far cry from becoming a modern-day Lincoln aspiring to the White House.

## The Movement

The thunder that rolled through the South and shook Julian Bond from his lethargy came from Greensboro, North Carolina. In February of 1960 students at North Carolina A & T sat down at a whites-only lunch counter and refused to leave until they were served. The event produced front

page headlines and discussions on black college campuses. Although Bond was not yet inclined toward political affairs, he heeded the urgings of Lonnie King and helped organize the Atlanta Committee on Appeal for Human Rights (COAHR). The Committee published a newspaper advertisement calling for the abolishment of discrimination, but to little avail. The administrators of black colleges worked to defuse the student dynamite. The white community ignored it. But not for long.

The first wave of sit-ins came in March of 1960, targeted at public buildings. Bond led a group to the City Hall cafeteria where he was arrested for the first, and thus far, the only time. Bond then withdrew from the front lines and took command of the communications and public relations for COAHR. Desegregation successes began to come--lunch counters, restrooms, public places. By the time COAHR was taking aim at Rich's Department Store's Magnolia Room, many college administrators were calling King asking to participate. The student movement had become part of the single most significant force for social change in the South since Reconstruction (Williams, pp. 204-209).

The spring of 1960 was also when SNCC was organized, at the behest of Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Julian Bond was there at the birth of SNCC and became Director of Communications the following January.

SNCC was composed of a group of fierce individualists who scorned elitism and hero worship. In the early 1960's they concentrated on voter registration and local organizing. It was SNCC that laid the groundwork for the dramatic events of 1965 in Selma. SNCC workers were beaten, jailed and killed in towns and counties throughout Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana and Tennessee. John Lewis, who became the group's

leader, was arrested over forty times and savagely beaten four times, having his skull fractured in Selma and his forehead gashed on the Freedom Rides (Neary, pp. 65-68). While national attention focused on Martin Luther King and his causes, it was SNCC that was doing the fundamental organizing throughout the South, building the foundations for later political victories.

Bond's job for SNCC was a crucial one. He served as a liaison with the press, promoting SNCC and its activities, while supervising SNCC's growing printing and publishing operations. Without a public figure, SNCC had to rely for recognition and financial support upon the public's awareness of its programs and activities. Bond worked tirelessly at his job, occasionally turning in eighteen hour days. He came to be regarded with considerable respect by the working press and black leadership in general. As early as 1963 he was included among "leading American Negroes" by pollster Louis Harris (1963, p. 243).

The crunch came for Bond in early 1961. He was working both with COAHR and SNCC as Communications Director. He was managing editor of the Atlanta Inquirer, the black newspaper he helped to organize in an effort to counter the conservative viewpoint of the established Atlanta Daily World, the major black paper. Some weeks Bond wrote almost all the original editorial copy himself. He was in the last semester of his senior year at Morehouse. And he had his eye on Alice Clopton, a co-worker at COAHR and the Inquirer. COAHR was soon absorbed into SNCC. Bond dropped out of Morehouse, failing to see the relevance of his studies to that which he considered important. (He eventually received his B. A. in English by special arrangement in 1971.) Alice became Mrs. Bond; SNCC and the Inquirer became his livelihood.

Bond now sees his work in journalism and public relations as the primary contributor to the development of his speaking abilities and style. While with SNCC he traveled extensively in the South, speaking to small groups and occasionally addressing rallies. He cites this as his earliest formal public speaking.

Battle over House Seat

The first year of federally ordered reapportionment of Georgia's legislative districts was 1965. The people at SNCC decided that it was their obligation to field a candidate rather than let the newly created black districts go by default to the old guard Negro leadership. Bond borrowed the $500.00 filing fee from his father and, to the amusement of many, entered the race for House Seat 136 against a minister and an educator. "The experts shrugged him off and reporters in the city rooms of Atlanta newspapers thought he was joking" (Knebel, 1965). Bond's standard campaign speech was two minutes long, saying "we" instead of "I", followed by long periods of listening to his constituents. He spent many hours in the ghetto homes and on the unpaved streets of the district, striking a responsive chord with his people. He polled 66% of the primary vote and 82% in the general election, when more voters cast ballots proportionately than in any other district in Georgia.

Representative-elect Julian Bond went to England before assuming his seat in the Georgia House. In his absence, pressure was growing within SNCC to take a stand on the burgeoning war in Vietnam. Shortly after his return, and four days before the convening of the legislature, SNCC released its statement, unbeknownst to Bond. (See Appendix A for complete text of the SNCC statement.) It was a strong civil rights and anti-war

statement, which Bond first heard when it was read to him by a local radio newsman. He dug himself a deep hole with that radio interview, a taped transcript of which was used against him in his House trial. Bond stated his agreement with the SNCC position, pointing to his own pacifism and the hypocrisy of the United States government fighting for Vietnamese liberty while not ensuring liberty for black Americans. In the year 1966, in Georgia, Julian Bond's position was tantamount to treason.

It did not take long for the shock waves to be felt in Georgia's rural hinterlands. By Monday's opening session, Bond had no chance of being seated. He was asked to stand aside as the rest of the members took the oath. Six blacks were included, the first since Reconstruction.

On Tuesday, Julian Bond was summoned for trial before the Georgia House of Representatives. The trial was nothing more than a formality. It would have been political suicide for the majority of those legislators to have voted for his seating. Some believed Bond still had one faint chance. If he simply recanted, a "clarification" as black legislator Leroy Johnson called it, then there was a chance that the House would only censure him. Considerable pressure was brought from Atlanta's black leadership and the Fulton County delegation to have Bond soften his stand. He thought about it, indeed considered it, and refused. The vote was 184 to 12. His only support came from Atlanta.

The empty seat in the Georgia House produced two actions. Governor Carl Sanders called for a special election to occur, ironically, three days following the conclusion of the legislative session. And Bond's lawyers filed suit in Federal District Court. On 31 January the court ruled that the House had acted within its powers. Two weeks later Bond was re-elected without opposition, and once again, was refused his

seat by a special House committee. In November he was elected for the third time. One month later the United States Supreme Court ruled unanimously that the Georgia House had violated Bond's right to free speech (Supreme Court 339, 1966, pp. 341-342).

In 1962 Julian Bond and some of his SNCC cohorts had attempted to integrate the whites-only section of the gallery in the Georgia House of Representatives. One of the legislators noticed the encroachment and bellowed, "Mistah Speakah! Mistah Speakah! Tell the doorkeeper to git those niggers out of the white section of the gallery!" (Llorens, 1969). Five years later Bond took his place as a member of that august body.

Julian Bond began living his role as an "asterisk in history," as he was characterized by Newsweek ("Bond's Word," 1966). He was writing and speaking for income, since his House salary was only $4,200 a year. He had resigned from SNCC in 1966 after his closest friend, John Lewis, was denied re-election as chairman and Stokeley Carmichael was elected in his stead. In the Georgia House he was a pariah. Nothing with the hint of Julian Bond could have had any chance of passage. Although he was well-known in Atlanta, by the summer of 1968 most Americans had forgotten Julian Bond.

## The Chicago Convention

The custom in Georgia was for the governor and the state Democratic party chairman, whom the governor appoints, to select the delegates to the national convention. Lester Maddox was governor of Georgia in 1968. One-fourth of Georgia's population was black, almost all of whom were Democrats. On the 107-person delegation were six Negroes.

In 1968 Lester Maddox was for Lester Maddox for President. Robert

Kennedy was Bond's first choice for the nomination, and he had campaigned for Kennedy in California. Following Kennedy's murder, Bond was undecided until the operatives of Eugene McCarthy influenced him to support their man. Bond agreed to attend a rump convention in Macon to elect a challenge delegation to the nominating convention.

The Macon convention was the creation of a group of Humphrey supporters who wanted to challenge the power of Lester Maddox in Georgia. To the surprise and horror of the organizers, it was the McCarthy people who showed "en force" to steal the convention and the majority of its delegates. The convention chairman resigned in a huff, and the convention elected the Reverand James Hooten, along with Julian Bond, to head the challengers. They flew to Chicago prepared to stay one day. Bond took one shirt. No one expected to win.

The credentials committee began hearings one week before the convention. It was chaired by New Jersey Governor Harold Hughes, a Humphrey backer, and was dominated by Humphrey supporters. The Democratic party was virtually committed since 1964 to the seating of the Mississippi challengers led by Fannie Lou Hamer. There were several other challenges, including one to John Connally's Texas delegation, but the consensus among observers was than none of them, including Georgia's, had much chance (Williams, pp. 246-247). As the Georgia challengers sat around a three dollar YMCA room planning their presentation before the committee, they struck on the idea of contrasting Julian Bond with Lester Maddox as the primary element of their strategy. It was irresistible. Now the man who had thrice refused nomination in Macon as their leader was to become the focal point of their efforts for recognition. As the week progressed

and the credentials committee began weighing the merits of the "Bond delegation" and the "Maddox delegation," it became clear that Maddox's group was in greater danger of early departure from the convention. The credentials committee offered the challengers a compromise in which both delegations would be fully seated with every delegate having one half vote. Bond refused. The challengers decided to take the issue to the full convention for a vote.

Alice flew to Chicago with a few more shirts to stay with Julian at the Hilton Hotel, McCarthy's headquarters. The McCarthy camp had plans for their new-found political personality.

The credentials committee had assured the Georgia challengers that since neither of the vying delegations had been authorized by them, the Georgia seats would remain empty until the issue had been decided by the convention. However, when Bond arrived with a gallery pass to observe the opening session, he discovered the Georgia regulars calmly filling the floor seats, preparing to participate in convention business. Bond was not pleased, and pressured the committee into producing forty floor passes for his group. At 10:20 on Monday evening, Bond triumphantly led his group onto the convention floor, there to be beseiged by reporters and police. Sympathetic delegates and spectators sent up cheers as Bond drove through the throng, arm raised with a "V" sign (CBS News, 1968).

The convention eventually broached the Georgia question after midnight. Bond had been roaming the floor, lobbying intensely for seating of his entire delegation to the exclusion of the regulars. That motion was defeated by the closest vote of the convention, 1,413 to 1,041 1/2. The credentials committee compromise was accepted. As the vote total was announced to the delegates, a spontaneous roar of disapproval went up

from the defeated forces. The opening session was gaveled to adjournment at 2:40 a.m. as the floor rang to the chant "Julian Bond, Julian Bond."

Wednesday was Presidential nominating night and the second day of the "Battle of Chicago." As Bond delivered the first seconding speech for McCarthy, police were attacking Yippies in Grant Park.

The following evening Julian Bond became the first black offered for the Vice-Presidential nomination of a major political party. The nomination was a ploy by anti-war forces to secure the microphone. Two others had turned down the role before Bond accepted. "Why? Bond shrugs, 'I didn't see any reason not to'" (Williams, p. 252). The maneuver failed. Convention chairman Carl Albert refused to allow seconding speeches for the nomination since voting had already begun on the nomination of Edmund Muskie. When the Georgia delegation was asked for its vote count, Bond withdrew his name because he was seven years under age.

## Countdown to 35

He may have been too young in 1968, people were saying, but when he gets old enough, watch out. Bond was inundated with letters, interview requests, speaking offers, business propositions, and admirers' telephone calls. He quickly became one of the most demanded speakers on the college circuit. His views were sought by newsmen and his presence requested by television talk shows. In short, he became a celebrity.

Financial security was the most tangible result of his stardom. He moved his family of six out of their cramped little house and next door to Coretta King. He spent prolonged periods away from home on speaking tours. His time was being requested by far more people and organizations than he could possibly satisfy. His name became associated with

many organizations to which he is still attached. Bond currently serves on the Board of Directors of Delta Ministry Project of the National Council of Churches, Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Fund, Martin Luther King, Jr. Center for Social Change, Center for Community Change, Highlander Research and Education Center, National Sharecroppers Fund, Southern Regional Council, New Democratic Coalition, and the Voter Education Project. He is board chairperson of the Southern Elections Fund and President of the Southern Poverty Law Center. Bond attributes much of his popularity to being associated with such organizations and their causes.

Controversy continued to be Julian Bond's lot in life. He associated himself with numerous causes--prison revolts, student protests, minority grievances, liberal candidates. Two incidents illustrate the continuous swirl of controversy that seems to be a part of his daily routine. The first was a business venture in which white capital was invested into black managed enterprise. The endeavor in black capitalism was created by the substantial investment of a local white dentist and civil rights activist of the sixties, Dr. Gerald Reed. Bond's role was to help organize and find the people to run the various retail outlets. Reed and Bond were to receive only their initial investments in return, with the businesses eventually turned over to the black managers. The stores were victimized by an abnormally high rate of robberies and the management was guilty of bad bookkeeping. The enterprises folded. As jobs were lost, militants attacked Bond for being the tool for white exploitation. Black moderates refused to come to the defense of Reed and Bond, who both lost substantial investments. Each was embittered by the failure: "Julian and I were both a couple of noble jerks," said Reed in a front page story in the New York Times (15 June 1970).

Bond became embroiled in another brouhaha involving Sandy Springs High School in wealthy, conservative, all-white suburban Atlanta. A group of honor students invited Bond to speak to them, but the invitation was cancelled by the administration. The incident received widespread publicity as students argued with administrators, and the local media condemned the action of the administrators. Half of the student body signed an apology addressed to Bond, but he was never allowed to speak. Bond was philosophical: "I've been ejected from worse places by better people" (New York Times, 16 May 1971).

As another year of Presidential politics approached, Julian Bond was still in the Georgia House, having never spoken, having never introduced successful legislation. He broke the ice on 3 March 1972 by proposing and speaking for a bill on sickle cell anemia. But he had generally not lived up to the expectations of many people. There had been considerable speculation that he might run for the newly reapportioned Fifth Congressional District seat encompassing black Atlanta. Instead he chose to support Andrew Young, once the closest aide to Martin Luther King, Jr. Young is now considered unbeatable.

In the period leading to the 1972 convention, Bond became embroiled, along with other blacks, in a controversy with Shirley Chisholm. Bond felt that there was no single black candidate who would run strongly enough to attract a sizable delegate bloc to the convention. He suggested a favorite son strategy in which influencial black leaders in certain areas would try to attract support within their own states. He felt that it would be possible for a caucus with delegate votes pledged to several black and minority candidates to wield some clout. Perhaps Bond was

hoping for more miracles on the order of 1968 which might push him to the fore as a leader of such a caucus, since he quite likely would have emerged as a spokesman for such a coalition.

Chisholm (1973, p. 34) opposed the idea. She believed her candidacy viable, accusing Bond and the other black males of chauvinism. She said that if blacks had united behind her, "I believe that I would have drawn as much as 85% of the black vote. But that was a fantasy, then and later. They would never get 'behind' me. Behind a woman? Unthinkable!"

Bond campaigned vigorously for George McGovern. He worked behind the scenes in the successful effort to have McGovern nominated on the first ballot. He was influential in moving Southern black delegates, who had been released by Humphrey, away from Chisholm and into the McGovern camp. During the fall campaign he raised the hackles of black supporters of Richard Nixon by calling them "political prostitutes." Using hindsight, he now believes that the nomination of McGovern was a mistake, although subsequent Watergate revelations have caused him to feel vindicated for his position during the campaign.

In 1974 Bond won election to the seat in the Georgia State Senate which had been vacated when the sitting Senator was appointed the first black on Georgia's Supreme Court. The move improved Bond's status and his outlook. "In the Senate . . . the reception I've gotten is much different. I can't say that every member has greeted me with open arms, but at least I can say that I'm a functioning part of the State Senate. I never felt that way in the House" (Bond, 1975b). He is happy to be in the Senate. "Being in the Senate is like really being reborn, starting all over again" (Bond, 1975c). In his first year he introduced several minor pieces of legislation which were passed. He addressed the Senators

on several occasions. Once, in the halls of the State Capitol, he greeted this writer with genuine enthusiasm over a recent speech he had given. That seemed most unusual conduct from a professional speaker who has received national acclaim and popular attention.

He escaped the House but he didn't escape controversy. As a freshman Senator he once again became the target of feminist wrath concerning his role in the defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment. The legislative coordinator of the National Organization for Women bitterly attacked Bond's motives as co-sponsor of the bill. "Could it be coincidence that Julian Bond announced his candidacy for U.S. President only two days later? Or is it true that feeling certain the ERA would be ratified by 38 states by 1976, Bond felt it would be politically astute to be able to say he had sponsored the ERA in Georgia?" (Atlanta Gazette, 1975).

## Profile of Julian Bond

The most striking quality of Julian Bond is the ease with which he treats every situation. Neary (p. 15) traced the development of that grace to Bond's unique situation as a black youth:

> As Julian Bond acquired an easy familiarity with the intellectualities of the campus, got accustomed to being invisible, learned grace under suspicion, and came to understand the . . . specters of blacks, he found he was in fact getting a kind of weapon few Americans truly have: a passport enabling him to journey safely and leisurely through all the warring camps on the American scene from angry black militant to baffled and fearful white.

Mrs. Grace Hamilton, a family friend and colleague in the House, believes that Bond's childhood situation was responsible for his healthy self-image. "Julian's early life, spent in settings where the ugly parts of the racial situation did not surface, permitted that. It gave him time to develop his spirit" (Williams, p. 183). Many blacks believe that

Bond has not had to experience the harsher realities of black life because of his light skin, cultured language and protected childhood. Neary asserted that Bond's cool and aloof personality developed from inner conflict which was the result of racial tension. Williams (p. 191) disagrees, implying that his security in the "bosom of the middle-class" was responsible.

Despite the constant public exposure, Bond zealously guards his private life. He refuses photographers or writers access to his wife or children. His home telephone number is unlisted. In his solitude he listens to jazz and writers describe him as a voracious reader.

Bond considers himself largely unchanged philosophically from his days in the civil rights movement. However, some changes have occurred. In 1966 he declared himself a pacifist. Today he believes nonviolence can be an effective strategy for social change, but no longer accepts the tenets of pacifism. He now considers violence a justifiable method for social improvement, and "I would be willing to use it myself if it would produce desirable changes" (Bond, 1975b). A more basic philosophical change is transforming his Weltanschauung as he drifts leftward. "I have much more of a Marxist view of the world, and make much more of a Marxist analysis of these large economic forces which are controlling us all" (Bond, 1975c).

Bond's maturation is reflected in his personality. Whereas in the early years of his national fame he shone because of innate qualities, he has learned sophistication to go with his abilities. He has parlayed his natural and learned communication skills into a compelling personality. It comes across in person, on television and during question and answer

sessions after his speeches. The nonchalance he exhibits suggests that he does not take himself too seriously, as several writers have suggested. Cleghorn (1968) has another answer that seems more applicable: "He takes himself seriously, but not as seriously as do many of his greatest admirers, who seem to worship the symbol without knowing the man." The contrast between Bond and today's highly marketed political product was well described by Neary (p. 17):

> In an age where quite ordinary politicians have successfully assumed the mantle of statesmanhood, and thus become as carefully screened, prompted, coached, and shellacked with the sleek sheen of success as any Hollywood mannequin, Bond has somehow managed genuinely to stay just Bond.

## CHAPTER III

## THE GROWTH OF THE IMAGE OF JULIAN BOND

The study of a speaker's image is a crucial extension of the perimeters, and parameters, of the field of rhetorical criticism. The study of images is an essential province because the image may be the primary factor of the speaking situation.

Decisions to invite Bond to speak and to listen to him speak are usually predicated on an awareness of his image. The image as the selecting factor for Bond's audiences is supported by biographer Williams (p. 277). "His commentary is, to be sure, well-crafted and relevant, but the audience for it is attracted at least as much by who Bond is, or what he was, as by what he says and stands for."

Alleging that Bond does not adapt speeches, Lower (1975) reasoned that Bond's image often precluded the need for audience adaptation.

> Another explanation for the results obtained in this study may be due to Julian Bond's reputation. Because of Bond's popularity as a speaker, it is possible that his reputation precedes him to the speaking situation and thus he is not called upon to make the textbook type audience adaptation. . . . His audiences know something about him and his ideas and he can then be successful by meeting their expectations as opposed to having to adapt himself to their particular interests.

Four factors have combined to form the image most people have of Julian Bond: (1) his personality, (2) his role as a symbol for causes, (3) the juxtaposition of Bond with less desirable figures and events, and (4) the medium of television. This chapter traces the development of Bond's national image as seen through the prism of these factors. The occurrences of the year 1966 in the life of the young politician vividly

show the symbolic role of his name and how the juxtaposition with his accusers helped create the symbol. The 1968 convention was the stage and television was the agent that projected Bond's personality into homes throughout the nation. After exploring the development of these events, the chapter includes a section on the way he has been depicted in the print media--magazines, books, and the New York Times as representative of newspapers. The significance of television is examined, followed by an analysis of his constituency.

## Exclusion from the Georgia House of Representatives

Julian Bond became a symbol of youthful rebellion against the leadership of the black community and the oppression of the white dominated social structure when he was elected to the Georgia House. Herbert Shapiro (1966), a professor at Morehouse College and one of Bond's constituents, perceived him in this symbolic role. " . . . the whole significance of Bond's election is that he represents a new kind of Southern politician. . . ."

In gaining the first election victory, Bond opposed candidates from two of Negro America's bastions of power--religion and education. Ivanhoe Donaldson, one of Bond's cohorts, characterized Reverend Howard Creecy, Bond's opponent in the primary, as a representative of the old order. " . . . he just didn't appeal politically, he was not where it was at" (Neary, p. 77). The Dean of Men at Atlanta University, Malcolm Dean, ran as a Republican in the general election. Bond handily defeated Dean in 1965, but Dean returned the next year to do battle in the Democratic primary as he ran for the seat a third time. Just one week before the election, Atlanta was the scene of civil disorders for which SNCC President Stokely Carmichael was blamed. Bond resigned from SNCC, but as the

symbol of youthful militancy within the black community he narrowly escaped defeat in the election. He edged out Dean 1,317 to 1,267, in contrast to the earlier election when the difference was 2,305 to 486.

Another symbolic role he assumed was as a representative of the struggle of blacks for political equality. Race was an obvious issue, as the American Civil Liberties Union brief pointed out: "If a member of the Ku Klux Klan or the John Birch Society or the White Citizen's Council had spoken against federal policy, he would have been cheered" (New York Times, 14 January 1966, p. 26). In an almost full page advertisement in the New York Times (20 January 1966), the deposed legislator's own words were used as a heading. "Negroes have died for the right to vote in Georgia. . . . Now they are saying, what good does it do to get the vote to elect representatives, if those elected must face 'attitude tests and loyalty oaths'?" According to Pat Watters and Reece Cleghorn (1967, p. 319), Bond's refusal to withdraw from his original position symbolized the possibility of true independence from white intimidation. "Some saw in his refusal to play the game, to make a deal, a harbinger of the freedom Negro-supported politics might develop."

Civil rights leaders rallied to the support of this symbol of Negro suppression. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) President Roy Wilkins petitioned the House for Bond's seating (New York Times, 15 January 1966). Martin Luther King returned to Atlanta from Los Angeles to organize a march on the State Capitol, where a crowd estimated at 1,000 to 1,500 gathered to chant "Julian Bond, Julian Bond." Ralph David Abernathy offered a prayer on his behalf. As described by Douglas Kiker (1970), he "knelt on the capitol steps and asked the Lord

to rough up the legislators a little bit. 'May their nights be restless and their beds be hard, hard, hard,' he pleaded." King filed as a co-plaintiff in the lawsuit, and voted with Bond in a widely published photograph on the occasion of the first special election.

Bond's role as a symbol for his race almost reached international proportions. He was summoned to the United Nations for a banquet sponsored on his behalf by the chief delegates of fifteen African nations, an incident which the New York Times (22 January 1966) called a "civil rights demonstration." Some American United Nations officials complained of interference in American domestic affairs.

More widespread support accrued to Bond from his position as symbol for freedom of speech. Twenty-four Democratic Congressmen and numerous private citizens issued a statement supporting Bond's right to speak:

> . . . The right of every citizen to voice dissent is a keystone to our democracy. To destroy the right by refusing to seat a legislator elected by the people, who has expressed unpopular opinions, strikes at the very basis of our democracy. The fact that Julian Bond is one of the first Negroes freely elected to a formerly segregated Georgia House is cause for further grave concern on the part of all Americans. Free speech, as guaranteed in our Constitution, means nothing unless it means free speech for the unpopular cause and the dissenter. The right of every American stands in jeopardy if the action of the Georgia House is not reversed. . . . (New York Times, 20 January 1966).

Among the signers of the statement were Adam Clayton Powell, Henry Reuss, Woody Allen, Theodore Bikel, Sidney Poitier, Norman Thomas, and Dr. Benjamin Spock.

Senators Clifford Case, Jacob Javits and Hugh Scott joined five other Republican Congressmen in condemning the Georgia legislature's action:

> The Georgia legislature has repudiated an honest and open election on the sole ground that the elected representative endorsed unpopular views. . . . None of us agrees with Mr.

> Bond's views on the Vietnam War . . . but unless otherwise determined by a court of law, which the Georgia legislature is not, he is entitled to express them. (New York Times, 20 January 1966).

Even Vice President Hubert Humphrey, an ardent advocate of the policies in Vietnam, rose to Bond's defense. Appearing on CBS's "Face the Nation," Humphrey said:

> . . . we ought to remember what John Stuart Mill once said, and I can only paraphrase: one of the reasons we ought to protect the right to dissent is that the dissenter may turn out to be right. I do not think that the dissenters in this instance will be right but I want to forewarn every American that one of the most precious freedoms we have is the right to be different. . . . (New York Times, 20 January 1966).

It was the Supreme Court, siding unanimously with Bond, that had the last word. Chief Justice Earl Warren wrote the opinion, which stated, in part:

> We are not persuaded by the State's attempt to distinguish, for purposes of our jurisdiction, between an exclusion alleged to be on racial grounds and one alleged to violate the First Amendment. . . . The interest of the public in hearing all sides of a public issue is hardly advanced by extending more protection to citizen-critics than to legislators. (Neary, pp. 138, 140).

There was a profound contrast between Julian Bond and the men who opposed him. Standing in opposition to this solitary figure were virtually all the elected officials of the State of Georgia--the governor, lieutenant governor, both senators, and the legislature--the press, and later, the courts. To the Georgia legislature, which had just been forced into reapportionment, Bond represented a special evil. He "symbolized the most galling elements of the change that had descended on the South," wrote Williams (p. 222). "He was black, he was young, and he did not wait for change; he pushed for it."

The Georgia House was composed mainly of the felt-hat legislators

from rural areas, "hard-drinking, hard-praying folks," (Frady, 1967). Marshall Frady, in the Saturday Evening Post, described them as men who "saw at Julian's elbow the specter of S.N.C.C. whose master-design for America, they were convinced, was godlessness, disruption and 'inter-race sex'".

They assailed Bond and SNCC as one. Rep. James "Sloppy" Floyd organized the move to exclude. Floyd said, "That was a truly un-American statement, and it was real bad for a man to be a public official of the state of Georgia advocating that anybody burn their draft cards to the youth of this nation" (Williams, p. 223). To Arthur J. Funk of Savannah race was the issue: "I don't care if he's innocent of making those remarks. . . . All those people tend to think that way, and every day he's on this floor is a disgrace" ("Two Time Loser," 1966). Jones Lane joined in, "I'm scared of him. . . . I'm scared of all those people" (Frady). Lieutenant Governor Peter Zack Geer denounced Bond and the statement as a "glaring, sad and tragic example of a total lack of patriotism to the United States of America. Wittingly or unwittingly, this position exactly suits the Kremlin" (Atlanta Journal, 7 January 1966). Lane summed up the general sentiment: "Anyone who gives aid and comfort to the enemies of the United States . . . is guilty of treason" (New York Times, 10 January 1966).

Representative Bobby Pafford applied the final touch in grandiloquent style before the assembled House members:

> "There is blood that runs down the trenches in a far-off land that causes tears to run down mothers' cheeks. . . . And yet, there are those in this land that love not country more than self, and advocate doctrines that rent at the very heart of our nation itself. Usually these creatures . . . are far, far away from this land of beautiful rivers, great cities,

> pine forests, fresh air and pleasant living known as Georgia. But now we find not only our state, our counties, but the legislature itself has been invaded by one whose Snicking pursues not freedom for us but victory for our enemies. I regret to say that reapportionment ousted noble and distinguished statesmen from our midst, and has shoved in their stead, that this state might see darkness rather than light, the infamous Mr. Bond. . . ." (Frady).

The contrast between Bond and these men adds dimension to Bond's image. He displayed perserverance and shyness; they displayed arrogance and power. While they were frightened of him, he was calm. They represented the old, discredited policies of segregation. Bond symbolized the new world of racial equality.

Before Julian Bond became a member of the Georgia House, the oath of office was administered to the members as a whole. When Bond became a member, the leadership instituted an oath-taking in which small groups took it separately. "Sloppy" Floyd and Jones Lane did not want to take the oath in the same breath with Julian Bond. As Bond was finally sworn-in, Floyd walked out of the chamber, explaining, "This has nothing to do with race. We've got other nigger people in the House and seated them" (New York Times, 10 January 1967). One rural legislator expressed the prevailing feeling toward the Supreme Court's imposition of Bond on the house. "It don't make no difference. He's done ruined hisself in here. He won't get to first base. All he'll be doing is sitting in that chair for two years "(Frady).

Bond hardly appeared to be the threat that the legislators believed him to be. In contrast to his views, his appearance was conservative and his manners were proper. Marshall Frady described his appearance on the day the Georgia House tried him.

> He was attired in a somber brown herringbone suit and vest with watch chain. He looked both harried and doomed. There was a matchstick delicacy about his neck and wrists, and his forehead seemed as fragile as a thin bulb of glass which can be smashed with the flick of a finger. (Frady).

Reece Cleghorn (1968) offered another description of Bond on that day.

> Bond appeared, immaculate as usual, in a conservative suit and vest. He remained poised, sometimes smiling, sometimes earnest. But he had about him the aspect of a frail college student going into the lion's den.

Like most Daniels, Bond was intimidated by the ordeal. "He had about him now the hurt, bewildered air of a young man who suddenly has discovered the perils of casual commitment" (Frady).

Throughout the confusion that pervaded the capitol, Bond remained unperturbed, except once. In a crush of SNCC people, reporters and television cameras he held a news conference. After several days of repeated denials, he was asked whether he was a Communist. His response was emphatic, angered, "I tell you now that I never intend to answer that question again. I will take the oath, but I am putting you on notice now that I am not going to answer that question again" (Cleghorn, 1968).

The circumstances of Bond's exclusion created mixed blessings for him. Although he wanted the seat badly, the conflict produced instant notoriety, a fact bemoaned by the legislators. He appeared on television programs, met with national leaders, and spoke to rallies. It is difficult to gauge the extent of coverage by television during the 1966 events. The networks kept no logs of their evening newscasts. Bond appeared on NBC's "Meet the Press" on 30 January 1966 and the Times makes references to other such appearances. Press coverage of the story was thorough and extensive, with the New York Times running forty-nine articles concerning

the events.

The press observed Bond as he was beckoned by national leaders who wished to express sympathy. He appeared at a press conference in Washington with a group of congressmen who met to show support for Bond's cause. Mayor John Lindsay of New York volunteered to take his case, if he were still in private practice. On his United Nations trip he met with Harry Belafonte, who was serving as chairman of the Citizens for Bond Committee. Sam Pope Brewer of the New York Times (22 January 1966) described the scene: "Mr. Bond, himself, had little to say, and he spoke so softly most of his remarks were lost in the hubbub of reporters, television cameramen, fellow guests and security guards." His fame brought speaking invitations from colleges, prisons, high schools and peace rallies from Boston to San Francisco.

Dramatic changes transpired in the civil rights struggle during 1966. Stokely Carmicheal coined "Black Power," cities smouldered after a summer of riots, and militancy became the new form of dissent. Through no change of his own, Bond was no longer on the far left of the civil rights movement. The New York Times (11 December 1966) observed that "the bemused young man's" resignation from SNCC, coupled with the fact that he came from a respectable family, had "pushed him quite willy-nilly inside the circle that defines the limit of political toleration in Georgia."

By 1968 the rapidly shifting sands of political perception had made Bond not only a respectable, but a desirable symbol of activism within the system. He was claimed first by the Humphrey camp and then by McCarthy's. Roy Reed (1968) explained why: "Mr. Bond, 26 years old,

would have considerable symbolic value for a Presidential candidate because of his reputation as an attractive and militant exponent of Negro rights."

1968 Democratic Convention

The 1968 Democratic Convention ranks as one of the most remarkable events in American political history. It dominated that year's Presidential election and it irrevocably changed the system whereby Americans select their President. The convulsive events inside the Chicago Amphitheatre and outside in the streets and parks showed vividly the deepening rift in American opinion fostered by the war in Vietnam. That week in Chicago was the climax of a bitter political year.

Two weeks earlier the Republicans had nominated Richard Nixon and Spiro Agnew. The Democrats were prepared to nominate Vice President Hubert Humphrey. There were other candidates, but Humphrey was the choice of Lyndon Johnson and Richard Daley. It was their intention to orchestrate the proceedings in order to select their man with little disarrangement.

Loss of popularity, the dramatic showing of Senator Eugene McCarthy, and the Tet offensive of February 1968 in Vietnam had precipitated the retirement decision of President Johnson. McCarthy had attracted thousands of young people to his campaign and cause. He arrived in Chicago with the second largest delegate bloc and by far the most enthusiastic supporters.

Three months earlier, on the occasion of his triumph in the California primary, Senator Robert Kennedy had been assassinated. His delegates were disorganized and rowdy. Senator George McGovern entered the race just prior to the convention with the hope of capturing the Kennedy delegation and offering the polarized convention delegates a

compromise candidate. Until nominating night, former Kennedy aides kept churning out rumors that youthful Senator Edward Kennedy would accept a draft.

The spotlight was to be shared by a throng of protesting young people and their police adversaries. The media dwelled at length on the preparations of both sides for the confrontation in Chicago. A loosely organized group called the Youth International Party sent out the call to win in the streets what was obviously not to be won in the convention hall. Chicago police were being trained in special riot tactics. The Illinois National Guard was mobilized, and an Army division was called to Chicago to stand by. The courts refused parade permits, while city officials allowed the protesters to camp only in areas far from the Amphitheater.

Black America experienced traumas during that year. Their Messiah for integration and equality had been murdered in Memphis. Riots followed that immobilized Washington, Detroit, and other major cities. The Movement had been floundering, being divided between the militants and moderates. The assassination of King left blacks without the symbolic figure around whom to rally. The leadership for the causes of the disadvantaged was left with a massive void.

The scenario was completed one week before the convention when troops of the Soviet Union overran Czechoslovakia to suppress Czech liberalization.

Pre-convention publicity had centered on the candidates and on preparations for the battle in the streets that everyone was sure would materialize. The week before the opening gavel, the credentials committee opened hearings. The deliberations drew increasing press attention

as the crucial decisions on Mississippi and Georgia were being considered.

The way for the Georgia challenge had been paved by a similar challenge from Mississippi's Freedom Democratic Party in 1964. They had confronted the Democrats at Lyndon Johnson's convention with embarrassing claims to party suffrage. The repercussions of their rejection by that convention had stung the Democratic leadership. In 1968 Governor John Bell Williams brought a delegation to Chicago with one black included. Williams was sent home by the credentials committee and the Freedom Party's delegation was seated in full.

Next on the docket was the Georgia challenge. The challenge to Lester Maddox and his hand-picked delegation had not been given much hope. The Humphrey dominated committee did not want to turn the credentials' battles into a general blood letting that might erode Humphrey's strong support among traditional Democrats in the Southern and border states. Georgia's was but one of several disputes, and it most likely would have been resolved with the seating of the regular delegation had it not been for Julian Bond. He gave the Georgia delegation a priceless identity. In his folio Self Portrait: U.S.A., photographer David Douglas Duncan (pp. 137-148) profiled Bond's speech before the credentials committee, writing in poetic form:

> The following challenger stood alone: a tall slender young legislator--from Atlanta--who bent low over the microphone, looked out into the faces of the tribunal, and said: "My name . . . is Julian Bond." He told of his life as a Georgia Negro; of their dreams. And as he spoke a hush fell over the room--where all America listened.

Duncan filled the next twelve pages of his book with reaction shots, faces of people showing the impact of Bond's presentation.

> There was no sound in the room . . . not a voice . . . no creaking chair. Only silence . . . Julian Bond had finished. Far away in the audience the lips of an impassioned orator opened . . . but they were silent, too.

Not only was Bond's presence compelling, but also his arguments. He cited statistic upon statistic to illustrate the scope of discrimination. Then he struck at the heart of the argument. ". . . black people have been systematically discriminated against in their effort to participate," he said, "and the party itself has made no effort in accordance with the call of this convention to encourage their participation" (Williams, p. 247). Bond's speech represented the turning point of the conflagration. No longer were the challengers on the defensive. The credentials committee began efforts to reach a compromise that would satisfy the challengers. Neither side was pleased with the proposed compromises, but in the end it was the Bond delegation that forced the issue onto the convention floor. The regulars sought one final solution. With Lester Maddox off the delegation in pursuit of the Presidency, couldn't they have Bond removed? Committee Chairman Richard Hughes refused: "This man's a symbol. We've got to have him" ("The Winner: How--And What--He Won," 1968).

The opening of the convention found the unresolved Georgia question center stage. As delegates arrived for the convention the name of Julian Bond was frequently heard as a topic of conversation. "Julian was increasingly becoming the glamour boy of the delegation," said fellow challenger Al Horn. "Hell, in some ways he became the Georgia challenge, period" (Williams, p. 248). McCarthy operatives connived to divide the Humphrey forces between those who were trying to hold the credentials committee line, on the one hand, and those who felt sympathy for the Bond cause, on the other.

The first newsworthy "event" of the convention was the storming of the floor by the Georgia challengers. They had been consigned to the gallery while their opposites filled the Georgia seats on the Amphitheater floor. Bond led his group of forty, triumphantly raising their hands in victory/peace signs. Cheers rang out from sympathizers in the hall as press and security police rushed to the scene. John Hart of CBS reached Bond as he was being forced against the wall by the crush of bodies. Amidst the shoving and shouting, Hart extracted an interview:

> Hart: Are you all coming to the floor?
> Bond: All except my wife.
> Hart: She is a delegate, too?
> Bond: No, she's a guest and shouldn't even be down here.

So went the interview. Bond, shoulders pinned against the wall with arms raised in surrender fashion, filled the screen with his bemused smile and sardonic humor, delivering brief comments to reporter's questions which were being hurled at him across the top of the packed throng.

Later that evening Dan Rather was slugged in the stomach and knocked to the floor by a security policeman as he tried to reach the Georgia challengers. CBS protested. Roger Williams (p. 250) observed that the turmoil contributed to the Bond mystique: "The favorable image of Bond was strengthened by subsequent scuffles and arguments that took place around the Georgia delegation's seating area."

The first, and perhaps most important, vote of the convention was one that outlawed the unit rule. The vote had been precipitated by the Georgia challenge. The result was the creation of the national commission on party reform, chaired by George McGovern, which instituted massive changes in convention rules.

The evening's schedule dragged mercilessly. It was not until the small hours of Tuesday morning that the Georgia question was broached. Between 1:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m., three successive speakers sounded the praises of the Bond delegation and scourged the Maddox crowd. The opposition speakers argued for the compromise one-half-vote-per-delegate recommendation of the credentials committee. Interspersed on television screens were scenes of Bond lobbying on the floor for the seating of his delegation in its entirety. At 2:20 a.m. the vote was completed. The Georgia challengers-only resolution was defeated by the closest vote of the convention, 1,413:1,041½. Max Frankel reported the reason for the close vote in the next day's New York Times (28 August 1968): "Old New York liberals and Negro newcomers in this party broke even from their allegiance to Vice President Humphrey to join in the tense and emotional vote and tribute to Mr. Bond. . . ."

That tribute to Mr. Bond was a spontaneous outburst of support and indignation. The New York and California delegations had been consigned to the rear of the hall because they contained only tepid support for the Vice President. But from their side-by-side seating arrangement they formed a formidable bloc of convention protesters. As the vote was announced, a chorus of "boos" erupted, out of which grew the chant, "Julian Bond. Julian Bond." Walter Cronkhite reported, "Almost half of the delegates are participating. It's certainly the most rousing and spontaneous political demonstration we've seen in two conventions so far." A black delegate from California, Eddie Anderson, attempted to set fire to his convention credentials as protest. It wouldn't burn. He shouted into television cameras, "There's no justice in the Democratic party!"

Senator Daniel Inouye, temporary chairman, was unable to regain control. On instructions from Daley he gaveled the convention into recess. The demonstration continued. As non-participating delegates began leaving, the demonstrators grew more rowdy, clapping and stomping their feet. "An exciting moment at this Democratic convention, and perhaps a significant moment. . . ." intoned Cronkhite. With his name still in chant resounding through the Amphitheater, Bond was reached by Dan Rather.

Rather: Do you think you got a fair shake?
Bond: Considering the nature of politics, yes.

The whole episode was rebroadcast the following evening by ABC. NBC featured the scene on its Tuesday evening newscast. Both shows contained reactions from Lester Maddox and other Georgia regulars. Said one unidentified Georgian: "I'm going home to think awhile, and then I might decide to work for Mr. Wallace." "Julian Bond is knowingly or unwittingly a full-fledged Communist or Communist dupe," huffed Lester Maddox.

The comparison of Bond to Maddox represented a crucial part of the strategy by the challengers. The juxtaposition added believability to their cause and dimension to Bond's image.

Lester Maddox arrived in Chicago acknowledging that he had ambitions to become President. The following are excerpts from his announcement speech:

> I am proud to be an American. Aren't you? I love my country and its flag and I regard defending them a privilege as well as a duty. Don't you? . . . when I sing God Bless America, I mean it with all of my heart. (Mailer, 1968).

No one took him seriously, including his own delegation; Maddox was treated by the media mostly as comic relief. Norman Mailer (1968)

described him as having "the face of a three-month-old infant who is mean and bald and wears eyeglasses." Maddox claimed it hurt his sensitivities to utter the name "Julian Bond," referring to him instead as that "draft-card burner." He left Chicago in a fit of pique following the seating of both delegations from Georgia. Walter Rugaber (New York Times, 23 August 1968) described his farewell news conference. "He talked about misinformed and power-mad politicians. He assailed the Democrats as the party of 'looting, burning, killing and draft-card burning. What's more,' he said, 'I denounce them all.'"

Despite its rejection by Maddox, the convention progressed into nominating night. The most memorable scene of that night was Mayor Daley shaking his fist at Senator Abraham Ribicoff, cursing his Jewish ancestry. Bond had been chosen to second the nomination of McCarthy. The speech was not unusually noteworthy, although it was well written and effectively spoken. Understanding his symbolic role, Bond spoke for people whom he perceived identified with him, "to all those who are excluded in this country":

> For me and for millions of Democrats and independents, millions of young people, black people and poor people, there is one candidate who understands, who has lived it day by day. One candidate who will tell it all. That candidate is Gene McCarthy.

The importance of Bond's speech was enhanced for viewers of CBS. The network had just been running footage of film taken during a confrontation at Grant Park; then it switched to Bond speaking. The juxtaposition was Bond and all he came to symbolize, next to film of police groin-slugging demonstrators. "I am proud to second the nomination of Eugene J. McCarthy," said Bond as CBS showed more film of police chasing demonstrators.

The next morning Bond appeared at that same park to address a mass of protesters. In an impromptu speech he said: "My first impulse is to say, 'Let's rush the police.' . . . but it is not right for us to attack the police. They are victims, too. They aren't responsible for Chicago and this repression--Mayor Daley is " (Williams, p. 251).

Cleghorn (1968) observed the impact Bond had made on the convention: "His name had already become a daily point of reference in the convention proceedings." But it was the symbolic nomination for Vice President that catapulted him into the role of folk hero. The nomination was simply a ploy by the dissident, defeated factions of the party to capture the microphone in order to protest the handling of the convention. As such it failed. But, as a symbolic manifestation of defiance and hope for the future, the nomination, and the nominee, were successful. Ted Warshafsky placed the name in nomination. "We of Wisconsin are concerned what the party is to become . . ., not only for the affluent delegates, but for the young who march in the park for equality of rights. I wish to offer in nomination the wave of the future" (CBS News, 29 August 1968). A swell of cheers burst across the hall, and once again Julian Bond heard his name in chant. Dan Rather was with Bond as Warshafsky finished.

Rather: Mr. Bond, how old are you?
Bond: I'm 28.
Rather: And how old does a Vice President have to be, legally, by the Constitution?
Bond: 35, I believe.
Rather: So it isn't likely that you'll be a serious Vice Presidential nominee?
Bond: No, no. This convention might mandate the Congress change the age by election time and I might make it.
Rather: Well, you're saying that tongue-in-cheek.

At this point in the interview, the screen was almost completely filled with nothing but Bond's features, his smile, his unabashed enjoyment of this violation of protocol. In the background the chanting continued.

Rather: The name Julian Bond, is it a household word?
Bond: No, no. It's barely a household word in my own house. I'm not there very often.
John Chancellor (NBC): For what purpose is this nomination?
Bond: To see if I could be elected Vice President. I'd like to be Vice President.
Chancellor: You've been just about everything else.

Seconding speeches for the nomination were denied by the convention chairman and the roll call was commenced. With every vote for Bond, even one-half vote, cheers rang out from the rear of the hall and the galleries. The strategy having been unsuccessful, Bond withdrew his name when the roll call reached Georgia. "I deeply appreciate the honor of having my name placed in nomination," he said. "Unfortunately, I have not yet reached the age and must therefore ask that my name be removed." Chancellor interviewed him one more time.

Chancellor: How have you risen so quickly to national prominence?
Bond: Clean living.
Chancellor: Where do you go from here?
Bond: I've been cut out of the Vice Presidency. If I can't have that, I don't want anything.

The Bond name contained magic throughout the convention. Even Norman Mailer (1968) was, almost, at a loss to describe it. "Bond was extraordinarily--no other adjective--popular in this convention, his name alone possessed an instant charisma--people cheered hysterically whenever it was mentioned from the podium, and the sound 'Julian Bond' became a chant."

Bond won the respect and praises of the delegates because of his politically astute maneuverings and ability with the press. He won the admiration of the television audience with his personality. Cleghorn

(1968) wrote of the effect of his personality: "The poise and presence he displayed at the convention have won him grudging compliments even from some who condemn him generally." The good humor he displayed in interviews was easily contrasted with the ill feelings all around him. Perhaps much of Bond's appeal was that he was on the fringes of the real struggle that took place in Chicago. He was not a central character in the battle for the nomination or in the bitter fight over the Vietnam plank in the party's platform. Nor was he seen cursing the demonstrators or police as McCarthy, McGovern, Daley, and others were. Bond was an appealing and friendly face in a sea of hate and confusion and violence. His appearances provided some brief relief from the emotionally charged environment being projected into people's homes.

Bond left Chicago as a national symbol for liberals, blacks and even middle-class Americans. Having Maddox and Daley on his right and the Yippies on his left, he emerged as something of a centrist with whom people could identify. He played well in Peoria. Williams (p. 250) summarized his performance and the impression it left on people who were searching for an explanation to the baffling events they were watching.

> His performance was memorable. Only twenty-eight and looking younger, he calmly articulated his cause in the midst of political posturing and rhetoric. His self-assurance was astonishing, yet it seemed wholly natural. He was black, but he could have been green; it was the poise, the sense of utter confidence that was so impressive. Somehow, amid the clamor and the incessant verbalizing of newsmen fighting for exposure as well as information, Bond's words came through. Their meaning came through too, and millions of people, watching intently in their homes, got a clear, believable explanation of what the fuss was all about.

Victor S. Navasky (1968) wrote of the role Bond played as symbol for liberal hopes of future reform.

> . . . it seems to me significant that the liberal folk-hero of this convention was not McCarthy, who had fought the courageous fight of last year, last month, last week, but Julian Bond, the attractive young Negro head of the insurgent Georgia delegation who personalizes the possibility of a radically restructured party by 1972.
>
> Bond satisfied the requirement of regularity by accepting the Rules (sic) Committee compromise in the seating of his delegation, yet his challenge was so effective that Wisconsin's Ted Warshafsky spoke for more than the dissidents when he nominated him for the Vice Presidency . . . 'This may be a symbolic gesture tonight, but it may not be symbolic four years from tonight.'

Most importantly for Bond was his role as symbol for black America. Simeon Booker (1968) stated it simply, "If anyone in that critical moment symbolized the survival struggle of the nation's 25 million blacks, he was Julian Bond." The 1968 Democratic Convention was an important one for blacks. The Mississippi challenge delegation had been seated en toto. The first black caucus had been organized. The discriminatory unit rule had been outlawed by convention vote. Channing Phillips had been the first black man to be nominated for President by a major party. But it was in Julian Bond that black Americans took the most pride. A black delegate was quoted by Booker:

> "Julian's the man to watch. He showed a courage and maturity far beyond his age. He helped inspire many a black who had given up and uttered 'Let Stokely take over.' He won respect of whites who admired his leadership qualities in an atmosphere of confusion and turmoil."

It was those leadership qualities that had blacks thinking in grandiose terms. John Lewis of the Voter Education Project saw great potential. "With the loss of Martin King and Senator Kennedy, I think Julian has real potential to emerge as the symbol that can bring together certain elements within the old civil rights movement, what we call the New Politics, and to create a viable political force." (Cleghorn, 1968).

## The Portrayal of Bond in Print

Fame had a self-perpetuating effect for Bond. With the passing of those events which brought him to national attention, the purveyors of newspapers, magazines and books featured him on their pages. With publishers feeling that there existed a public thirst to know more about this attractive young politician, a spate of print surfaced on the subject of Julian Bond. Following is a survey of that material, beginning with an analysis of articles which have appeared in the New York Times.

The Times began reporting the saga of Julian Bond in January of 1966 in a story emphasizing the controversy surrounding his opposition to the Vietnam War. Beginning with that article and extending through February of 1975, the Times has run 190 seperate articles, editorials or photographs concerning Bond, his activities and interests (Appendix B).

The Times' coverage of the young legislator's troubles with the Georgia House was comprehensive. It editorially opposed his position on the war issue, but strongly supported the right to dissent without forfeiture of his seat (12 January 1966). The Times frequently described him as a youthful pacifist. As the story developed during that year, it acquired more the flavor of a civil rights issue--the disenfranchised Negro versus the Southern white power structure. By December his own views were seen as moderate when compared to the militancy of some black activists (11 December 1966). When Bond was finally sworn in, his story had taken a back seat to the contested Georgia gubernatorial contest. Georgia legislators resolved an inconclusive general election by selecting Lester Maddox over Howard "Bo" Callaway.

Bond was mentioned only sparingly during 1967 and early 1968, primarily in connection with national politics. He was clearly not seen as a national leader, and his actions and opinions were not considered newsworthy. As the Presidential race heated, the Times reported Bond's campaigning with Robert Kennedy (26 May 1968), the premature claim of his support by the Humphrey camp (7 July 1968), and his subsequent endorsement of McCarthy (8 August 1968). Times reportage of the Bond sideshow at the convention was accurate, but neither extensive nor very descriptive. It was not until late October that it presented an in-depth story on Bond's convention role in a feature story by Reece Cleghorn (20 October 1968). The television viewer would have had a far clearer understanding of his importance at the convention than the Times reader.

The Cleghorn article was an extensive feature appearing in the Sunday magazine section. The author characterized the paradoxical nature of the man:

> Bond is the new breed of anti-hero heroes, a protagonist who will not play the role of protagonist, a spokesman who will not agree to be called a spokesman, an intellectual with considerable disdain for doing things the expected and politic ways.

Accompanying the article were several action photographs showing Bond at the convention. The portrayal of the subject was unwaveringly favorable.

Another New York Times Magazine (27 April 1969) featured a dialogue between Bond and Roy Harris, a leading Georgia segregationist. The thrust of the article was that the two political opposites agreed on far more issues than would seem probable.

Roy Reed wrote a briefer feature which appeared 4 January 1970. Written as a sort of update, the article emphasized the contrast between

the militancy of his message and the conservative nature of his appearance and disposition. However, Reed observed that a recently grown Afro had helped close the gap of dissonance between philosophy and veneer. "Somehow, the mass of hair reinforces the militancy of his words."

The regular Times reader has had no other opportunity to read of Bond except in the context of news stories. Many of those stories have reported on his role as a politician. He endorsed selected candidates during the 1968 campaign (9 September 1968; 4 November 1968), but backed off from endorsing Hubert Humphrey. As early as 1970, the Times reported his support for George McGovern (13 December 1970) and then his activity as a McGovern campaigner (22 June 1972). Bond participated in a number of publicized caucuses among black leaders in which he suggested his favorite-son strategy for 1972 (9 June, 20 October, 20 September 1971). During the fall campaign, Bond's labelling of black supporters of Richard Nixon as "political prostitutes," evoked controversy on the pages of the Times (3 August, 25 August, 29 August, 17 October 1972).

The Georgia activist made news for his involvement in social causes ranging from support of strikers (21 April 1969) and prisoners (2 October 1970) to testimony at the trial of the Chicago Seven (14 January 1970), to fund raising for the Southern Elections Fund (23 August 1970; 6 July 1971). The failure of the business venture with Atlanta dentist Gerald Reed landed front page space (15 June 1970). Even the highly localized controversy at Sandy Springs High School found its way onto Times pages (16 May 1971).

Opinions expressed by Bond in his role as a public speaker have

been a regular source of news copy for the Times. Addresses before college audiences which were covered included Lincoln University commencement exercises (9 May 1970), mourning at Kent State (4 May 1971), and a special seminar at Columbia's School of Journalism (29 August 1970). Other speeches were for special occasions as diverse as the dedication of a park (19 October 1969), the annual gathering of the Young Democrats (5 December 1971), and a labor meeting (14 January 1972).

If the coverage in the New York Times can be used as a measure, then Bond reached the height of his influence in 1970 and 1971. His words and actions were treated as those of an opinion maker. Beginning in 1972, he was associated increasingly with purely black causes and problems. Through the past three years mention of Bond has steadily decreased.

Magazine articles on Bond fall into roughly three categories: features, news reports and pieces reflecting Bond's opinions. The following is a survey of articles appearing in the major magazines.

"The Infamous Mr. Bond," Saturday Evening Post, 6 May 1967 (Circulation: 6,679,763). Marshall Frady created a solitary hero figure and contrasted him with a villainous group of Georgia legislators. "To the Georgia legislators," he wrote, "the young Negro was a fiery radical. But he has proven a most reluctant dragon." Frady was most sympathetic to Bond's plight, but seemed to suggest that he would not be heard from again for quite awhile. Accompanying photographs perpetuated the theme of the lone, introspective youth who had been martyred by the angry mob. Only a positive image could have been drawn by the reader.

"Out of the South, A Hero-at-Large," Life, 8 November 1968 (Circulation: 7,832,511). In the flush of success following the Democratic con-

vention, John Neary wrote this article which he later developed into a biography. The bulk of the story was biographical with emphasis on Bond's potential as a national leader. The narrative was most complimentary but Bond believes that it placed inordinate stress on fate as the source of his success. As with most features in magazines of this genre, photographs supplemented the written copy. Bond was shown with his family, in admiring crowds, in the convention tumult and alone, in an introspective moment. The article was unerringly favorable.

"Up, Uppity and Away," Esquire, May 1971 (Circulation: 1,182,280). The title suggests the attempt at hero building by author Neary. The sub-heading reinforced his purpose: "Faster than a credentials committee more powerful than the Georgia Legislature, able to leap to national prominence on a single issue--it's Julian Bond!" The lengthy article was a recounting of the fight with the Georgia legislature. Much space was dedicated to the court case, making Bond a passive subject for much of the article. If anything, it portrays Bond as a pawn, not an activist, a victim not a super-hero.

Ebony (Circulation: 1,216,626) is the black community's equivalent of Life, Look and Saturday Evening Post. It is the last of the large (10" x 14"), pictorial family magazines still in general circulation. Its slick pages reflect an idealized perspective of black American life with few changes having occurred in format since the 1950's. Bond is regularly included on Ebony's list of "100 Most Influential Black Americans" (May, 1975).

"Black Politics at the Crossroads," October 1968. Simeon Booker's article was an account of the role of the blacks at the Democratic convention.

From the first paragraph he set out to idolize Bond, a trend that follows through the subsequent Ebony articles. Booker reflected the pride in the black from Georgia that must have been shared by many blacks. The convention was a visualization of the giant steps being taken by blacks, and the swashbuckling performance of Julian Bond became symbolic of that progress. He was "like a rainbow after a furious storm," wrote Booker.

"Julian Bond: Down by the Lake Shootin' Fish," May 1969. Bond, whimsical smile intact, furnished the cover and associate editor David Llorens the cover story. The folk hero image was propagated with all the gushy enthusiasm characteristic of such "gee whiz" journalism. He is described as being "without the usual fits of anger that plague man," as one who knows not his own magnetic appeal, and as being among the "gentlest of men." All but sainthood is bestowed. That all important factor that contributes so heavily to the youthful legislator's image, his potential, is not ignored. "Julian Bond, as a politician, represents hope for the freedom of black people . . . hope entirely dependent upon the possibility that white people are capable of a humane and non-racist America."

"Sowing the Seeds of Power," October 1971. This photographic essay tells the story of a whirlwind campaign by Bond and John Lewis to register voters in Mississippi. They drew large and enthusiastic crowds which responded to an appeal for consolidation of black power through the election of black candidates. Wrote W.W. May, publisher of the Tallahatchie Sun, in an editorial: "I have more faith in our niggers than that. . . . They are going to vote for the best qualified candidates."

"Cutting Goliaths Off at the Knees: Julian Bond and SEF," March 1975. Like the previous piece, this article dealt with Bond in his role as a black leader. It was a profile of the Southern Elections

Fund, a political organization which parcels out money to black candidates in the South, of which Bond is President. His value to the organization, it is emphasized, is his name recognition. "Much of its fund-raising efforts trade on Bond's national celebrity." A personal note was mailed by Bond to voters in Bolton, Mississippi, just one week before election of city officials. "That really helped," said the newly elected black mayor. "You'd be surprised how well-known Julian Bond is in this region." Blacks won a total sweep over incumbent whites.

"Now From the State that Brought You Lester Maddox," Playboy, June 1970 (Circulation: 5,386,241). Douglas Kiker of NBC News wrote the most absorbing and perceptive of all the features about Bond. However, it drew Bond's ire, as expressed in this exchange during an interview (Bond, 1975c):

> French: Douglas Kiker wrote . . .
> Bond: An ignorant piece about me.
> French: You didn't like that?
> Bond: Oh, hell no! And wrote him a letter complaining about the way he characterized my youngest child's talk as "Nigger South." He wrote me back "Fuck You." and I haven't seen or spoken to him since.

Kiker adjudged his subject an enigma. "Julian Bond is not what he appears to be. He is more--and less." He describes Bond's appearance personality and presence. "It is, most of all, his good looks, his prevailing courtesy--his grace--that civilized people find so attractive." Kiker's narrative expanded and perpetuated the idea that his success was due to "the dark miracle of chance." The sum effect is to enhance the feeling that Julian Bond has some sort of mystical force that catapulted him to national prominence and continues to watch over him.

"The Rising Stock of Julian Bond," McCall's, May 1971 (Circulation: 8,529,450). This was only a minor feature which appeared in a section entitled "McCall's Monthly Newsletter for Women." The article appeared in the same issue that featured Richard and Pat Nixon on the cover--"The Nixons Nobody Knows"--and it shared the page with a little filler about babies born in Volkswagens. After a brief summary of his public career, Eleanor Clift launched into Bond's current state of public acceptance. On his speaking tour " . . . he remains cool and detached from students." He also appeals to adults: "Julian Bond has caught on with adults, too. He is a 'continuum.'" Finally, she postulates about his future: " . . . to fracture Shakespeare, beware of this lean and modest man."

"Julian Bond: Reluctant Hero," Cosmopolitan, January 1974 (Circulation: 1,153,011). Thomas Meehan, writing a first person account of a visit to Bond in Atlanta, was generally successful in avoiding understatement. Concerning the 1968 covention he wrote: "Calm, logical with boyish charm and McLuhanesque cool, he soon emerged as the single hero of an ugly conclave. . . . by the time he had arrived back home he'd become one of the most famous men in the country." Meehan did portray his every day interactions more realistically than most writers did. In the end, Bond emerged an interesting but somewhat enigmatic character.

Time (Circulation: 4,137,697) and Newsweek (Circulation: 2,540,876) evidenced different perspectives in reporting on Bond's tussle over the Georgia House seat. Time ("One Word Too Many," 1966; "The Bond Issue," 1966; "Right to Speak," 1966) was generally unsympathetic, emphasizing his unpopular antiwar position and repeatedly associating him with the

militancy of SNCC. Newsweek ("Two Time Loser," 1966; "Bond's Word," 1966), in stories submitted by Marshall Frady, emphasized the race issue, contrasting the attitude evinced by Bond and his antagonists. Coverage of the Democratic convention by both news magazines depicted him as a minor character, but both found favorable terminology to describe him.

Newsweek ("Sweepstakes of the '70's," 1969) featured Bond in 1969 as a potential national candidate for the seventies. His future? "'Guess the only thing left will be to run for President,' laughs Bond." In a special issue on black America, Time (Other Voices, Other Strategies," 1970) featured an interview with Whitney Young, Bobby Seale and Julian Bond. He was described as a "militant activist, but not a revolutionary, he represents those blacks seeking to influence the nation through the existing governmental system." With Seale ventilating the revolutionary message and Whitney Young the embodiment of old-line Negro thinking, Bond emerged occupying the center ground. The interview graphically illustrated the importance of a vocal radical movement to maintain his centrist image.

"Memoirs of a Southern Gentleman," Ramparts, January-February 1967 (Circulation: 103,469). This was the first of Bond's own writing to receive national circulation. An autobiographical piece in two installments, the first recounted his role in the early development of the student movement and part two focused on SNCC and his election to the Georgia House. Even at this early point in his public life, he evidenced skepticism about the nature of his notoriety. In 1962 he modeled for a Royal Crown Cola advertisement which appeared on a poster in Southern areas. "It has

made me better known in Selma as the Coca Cola man than as a member of the Georgia legislature." The furor kicked up by the battle for his House seat also produced undesirable results for his image, from Bond's point of view.

> I had been elected by Black Power, rejected by white power and I found neither represented the power I thought would make the changes I needed made. I had begun to receive honors based on my ability to represent at once youth, peace and civil rights, and wanted only to represent the 136th District of Georgia.

"The Negro and Politics," Motive, May 1968 (Circulation: 25,000). As the title implies, Bond used this now defunct journal as a forum for a systematic statement of his political philosophy and hope for black people. Racial politics, he wrote, begins with a consideration of the white's attitude problem.

> Black politics must address itself to solving America's white problem, to developing a new sophistication and consciousness in the black and white communities, and in making democracy safe for the world.

"Uniting the Races," Playboy, January 1970 (Circulation: 5,386,241). The aspiring black politician was asked to contribute one of four articles jointly entitled "Bring Us Together." The others were by George McGovern, Cesar Chavez and Tom Wicker. Playboy described the enigmatic Georgian as having so "captivated political pundits that he wryly asserts he can't decide whether he wants to become Congressman or King. . . ."

Reconciliation was not the tone of the article. Bond united the plights of blacks, Indians and Spanish-speaking people into the one cause against oppression of the white power structure. He stressed the imperative need to remove "the white man's foot off the non-white's neck." The problem, and the solution to the problem, he dumped into the collective

lap of white America.

> Finally, white America is going to have to accept the judgment of the Kerner Commission report that the fragmentation of the races in this country is its problem, and an explosive one.

"Peace of Mind," Look, 27 July 1971 (Circulation: 7,832,511). Look asked sixteen prominent people their secret to peace of mind. Bond landed on the cover with the likes of Barry Goldwater, Hubert Humphrey, Walter Cronkhite, Margaret Mead, and Norman Vincent Peale. His secret to peace of mind was perpetual action.

"Students are an Oppressed Class," Mademoiselle, February 1969 (Circulation: 706,546). In an excellent interview conducted by Editor Joanna Romer, Bond expressed many opinions about the pressing issues of the day. Romer introduced him as "Mister Hero in the country's colleges and high schools." The interview began with him commenting on young people and ended on the subject of his potential as a Presidential candidate in 1976. In the process he touched on politics, racists, radicals, and confrontation. The reader was exposed to his constructive militancy, and, in the final analysis, he seemed more radical than in any other major article.

"Julian Bond: Political Electricity," Harper's Bazaar, January 1972 (Circulation: 444,166). In an issue built around the theme of politics, this interview of Bond was not prominently featured. He was introduced as "the hottest black personality on the national scene, and his political sex appeal extends beyond his local constituency." The interview reflected his candidness, as illustrated by his view of power. "I would like to have power. I think it would be unusual not to want it. But without being overly modest, I don't think I'll ever reach a position of great power."

Bond has authored two books himself and he has been the object of two others. Additionally, he wrote the introduction and contributed an essay to Nathan Wright's (1972) anthology What Black Politicians are Saying. He granted an interview to James Finn (1967) which was included in Protest: Pacifism and Politics. A dialogue between himself and Roy Harris which had appeared in the New York Times was used in Prejudice and Race Relations by Raymond W. Mack (1971). In a negative vein, Lionel Lokos scored Bond as a "black Huckster of Hate" in The New Racism (1971, p. 397).

Bond edited a small book for the Voter Education Project intended as a handbook for prospective black candidates. Black Candidates: Southern Campaigning Experiences was a compilation of edited interviews with nineteen blacks who had run for elective offices in different areas of the South.

A Time to Speak, A Time to Act was a statement of Bond's own political philosophy based largely on his speeches and previous writing. Norman Lederer (1972) believed it was "designed as a handbook for blacks desiring maximum participation in the 1972 Presidential election." The book embraces a wide range of topics but the theme is constant--a call for black political power. Reviewer G.L. Chamberlain (1972) was favorably impressed. " . . . (it) is an all too brief, pragmatic, sometimes radical articulation of a new black politics for all those interested in any 'new' politics."

Neary's Julian Bond: Black Rebel was greeted with mixed reaction. Reviewers found the subject interesting but the writing poor. "John Neary exhibits few narrative gifts, lacks a concept of biography and is altogether too close to Julian Bond to portray him in a critical dimension," wrote

Harvard historian Martin Kilson (1971). The book is rambling and often diverts into tangential topics. It portrays its subject favorably, although the reader would be convinced that Bond is somewhat lazy and terribly fortunate. Benedict Wengler (1971) characterized the book as "an honest, hard-hitting account of a politician on the make, one who is both enigmatic and charismatic, whose character bristles with foibles and paradoxes, who cannot rise above his own challenges and testing points. . . ."

The Bonds: An American Family by Roger Williams overcomes some of the stylistic drawbacks of the Neary book, though Bond himself criticized both authors for an abundance of inaccuracies. Williams' book is a lengthy description of four generations of the family reaching back to the days of slavery. It was well received by critics. "A well constructed narrative, covering 130 years, rich in social and political insights," wrote Carey McWilliams (1972) in the Times. An exception was the Journal of American History which took the author to task concerning some of his assumptions, as well as his scholarship. "Sketchy documentation makes it difficult to determine how much research Williams actually did" (Weis, 1972).

Julian Bond also can be found on reference shelves in biographical books such as Who's Who in America (1969), Current Biography (1969), Who's Who in the South and Southwest (1974), and World Book Encyclopedia (1974). He is not included in others such as Encyclopedia Britannica (1975).

## The Role of Television in the Development of Bond's Image

Television is the medium through which the American people are nominally informed more intensively and homogeneously than ever before. Any research into the national image of any modern American politician

must include the effects of television. According to Milton Schulman (1973), "the image most people have of their leaders--particularly politicians--comes from their appearances on television."

The name recognition of Julian Bond is in no small way attributable to the exposure he has received through appearances on television. The recurring sight of his visage on the home screen during the 1968 Democratic convention reached countless millions of American viewers who were riveted to the remarkable events being shown them that week. Reuven Frank, former President of NBC News, believed that "television is a medium for transmitting experience" (MacNeil, 1968, p.10). Television viewers throughout the nation shared with Bond the experience of the 1968 convention, as well as his earlier ouster by the Georgia House.

Since the convention, Bond has appeared on a variety of television programming. He has made the rounds on the talk show circuit by appearing on programs such as the "Tonight Show," "Today," "Dick Cavett Show," "David Frost Show," and the majority of programs of that genre. "The Tonight Show" reaches in excess of six million households nightly (Nielsen, 1974), with syndicated programs such as the "Mike Douglas Show" reaching more than five million households (Arbitran, 1970). Daytime shows such as Douglas' are watched by twice as many women as men, with a relatively balanced audience racially. Bond has appeared on the evening news of all three networks since emerging as a spokesman for black causes. Periodically, he does local public service type programs in cities where he is scheduled to lecture. His only performing role was when he served as host and narrator for a six-part series of half hour shows entitled "Rush toward Freedom." It was produced and syndicated by Westinghouse Broadcasting and aired in 1972.

An idea of how frequently he appears on televison can be garnered by noting his appearance on network television during the first part of 1975. In January he appeared on "Black Perspective on the News" with John Lewis and Coretta Scott King. Later that month he was interviewed on "AM America," ABC's morning show. In March he appeared on the David Susskind Show with other well-known black leaders including Jesse Jackson, Congressman Ronald Dellums and Bayard Rustin.

Bond has been mentioned several times on the networks' evening news. In January he was interviewed on both ABC and NBC as part of the news features on the birthday of Martin Luther King, Jr. Later that month, his deliberations about running in the 1976 Presidential primaries were reported on ABC and CBS. In April, Dan Rather used a humorous remark by Bond, about choosing a running mate, as the final item for a CBS weekend newscast. David Snell of ABC produced a feature on Bond which appeared on the "Harry Reasoner Report" of 14 June 1975.

The total effect of this air time cannot be systematically gauged, although ratings indicate that more people know of Bond through television than through any other medium. It is certain that no one could appear so frequently in people's living rooms and dens without those people formulating some judgment about that figure. Whatever that judgment, be it sketchy or multidimensional, it is influenced by the nature of the medium which conveyed the message.

The importance of the television medium on our culture has been demonstrated on many levels. It is a powerfully complex medium, combining the compelling force of dynamic vision with spoken language. It is available to virtually everybody all the time--instantly, spontaneously, realistically, and intimately. It is an intricate part of our society economically,

politically and socially as a principal instrument of commerce, entertainment, information and education. It is potentially an instrument for vast social change, and, according to Simonson (1966, p. 8), it is now fostering that change. "Despite the terror engendered by the atomic revolution, . . . it is television that is fashioning the greatest changes in our society."

The overt acceptance of the television medium in America is obvious and virtually universal. Yet the researcher into the influence of television quickly discovers that the real impact of the medium is still too sparsely documented or analyzed to justify specific conclusions of an empirical nature. Dan Hahn (1970) observed that the full effects of television "have not been systematically identified." A large part of the difficulty in analyzing it in quantitative terms is the medium itself. Thomas Olsen (1966) commented on the intangible nature of television: "Its messages are transient, temporal impressions, not physical entities which can be counted." The influence of the television product is still within the purview of the technician and the theoretician.

There are three observable technological qualities of television. First, it is a synthesis of sound, sight and motion. Secondly, the photographic techniques which are used create an intimacy between the viewer and the screen. Thirdly, it is instant communication which is ever-presently available.

Television's ability to reproduce accurately the voice, picture and motion of a performer or personality gives the viewer confidence in his ability to form images of that person (Kuhns, 1969, p. 117). These qualities of the television medium make personality a crucial element, if not the crucial element, in the ultimate impression formed by the viewer.

William Kuhns (p. 70) wrote that "(t)he 'personality' was born of television. Total personality needs the human face: something television not only was equipped to handle, but in which it soon came to specialize." It has been the ability of television to project Julian Bond's total personality that has made Bond so effective on television.

Bond fits the McLuhan prescription of a "cool" personality. His voice is pleasantly underplayed; it is distinctive. Bond is physically attractive, seemingly more so on television than in person. But the actual appearance is not as important as the manner of the person, as described by Kuhns (p. 113). "Physical features are less important than the ways in which a personality uses them. Yet too elaborate a range of facial expression--especially when liberally used--can overpower other expressive modes." It is personality in motion--facial expression-- that determines the success of a television performer. For example, Jerry Lewis was a considerable success in motion pictures, but was too "hot" for television. Most politicians have a similar problem. David Snell believes that Hubert Humphrey is "intolerable" on television for that reason. Snell called Bond a child of the television era, suggesting that he intuitively understands the nature of the medium and how to use it. Snell speculates that that may be the reason for Bond's relaxed demeanor on television, thus allowing the medium to project a natural personality.

Vision is the source of the majority of our sensory stimuli. Vision is a synthesizing process, corrected and sharpened by our other senses. We feel that seeing is believing. When visual stimuli, such as the television figure of Julian Bond, is reinforced by other stimuli, such as Bond's soothing voice, the overall impact is profound and distracting. It is characteristic of television to emphasize the visual and

auditory at the expense of the intellectual. Content is subordinated to glibness. The answer to a question is far less important than the ability to answer. Kuhns (p. 38) points out that this factor tends to over-simplify complexities:

> Television by its nature presents a much more simplified, easily-digested, effortless way of acquiring social and cultural beliefs than other mass media and art forms. Life as seen through the small screen is purged of complexities, subtleties, dialectic nuances. Social problems are reduced to issues that can be explained and debated in a matter of a few minutes.

The end result is that Bond, because he is such an attractive, articulate, "cool" character, is acceptable to a large segment of the population that might otherwise find his solutions unpalatable. (The same is true at the other end of the political spectrum in the case of Ronald Reagan, as explained by MacNeil, p. 149.)

A final point to be made about the visual characteristic of television is its temporal nature. It is seen one instant and gone the next. Television often leaves the viewer with an impression, and little else, making it difficult to deal with on the conscious level of the mind. As Vance Packard (1956) wrote in the Hidden Persuaders, such subliminal influence can be most effective in opinion formulation.

Television has been described as an intimate medium, bringing the viewer and performer into a personal relationship. Edward T. Hall (1966) has explained the concept of social space as it relates to inter-personal relationships, from intimate closeness to impersonal distance. Television directors invade the area Hall calls "personal distance" of most subjects on camera. Personal distance is the view one has when situated

one and one-half to four feet from another. Hall (p. 113) describes facial appearance from the close phase of personal distance.

> The planes and roundness of the face are accentuated; the nose projects and the ears recede; fine hair of the face, eyelashes, and pores is clearly visible. . . . Surface textures are also prominent and are clearly differentiated from each other.

He also describes the vision of personal distance, far phase.

> Subjects of personal interest and involvement can be discussed at this distance. Head size is perceived as normal and details of the other person's features are clearly visible. . . . The voice level is moderate.

With the television camera zeroing-in so closely to its subject, the viewer becomes personally involved with television personalities. Television performers often complain of people walking up to them in public and treating them as old friends. The intimacy of television, the use of angles and distances in camera shots, has created a veritable language of perspective in space to which people instinctively respond. Television as a medium is engrossing; it involves its audience.

At the intimate distance Julian Bond is a handsome person. He has no single outstanding feature. The corners of his mouth and his eyes dominate his range of expressions. His face is very clear, giving the impression of having neither been assaulted by acne in his youth nor a razor in his maturity. His skin is a light shade of tan, so light in fact, that he once had to produce identification proving he was a Negro in order to be refused service during a sit-in at a segregated lunch counter. An oft quoted Chicago columnist described him as "creamy, dreamy" (Llorens, 1968). McLuhan (1970, p. 218) believes that the skin color is an advantage on television.

> It is apparently unknown to the Negro . . . that his TV image is enormously superior to that of the white person--especially on

> color TV. . . . It is simply due to the fact that the TV image is itself iconic. It favors the contour, the mask, the sculptured form. The play of light and shade in the white countenance, to say nothing of the habitual effort at individual facial expression, renders the white person hopelessly inferior on the TV medium.

The third factor of television, instant communication, was evident in the coverage of the 1968 Democratic convention. The fact that the action occurred even as people watched intensified the dramatic atmosphere. Kuhns (p. 148) emphasizes that "the medium has a preference for movement over stasis, process over event." Bond's action role at the convention made him a more impressive figure than simple exposure on largely motionless talk and news programming. The convention trauma became a shared experience, as Reuven Frank would have it, because, in part, of the instant dissemination of the story. The effect of the intermingling of television and politics on the image of Julian Bond can be more clearly understood through an analysis of television's role in broadcasting the convention.

Television programming extends across a vast sea ranging from the serious to the superfluous. Commercial television is dominated by the need for viewers, and viewers are most attracted to entertainment programming. Television's current manifestation is to involve its audience in a series of fantasies. The viewer becomes a willing participant in a fanciful journey. As one program ends and another begins, the viewer makes the transition in terms of plot, but his involvement in the fanciful journey remains intact. Building on that premise, Kuhns (pp. 106-107) extends the idea:

> Since the basis of fantasy is illusion--the way people would like it to be--a new kind of reflection process is at work; reflecting no so much present perceptible attitudes and images, but idealized images.

The embodiment of the idealized images, asserts Kuhns, is the hero of the entertainment milieu. Television depends on heroes. Heroes depend on communication media, including televison. The hero medium, television, created a hero at the 1968 Democratic convention--Julian Bond.

The idea of Bond as hero, i.e. idealized image, is not a dubious diversion. Rather it is the contention of this paper that Julian Bond, Hero, is the most central concept to the understanding of his image and the prolonged popularity he has enjoyed. Each of the major writers on Bond--Neary, Williams, Cleghorn, Llorens, Kiker, Reed, Meehan--has referred to Bond as a hero. Bond was made into a hero at the Democratic convention. The factors were these. (1) The convention was played on a medium where its viewers were accustomed and expecting to find heroes--television; (2) the convention was emotionally charged, it "hotted up" the screen. Bond's "cool" personality seemed appealing in contrast; (3) in the midst of authority and power run amuck, there emerged one figure who flaunted that authority in a way with which the audience could identify--Bond's "put-on;" (4) Bond offered not an answer to the serious problems of the convention, but he offered relief, an alternative. The first two of these factors, television as a hero's medium and Bond's "cool" personality, have already been discussed at length.

A manifestation of Bond's personality which was perfectly adapted to the medium was what Kuhns (p. 128) called the "put-on." He defined the put-on as "social fantasy, games that people constantly interject between themselves and others, themselves and situations. The essence of the put-on is not deception, but impression." He points to humor as a prime ingredient of the put-on. The put-on is a phenomenon of television, says

Kuhns, and, therefore, a phenomenon of the television generation. As illustrated by the accounts of interviews given by Bond during the convention, there is no better description of his style than "put-on." The object, or butt, of that put-on was authority.

There arose in 1968 a swell of ridicule against authority, particularly among the young and disenchanted. The popularity of President Johnson reached a low-ebb in the spring as he dropped to a 36% job efficiency rating in the Gallup Poll ("The Rivals," 1968). Police were being vilified as pigs. In entertainment the anti-hero appeared in films; Hair opened on Broadway. On television the twitting at authority figures was more benign, but popular. Max Smart was giving the Chief a hard time; Hogan played tricks on the Commandant. Much of the scene appearing on home screens during the convention was of rebellion against authority. Of all the figures so involved, only Julian Bond emerged as a person with whom the mass audience could identify. He flouted authority, but within the prescribed rules. He shared so many things with the rioters in the streets and McCarthy's cadre--dissatisfaction with the nation's leadership, opposition to the war, youth--but his performance was conducted with a sparkle in his eye, the trace of a smile on his lips and the grace of the Southern gentleman that he is.

Kuhns asserts that the hero need not be Superman, but rather a personality who at once transcends and explains the environment. The hero offers a safe yet exciting alternative. Given the harsh realities of that convention, Bond offered a most exciting yet safe alternative to both the convention managers and the youthful protestors.

Additional Factors

Three additional influences have molded the image of Julian Bond, although these have not been the most consequential elements, and their reach has been largely into the black community.

Bond believes that through his role as a member of social action organizations his name has reached many people. As example he cited the case of a young black woman from North Carolina accused of murdering a prison guard whom she said was attempting to rape her. The Southern Poverty Law Center, of which Bond is President, sent forth a massive mailing under his signature, soliciting defense funds. Subsequently the case attained national attention and is in litigation at this writing.

> I think that I have been associated with causes that strike them. For example, right now this Joanne Little case is hot stuff everywhere. I'm surprised at how many people have been touched and moved by it with almost no publicity. . . . Tremendous interest, and people associate me with that (Bond, 1975c).

He believes that the mail, as a medium, has been effective in spreading his name.

Another factor, believes Bond, is known among blacks as the "Atlanta mystique." Calling Atlanta "the capitol of black is beautiful," the New York Times (Range, 1974) noted Atlanta's reputation as a center for black capitalism, black education, black political achievement and good race relations--"the city too busy to hate." John Lewis called Atlanta "the new frontier for blacks." Range quoted Mayor Maynard Jackson as saying that it "is the best city in America for black people to live." Bond said:

> A part of this (charisma) is because I come from Atlanta and no other reason. Black people around the United States look upon Atlanta as not just a Mecca to go to work, but as a

> shining example of what can be done. It would be a lot different (if I came) from Birmingham or Jacksonville (Bond, 1975c).

A thrice-weekly radio commentary called "Julian Bond at Large" is broadcast in "most of the major metropolitan areas" by the National Black Audio Network. Sam Tucker (1975) of that network said that the programs are being well received: "The reception is very heavy to some of his programs; lots of phone calls. He is very, very well received across the country."

## Constituency

The missing element thus far in the consideration of Bond's image has been an analysis of his constituency. It is a constituency of unknown size but with somewhat defined demographic and philosophical characteristics. While it is impossible to clearly isolate the members of such a diverse and scattered group, it is feasible to ascribe general characteristics to those who form his constituency.

It has not been within the scope of this research to quantify Bond's popularity--i.e. the number of people who admire him, dislike him or know not of him. That would require a pollster. The only indicators of the size of his constituency are political preference polls. Two such polls taken within six months of one another indicated that 3% and 5% of Democrats would support him for President (New York Times, 5 December 1974; ABC, 1975). Another poll among black heads of households showed Bond the preference among 27% to become the first black President (Atlanta Journal, 9 February 1970). Williams (p. 256) characterized him as "a man with small and large constituencies--his Atlanta district of 27,000 people and the

nation as a whole--and damned little in between." Bond (1975c) himself professes ignorance of the size of his national constituency, but estimates the number of people "who have been touched by my name" in the millions.

His role as a symbol for blacks, youth and anti-war sympathizers has carved out a body of followers from among those groups. "Bond's constituency is national in the sense that his credentials place him at the head of these movements for change," wrote Cleghorn (1968). Bond (1975c) described his constituency as "veterans of the peace movement, of the sixties civil rights movement, members of the old left from the thirties and forties, and perhaps people who were in the CP (Communist Party) twenty-five or thirty years ago, who were involved in left politics thirty years ago."

He is extremely well-known in the black community where the largest single bloc of supporters is found. "He is considered a spokesman for his race," according to Kiker (1970). Among blacks he appeals mostly to those who are politically active. "He is spokesman chiefly for those moderate blacks who believe in working within the existing system . . ." wrote Meehan (1974). Bond (1975c) calls this group "NAACP types." "These NAACP types know me because I've spoken to NAACP groups before and they know I'm interested in having the job Roy Wilkins has now. And (they) know that my style of work is generally what you might call an NAACP style." While he is admired greatly as a symbol, most blacks manifest considerable affection for him as a person. "Bond's strengths among black people are his obvious sincerity and his willingness to embrace, and encourage, the full spectrum of black activism, from the Urban League to the Panthers" (Williams, pp. 274-275).

The rise to national political prominence has made Bond a popular figure among many young people. His popularity as a lecturer on college campuses has led him to conclude that "a great percentage" of his constituency is youthful. "But by young I mean between their late teens, 18 or 19, at their youngest and their mid-thirties" (1975c). He explained:

> I'm relatively young and have an image of a certain kind of militancy which is attractive to college students. Here is a political figure, who, in their view, has not made the political compromises that older politicians have. (1975c).

Calling the emphasis on youth "one of the foremost facts of the seventies," Newsweek ("Sweepstakes of the 70's," 1969) projected Bond as a personality capable of capturing sizeable support from young people in furthering his political ambitions. Senator Birch Bayh noted his attractiveness to the youthful. "I think he has particular appeal to the young, disadvantaged and poor" (Bayh, 1975).

His opposition to the Indochinese war was a major contributing factor not only in captivating a youthful constituency but also in attracting liberals. Much of his white support originates with liberals and others further left. He is promoted by his lecture agent as a proponent and example of the "New Politics." Early political involvement centered around new left activities and his endorsement is deemed valuable by liberal candidates throughout the country (New York Times, 9 September 1968; 6 April 1972). His advocacy of causes such as the Chicago Seven, Angela Davis, consumerism and national health insurance, to name only a few, have followed liberal philosophy. Bond's liberal credentials are fortified by the relationship between himself and other black leaders. "Far less militant than an Eldredge Cleaver or a Rap Brown, but far left of older

civil rights stalwarts like a Roy Wilkins or Whitney Young, he has emerged as a major figure in the black struggle" (New York Times, 27 April 1969).

Bayh, who regards himself as a liberal, acknowledged similarities between his and Bond's constituencies. "Certain elements, yes. I would expect to lose votes to Julian if we ran in the same Presidential primary. We make our appeal to some of the same people." Regarding the Georgian's popularity in Indiana, Bayh indicated that he is not very well known, but "among the people who I respect in Indiana, those to whom I listen, he is viewed quite favorably. Well, there are those who hate him simply because of the color of his face--John Birchers, Klan members and people like that."

Bayh introduces the idea of an anti-Bond populace, what could be called a counter-constituency. The very fact that he is so well regarded by some means others think otherwise. "No doubt it is Bond the symbol who evokes all this columny, just as it is Bond the symbol who wins admiration" (Cleghorn, 1968). Opposition ranges from conservatives like Buckley (1966, 1972) and Lokos (1971), to white racists to radical revolutionaries. Opposition to him is particularly vehement among certain whites. In 1967 Governor Lester Maddox's life was threatened after publication of a photograph showing him shaking Bond's hand (New York Times, 17 March 1967). "To white racists," observed Kiker (1970), "especially those of the traditional Southern variety, he is a traitor and an anarchist, a new wild and wooly radical who is out to set their house on fire."

In addition to those natural constituencies and counter-constituencies, there are those people to whom he directs his public appeal, i.e., the constituency he would like to attract. He has described this desired constituency as people who suffer a disadvantage as well as those who

are sensitive to the needs of the disadvantaged. Writing for Playboy (1971), he advocated the cause of people of color. "What black people--and Spanish Americans and the original Americans--do want is a share of the goodies they see so abundantly spread around them."

Considering himself a "non-traditional" politician, as the Times once called him, he extends his appeal to "the constituents of the 'new politics' . . . urban militants, campus rebels, small farmers who can't compete with big ones, tenent farmers who refuse to pay rents, welfare people, housewives who are tired of rising prices and high school students who want to wear their hair more than an inch long" (Current Biography, 1969). More recently he has worked to organize a "coalition of the needy and the concerned. The components would be women, blacks, poor whites, Spanish Americans and other minorities. Bond indicates that he would solicit support for his Presidential aspirations from such a coalition" (Courier-Post, 7 February 1975).

While he advocates the cause of the disadvantaged, he does not consider them part of his own constituency. "The really disadvantaged people in this country are not (attracted) by anyone. They're apolitical people. The people (I attract) are in the political process" (Bond, 1975c).

# CHAPTER IV

## ETHOS IN THE PUBLIC SPEAKING OF JULIAN BOND

Public speaking has become a way of life for Julian Bond. Not only does it provide his income, but it also contributes to his national name recognition. When asked to explain his standing in the Presidential preference polls, he points to his speaking career. "For the past seven years I've spoken all over the country to thousands of people, and they remember me" (Bond, 1975b). His image contributes to success as a lecturer, and his speaking adds to his image.

The years on the lecture circuit have produced an evolution in Bond. By his own admission, the best of his speech writing was a few years ago. As time has passed, he has become bored with the routine, hearing the same introductions, reciting the same litany, answering the same questions. "It can become an unbelievable drag," he says (Bond, 1975b). He recently admitted that it has been "at least two years since I've written a totally original speech" (Bond, 1975b). Williams assessed the situation as one of being caught on a "golden treadmill." On the other hand, Bond is a thorough professional, and although it may seem a drag to him, he is proficient enough to bring his speeches to life for his audiences. Williams (p.269) wrote of his professionalism before a group of college students.

> He was professional: never flustered, never at a loss for a calm, clear, and sometimes cutting reply to a sharp or hostile question. Because he could predict the questions and knew the answers, he could appear sensitive and genuinely concerned while at the same time feeling fully confident of his ability to handle the situation. There is nothing mystical about this--anyone who makes public speeches for a living has to be able to do it--but it is nonetheless impressive.

This professionalism is no accident. It is the result of a study of his craft. Bond is a student of speakers and speech-making, discussing them knowledgeably. In one interview, he concluded a lengthy colloquy on speakers with an assessment of Martin Luther King. "King, I think, was unique in this ability to take all the ministerial tricks and to put them with a very heavy philosophical and political message" (Bond, 1975c). Speech-making has become his craft. As with every good craftsman he whittles and hones, experiments and discards, taking pride in his creation while searching to improve it. This craftsmanship does not clash with this feeling of boredom. His early speeches reflected more careful logical development and reasoning, while later speeches evidence sophistication of style.

Audience

Basically two kinds of settings predominate for the speaker on the lecture circuit--colleges and conventions. Colleges and universities usually assign a budget allottment for guest speakers. The college audience is the staple of Bond's listeners, as he speaks before large assemblies, to classes and in rap sessions. An increasing percentage of his lecture engagements are before conventions, large and small. These include professional organizations, trade associations, unions, civil rights groups and educational interest groups. He makes infrequent appearences before clubs and churches, and, during elections, is occasionally invited to speak at rallies.

Since Bond has been on the collegiate circuit for the past seven years, his college audiences have changed. In the early years he attracted large audiences, many of which were wildly enthusiastic. The Times

(4 January 1970) described white girls joining black girls "in jostling for his necktie and cuff links as if he were a young Frank Sinatra or Bobby Kennedy." Kiker (1970) described one early audience of a different breed.

> The black students, in natural hairdos and colorful African prints, come early and sit in a tight group, in proud, self-imposed segregation. The white kids, in tough gear. . . fill the rest of the seats.

In an interview, Bond (1975c) described his current college audiences.

> The audiences are college students--18,19,20 years old--about half black, half white, but increasingly black over the last two years. And they are national. . . . They're also people who were in college over the last six years and who are now in the general community and who I now find are coming up and saying "I heard you speak at Harvard in 1968, and now I'm teaching here and I wanted to come back and hear you again."

He explained further the statement that his audiences were becoming increasingly black. "What I meant was the number of whites is decreasing."

The homogeneity of the college audiences has been a source of frustration and boredom for Bond.

> The colleges are almost all the same, whether they're North or South, white or black, rich or poor. The students at one place dress, think and read the same things as the students at another. And they ask the same questions (Williams, p. 258).

A segment of his national constituency which attends his speeches are middle-aged, middle class Negroes, as Bond describes them.

> There's a second audience of black NAACP types, for want of a better descriptive word, which are middle and lower-middle class working people, professional people, people with good blue-collar jobs, teachers and Urban League types, too.

One such group attended his address to the Southern Policy Conference on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The audience included only a

few whites, with a conspicuous absence of younger blacks or counter-culture youth of any sort.

Bond mentions another audience of people who are "involved in both public and private social welfare work." These are often professional groups whom he addresses at conventions, such as Friends of the Libraries and the Southeastern Council on Family Relations.

He addresses a greater variety of listeners when he is asked to speak before conventions. An illustration was a recent speech before the Iowa Bankers Association in which he shared the dias with Barry Goldwater. "And, I might add, we were both well received," said Bond.

Similarities quite naturally exist between his constituency, as discussed in the previous chapter, and his audiences. There are differences, however, caused by the selecting factors for a Bond speech--the ability to pay the fee and the ability to produce an audience. As a whole, his speech audiences are more youthful and well educated than his at-large constituency, and quite likely more middle class. Few of the disadvantaged, who represent one element of his constituency, hear his addresses.

There is attracted, also, a heterogeneous collection of people who are not really Bond's constituency but who attend his speeches. Williams (p. 276) cites his low key approach as the attraction. "Others, who are neither instinctively sympathetic nor hostile, see in him a man dedicated to curing the nation's ills without destroying the society that has created them; these people like his sensible approach to emotional issues. . . ."

The Times (8 August 1971) captured Bond before an atypical

audience in Waterproof, Louisiana, as he and John Lewis toured the South.

> As they arrived here deep in the Delta and hard by the Mississippi River, they were greeted by an enthusiastic audience in a small hall, lauded and applauded with great gusto and unabashedly idolized. . . . "If you hit them with a vote and hit them right, they'll remember it for the rest of their natural-born lives," said Bond. Once again the all-black audience shouted its approval.

Williams (p. 272) quoted Bond on the subject of his listeners. "There is a great temptation to play up to them, to say the things you know will turn them on. But I don't really do that. . . ." Continuing the thought, Williams wrote, "Bond does not vary his message to suit geographical, racial or political differences among his audiences." Taking that as a cue, Lower (1975) set out to determine if that were true. He compared a number of speeches to determine of Bond had changed his language or message to predominatly white as opposed to predominatly black audiences. After subjecting the speeches to rigorous analysis, he concluded that "Julian Bond makes no distinction in his use of language between remarks intended for predominatly black audiences and his comments directed to predominatly white audiences." While the research had a number of serious flaws--using only manuscripts of speeches without including the complete rhetorical situation, for example--the conclusion seems a valid one, as shown by the ensuing discussion of his message.

## Bond's View of Ethos

The concept of ethos has been an accepted tenet of communication since Aristotle. ". . . We might almost affirm," wrote the ancient rhetorician, "that the ethos of a speaker is the most potent of all the means for persuasion" (Cooper, 1932, p.9). Empirical research has also

pointed to the importance of source credibility, as reported by Anderson and Clevenger (1963). "The finding is almost universal that the ethos of a source is related in some way to the impact of the message."

Ethos has been a particularly important factor in the public speaking of Julian Bond. In combination with his image, it seems to dominate the rhetorical situation. Kiker (1970) reported that listeners sometimes discard his message and cling to the concept of the man, rejecting what they just witnessed in the public speaking situation. "It appears that a lot of them succeed in convincing themselves that the whole thing never happened." The primacy of his ethos has been a perplexing fact of life for him.

> I always wonder, are they applauding because I've just delivered a hard-hitting, dynamic, well thought-out, well-written, beautifully phrased speech? Or are they applauding because they saw some guy on TV? Sometimes I might just as well be a dancer. (Bond, 1975b).

Bond rejects the idea that he overtly attempts to enhance his prestige in the eyes of the audience. "No. I don't like people who talk about themselves" (Bond, 1975c). He does, however, employ some traditional methods of ethical proof which will be analyzed as intrinsic ethos. Those factors contained outside the speech text are then examined to determine their effect on his ethos.

## Intrinsic Ethos

Nine speeches have been selected for analysis of intrinsic ethical proof, subject matter and style. The first seven of these were selected because they constitute a representative sample of the speeches, audiences to which they were delivered, and occasions of his addresses. Bond made

available his personal file and affirmed the representative nature of the sample. The final two speeches were selected because they were witnessed by this observer. The nine cover a period from the spring of 1969 to the spring of 1975.

The first speech (S-1) was Bond's standard for several months during 1969. Called "Bias on Race," it was delivered many times, including once at Wayne State University on 21 April 1969. S-2 was given before the National Urban Coalition steering committee meeting in Washington on 10 December 1969. Originally called "Lincoln Revisited," it was subsequently published in The Black Scholar (1970) as "The Roots of Racism and War." S-3 entitled "What Now?" was presented to the Friends of the Libraries at the American Library Association's Annual Conference in Detroit, and was printed in the American Libraries (October, 1970). It is representative of the kind of address he was delivering to professional groups during the period. S-4 was delivered for the first time at Florida Memorial University, 6 October 1970. It was a revision of S-1 and was used frequently.

Bond delivered the major address (S-5) at the first memorial observance of the death of four students at Kent State University. This was one of the important speeches of his career, revised at least three times, and presented to a crowd of 3,500. He gave a prepared address (S-6) to the Georgia House of Representatives, 3 March 1972, his first speech in the House, supporting the first legislation to bear his name. The bill called for tests to be administered by the state to diagnose sickle-cell anemia, and was passed without opposition. S-7 was the commencement address to the predominantly black graduating class of Federal City College, 17 June 1973, in Washington.

S-8 is a transcription of a luncheon speech given in Atlanta before the Southern Policy Conference on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. A similar speech delivered to the Southeastern Council on Family Relations is included in Appendix C for several reasons. It allows the reader to sample Bond's prose in a speech of recent vintage. It exemplifies most of the stylistic and rhetorical skills that he has developed over the years and that are analyzed in the following pages. Most importantly, it includes the entire public speaking situation that affects Bond's ethos--introduction of the speaker, opening remarks, the manuscript, and succeeding questions and answers.

It is important in analyzing Bond's ethos to consider the complete rhetorical situation rather than be confined solely to the manuscript. Before he begins reading the prepared text, he invariably indulges in extemporaneous remarks which represent his most overt effort at audience adaptation. In S-9 he first acknowledged the introduction. "I've been introduced in glowing terms many times before, but I don't think ever quite so well." He then identified with his audience by expressing gratitude at having been asked. "It's indeed a great pleasure to have been asked to speak before you this evening."

Following most of his speeches he is questioned by the audience. Being very proficient at such exchanges and being freed from his manuscript and role of lecturer, he projects a different personality, which affects his ethos. He maintains more consistent eye contact with the audience, his facial expressions are more animated and he exhibits a quick tongue and facile wit.

Expertness. Bond relies on the quality of his material as the chief contributor to the development of his ethos. From the moment he begins reading the text until he is completed, he is prepossessed with it, to the exclusion of almost every other consideration. He depends on excellence of reasoning to justify expertise on the subject, and he relies on stylistic techniques to recommend himself as a speaker.

The typical Bond speech includes these ingredients: analysis of historical events as they have affected black people; identification with and apology for the disadvantaged; a stream of statistical evidence; a prescription for social action; an expression of skepticism about current youth, activists and liberals; denunciation of the present administration; and a quotation to conclude. His use of each of these is embodied in S-9 (Appendix C).

Bond sees the history of black Americans as the struggle against oppression by whites. Most speeches include historical reference to that struggle. In S-4 and S-7 are several paragraphs reciting the same message.

> My ancestors came in chains, husband torn from wife, child from mother. In a land where family and education are venerated, we were denied the chance to learn and maintain a stable family unit. In a country populated by sufferers from religious persecution, we found a strange and alien religion forced upon us. While we came from a land whose inhabitants believed in communalism and the extended family, we found created a system of merchantile capitalism that exactly fitted the cash box mentality of the founding fathers. From that day to this, the seperate status of black people here has been a fact.

Fully one-third of his Kent State address was dedicated to an analysis of the civil rights movement. S-1 also contains a lengthy statement on civil rights which begins as follows.

> Since 1954, there have been various sorts of methods and techniques directed at solving America's white problem. These have included the sit-in demonstration and nonviolent march, the pursuit of education as a barrier breaker, the use of violence as an inducement to change, the challenging in the courts of segregation by law and the thrust for power through political action. Let us examine each of these.

He seeks to identify with and advocate the cause of blacks, poor people and the disadvantaged in general. This element of his subject content fits comfortably into his historical perspective. This paragraph from S-4 appears following a discussion of black Americans as a colonized people.

> But we are citizens only in the narrow sense in that we must meet certain obligations to the state without receiving all of the corresponding benefits of citizenship. We all pay taxes, but because more of us are poor, and because the poor pay more and some of the rich pay nothing, we pay more of our share for less of the rewards taxpayers rightfully expect.

As supportive evidence for his advocacy he relies on statistics. "Generally, what I love in speeches is opposing statistics," he says (Bond, 1975c). "50 % of the people have 20% of the this, while 30% of the people have 80% of the that." Such an example is found in S-2. ". . . where 5% of the people have 20% of the wealth and 20% of the people have 5% of the wealth." With the exception of an occassional quotation, he uses statistics almost exclusively for supportive evidence, as illustrated his speech before the Georgia House (S-6): "One black American out of every ten carries the sickle cell trait and at least one black citizen out of every four hundred is afflicted."

Bond is not without suggestions for change, and every speech contains a prescription for action. Most of the solutions are political. In S-1 he outlined a list of six "rules peculiar to this new movement

in politics." The new movement is characterized by independence, "political promiscuity," as delineated in S-4.

> Foremost among these must be political action, but not the old style of machine politics of the unequal black-labor-liberal coalition that we have entered into like a willing bridegroom so many times in the past, only to emerge ravished and our innocence gone. Our politics must be an aggressive, independent politics, free from any alliances of party or partisanship that has made us slaves first to the party of Lincoln and now to the party of Roosevelt. We must begin to seize power where we are, in the cities and the black belt counties of the old Confederacy.

In the process of ordaining a course for a new social movement, he frequently assaults the strategies of other activists, as in the speech at Kent State (S-5).

> What is immediately obvious is how it cannot be done. It cannot be done, for example, in adventurism of the sort that results in appealing rhetoric but also in increased oppression for this country's non-white population. Revolution is seldom precipitated through the exercise of the vocal cords, and slander, however clever, will never substitute for scientific analysis. Woodstockism cannot be tolerated while Watts exists; ROTC on the campus cannot compete for the attention of today's activist with rats in the ghetto.

Current youth are frequently the object of his derision, as in this segment from S-8.

> For many being black became a rhetorical, or sartorial, accomplishment. For others, social commitment began to be measured by the length of their hair or the intricacy of their handshake. Many of the young people who were some years ago seen marching militantly through the streets are now found running nude on the college campus, attempting to prove, perhaps, that all men are not created equal.

Bond has saved the flower of his contempt for the Republican administrations of the last few years. These remarks have been a prime source for national publicity. In 1971 the Times (5 December 1971) reported that he "received one of the loudest ovations last night when he denounced 'the pornography of having to live in a country governed by such a middle-

minded mediocrity as Richard Nixon.'" During the campaign of 1972 he stirred up a minor brouhaha when he told the National Urban League convention that black supporters of Nixon were "political prostitutes" (Times, 3 August 1972). Showing cutting sarcasm, he told a Princeton audience that, "I'm willing to go to almost any length to make President Nixon like me; even learning to tap dance." (Times, 28 March 1973). In speeches during 1975 he has attacked governmental inequities of "socialism and subsidy for the corporate rich, and capitalism and self-sufficiency for the nation's poor" (S-8).

As a conclusion Bond invariably utilizes a quotation. Among his sources are Langston Hughes (S-1), Harvard biology professor George Wald (S-2, S-5), Frederick Douglass (S-3, S-4, S-7) and W. E. B. DuBois (S-8, S-9). He has quoted from Bayard Rustin and Tom Hayden, also.

Bond makes very few conscious efforts to reinforce his right to speak by adding ethical proof. The fact of his skin color seems to qualify him as an authority on questions of race. In S-1 he added an opening statement to reinforce that factor.

> Before I begin I must admit to a prejudice, a bias. That is race. Most of my life has been colored by race, so you will pardon me if most of my address is colored by race.

Preliminary remarks in S-9 made reference to his profession.

> I am flattered to have been invited here in another way, as well. I am . . . by profession a politician. It's not a very popular profession to be in in 1975. And therefore it's a great pleasure to be invited anywhere by anyone. The profession is held in rather great scorn today. . . . It's unfortunate in a way, because it is a very important profession. It is the people who do what I do who decide whether or not you will do whatever it is you want to do.

Bond depends on his prose style to validate his expertise as a speaker. It is, perhaps, more accurately a poetic style that harkens back

to the days when, as a budding young poet, he wrote the couplet, "Look at that gal shake that thing/We can't all be Martin Luther King." He is most proud of "my alliteration. I think alliteration is such a beautiful device" (Bond, 1975c). It is a technique he is using more now than ever before, as illustrated by S-8.

> The reins of government have been seized by a national political movement whose acts are characterized by nothing less than the national nullification of the needs of the needy, the gratuitous gratification of the gross and greedy, a victory for the politics of pernuriousness, prevarication, pious platitudes and self-righteous swineishness. . . .

Another word device is assonance, as in S-1 when he condemns the teaching to black children that "whiteness is rightness." In S-7 he produced a combination of alliteration and assonance.

> The tragedy of the Watergate is not that the Presidency stands cheapened by the pious protestors who publicly preach against crime in the streets and privately practice crime in the suites.

Finishing his statement on Watergate, he adds consonance to alliteration and assonance to produce a metrical flow of sound.

> The damage done is not to the functioning of the political process or the uni-party system. These techniques of forgery, bribery, wire-tapping, breaking and entering, suborning testimony, burglary, theft and conspiracy have been decided, directed, planned, committed, connived at (sic), condoned, and covered up by a succession of American governments, under a variety of Presidents belonging to each of the parties.

It is clear that Bond enjoys the rhythmic pulse that creates ebb and flow in his style and which is appealing to the ear of this listener. He is fond of juxtaposing two series, as in S-9: "Families live and sleep and work and learn in an environment which is tempered and shaped and formed by government. . . ."

Such stylistic devices were not used by Bond early in his career,

although he was fond of the rhythm inherent in repetition. S-1 indicates early stirring of what later developed.

> That equality gives us an equal chance to be poor, and an equal chance to be unemployed, an equal chance to drop out of school and a more than equal chance to fight for someone else's freedom thousands of miles from home.

Another Bond favorite is contrast. S-2 contained a paragraph which he has used in numerous speeches.

> There is no escaping the duality of these subjects in a country where more money is spent on pet food than on food stamps; where private citizens spend more on tobacco than all government does on education; where airlines and rail lines receive income subsidies; where farmers receive welfare payments of one billion dollars a year; where the oil industry in the past ten years has received government handouts of upwards of fifty billions of dollars and where supplements for the poor are laughed out of Congress.

Since attempts at eloquence such as rhythm and contrast are difficult to sustain in a speech, and less effective if overused, the remainder of Bond's prose utilizes more mundane strategies like clarity, appropriateness and flow of consciousness. Sprinkled through the text can be found an occasional metaphor. In S-7 he speaks of an arsenal filled more with "pop guns than howitzers." In that same speech he likened the American city to a reservation for the unwanted, where votes could "begin to make a dent in the reservation wall to let money and sunshine and air and life inside." In S-5 he warned that the new consciousness which the "American black community is now pregnant with" could be "stillborn or aborted." In the same mode of thought was a vivid paragraph delivered in S-9 to a group of family counselors.

> What we need now is not the inception of old ideas, but the conception of new realities. We must halt the contraception of new ways of dealing with old problems and begin now to promote the birth of tomorrow's dreams. The incestuous relationship between government and America's affluent must cease and we must halt the sterile relationship between the needy and their needs.

There is one particular phrase he uses in most of his speeches. It is a bastardized version of Light Horse Harry Lee's eulogy of Washington--"First in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Characterizing the plight of young blacks, he says, "Our young men remain first in war, last in peace, and seldom in the hearts of their countrymen."

Trustworthiness. Bond predicates the effort to make his audience want to believe him on his sincerity and integrity on the one hand and on humor on the other hand.

Introductory remarks often find him making light of himself and his chosen profession of politics. The effort is not condescending, but it does suggest a certain humility, as in S-8.

> I have just been sworn in to the Georgia Senate. As you know, I have moved this year from the House to the Senate, and they say it has improved both bodies. I'm just proud to know that I now belong to the greatest deliberative body of men money can buy.

Another self-effacing tack is designed to relate himself to his audience and the occasion. Once again humor is employed, as in S-9.

> It's indeed a great pleasure to have been asked to speak before you this evening. . . . Because so many of you are experts in your field, I feel a little like Zsa Zsa Gabor's fifth husband. I know what's expected of me, I'm just not sure how to make it interesting.

When speaking before the House of Representatives, Bond honestly disavowed any expertise in one area, but then turned around to lean heavily on his trustworthiness to support a series of observations.

> Now, I'm not a medical doctor, gentlemen. I can't explain to you just how sickle cell anemia does cause the pain that it does. I can tell you it is more painful than acute leukemia, more horrible than the suffering agonies of cystic fibrosis. I can tell you. . . .

Although he does try to reflect humility, honesty and appreciativeness, especially in the opening remarks, Bond relies on the hard-hitting nature of his message to reinforce the audience's belief in his integrity and sincerity. He tries to "tell it like it is." As earlier statements have shown, he makes no effort to soften his criticism. Even his audiences have sometimes felt the stinging lash of his tongue. At Kent State he spoke of the importance for political activism.

> It is important, finally, because most of you will do nothing anyway, no matter how many speeches are made or how many shots are fired or bodies counted or babies starve to death, and it is important because, since your mothers and fathers didn't do it, your children may not have the chance to do it.

In S-4, a standard speech of 1970 to his college audiences, he decried the trend of white students away from social involvement.

> The hoped-for coalition with white college students has failed to materialize, as far too many of this group have shown more interest in music, drugs, the romantic rhetoric of revolution and the enobling sacrifice of self-imposed poverty than in the very real problems of existence that afflict black people in this country.

Bond is not always negative toward his listeners, identifying with them on occasion. In the commencement address at Federal City College (S-7), he related directly to the students.

> You are the spiritual descendants of those young people who thirteen years ago, coming from schools very much like this one, demonstrated that young people could make a difference, first at lunch counters and bus stations, then at county courthouses and voting booths all over the dark nether regions of this country. Throughout the decade of the sixties, young people the age most of you are now, faced police dogs, fire hoses and midnight murderers and jails in order to bring a small taste of democracy to this region of the country.

A clear line of demarcation is drawn in Bond's rhetoric between the virtuous and the evil, and as to which side he is on. As previously

quoted statements have shown, he finds evil in the separate status of black people (S-4,S-7), in the callous disregard of human needs (S-2), in the inequities of the economic and governmental systems (S-4) and in the White House (S-8). He associates himself with goodness by identifying with the poor and dispossessed (S-1), by calling for rational change within the existing system (S-1, S-4), and by choosing an appropriate quotation (S-9, Appendix C).

Perhaps the most effective strategy employed in the effort to develop trustworthiness is humor. Humor is his chief asset during introductory remarks, it surfaces less frequently during the manuscript portion of the speech, but it blossoms into full effect during question and answer sessions. One reason his humor is effective is that it often catches the audience by surprise. His image associates him with serious causes and his ethos is built on the impact of his message while he projects a very low-key profile. Humor, a value as ingrained in the American psyche as any, is appreciated wherever it can be found, and Bond's humor is effective because of that too. In an interview he spoke at length about the importance of humor to him.

> I think some of my humor has gotten better. Yesterday in Peoria a woman asked me if I could satisfy the demands of militant women, and I said there is no question in my mind that I can satisfy women. . . . I like humor, first because I just like humor. When I was a kid my reading matter was joke books. . . full of limericks and rhymes. "Willie, cunning little creature, blew a bean and hit his teacher. Most surprising was the scene, Willie said, when bean met bean." And stuff like that. . . . I was always very shy and humor, you know, is a way to overcome that.

Some of the humor is directed at himself; some of it has deeper meaning. One story he tells is both.

> Delta has one of the best safety records and one of the worst records of minority hiring. So I have to choose between being a race man and staying alive. So far I've chosen to stay alive (Meehan, 1974).

Bond is at his best when subjected to questioning. In one session he told students that marijuana laws were not a major concern to him, "besides, you know, it makes hair grow on your palms" (Snell, 14 June 1975). In Arkadelphia, Arkansas he was asked about the choice of a running mate should he become the Presidential nominee.

> It must be a white woman from the Northwest. She needs to be Catholic and married to a Jewish oriental who speaks Spanish (Jet, 1975).

In a St. Petersburg rap session with students on being asked, "The leadership of the Sixties has disappeared--what do you intend to do about it?" he replied with a smile "I've decided to declare myself the leader" (Williams, p. 271).

It is traditional for Southern politicians never to be caught without a yarn, an infectious tradition which has been adopted by the black state senator. Most are funny and represent an extension of his humor, as this story he used to tell on Lester Maddox.

> The governor . . . wanted to be here, but there was a fire at the mansion. . . . Don't be alarmed; nobody was injured. The fire did, however, destroy the library. . . and both of the books were burned. . . . And the governor was particularly upset, because one of them hadn't even been colored in yet! (Neary, p. 23).

Other stories he uses for a different effect, particularly one about a young black flying to New York for the first time. As the plane circled the city, the stewardess pointed out some of the landmarks. The stewardess became vexed that he did not recognize the Statue of Liberty.

> "'Well, I though everybody knew what that is--that is the Statue of Liberty.'"

> My friend said 'I'm sorry; I've never been here before; I'm really sort of ignorant. I didn't know what it was. I hope you can explain it to me.'
>
> She said, 'The Statue of Liberty was put there so that people who come in from England, or France, or Germany see it and know that they are in the land of the free and the home of the brave, the land of freedom and justice, democracy, equality, brotherhood and fair play.'
>
> My friend said, 'That is the most beautiful thing I've ever heard in my life, but isn't there something wrong with it?' She looked over and said 'No.'
>
> He said, 'Don't you think they ought to put it on a turntable, so it would turn around, so those of us who are inside the country would know we are in the land of the brave?'
>
> The stewardess got angry, and the plane came in low, at three hundred miles per hour, and he read, 'Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free,' and my friend said 'Baby, here we are!'" (Neary, pp. 30-31.)

Extrinsic Ethos

Personal Characteristics. Much has already been written about Bond's appearance and manner, although the perspective of a speaker's audience is unique. From a podium, Bond appears tall; he is 6' 1", slender, and even at a distance, insouciant. "His manner is an uncanny combination of awkwardness and grace, typified by his casual slouch" (Current Biography, 1969). He dresses conservatively to match his demeanor.

Facial attractiveness has been a factor in his ethos. Mailer (1968) provided a comparison. ". . . he was adored for his sensational good looks. He was handsome not like a movie star, but like a highly touted juvenile, good looking as actors like John Derek, even Freddie Bartholomew, had been when they came along." His hair is between the short crop of the Sixties and the large Afro he grew later. As with so many blacks who are well accepted by the white community, his skin is very light. The total effect for some in his audience, particularly some black militants, is "the epitomy of Nephew Tom," in Kiker's words.

Williams (p. 276) found that his ethos is established in part on an impulsive, irrational confidence based on his attractiveness.

> It is not wholly rational because a good deal of it is based on his looks and manner and because it still stems partly from the needs of his listeners to find somebody in public life worth trusting.

Bond's voice is at once consonant with his ethos and a contributing factor. Reed (1970) described it as having the quality of "textured wool." His speech style is a slightly elevated conversational tone which at first is somewhat disarming. But in the words of Stanger (1972), he "doesn't automatically twinkle on and off like a Christmas tree bulb." There is a tenor of authority in his voice. He doesn't need to raise his voice because people are already listening--that is authority.

This verbal style is a learned characteristic.

> When I began making speeches . . . I very quickly discovered that the louder I was, the louder the audience was; that my loudness gave them license to be loud. And so, as I toned down, they toned down. They have to do it to hear me. And so I began deliberately to try to talk in as quiet a manner as I could. . . . (Bond, 1975c).

The consistency of his style was vividly demonstrated by Snell (ABC, 1975) when he spliced together a series of Bond alliterations from several of his speeches with no noticeable differences.

Not only does he project a low verbal profile to begin with, but he also often lowers his voice, softens his tone or pauses briefly as a method of emphasis.

Certain seemingly irrelevant factors have bearing on Bond's ethos. In a study of sixth-grade arithmetic students, Aronson and Golden (1962) discovered that race was a factor in persuasibility,

depending largely on the perceived expertise of the communicator. They discovered that subjects who were not prejudiced against Negroes were influenced greater by a Negro of high credibility than by a white of similarly high credibility. Since Bond's speeches always deal with the subject of race, the fact that he is black adds to his credibility. Other research, such as by Brock (1965), has determined that sources are more believable when they share common characteristics or beliefs with the audience. This probably adds to Bond's ethos among blacks and among the young.

Aronson and Golden's research seems to support earlier suspicions that irrelevant source characteristics affect the communicator's ethos. Therefore, it is logical to assume that factors such as age, sex and accent are influential. It is axiomatic to say that attractive members of one sex are more persuasive on the other sex than they are on their own sex, but research seems to be mixed on that score. Without trying to dodge the issue, it can be said that these are influences on Bond's ethos, but it would be highly speculative on the part of the critic to assign specific significance to them without the availability of corroborating evidence.

Personal dynamism. The dynamic speaker, in a traditional sense, Julian Bond is not. There is very little that can be said about gestures or enthusiasm for his subject, or any of the other accepted gauges of the dynamic speaker. He relies on the continuous de-emphasis and under-emphasis as strategy for persuasion. He has declared himself incapable of utilizing the vigorous style characteristic of speakers like Martin Luther King, Jr. "I wish I could or I wish I could slip into it, anyway," he says. "I have on two occasions in the hundreds of speeches I've

made." He does make a distinction between such speaking and assuming a more emotional style, which he says he can do when "the emotion of the moment calls for it. . . . Every now and then I can pick up the tempo and noise level, but I generally like to speak, as opposed to make (sic) speeches, I like to speak" (Bond, 1975c).

His delivery is an extension of his style. Gestures are conspicuously absent; body movement of any kind is limited; facial expression is serious and deadpan. In delivering his manuscript, he pursues it relentlessly allowing little time for extraneous action or audience response. He tends to lean into the microphone, his head cocked forward, with an occasional glance from side to side. Eye contact is limited during the delivery of the manuscript.

Much of his delivery is dictated by the written speech. During opening remarks, and particularly during interchange following the speech, he is more animated, maintains eye contact with a wider array of facial expressions and more flexibility in his vocal projections. At no point would he be mistaken for a revival preacher, but, at least, he is somewhat livelier during these periods.

As the national success attests, Bond's style is engaging, his audience responsive. By de-emphasizing himself he perpetuates the McLuhan cool image. Combined with a reliance upon his material and stylistic techniques, he is able to avoid any hint of demagoguery while maintaining an interesting and forceful speech.

# CHAPTER V

## CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study has been to examine the image and ethos of Julian Bond, beginning with a portrayal of the individual in Chapter II. The next section traced the development of his image and the fourth chapter analyzed his ethos within the rhetorical setting. This chapter provides the conclusions of the research.

Since image and ethos are concepts held in the mind of the beholder, there follows, first an examination of his constituency and audience. Bond's popularity was at an all time high shortly after the 1968 Democratic convention. The period 1969 through 1971 constituted the time when he was in greatest demand as a speaker and when he was receiving the most extensive press coverage. His popularity, perhaps name recognition is more accurate, has decreased gradually since then, although Presidential preference polls and a heavy speech itinerary indicate significant acceptance still remaining.

Both his constituency and audiences have changed during these years of recognition. During the aforementioned peak years of popularity he was widely known and respected by white Americans, particularly youthful activists. That group seems either to be non-existent or interested in areas other than those in which Bond is active. His white constituency is older and smaller today, if his audiences may be used as a measure. Within the black community, where he has a higher visibility, Bond has maintained the early name recognition. The result has been a virtual dichotomy in his image. The white image is less well defined and not as

widespread, while blacks know of him and many hold strong opinions about him.

Differences exist between his constituency and audiences, thus contributing to a difference between his ethos and image. His constituency is mostly black, while the audiences are often mostly white, although his audiences are becoming increasingly black. An element of his constituency which could be classified as the disadvantaged rarely forms a large portion of his audiences. The audiences are more heterogeneous than his constituency, often including people who are not part of that constituency. As a whole, his audiences are more youthful, better educated and earn a higher average income than his constituency.

## Image

Personal dimension. Bond's attractiveness and personality have been constant factors in his career. He epitomizes the low-key, casual disposition that McLuhan calls "cool." His dress is conservative, his voice quiet, his demeanor reserved and gentlemanly. His face makes him appear younger than his years, thus accentuating the impression on young people and adding to the impact of his accomplishments. Articulateness, good education and family tradition have given him a reputation for intelligence. Success in securing his House seat and delegation's seat at the convention helped develop a reputation for craftiness, skill and leadership. Refusal to recant regarding his anti-war sentiments showed his integrity, which has been reinforced by the forceful message he delivers as a speaker. Throughout it all he has been the personification of the individualist.

Historical dimension. Bond initially emerged as a symbolic figure for the peace, youth and civil rights movements. These have since faded as significant social forces, but at their height there was perhaps no other person who personified those three forces quite as well as the young black from Georgia.

He remained popular in the anti-war movement for its duration. When he first advocated his position, the peace movement was small, but by the time he addressed the Kent State commemoration of four murdered students in 1971, it had grown to widespread proportions, and his popularity increased apace. The peace movement is now a moot issue, making Bond's symbolic role a thing of the past. The so-called "youth movement" was a phenomenon closely attached to anti-war sentiment. This, too, has faded as a social movement. Although Bond's youth remains attractive to young people, it can be said that there is no longer a ground-swell for which he is a symbol. The nature of youth being what it is, one of his attractions was his potential for the future, but that may have been clouded by his recent decision not to enter politics on the national level.

Bond's most significant role was as a black. His family heritage and early SNCC activities are well known among American blacks. By refusing to bow to white pressures in 1966, he emerged as a symbol of independence for black politics. By leading the challengers to success in Chicago, and then having his name placed in nomination for the Vice-Presidency, he emerged as a symbol for black political power on the national level. During that period his was one of few voices to rise

from his generation of black youth which called for change within the political process, while others preached revolution. The subsequent shift in opinion to Bond's position has also removed this as a distinctive factor of his image. Disunity among blacks makes it difficult to assess Bond's status today, but it can safely be said that he remains a spokesman for his race.

Relational dimension. The people who have opposed him have added dimension and perspective to Bond's image. The battle over his seat in the Georgia House showed vividly the difference between the young black who represented the future in race relations, and the legislators who were clinging to a discredited past. Given the choice, press coverage indicates that many Americans chose to sympathize with Bond. At the Democratic convention, he found himself in a centrist position between Lester Maddox and Richard Daley on the right and the riotous peace demonstrators on the left. Subsequently, the rise of revolutionaries like Carmichael, Brown and Cleaver on his extreme left caused Bond to appear moderate by contrast. In recent years the political spectrum seems to have shrunken, leaving him once again on the far left. That tilt seems to be less pronounced within black America than in the more conservative white community.

He has performed the roles of activist, politician, and lecturer. Early work as an activist has moved him now into association with social work organizations. Many people now recognize him for his leadership of the Southern Elections Fund, the Southern Poverty Law Center or one of the other groups to which he lends his name. His role as a politician

is mostly of local significance and generates little national attention except for the two occasions when he rose to nationwide attention. On the lecture circuit he is recognized mostly as a political gadfly.

Affectional dimension. Bond emerged from the 1968 Democratic convention as the lone hero for the liberals. Subsequently, an idealized image of Bond has been projected through the media which intensified the hero impression. He became very popular on the college and high school campuses. In the vernacular of the day, he was believed to have charisma. Few features have appeared in the media in recent years and it was the media which perpetuated the hero image. The exception is within the black community where he has been featured in Ebony and has a thrice-weekly radio program. He seems to have maintained his hero image within the black community, particularly in the South. The dichotomy between the black and white images seems to be particularly significant with respect to the affectional dimension.

## Ethos

Bond's image is a crucial element affecting the public speaking situation. It not only works as a selecting factor to determine his audiences, but it also affects his strategies during the speech. He does not find it necessary to contribute overtly to his ethos with large quantities of ethical proof, and his presentation is purposely de-emphasized in an effort to subordinate his personality and focus attention on his message.

Intrinsic ethos. Bond delivers his speech from a manuscript with extemporaneous opening remarks. During his introductory statement he relates to his audience and tries to establish good will. The texts of

his speeches are forceful statements on the race issue with his analyses of contemporary and historical events. Stylistic devices, particularly rhythm, are his favorite means to establish his expertise as a speaker. Usually he answers questions following speeches, and during this period he utilizes humor extensively.

Extrinsic ethos. A conscious effort is made by Bond to avoid any hint of dynamism in the speech presentation. The chief extrinsic factors affecting his ethos are his attractiveness and voice. He has cultivated a conversational speech style, keeping his voice calm and level, and lowering it at points for emphasis. Being black adds credibility to his message.

Ethos is the overbearing influence on the public speaking of Julian Bond, and it is modified and changed by the experience. He emerges with most of the desired ethical characteristics--sincerity, integrity, honesty, expertness and intelligence. Trustworthiness seems to depend more on the individual auditor's agreement with his message than on ethical factors. He surprises his audiences with the frequent use of humor. The greatest difference between his image and ethos is in the category of sociability. His aloofness, reserve and low-key approach to public speaking cause his audiences to perceive him as standoffish and remote. (Appendix D contains a brief discussion of semantic differential results which suggest these conclusions.)

In the end, the paradoxical nature of the individual seems to have a significant influence on his image and ethos. He has maintained a certain level of popularity, but has not assumed the leadership role to match the size of his constituency. He remains a popular speaker while maintaining

a distance from his audience. Ironically, the same cool image which was so effective on television persuades many of his speech listeners that he is aloof and unapproachable. A man to whom fame has brought influence and wealth, he prefers to malign the fame. He seems to be a person with a national constituency and a national image who doesn't know what to do with it.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ABC. "Harry Reasoner Report." 14 June 1975, "Off-Beat and Running," David Snell.

ABC. "1968 Democratic Convention." 26 August-29 August 1968.

A.C. Nielsen Company. Network Television Ratings, 2 January 1974.

American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1969.

American Program Bureau. "Julian Bond: Apotheosis of the New Politics." Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts, 1974. (Pamphlet.)

Andersen, Kenneth, and Clevenger, Theodore, Jr. "A Summary of Experimental Research in Ethos." Speech Monographs, June 1963, pp. 59-78.

Arbitron Television. Syndicated Program Analysis, February 1970.

Aronson, Elliot, and Golden, Burton W. "The Effects of Relevant and Irrelevant Aspects of Communicator Credibility on Opinion Change." Journal of Personality, 1962, pp. 135-146.

Atlanta Constitution, 8 January 1966-12 July 1975.

Atlanta Gazette, 16 April 1975.

Atlanta Journal, 8 January 1966-12 July 1975.

Bayh, Birch. Ebenezeer Baptist Church, Atlanta. Interview, 13 January 1975.

"Bond Issue." Time, 18 February 1966, pp. 24-25.

"Bond's Word." Newsweek, 19 December 1966. p. 27.

Bond, Julian. Black Candidates: Southern Campaign Experiences. Atlanta: Voter Education Project, 1968.

_____. Georgia State Capitol, Atlanta. Interview, 27 January 1975a.

_____. Georgia State Capitol, Atlanta. Interview, 27 February 1975b.

_____. "Memoirs of a Southern Gentleman." Ramparts, January 1967, pp. 21-22; February 1967, pp. 55-56.

_____. "The Negro and Politics." Motive, May 1968, pp. 16-20.

_____. "Peace of Mind." Look, 27 July 1971, p. 20.

_____. Read House Hotel, Chattanooga. Interview, 23 March 1975c.

_____. "The Roots of Racism and War." The Black Scholar, November 1970, pp. 20-23.

_____. A Time to Speak, A Time to Act. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1972.

_____. "Uniting the Races." Playboy, January 1970, pp. 128, 154.

_____. "What Now?" American Libraries, October 1970, pp. 847-848.

Booker, Simeon. "Black Politics at the Crossroads." Ebony, October 1968, pp. 31-42.

Bormann, Ernest G. Theory and Research in the Communicative Arts. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Boulding, Kenneth. The Image. Ann Arbor: Michigan, 1965.

Brink, William, and Harris, Louis. The Negro Revolution in America. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1963.

Brock, Thomas. "Communicator-recipient Similarity and Decision Change." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, pp. 195-201.

Buckley, William F. "Inflated Bond." National Review, 8 February 1966, p. 102.

_____. "Julian Bond Runneth Over." National Review, 1 September 1972, p. 102.

CBS. "1968 Democratic Convention." 26 August-29 August 1968.

Camden (N.J.) Courier-Post, 7 February 1975.

Chamberlain, G.L. Review of A Time to Speak, A Time to Act, by Julian Bond. America, 19 August 1972, p. 100.

Clift, Eleanor. "The Rising Stock of Julian Bond." McCalls, May 1971, p. 40.

Chisholm, Shirley. The Good Fight. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Cleghorn, Reece. "Here Comes Julian Bond: Quiet, But Angry Rebel." New York Times Magazine, 20 October 1968, pp. 38-39, 72-79.

_____. "No Seat for the Negro Who Won." New Republic, 29 January 1966, pp. 11-12.

Cooper, Lane. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: Appleton, 1932.

Couch, Jane Allen. "Julian Bond: The Rhetoric of Realism." M.A. thesis University of Georgia, 1972.

Cronkhite, Gary. Persuasion: Speech and Behavioral Change. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1969.

Duncan, David Douglass. Self-Portrait: U.S.A. New York: H.N. Abrams, 1969.

Encyclopedia Britannica. Chicago: Benton, 1975.

Finn, James. Pacifism and Politics. New York: Random House, 1967.

Frady, Marshall. "The Infamous Mr. Bond." Saturday Evening Post, 6 May 1967, pp. 94-98.

"Georgia Bans Bond." Christian Century, 26 January 1966, p. 102.

Hall, Edward T. The Hidden Dimension. Garden City: Doubleday, 1965.

Hahn, Dan. "The Effects of TV on Presidential Campaigns." Today's Speech, Spring, 1970, pp. 4-17.

Hendrix, J.A. and Polisky, Jerome B. Rhetorical Criticism: Methods and Models. Dubuque: W.C. Brown, 1968.

Hovland, Carl I., Irving, J., Janis, L., and Kelley, Harold H. Communication and Persuasion. New Haven: Yale Press, 1953.

Hovland, Carl I. and Weiss, Walter. "The Influence of Source Credibility on Communication Effectiveness." Public Opinion Quarterly, Winter, 1951-1952, pp. 635-650.

Information Please Almanac. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1971, p. 394.

"Julian Bond." Current Biography, New York: H.W. Wilson, 1969, pp. 47-49.

"Julian Bond." Negro History Bulletin, December 1968, pp. 21-22.

"Julian Bond." Who's Who in America. Chicago: Marquis, 1970.

"Julian Bond." Who's Who in the South and Southwest. Chicago: Marquis, 1970.

"Julian Bond." World Book Encyclopedia. Chicago: Field Enterprises, 1974.

Julian Bond, et al. v. James "Sloppy" Floyd, et al., 87 Supreme Court 339 (1966), 341-342.

Kiker, Douglas. "Now From the State That Brought You Lester Maddox...." Playboy, June 1970, pp. 105-106, 204-207.

Kilson, Martin. Review of Julian Bond: Black Rebel, by John Neary. New York Times Book Review, 16 May 1971, p. 5.

Knebel, Fletcher. "The Changing Face of Southern Politics." Look, 17 November 1965, pp. 50-54.

Kuhns, William. The Electronic Gospel. New York: Herder and Herder, 1969.

Lederer, Norman. Review of A Time to Speak, A Time to Act by Julian Bond. Library Journal, 15 June 1972, p. 2169.

Llorens, David. "Julian Bond: Down by the Lake Shootin' Fish." Ebony, May 1969, pp. 58-70.

Lokos, Lionel. The New Racism. New Rochelle: Arlington House, 1971.

Lower, Frank J. "A Content Analytic Comparison of Julian Bond's Speeches Before Predominantly Black Audiences and Before Predominantly White Audiences." paper presented to Southern Speech Communication Association Convention, Tallahassee, Florida, April 1975.

Mack, Raymond W., ed., Prejudice and Race Relations. Chicago: Quadrangle, 1971.

Mailer, Norman. "Miami Beach and Chicago." Harper's, November 1968, pp. 41-130.

McLuhan, Marshall. Culture Is Our Business. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

_____. "Television in a New Light." ed. Stanley T. Donner. The Meaning of Commercial Television. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1967, pp. 87-107.

MacNeil, Robert. The People Machine. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.

McWilliams, Carey. Review of The Bonds: An American Family by Roger Williams. The New York Times Book Review, 13 February 1972, p. 16.

Meehan, Thomas. "Julian Bond: Reluctant Hero." Cosmopolitan, January 1974, pp. 78-81, 148.

Mitchell, Grayson. "Cutting Goliaths Off at the Knees." Ebony, March 1975, pp. 136-142.

NBC. "1968 Democratic Convention." 26 August-29 August 1968.

Navasky, Victor S. "The Nomination as Seen and Directed by the Best Politician in America." New York Times Magazine, 8 September 1968. pp. 32, 134-140.

Neary, John. Julian Bond: Black Rebel. New York: Morrow, 1970.

_____. "Out of the South, A Hero-at-Large." Life, 8 November 1968, pp. 43-48.

_____. "Up, Uppity and Away." Esquire, May 1971, pp. 109-111, 188-196.

New York Times, 8 January 1966-28 February 1975.

Olsen, Thomas O. "A Basis for Criticism of the Visual Aesthetic Elements of Television." Ph. D. dissertation, Wayne State University, 1966.

"The 100 Most Influencial Black Americans." Ebony, May 1975, p. 59.

"One Word Too Many." Time, 21 January 1966, p. 20.

"Other Voices, Other Strategies." Time, 6 April 1970, pp. 23-24.

Packard, Vance. The Hidden Persuaders. New York: Pocket Books, 1957.

Range, Peter Ross. "Capitol of Black-is-Beautiful: Making it in Atlanta." New York Times Magazine, 7 April 1974, pp. 28-29, 68-78.

Reed, Roy. "Julian Bond Emerges as Symbol of Black America's Problems and Promise." New York Times, 4 January 1970, p. 62.

"Right to Speak." Time, 16 December 1966, pp. 31-32.

"The Rivals." Newsweek, 8 April 1968, pp. 35-36.

Romaine, Howard. "Julian Bond Has Cut Off His Afro." Gentleman's Quarterly, September 1970, pp. 126-160.

Romer, Joanna. "Students Are an Oppressed Class." Mademoiselle, February 1969, pp. 166-167, 184-188.

"'70 Stages Its Last Confrontation." Life, 19 June 1970, p. 27.

Shapiro, Herbert. "Georgia's Uppity Legislator." Nation, 7 February 1966, pp. 145-148.

Shulman, Milton. The Ravenous Eye. London: Cassell, 1973.

Simonson, Soloman. Crisis in Television. New York: Living Books, 1966.

Snell, David. Read House Hotel, Chattanooga. Interview, 23 March 1975.

Snider, James G. and Osgood, Charles E. Semantic Differential Technique. Chicago: Aldine, 1969.

"Sowing the Seeds of Power." Ebony, October 1971, pp. 104-110.

Stanger, Ila. "Julian Bond: Political Electricity." Harper's Bazaar, January 1972, pp. 86, 106.

"Supreme Court Rules for Julian Bond." Christian Century, 21 December 1966, pp. 1560-61.

"A Surprising Talk Between a Black Leader and a Top Segregationist." New York Times Magazine, 27 April 1969, pp. 34-35, 109-120.

"Sweepstakes of the '70's: Five Entries." Newsweek, 24 February 1969, pp. 27-28.

"Talk of the Town: Representative." The New Yorker, 1 April 1967, pp 34-35.

Thonssen, Lester and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism. New York: Ronald, 1948.

Tucker, Sam. National Black Audio Network, New York, New York. Telephone interview, 10 July 1975.

"Two Time Loser." Newsweek, 24 January 1966, pp. 26, 29.

Watters, Pat and Cleghorn, Reece. Climbing Jacob's Ladder. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1967.

Weis, N.J. Review of The Bonds: An American Family by Roger Williams. Journal of American History, June 1972, p. 225.

Wengler, Benedict. Review of Julian Bond: Black Rebel by John Neary. Best Sellers, 1 May 1971, p. 61.

Williams, Roger. The Bonds: An American Family. New York: Antheneum, 1972.

"The Winner: How--and What--He Won." Newsweek, 9 September 1968, pp. 30-36.

"Words of the Week." Jet, 1 May 1975, p. 32.

Wright, Nathan, ed. What Black Politicians Are Saying. New York: Hawthorne, 1972.

# APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

## SNCC STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee has a right and a responsibility to dissent with United States foreign policy on any issue when it sees fit. The Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee now states its opposition to United States involvement in Viet Nam on these grounds:

We believe that the United States government has been deceptive in its claims of concern for the freedom of the Viet Namese people, just as the government has been deceptive in claiming concern for the freedom of colored people in such countries as the Dominican Republic, the Congo, South Africa, Rhodesia and in the United States itself.

We, the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee have been involved in the black people's struggle for liberation and self-determination in this country for the past five years. Our work, particularly in the South, has taught us that the United States government has never guaranteed the freedom of oppressed citizens, and is not yet truly determined to end the rule of terrorism and oppression within its own borders.

We ourselves have been the victims of violence and confinement executed by United States government officials. We recall the numerous persons who have been murdered in the South because of their efforts to secure their civil and human rights and whose murders have been allowed to escape penalty for their crimes.

The murder of Samuel Younge in Tuskegee, Alabama, is no different from the murder of people in Viet Nam , for both Younge and the Viet Namese sought, and are seeking, to secure the rights guaranteed them by the law. In each case the United States government bears a great responsibility for these deaths. (Note: Younge was shot in the back as he walked into a whites-only toilet at a service station. His death provided the impetus for this statement.)

Samuel Younge was murdered because United States law is not being enforced. Viet Namese are murdered because the United States is pursuing an aggressive policy in violation of international law. The United States is no respecter of persons or laws when such persons or laws run counter to its needs and desires.

We recall the indifference, suspicion and outright hostility with which our reports of violence have been met in the past by government officials.

We know that for the most part, elections in this country, in the North as well as the South, are not free. We have seen that the 1965 Voting Rights Act and the 1964 Civil Rights Act have not yet been implemented with full federal power and sincerity.

We question, then, the ability and even the desire of the United States government to guarantee free elections abroad. We maintain that our country's cry of "preserve freedom in the world" is a hypocritical mask behind which it squashed liberation movements which are bound by the expediencies of United States cold war policies.

We are in sympathy with, and support, the men in this country who

are unwilling to respond to a military draft which would compel them to contribute lives to United States aggression in Viet Nam in the name of the freedom we find so false in this country.

We recoil in horror at the inconsistency of a supposedly "free" society where responsibility to freedom is equated with the responsibility to lend oneself to military aggression. We take note of the fact that 16% of the draftees from this country are Negroes called on to stifle the liberation of Viet Nam, to preserve a "democracy" which does not exist for them at home.

We ask: where is the draft for the freedom fight in the United States?

We, therefore, encourage those Americans who prefer to use their energy in building democratic forms within this country. We believe that work in the civil rights movement is a valid alternative to the draft. We urge all Americans to seek this alternative, knowing full well that it may cost them their lives--as painfully as in Viet Nam.

## APPENDIX B

## NEW YORK TIMES BIBLIOGRAPHY


"Georgian's Score Vietnam Critic." 8 January 1966, p. 4.

"Georgia House Bars War Critic." 10 January 1966, p. 1.

"Pacifist Rights Aide." 12 January 1966, p. 18.

"Special Election Asked in Georgia." 12 January 1966, p. 18.

"Mr. Bond of Georgia." Editorial, 12 January 1966, p. 20.

"Negro Ousted by Georgia House Supported by 23 Congressmen." 13 January 1966, p. 43.

"Negro Asks Court for Georgia Post." 14 January 1966, p. 26.

"1,000 Stage March on Georgia Capitol: Back Ousted Negro." 15 January 1966, p. 1.

"Seat for Bond Riles Georgia." 16 January 1966, IV, p. 2.

"Court Sets Date for Bond's Suit: Sanders Sets Special Election." 18 January 1966, p. 20.

"Georgia Fixes Date for New Election to Fill Bond's Seat." 19 January 1966 p. 17.

"Citizens Committee for Julian Bond." Advertisement, 20 January 1966, p. 23.

"Bond Seeking Draft Exemption in Conscientious Objector Role." 21 January 1966, p. 27.

Kalm, Chet. "Julian Bond's Stand." Letters to the Editor, 21 January 1966, p. 46.

Brewer, Sam Pope. "Bond Hailed at U.N. Luncheon Given by Africans of 15 Nations." 22 January 1966, p. 12.

"Bond Told to Get Race Issue Data." 25 January 1966, p. 34.

"Bond Visits Albany; Gets Cool Greeting." 26 January 1966, p. 17.

"To Seat Bond." Letters to the Editor, 26 January 1966, p. 36.

"Atlanta Educators Decry Bond Ouster." 27 January 1966, p. 12.

"Racial Issue Out in Bond Case; Court Weighs Free-Speech Plea." 29 January 1966, p. 9.

"Bond Sole Qualifier for Seat Denied Him." 9 February 1966, p. 30.

"Bond Loses Plea on Georgia Seat; U.S. Justices Uphold House in Rejection of Pacifist." 11 February 1966, p. 20.

"Bond Asks Negroes to Avoid the Draft." 12 February 1966, p. 12.

"400 March 2 Miles in Vietnam Protest." 13 February 1966, p. 9.

Bennett, Charles G. "Way Opened for Council to Hold Hearings on Big Trade Center." 16 February 1966, p. 43.

Roberts, Gene. "Liberties Union Quits Bond Case." 21 February 1966, p. 44.

"Lawyer for the Left: Leonard B. Boudin." 21 February 1966, p. 44.

"Bond Re-elected to Georgia House." 21 February 1966, p. 75.

"Bond Prefers Jail to Induction Into the Army." 5 March 1966, p. 4.

"High Court Is Asked to Act on Bond Seat." 17 March 1966, p. 27.

"Julian Bond Denied Ouster Review Now." 29 March 1966, p. 22.

"Julian Bond Barred Second Time From Seat in Georgia's House." 24 May 1966, p. 27.

"Bond Qualifies as Candidate by Pledging Party Support." 16 June 1966, p. 40.

"Julian Bond to Get Court Review." 21 June 1966, p. 28.

"Carmichael Held in Riot Aftermath." 9 September 1966, p. 28.

"Julian Bond Winner in Georgia Primary." 16 September 1966, p. 22.

"NAACP Bids Court Move to Seat Bond." 6 October 1966, p. 32.

"Georgians Re-elect Barred Legislator." 10 November 1966, p. 30.

"Supreme Court Seems Cool to Georgia Plea on Negro." 11 November 1966, p. 27.

"New Moves Snarl Georgia Election." 16 November 1966, p. 21.

"High Court Voids Georgia Refusal to Seat Bond." 6 December 1966, p. 1.

"The Court Speaks for Freedom." Editorial, 6 December 1966, p. 46.

Krock, Arthur. "An Expansionist Court." 7 December 1966, p. 42.

"The Court Says Seat Is Bond's." 11 December 1966, IV, p. 2.

"Maddox Victory Forseen." 13 December 1966, p. 41.

Roberts, Gene. "Maddox Favored in Ballot Today." 10 January 1967, p. 1.

"Maddox Greets Georgia Negroes." 14 January 1967, p. 29.

"Julian Bond to Get Back Pay." 26 January 1967, p. 20.

Roberts, Gene. "Julian Bond Is Accepted by Georgia House." 3 February 1967, p. 16.

"Welcome to the Capitol." photograph, 11 March 1967, p. 14.

"Maddox Threatened Over Photo With Bond." 17 March 1967, p. 28.

"Powell Announces Political 3rd Force." 31 March 1967, p. 24.

Hoffman, Paul. "50,000 at San Francisco Peace Rally." 16 April 1967, p. 3.

"New Left Convention Next Month Will Seek Strategy to Defeat Johnson." 9 July 1967, p. 38.

"Pacifist Group Defies U.S. on Sending Hanoi Aid." 7 August 1967, p. 15.

"Political Alliances with Whites Urged by Negro Leaders." 11 August 1967, p. 34.

"Negro Teenagers Studied in Report." 30 December 1967, p. 21.

"Gregory-Spock Ticket Urged." 14 February 1968, p. 56.

"Big Kennedy Team at Work on Coast." 26 May 1968, p. 52,

"Humphrey Is Upset at Abusive Tactics in Presidential Race." 7 July 1968, pp. 1, 23.

Reed, Roy. "Julian Bond Denies He'll Aid Humphrey's Drive." 23 July 1968, p. 23.

Janson, Donald. "Democrats Seek 'Open' Convention." 5 August 1968, p. 28.

"McCarthy in Ohio Campaign, Endorsed by Ex-Kennedy Aide." 8 August 1968, p. 26.

Bigart, Homer. "McCarthy Hailed in Chicago Ghetto." 18 August 1968, p. 66.

Johnson, Thomas. "Negro Plans Study of Campaign." 20 August 1968, p. 27.

Rugaber, Walter. "Politics: Alabama Challenges McCarthy Delegates." 22 August 1968, p. 25.

_____. "Democrats Vote on Equal Division of Georgia Seats." 23 August 1968, p.1.

_____. "Politics: Georgia Liberals Lean to Delegate Compromise, But Conservatives Refuse." 24 August 1968, p. 18.

_____. "Politics: Some Georgia Regulars ready to Accept Compromise with Insurgents." 26 August 1968, p. 24.

Frankel, Max. "Connally Slate Wins Floor Fight." 27 August 1968, p. 1.

"Georgia Insurgent." Photograph, 28 August 1968, p. 30.

Frankel, Max. "Debate Fights Transform Party." 28 August 1968, p. 1.

Wicker, Tom. "Humphrey Nominated on First Ballot." 29 August, 1968, p. 1.

_____. "Humphrey Bars Rigidity on Vietnam Policy." 30 August 1968, p. 1.

"Bond Calls Political Involvement Vital to Progress of the Negro." 31 August 1968, p. 10.

Navasky, Victor S. "The Nomination, As Seen and Directed by the Best Politician in the Country." 8 September 1968, VI, pp. 32, 134-140.

"Bond Says He Will Support Negro and Peace Candidates." 9 September 1968, p. 42.

Carroll, Maurice. "Campaign Takes O'Dwyer from Slum to Garden Party." 9 September 1968, p. 49.

Roberts, Steven. "Dissident Democrats Organizing as a Permanent Power in Party." 17 September 1968, p. 38.

Jansen, Donald. "Rebellious Democrats Establish Coalition to Seek Party Reform." 7 October 1968, p. 40.

_____. "Negro Unit Refuses to Aid Humphrey." 14 October 1968, p. 33.

Cleghorn, Reece. "Here Comes Julian Bond: Quiet, But Angry Rebel." 20 October 1968, VI, pp. 38-39, 70-79.

Mumford, Lewis. "For Paul Davidoff," Letters to the Editor, 4 November 1968, p. 46.

"Democrat Fight Looms Over Commission that Could Influence Make-up of '72 National Convention." 1 December 1968, p. 49.

Buber, Leonard. "Pupils Stay Out of Harlem School." 10 December 1968, p. 1.

Rugaber, Walter. "Blacks in Office: One of the Miracles of the Democratic Process." 15 December 1968, IV, p. 6.

Kifner, John. "Organization Is Set Up to Help Local Groups Applying for Aid." 16 December 1968, p. 40.

"Williams College Curtails Classes." 7 April 1969, p. 32.

Wooten, James. "14 Rights Leaders Support Strikers." 21 April 1969, p. 29.

"A Surprising Talk Between a Black Leader and a Top Segregationist." 27 April 1969, VI, pp. 34-35, 109-120.

Herbers, John. "Evers Sworn In, And Blacks Control Town in Mississippi." 8 July 1969, p. 1.

"Southern Liberals Open Fund Drive." 13 July 1969, p. 64.

"Campaign by a Negro Is Urged for the Vice-Presidency in '72." 31 August 1969, p. 42.

Robinson, Douglas. "Berkshire Park Named for DuBois." 19 October 1969, p. 30.

Hunter, Charlayne. "Panel to Review Panther Clashes." 16 December 1969, p. 20.

Reed, Roy. "Julian Bond Emerges as Symbol of Black America's Problems and Promise." 4 January 1970, p. 62.

Lukas, Anthony. "Bond Says Two Chicago Defendants Feared Police Violence Would Occur." 14 January 1970, p. 31.

"Black Poll Set on Vietnam War." 1 February 1970, p. 31.

Apple, R.W.,Jr. "Group of Left-Wing Democrats Assails Methods Used in Selecting National Chairman." 5 March 1970, p. 25.

"Blacks Found to Favor Working Through System." 30 March 1970, p. 86.

Schumach, Murray. "Unrest Simmers at 7 Colleges." 17 April 1970, p. 42.

"Commencement Speakers Across the Nation Stress the Theme of Reconciliation--Lincoln University: Bond Admonishes Blacks." 9 May 1970, p. 24.

Nordheimer, Jon. "Black Atlanta Venture Backfires on Liberals." 15 June 1970, p. 1.

Waggoner, Walter. "Gibson Is Backed by Newark Chamber." 18 June 1970, p. 51.

"Black Party Backs a Candidate to Face Wallace for Governor." 2 August 1970, p. 38.

"L.I. Benefit Aids Blacks in South." 23 August 1970, p. 20.

Shipler, David. "Negro Legislator from South Rejects Tactics of Some Blacks." 29 August 1970, p. 11.

"Georgia Hopefuls Turn to Right." 30 August 1970, p. 32.

Sibley, John. "Prisoners Seize Hostages, Take Over Jail in Queens." 2 October 1970, p. 1.

Lesher, Stephen. "Leroy Johnson Outlicks Mr. Charlie." 8 November 1970, VI, pp. 34-54.

Fraser, Charles. "Who's Who Drops Plan for Black Edition, Causing Some Blacks to Quit as Advisors for Main Listings." 15 November 1970, p. 47.

"Blacks Present Views on N.E.T." 1 December 1970, p. 93.

"Bond Supports McGovern." 13 December 1970, p. 84.

Ferretti, Fred. "Julian Bond Here to Push T.V. Series." 30 December 1970, p. 49.

Lyons, Richard. "A.M.A. Presents Its Plan for Health Insurance." 26 February 1971, p. 18.

Salupkis, Agis. "Kent State Holds 4-Day Memorial." 4 May 1971, p. 33.

Wooten, James. "Atlanta Suburb Split Over Bond." 16 May 1971, p. 51.

"Notes on People." 9 June 1971, p. 33.

"Julian Bond Finds Blacks Worse Off." 8 September 1971, p. 29.

Greeley, Andrew. "For a Black Vice President in 1972." 19 September 1971, VI. pp. 28, 39, 42-44.

Delaney, Paul. "Negroes Eye Presidential Races." 20 September 1971, p. 19.

Apple, R.W.,Jr. "How Can We Have a Real National Impact?" 26 September 1971, IV, p. 7.

"Nixon Urged to Pick Alabamian as Judge." 29 September 1971, p. 19.

Apple, R.W.,Jr. "Struggle for Democratic Credentials Post Is Tight." 12 October 1971, p. 26.

Herbers, John. "Single Candidate by Blacks Hinted." 20 October 1971, p. 21.

"Black Power." 24 October 1971, IV, p. 3.

Roberts, Steven. "Youths Meet on 1972 Drive, and Politicians Pay Heed." 5 December 1971, p. 65.

"Drug Dealers Denounced." 5 February 1972, p. 19.

"New Legal Aid Center in Alabama Seeks to Aid Poor Politically and Economically." 20 February 1972, p. 40.

"Notes on People." 4 March 1972, p. 4.

Johnson, Thomas. "Blacks at Parlay Divided on Basic Role in Politics." 12 March 1972, p. 1.

Nordheimer, Jon. "16 Georgia Blacks Named Delegates." 12 March 1972, p. 1.

Delaney, Paul. "Increasing Number of Black Legislators Beginning to Have Impact on Issues Throughout the Nation." 19 March 1972, p. 38.

"Bond Endorses McGovern." 6 April 1972, p. 30.

Delaney, Paul. "Black Voters Wooed by Two Rivals in Ohio." 30 April 1972, p. 44.

Apple, R.W.,Jr. "McGovern Continues to Lag in Bid for Black Vote." 19 May 1972, p. 42.

Hunter, Charlayne. "Last Do-wah Played by Smokey Robinson." 1 June 1972, p. 48.

Delaney, Paul. "Black Caucus Adopts 'Realistic' Goals." 18 June 1972, p. 42.

_____. "Black Bloc Decides to Back McGovern." 22 June 1972, p. 44.

_____. "Jesse Jackson Calls for Summit Meeting of Black Leaders to Set Priorities." 6 July 1972, p. 21.

_____. "Blacks Are Divided on Convention." 16 July 1972, p. 42.

_____. "Blacks for Nixon Rebuked Sharply." 3 August 1972, p. 18.

"Bond Here, Bids Blacks Unite and Drive Nixon Out of Office." 25 August 1972, p. 40.

Teasley, Henry. "Blacks for Nixon." Letters to the Editor. 29 August 1972, p. 32.

"Georgia Winner Builds Support." 31 August 1972, p. 24.

"Black Supporters of Nixon Under Fire." 17 October 1972, p. 29.

"Johnson Ceremony Will Stress Rights." 20 October 1972, p. 23.

Herbers, John. "Johnson Mediates a Rights Dispute." 13 December 1972, pp. 1, 44.

Smothers, Ronald. "Welfare Activist Plans New Group." 17 December 1972, p. 49.

"Dr. Horace Bond, Educator, 68, Dies." 22 December 1972, p. 34.

Johnson, Rudy. "400 Earn Journeyman-Electrician Status Here." 14 January 1973, p. 48.

Delaney, Paul. "2 Civil Rights Groups Weigh Merger." 5 March 1973, p. 14.

"Notes on People." 28 March 1973, p. 43.

Fraser, C. Gerald. "Black Power: Groping for a New Level of Struggle." 13 May 1973, IV, p. 3.

Photograph, 18 July 1973, p. 18.

Nordheimer, Jan. "'The Dream' 1973: Blacks Move Painfully Toward Full Equality." 26 August 1973, p. 1.

Delaney, Paul. "16 Elected Black Leaders of Both Parties Meet to Chart a New Political Strategy." 28 August 1973, p. 25.

_____. "Civil Rights Unity Gone in a Redirected Movement." 29 August 1973, pp. 1, 16.

"Atlanta, After Bitter Campaign, Expects a New Era Under Black." 18 October 1973, p. 43.

"Lecture Tours Flourish as Watergate Whets Public Appetite for Learning." 4 November 1973, p. 78.

Delaney, Paul. "Low-Key Black Meeting." 22 March 1974, p. 28.

Range, Peter Ross. "Capitol of Black-is-Beautiful: Making it in Atlanta." 7 April 1974, VI, pp. 28-29, 68-78.

Ayers, B. Drummond. "Black Clubbed in Selma Assails Blacks Aiding Wallace." 6 May 1974, p. 44.

Salupkis, Agis. "Kent State, 4 Years Later: Routine Returns." 15 May 1974, p. 42.

King, Wayne. "Maddox Forced into Runoff for Georgia Governor." 14 August 1974, p. 14.

_____. "Maddox Links Rival to Black Leader." 30 August 1974, p. 17.

Reed, Roy. "New South Raising Crop of '76 Prospects." 27 September 1974, p. 37.

Ayers, B. Drummond. "Julian Bond to Enter Presidential Primaries in '76." 8 October 1974, p. 30.

Reston, James. "The Election Trends." 16 October 1974, p. 43.

Kraft, Joseph. "The Cast." 17 November 1974, VI, pp. 32-35, 112-122.

"Gallup Shows Wallace Leading Democratic Hopefuls." 5 December 1974, p. 40.

Kifner, John. "Brief Clash Mars March in Boston." 15 December 1974, p. 40.

"Notes on People." 8 February 1975, p. 15.

APPENDIX C

ADDRESS TO THE SOUTHEASTERN COUNCIL ON FAMILY RELATIONS

CHATTANOOGA, TENNESSEE

MARCH 23, 1975

Dr. James Walters, University of Georgia, introducing Julian Bond: The Honorable Julian Bond is representative of the very best of the American political system. He has championed the cause of the nation's neglected, and he continues to do so. It is with enormous pride that I introduce to you the Honorable Julian Bond--member of the Georgia legislature, and a distinguished American statesman. His topic is "Politics, Government and the Family."

Thank you a great deal. And thank you Dr. Walters. I've been introduced in glowing terms many times before, but I don't think ever quite so well. And I'm sure the introduction would have been just as nice even if the Georgia State Senate, which meets tomorrow morning, hadn't finalized the budget for the University of Georgia (scattered laughter).

It's indeed a great pleasure to have been asked to speak before you this evening, to speak before any group of people like yourselves, from across this region of the country, people who are vitally concerned about people, people who work to make our families whole. Because so many of you are experts in your field, I feel a little like Zsa Zsa Gabor's fifth husband (scattered laughter). I know what's expected of me, I'm just not sure how to make it interesting (laughter).

I am flattered to have been invited here in another way as well. I am, as Dr. Walters has told you, by profession a politician. It's not a very popular profession to be in in 1975. And, therefore, it's a great pleasure to be invited anywhere by anyone.

The profession is held in rather great scorn today, partly because of the Watergate scandal, because of Representative Mills' swimming lessons (scattered laughter), and for the general taint that has been associated with the profession over the years. It's unfortunate in a way, because it is a very important profession. It is the people who do what I do who decide whether or not you will do whatever it is you want to do. It is an ancient profession. There are many who believe it is the second oldest profession. And I'm just proud to know that I belong to the finest body of men money can buy (laughter).

(Manuscript)

Any discussion of politics, government and family is really just a discussion of politics alone, and our ability as parents, as voters, as either recipients of government largess or victims of it's stinginess. It's a discussion of our ability to influence through the political process the relationship between the governed, who are we, and the government.

Families live and sleep and work and learn in an environment which is tempered and shaped and formed by government--which can decide, if it chooses, to control everything about us. It can make our air clean or filthy. It can guarantee our employment or lack of it. It can insist

that our children learn to read and to write, to be healthy and to hope to be whole. It can insist that our streets be safe and secure. And we ought to begin now to insist that government do for us that which we cannot do for ourselves.

Now, for the remainder of this year and during most of the next one, as Presidential debate and rhetoric heighten and build, the question of government's relationship to us and our lives will be sharpened. The rising unemployment rate makes more striking the, until recently, nearly abandoned debate about guns and butter. Attempts by the administration to cut spending by making the poor pay more for food stamps and gas ought to be a signal to us to forge a new constituency which will demand a new set of national priorities.

Living as we do in an economy, and under a dying economic system, which demands divisions of class and race to keep its machinery turning, we must now, in 1975, begin both the discussion and action that will lead us toward a redistribution of both wealth and income in American society.

For most American families, but particularly for families of black and poor, the disadvantaged, this is an opportune moment to begin. Among American families, 10% or more of the married black mothers are now in the labor force than their white counterparts; 10% or more of the widowed and divorced black mothers work than their white counterparts; median income for working black mothers is nearly a thousand dollars less than their white counterparts. Infant mortality figures are twice as high for blacks as for whites. Accidental and illness death rates for children of the dispossessed are almost twice as high as for children of the more fortunate.

A partial solution for these distressing figures and to the pathology that results from them is felt by many to be found in the passage of national day care or children's assistance legislation, legislation which will free mothers and will provide children with the headstart they will need so badly as they make their way through life. The cost for such a program is estimated at between fifteen and thirty billion dollars. And, if enacted, would probably benefit only professional families where employment for the mother is a conscious choice, not dictated by necessity, or female headed families supported by public assistance.

The need for such a program is great. Most working women in this country work because they have to. Of the 27 million children under eighteen whose mothers work, twelve million are in female headed households where the median income is less than six thousand dollars. In another one million families the husband's income is only adequate enough to maintain minimal financial independence. And in most cases the wife's income makes the difference between the family falling into poverty or in the lower-middle class. One-half of all the children of working mothers are below school age. Since 1970, while the number of children of working mothers has increased by 1.2 million, the total number of children in the country has declined.

All of these figures reflect more than marks on paper. They stand for real men, women and children; families, both whole and splintered; victims of centuries of neglect and the last five years of callous indifference, who look to their government for some help. They are the victims of a coming together of a national coalition of the comfortable, the callous and the smug who have closed their hearts, their minds and their

brains to the claims and the calls to conscience put forward by the forgotten and unrepresented elements in American society.

The last twenty years in America have been incredible, swift ones. But for those at the bottom and near bottom the changes have been few. Despite protest and movement, despite election and resignation, what has occurred to all of us is rather simple. The reins of government have been seized by a national political movement whose acts are characterized by nothing less than the national nullification of the needs of the needy, the gratuitous gratification of the gross and the greedy, a victory for the politics of penuriousness, prevarication, impropriety, pious platitudes and self-righteous swinishness.

The two most recent national political elections, Presidential elections, in 1968 and 1972, gave this group rather awesome power. The second of these, less an election than a rout, a rout which installed the fiscal facist, the merciless merchants of the cost accounting school of social welfarism in the White House, insured a four year reign for men with an arrogant contempt for people and their problems.

The late American folk singer Woody Guthrie once said that some men kill with bullets, others kill with the stroke of a pen. The near genocidal results of the last half decade, sponsored and allowed by an impotent Congress unable to resist Presidential vetoes, impoundments, cutbacks, shifts and sham, all of these have cut sharpest at the people at the bottom. Human problems are now placed on a balance sheet and forced to add up to pay for themselves.

The government's policy toward the poor has changed from benign concern to malignant neglect. The new administrators in Washington run the programs they direct with all the solicitude of a hungry mortician at an old folks home.

While most of the nation's population waltzed into the 1970's believing that their black problem had either been burned or blown away, nearly half of all black families in the United States still earned less than five thousand dollars a year. The average black American was still dying seven years faster than his white counterpart. Our young men remained first in war, last in peace and seldom in the hearts of their countrymen. And we remained the last to be hired and the first to be fired.

We have reached this position today because of a confluence of events of the 1960's. The nonviolent, and in retrospect, lovable marchers of the first part of that decade began to be replaced, if not in fact then certainly in the public fancy, by the rapacious rioters of the latter part of the sixties. America's cities were believed to either be in flames, under marshall law, or sinking under the dead weight of a population of pensioners, the unemployed young and their presumably unemployable parents.

The middle mind of America was running away from social concerns in a crisis state all their own. They quite rightly saw that their taxes, much higher proportionately than those paid by their pernicious President, were escalating to pay for barely maintaining what they were running away from. But they were wrongly taught by their President, and others, that their taxes were high because of the lazy poor, and not because of the corporate evader or the military glutton.

The lower level administrators, on the other hand, the mayors,

councilmen and commissioners began to face an all too common list of plagues we have come to call the urban crisis--drug addiction, increased racial friction, civil service militancy, housing destroyed by Plan A faster than it's built by Plan B, schools which warehouse and miseducate their students, relief roles which give relief to no one. For them the "new federalism" promised to be manna from heaven. But instead of manna and millions, it became pennies stolen from the poor--robbing Peter to pay Paul half of what Peter couldn't get by on to begin with. The result was to shift the burden and responsibility and accountability from the federal government, where the resources are, to the states and towns and cities where the resources aren't. The rhetoric from Washington about sharing the wealth became a scandalous exercise in consolidating wealth and power where they always were--away from cities, away from children, away from people for whom wealth is an extra meal and for whom power the ability to hide from the census taker.

The often repeated connection between today's dilemma and the end of the Reconstruction era a hundred years ago is more than frightening. The collusion between an insensitive administration and a seemingly unfeeling majority seemed to doom the hopes of the American underclass. Then and now a President desperate for power entered into an illicit arrangement, not just with the unreconstructed South, but with the national unreconstructed mentality that believed then, as it does now, that private profit and public arrogance could be pursued at the expense of the people living on the American margin.

Concurrently, many of the liberal crusaders for social justice and democracy became tired or involved in less traumatic concerns. For many of them, picking up beer cans by the side of the highway became an acceptable substitute to winning jobs for black people in the brewery.

The aspirations of, and movement by black people began to be curtailed, not by organized violence and barbarity, but by a series of nationally choreographed legal and extra-legal maneuvers designed to make us less than political and economic equals. The frenetic and often frantic activity of the 1960's had created a political movement characterized by selfishness and fear. A political constituency was recruited from the frightened to form solid ranks against the forgotten. Backlash is too hackneyed a term for people confused by long hair and frightened by clinched fists. Their politics was directed by those who verbally opposed crime in the streets but who secretly practiced crime in the suites.

This massive manipulation of the American mind has made the mundane magnificent, and placed government in the hands of men who believe in privilege for the powerful and neglect for the powerless.

There can be no better prescription for relieving this crisis, and for reviving some interest in it, than by creating a partisan national coalition of need--of mothers who want care, not just warehousing for their children; of workers who want work and decent protected wage; of all those people who work for their living but can't live on what they make; as well as those who can't find work and can't live on what we so grudgingly give; of all those who want an end of welfare and capitalism for the poor, and subsidy and socialism for the wealthy, and who must learn that stability for people on the bottom is compatible with sufficiency for those in the middle. All of those people now live in America,

divided now by race and class, fearful of each other, contemptuous and impotent.

An entire political movement came to near maturity in America in the 1960's, fueled by the fire from the Southern civil rights movement. It threatened to challenge the foundations of monopoly capital, of white skinned privilege, of racial arrogance of the sort that has drained our treasury and our manhood and has created vast reservations of the unwanted on this country's soil. That movement became the partial victim of its own success. It fought for and won the right to sit in the front of the bus, to cast the vote, to sit at the lunch counter. It launched a Southern black political movement, but it failed to sustain and extend itself and instead saw itself dissipated by struggles on the edge.

For many, being black became a rhetorical, or sartorial, accomplishment. For many others, social commitment began to be measured by the length of your hair or the intricacy of your handshake. Many of the young people who some years ago were seen marching militantly in the streets are now found running nude on the college grounds, attempting to prove, perhaps, that all men are not created equal. (Scattered laughter).

The political process ought to be put on a constant test, not as an election day effort alone, but as another weapon in the arsenal that has always contained more pop guns than howitzers. The politics of protest in the streets in the 1960's discovered that publicly supported inequality at the lunch counter, the bus station, the movie theater would give in after a struggle. But the much more sophisticated, institutionalized inequalitites of the 1970's will not.

What is needed now is not the inception of old ideas, but the conception of new realities. We must halt the contraception of new ways of dealing with old problems and begin now to promote the birth of tomorrow's dreams. The incestuous relationship between government and America's affluent must cease, and we must halt the sterile relationship between the needy and their needs.

Over 40% of all young children in this country are not immunized against childhood disease. Approximately ten million poor children in this country get no health care at all. What is required to solve their problems and others that afflict families across this land is a comprehensive family support program financed from Washington, funded by progressive trust financing which would solve the health care and educational needs of our preschool young. It must recognize health care as a right, not as a privilege. It must insure consumer control of health and child care services. It must provide a full range of services needed by children and their families. It must assure community decision making based on community assessment of local needs. It must be flexible enough to provide options of both kinds of care and service. It must preserve existing community based care institutions, including Headstart and the neighborhood, home-based babysitter as options.

Four years ago a massive coalition of usually non-political Americans, most of them women worried about day care, massed their power to put through Congress a comprehensive bill that would have vastly altered child care services in America. Their effort fell victim to Presidential veto. But the new congress and today's failing economy demand that a second battle be fought to bring about a stronger federal presence in helping care for ourselves, our families, and our children.

It can be done by the construction of a massive and national movement again, a movement which might take as its watch words some words from the past from the late, great scholar W.E.B. DuBois who said, nearly a hundred years ago:

> "I believe in God who made of one blood all the races that dwell on the earth. I believe that all men--black and white and brown--are brothers, varying through time and opportunity in form and gift and feature but differing in no essential particular, alike in soul and in the possibility of infinite development. I believe in the devil and his angels who wantonly work to narrow the opportunity of struggling human beings, especially if they are black; who spit in the faces of the fallen; who strike them that cannot strike again; who believe the worst and work to prove it, hating the image which their maker stamped on a brother's soul. Finally I believe in liberty for all men, the space to stretch their arms and their souls, the right to breathe, the right to vote, the freedom to choose their friends, to enjoy the sunshine, to ride on the railroad uncursed by color, thinking, dreaming, working as they will in a kingdom of God and love."

Thank you.

(Questions and answers)

Q. What do you conceive the nature of this coalition that you say is necessary for us to move ahead in the area of child care services?

A. I think what's got to be done is you've got to try to put together people whose interests may coincide along this point--the desire for a strong federally funded, comprehensive child care and family services program. You've got to think of the United States, I think, as being composed of all these millions of people who are peripherally interested in that for different reasons. A mother who is head of a household wants that kind of service first so her children can be healthy mentally as well as physically, but also so she can have freedom, if she so desires it, to get out in the labor force. A professional woman already working may be displeased with the kind of care she is able to hire for the children while they're at home on the open market, so therefore, she's interested. Women who are increasingly joining the labor force, right now increasingly being forced out of it again, but over the long haul increasingly joining the labor force, are interested in it because increasing numbers of them are married. So what you do, hopefully, is you attract some of these, some of those, some of these, some of those, as well, I think, as their husbands, too, who ought to be interested in the same sort of thing. But I think those who most immediately feel affected have to be the people who get disturbed. And you put them all together and you settle on a legislative package, and you begin to put pressures on your Senators and your Congressmen, and you pray a lot, and if you're lucky, you get it.

Q. Mr. Bond, I hear you talking about lethargy, I think in terms of people's concern for politics and citizen's programs. Those of us who deal with family life run into lethargy, too. You mention that 40% of the children in the United States are not immunized. Do you have any suggestions how we can motivate America out of the lethargy we have gotten into, because of politics, because of the things we think we know?

A. Well, I think you have to appeal to their non-greedy selfishness, if you know what I mean. The selfishness that says, in a good sense, 'what's in it for me?' That if the worker, male head of the household sees his wife doing the things at home which are making a drudge out of her, and wants to free her from that in some way, then he may be interested in helping her, and that may motivate him into some political action. I guess what I'm really saying is I don't know how you get people interested in the political process unless they do it from a selfish point of view. Now, the Watergate scandals show you what happened when individual selfishness begins to be larger than national or group selfishness. But I think we have to appeal to people's group selfishness, their non-greedy selfishness. Say, 'Here's what politics does for you. This is what the political process can do for you.' And if you make the right appeal, I think they will respond rather quickly.

Q. Mr. Bond, would you like to comment, uh, on the state of the nation's economy. . . . There are many neglected Americans who are the first to have lost their jobs in the recent months. The time is going to come when their resources are going to be used up, the unemployment insurance is going to be used up. What's going to happen then?

A. Well, there are many people who predict that as the unemployment rolls get larger and larger, especially with these new people, I mean people who have had steady jobs for 10 or 15 years, as they join the unemployed and start lining up for welfare benefits that are going to run out themselves, there are some people who predict that there will be a tremendous, violent social upheaval in the United States. I tend to think not. I tend to think that people who become economically depressed, and therefore psychologically depressed, more often than not, turn on themselves, rather than striking out at real or imagined enemies. There is one danger in a country where unemployment figures rise, where the economy worsens and worsens. That is that the general population then becomes ripe for the appeal made by demagogues. A classic Hitler or Mussolini situation arises. Although the American people, I think, are capable of great goodness, they are also quite probably like everyone else, and have demonstrated in the past on occasion, they're capable of great evil too. But I don't expect there to be any hot summers, or riots of that kind. I think what you'd see, black America is an example today. The high crime rate is a classic example of rats in a barrel who do not attack the barrel which confines them, but begin to attack each other, and to crawl over each other in their attempt to get to the top.

Q. Mr. Bond, in light of the plight of many people today, do you think it would be a good idea to have a civil works program to clean up our cities and slums to get people back to work?

A. Yes. (Long pause, laughter.)

Q. Do you have any further comment?

A. That's it. (Laughter) I do think it would be a good idea to have another sort of WPA program, like the old CCC camps. I think we should have that in times of plenty as well as times of scarcity. There is no reason to wait until the unemployment figures go above four, because, as you know, when they're four for everyone, for black people, they're eight, and for black youth between eighteen and twenty-five, they're twelve. . . always three times as much as the standard figures. But I don't think there is any reason to wait until times get as bad as they are now, that we ought to have these kinds of social welfare, job providing and service producing programs all of the time.

Q. Mr. Bond, what kind of tax reform, if any, do you recommend in order to keep on paying a reasonable number of these national bills you mention?

A. Well, just this afternoon (I) was reading a report from the Brookings, what is called the respected Brookings Institute, which said that were we to do two things: (1) to eliminate existing loopholes, not add to anyone's ordinary tax burden but close existing loopholes, we would have sufficient funds to have an entirely federally funded system of public education in the United States, from the first grade all the way through graduate school, just by doing that one simple thing. If we were, in addition to doing that, begin to cut back in some areas of government spending where I think there is just too much, the military budget, say, cut back 30% to 35%, then you have monies enough to spread around. But don't even think about cutting. Just think about closing loopholes, and having these billions and billions of dollars available to us that some of us are paying so that others don't have to pay. In Georgia we have a tremendous tax reform, property tax rebate program. It's $35 million for all four million people in the state. If you're lucky and have a $20 to $30 thousand house, you'll get $30 dollars back.

Q. Mr. Bond, what is your position on the Equal Rights Amendment, and how do you feel about it?

A. Well, I was a co-sponsor of the Equal Rights Amendment in the Georgia Legislature this year and spoke on its behalf, but really fell out of favor with many of the feminist groups that were supporting it, many of whom thought that I was so unpopular in the legislature that if I supported it, it would die. The day the debate was to be held in the General Assembly in Georgia, a woman representing NOW said to me, "Please don't speak on this bill." I did, and it lost 33 to 22. But not because I spoke on it.

Q. Mr. Bond, I wonder if you would prefer to be Vice President before running for the Presidency?

A. No, I would not prefer to be Vice President at any time, before, after or during running for the Presidency. (Laughter) You know John Nance Garner, who was Roosevelt's Vice President, said that the Vice Presidency was as useful as a pitcher of warm spit, (laughter). He didn't say spit. In modern times it has come to be a "go-fur" job. I don't mean one of those little furry animals, but when they're sitting around and "I don't have any cigarettes, Spiro, go-fur some cigarettes." And I've never wanted to be a "go-fur."

## APPENDIX D

## SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

In an effort to harvest a more precise measure of Bond's ethos and image, a semantic differential questionnaire (following page) was developed for the purpose of being administered to selected members of an audience before and after a speech. However, no suitable occasion arose for which the profile would have provided reliable results. It is included here for the record.

Thirty continua were included to reflect the audience's perception in six more generalized areas: intelligence (items 5, 7, 13, 18, 20); integrity (1, 6, 9, 19, 30); good will (1, 3, 4, 10, 14, 24, 25, 29); attractiveness (3, 10, 21, 25, 28); leadership (2, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 17, 23, 28); political placement (16, 22, 26, 27).

The questionnaire was used on two occasions. The first was at the convention of the Southeastern Council on Family Relations in Chattanooga. The second was to a series of public speaking classes at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville. No effort is made to justify the results as reliable because of several obvious flaws in the sample groups.

In Chattanooga a random sample was selected from an audience preparing to hear Bond speak. They were asked to fill in the profile before the speech, and then they were given the same questionnaire following the speech. Nine respondents, approximately 10% of the audience, completed both the forms. Among the nine, only one person, a black visitor, had earned less than one post-graduate degree. The results showed a favorable shift from more neutral position in the categories of intelligence, integrity and leadership. No appreciable differences were evident in scores regarding political placement and attractiveness. A mixed response on good will was traced to the feeling among several respondents that Bond was "colder" and more "unsociable" than on the pre-speech profile. Other shifting continua showed a rise in "qualified" and "aggressiveness." The most dramatic shift was the feeling that the respondents found him uniformly more humorous than expected. As a whole, he scored highly in most of the positive categories.

The most significant factor with the public speaking students was that most didn't know him well enough to respond at all. Two-thirds were unable to answer the questionnaire, with many of those who did answer concentrating their answers in the noncommittal, neutral areas. Among the twenty who responded were all four of the black students included in the sample, some hint, perhaps, of his widespread recognition in the black community. Three were overwhelmingly favorable, as were the two blacks included in the Chattanooga sample. The other black student seemed to think Bond was too moderate. Among the white students, an equal number were neutral and favorable, with two being patently unfavorable. The two samples clearly illustrated the dichotomy between the black and white communities' knowledge and appreciation of Bond.

SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL PROFILE

Race _____ Age _____ Educational Level _____

Have you ever heard Julian Bond speak? _____ Have you ever seen him on television? _____

Rate Julian Bond in each category according to your impression of him.

*For example:* *If you feel that he is awful:* awful /✓/_/_/_/_/_/ nice

*If you feel that he is o.k.:* awful /_/_/_/✓/✓/_/ nice

*If you have no opinion (neutral):* awful /_/_/_/✓/_/_/ nice

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fair | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Unfair |
| Qualified | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Unqualified |
| Unpleasant | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Pleasant |
| Meek | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Aggressive |
| Informed | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Uninformed |
| Honest | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Dishonest |
| Superior | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Inferior |
| Decisive | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Wishy-washy |
| Unbiased | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Biased |
| Humorless | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Humorous |
| Leader | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Follower |
| Bold | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Timid |
| Expert | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Inexpert |
| Disrespectful | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Respectful |
| Successful | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Unsuccessful |
| Optimist | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Pessimist |
| Dependable | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Undependable |
| Relevant | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Irrelevant |
| Trustworthy | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Untrustworthy |
| Intelligent | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Stupid |
| Unattractive | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Attractive |
| Patriotic | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Unpatriotic |
| Competent | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Incompetent |
| Unfriendly | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Friendly |
| Cold | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Warm |
| Radical | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Reactionary |
| Liberal | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Conservative |
| Popular | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Unpopular |
| Unsociable | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Sociable |
| Constructive | / | / | / | / | / | / | / | Destructive |

Would you like to see Julian Bond become President of the U.S.? _____

# VITA

Gordon T. French was born in Utecamund, Kerola, India on February 28, 1949. He was the fifth son of missionary parents. During the formative years of his life he lived and attended school in Peru, Haiti and Puerto Rico as well as Benton, Illinois and Cleveland, Tennessee in the United States.

He attended Lee College in Cleveland, earning a bachelor's degree in sociology and graduating with honors in 1969. He accepted a graduate teaching assistantship in the Department of Speech and Theater at the University of Tennessee where he completed his coursework during the next school year.

In 1970-71 he was Instructor of Speech at Voorhees College, a black institution located in Denmark, South Carolina. Leaving the academic world, he joined the staff of the Maryville-Alcoa Daily Times. He moved to Atlanta and served as Advertising Manager for a group of suburban weekly newspapers. He had planned to expand his research on Julian Bond into a book, but Bond's decision not to run for President in 1976 removed that as a feasible course for action.