IDENTIFICATION IN THE CAMPAIGN SPEAKING OF
FRANK CLEMENT IN THE 1954 DEMOCRATIC PRIMARY

Stephen D. Boyd

Frank Goad Clement was a prominent political figure in Tennessee from 1952 through 1966. He served as governor of Tennessee longer than any other man, from 1953 through 1958, and from 1963 through 1966.[1] Throughout his career he was noted for his ability as a speaker. As one writer for a national magazine stated: "His compelling power as a public speaker . . . stems from a modern-dress revival of the William Jennings Bryan type of oratory."[2] The purpose of this paper is to analyze identification in the campaign speaking of Frank Clement in the 1954 Democratic primary. I have chosen this particular period in his career for three reasons: 1) This was the turning point in establishing a Clement organization which would dominate state politics for most of two decades;[3] 2) The campaign came at a time when Clement was nearing the height of his power as a political strategist and speaker; and 3) The campaign came at a time when Clement was at the height of his popularity with the voters. In the Democratic primary, Clement defeated veteran three-time governor Gordon Browning. He received 481,000 votes,[4] and carried 94 out of 95 counties.[5] At that time winning the Democratic primary meant virtual assurance of victory in the gubernatorial election because the

Republican Party was in the minority.

Kenneth Burke, one of the most profound students of rhetoric, has expanded upon various concepts from traditional principles of rhetoric to create what he calls a "new rhetoric." In an article entitled "Rhetoric--Old and New," he pointed out the distinguishing features:

> The key term for the old rhetoric was "persuasion" and its stress was upon deliberate design. The key term for the "new" rhetoric would be "identification," which can include a partially "unconscious" factor in appeal.[6]

I have chosen Kenneth Burke's identification to evaluate Clement's campaign speaking for three reasons. First, evaluation incorporating identification tends to focus on analysis of leading ideas rather than merely on detailed scrutiny of exact phrasing and style of the speaker's statements. Second, identification is a unitary principle which makes possible a close analysis of a speaker's relationship to his audience and how he reflects and influences the prevailing values and modes of thought. Third, the concept of identification is an extension of the Aristotelian approach in which there is extensive overlapping of critical criteria. For example, there is difficulty in separating logos from ethos.

A brief explanation will be made here of Burke's use of the term identification. The remainder of the paper will deal with the concept of identification operationalized in Clement's speaking by means of word choice, illustrative material, extra-verbal elements, and discussion of issues. Three progressively complex meanings of identification will be used to analyze Clement's speaking:

1) common ground; 2) an end to be achieved; and 3) a means of dissolving division.

It is important to realize that this key term of Burke's "new rhetoric" stems from his basic view of man. As Virginia Holland wrote about his philosophy in Counterpoint:

> The concept of identification is based upon the assumption that the beliefs and judgments of a person are in many respects similar to the judgments and beliefs of his fellows because all men have patterns of experience which are universal, permanent, and recurrent.[7]

Burke touched on the idea of common ground when he wrote: "Identification at its simplest is . . . a deliberate device as when the politician seeks to identify himself with his audience.[8] In this simple form of identification a speaker attempts to show that his views and attitudes are like those of his audience. By doing this he "identifies" with his audience and may make persuasion possible. As Burke explained in The Rhetoric of Motives: "You persuade a man only insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his."[9] This range of identity between speaker and audience is necessary to establish common ground.

However, Burke goes beyond this meaning of sharing interests and concepts. A second and more complex meaning is that identification can be seen as an end. This is evident when people desire or yearn to identify themselves with another group.[10] As Burke wrote in the Journal of General Education: "Here they are not necessarily being acted upon by a conscious external agent, but may be acting upon themselves to this end."[11] A young person may wear a certain type of clothing, or wear his hair a certain length,

to identify himself with a particular social or political group.

The same phenomenon can occur in a speaking situation in which a speaker talks or acts in a way which influences a listener to identify with a particular group. This concept of identification as an end will be observed in the speaking of Clement.

Thirdly, approaching identification from a somewhat different point of view, Burke talks about identification between different levels of abstraction as a means of dissolving division. As he pointed out in "Rhetoric--Old and New":

> . . .we may move from a world of disparate particulars to a principle of one-ness, an "ascent" got, as the semanticists might say by a movement toward progressively higher levels of generalizations.[12]

For example, two people may be talking about politics. One supports the present administration and the other does not. To seek unity, the two individuals seek a more general level of discussion. But on the next level they find that one is conservative politicaly and the other is liberal. Then they ascend to another level of abstraction and discover that each is very much interested in theory of development of political movements. This unifies them. Once this unifying principle is reached, a descent begins. As Burke continued: ". . . a Downward Way, back into the world of particulars, all of which would now be 'identified' with the genius of the unitary principle discovered en route."[13] Thus the two people might use their common interests. To say it another way, the two transcended their particular differences to reach the principle that unified them. The separateness was essential in the beginning in order for identification eventually to take place. As Marie

Nichols wrote in the <u>Quarterly Journal of Speech</u>: "Burke affirms
the significance of identification as a key concept because men
are at odds with one another, or because there is 'division.'"[14]
As Burke explained: "Identification is compensatory to division.
If men were not apart from one another there would be no need for
the rhetorician to proclaim their unity."[15]

A term basic to this third meaning of identification is
consubstantiality. It comes from Burke's emphasis on the nature of
substance, which he described as follows:

> . . . substance, in the old philosophies, was an act; and
> a way of life is an acting-together; and in acting together,
> men have common sensations, concepts, images, ideas,
> attitudes that make them consubstantial.[16]

Substance is an abstract term that implies permanence. It can
be any enduring idea, understanding, attitude, or concept that one
might hold. Thus, we might say that when a speaker relates his
"substance" in the Burkeian sense with the "substance" of his
audience, he has achieved consubstantiality with that audience.
Burke explained this identification and extended it to include a
kind of uniqueness:

> In being identified with B, A is "substantially one" with
> a person other than himself. Yet at the same time he
> remains unique, an individual locus of motives. Thus he
> is both joined and separate, at once a distinct substance
> and consubstantial with another.[17]

For example, a listener is a unique entity as he hears a sympathetic
discussion of his preferred political party. He may not agree with
everything the speaker says, yet he feels an identity with the
speaker because he believes in the same political philosophy.
Consubstantiality is achieved since he and the speaker share in
the same "substance."

In this discussion of consubstantiality we see that identification, in Burke's view, can be achieved at different levels, and we will see shortly that this has relevance for analysis of political speaking. If men cannot reach consubstantiality at one level, they keep moving to a higher level of abstraction until a unifying principle is attained. As Burke elaborated:

> All would be thus made consubstantial by participating
> in a common essence, as with objects bathed in the light
> of the one sun, that shines down upon them as from the
> apex of a pyramid.[18]

In discussing the meaning and use of the term identification, there are times when it is difficult to distinguish between persuasion, identification, and consubstantiality. Burke is aware of this. He wrote:

> . . . there is no chance of our keeping apart the meanings
> of persuasion, identification, ("consubstantiality") . . .
> But, in given instances, one or another of these elements
> may serve best for extending a line of analysis in some
> particular direction.[19]

This short analysis shows that three meanings of identification are: 1) common ground, 2) an end to be achieved, and 3) a means of dissolving division; now we turn to an analysis of Clement's speaking in the 1954 Democratic primary campaign.

IDENTIFICATION AS COMMON GROUND

As is characteristic of most political speakers, Clement was very careful early in his speeches to establish common ground with a local audience by saying complimentary and knowledgeable things about the town in which he was speaking. This characteristic is apparent in the beginning of each of the thirty available

manuscripts, and there is little doubt that these remarks were included in the actual speech since Clement did not usually deviate from the manuscript until after the introduction. When Clement addressed an audience in Pulaski on the subject of TVA, he began: ". . . I have chosen Pulaski as an appropriate place for my discourse. For it was in this fair and well-lighted city that TVA electricity was first distributed in Tennessee."[20] In the opening campaign speech in West Tennessee at Dyersburg, Clement asserted: "I am happy to be in the good county of Dyer and in this great section of Tennessee which has dealt so generously with me in all of my undertakings."[21] The most vivid example of the common ground element of identification was demonstrated in Clement's opening campaign address at Lebanon:

> From the historic rotunda of the Wilson County Courthouse--
> "far from the madding crowd's ignoble strife"--in the heart
> of the paradise we proudly call Middle Tennessee--where true
> blooded American citizens hold to the even tenor of their
> way--in the center of the tranquil and serene city of Lebanon,
> named for its Biblical counterpart, and surrounded by stately
> cedars as glorious as those from which Solomon of old build
> (sic) his temple; a city of culture and a seat of learning,
> located in a county which has enriched the public life of
> Tennessee by a host of statesmen and warriors; and presently
> populated by a people steeped in the traditions in which you
> and I believe; I open my campaign for a second term with
> pride, confidence, and enthusiasm.[22]

Douglas Fisher, Clement's publicity director, summarized this characteristic of his speaking by saying:

> Some part of his remarks were pitched to the local people.
> He would recognize campaign helpers--campaign committeemen
> that were there in the community. If there happened to be a
> public project in the community in which he had a part as
> Governor, certainly he would refer to that, . . .[23]

Demonstrating his knowledge of the history and activities of the county in which he was speaking was thus a typical way in which

Clement established common ground. Secondly, Clement was careful to discuss local problems and accomplishments in his speeches. Speaking at Maryville he stated that he was interested in a four-lane highway between there and Knoxville.[24] In Hickman County at Centerville he said his administration had spent $57,000 in Hickman County for roads. In Cheatham County at Ashland City he stated that Cheatham County had received $44,958 for its rural road program and $5,730 for improvements of Ashland City streets.[25] These examples are just a few of the many that are found in the accounts of his speeches.

A third way in which Clement identified with his listeners by establishing common ground was mention of family ties. As his eldest son said in an interview about the attitude of his father toward his family: "He was always proud of his family, you know, and he always wanted his family to be with him, and every opportunity he had to show off the family he would do just that."[26] This point was demonstrated in most accounts of his campaign speeches. He almost always took some members of his family with him and would usually refer to them at some point in his speech. At Brownsville his parents sat on the platform as he spoke. In that speech, reacting to the issue of his father's influence, Clement said: "I love and respect my daddy and I am not ashamed of this fact that I go to him for counsel and advice."[27] The "family tie" principle was an important part of his defense against charges by Gordon Browning (his opponent) that his father Robert Clement had made some illegal transactions in working for the State. For example, at Columbia

he said that even if such charges were true: "I'd still love him because he's my daddy. . . . No candidate will ever cause me to forget what the good Book says--'Honor thy father and mother.'"[28] In an overall defense of why he relied on his father, Clement pointed out at Cookeville: "I have sought the counsel of my father many times. You probably have too if you have a father."[29] The reference to family was an integral part of his campaign speaking. Harold H. Martin wrote:

> His speaking formula was infallible. He would begin quietly with a fifteen-minute homily on his wife and children, a re-cital of the little humorous, frustrating things which beset a family man.[30]

In an article reacting to the speaking of Clement, Mel Wax in the Chicago Sun-Times stated: "No speech is complete without mention of at least one, sometimes all, of the members of his attractive family."[31]

A fourth way in which Clement established common ground with his audience was through the use of the historical example. His favorite Tennessee heroes were Sam Houston and Davy Crockett. When he was in a part of the State where either had lived or worked, he would mention that in the speech. For example, in the beginning of his speech at Dyersburg, he said:

> This portion of our state was represented in Congress by a great Tennessean, the indomitable Davy Crockett who was cap-tured at the Alamo with his broken rifle in one hand and a butcher knife dripping with blood in the other, only to be murdered when he sprang to the defense of his companion cap-tives as they were killed by their treacherous captors.[32]

At Lebanon he proclaimed:

> Here your courtroom reverberated to the oratory of Sam Houston, that strange "man of mars and mystery," who was practicing law in Lebanon when the moving finger of destiny plucked him from your midst and started him upon a career unequaled in the annals of history.[33]

Clement referred to other native citizens, e.g., Andrew Jackson, Cordell Hull, and former governor James C. Jones, who had achieved renown as men of affairs and as Tennesseans. The crowds responded favorably to this material through identification with the famous figures of Tennessee history.

Thus, in almost every speech Clement identified with his audience by telling the people what a great city they lived in, by emphasizing importance of family, and by relating historical examples. The identification inherent in these materials was heightened by Clement's frequent use of the personal pronoun "we," making everyone a part of the speaking situation, and all people substantially one.

IDENTIFICATION AS AN END

A second way in which identification can occur, according to Burke, is an end to be achieved. It appears that the people of Tennessee saw in Clement what they wanted to be themselves, and to be identified with him was an end in itself. They saw in Clement the following ends which, by identifying with Clement, they could in part achieve: 1) the problem-solver for the State of Tennessee; 2) the exemplar of honesty, morality, and decency; 3) the symbol of hard work; 4) a humanitarian; and 5) the epitome of the "American Dream."

First, Clement sought to establish himself as the man who could solve the problems of Tennessee. He portrayed himself as a

twentieth-century "knight in shining armor." Everywhere he went
he extolled the accomplishments of his first eighteen months in
office. He demonstrated in his speeches that since he had been in
office major problems were being solved. Clement campaign pos-
ters, which were published weekly, emphasized his record. One
newspaper reported that Clement's ". . . speeches have largely been
devoted to a report to the people on his first term in office."[34]
Newspaper accounts of his speaking indicated that he spent a part
of every speech in "going to the record." For example, at Millington
in Shelby County, his report of the record of accomplishments of
his administration included seventeen points, most of which dealt
with problem-solving.[35] At Ashland City he stressed how his admin-
istration had saved money: "We have saved more than $11,500,000 on
tax collections."[36] In a speech at Gallatin, after his introduction
". . . Clement then launched into a detailed report on the operation
of state government during his administration."[37] At Columbia he
told what his administration had done for that county the past 18
months.[38] In every available manuscript of his campaign speeches
the body of the speech consisted largely of a record of his accom-
plishments or how he was solving the problems Tennessee faced when
he came into office. It is evident that Clement sought to place
himself in the minds of the people as the problem-solver for the
State of Tennessee. To identify with Clement was a way of believing
you were a part of the organization which was solving the problems
of Tennessee.

Second, for the audience to identify with Clement was an

end in itself because he sought to exemplify honesty, morality, and
decency in government. He made these themes in his campaign. In
the manuscript of his opening address of the campaign, which he
followed closely, Clement said:

> I promised to return honesty, decency, and morality to the
> executive branch of our government. I have kept that
> promise. I promised that the state's affairs would be
> conducted in a "political goldfish bowl." I have kept that
> promise. I promised that there would be no "man to see"
> and that the state's business would be conducted in public
> offices by public officials instead of politicians not
> connected with the state's government. That promise has
> been kept. I promised an unrelenting war against wasteful,
> extravagent and corrupt practices and they have been
> eliminated.[39]

To be part of this kind of government became a goal for voters to
achieve. Clement reminded people of what he stood for every time
he spoke. Speaking at Cleveland in reference to his raids on
gambling establishments, he said: "I mean business. As long as I
am governor of Tennessee, I will not sit back and tolerate outlaws
and other gangster elements who flout the law."[40]

Clement incorporated the theme of morality from another point
of view, that of admitting a mistake. In a speech to the Jaycee
Club in Chattanooga Clement said that he had made a mistake in
signing a bill which provided for a five dollar tax on small
automobile trailers. As the Chattanooga Times continued the account:

> My opponent has criticized me for signing that bill. I
> admit my mistake. I signed it. It was a poor bill . . .
> but I have admitted to the public that it was a mistake.
> I thought I had read the whole bill and what happened was
> that I didn't see that provision in it, I don't know . . .
> but I wish I hadn't signed it and I am going to have it
> repealed in January. My opponent has used it as a club
> and has ridiculed me all over the state but he has never
> acknowledged that he signed a bill once that didn't
> even have a caption on it . . . with the result that you

taxpayers are out $100,000 for a printing bill alone.

> The people of Tennessee are going to show August 5
> whether they prefer a man who will admit a mistake
> or one who operates on the principle that if you ever
> admit a mistake it amounts to political suicide.[41]

Thus, Clement through his speaking sought to make the voters believe they had a choice between good and evil and right and wrong; to vote for Clement was to obtain the end of righteousness and morality.

Thirdly, citizens could identify with Clement because he symbolized hard work. In Tennessee in the fifties, hard work was widely considered to be a virtue. When Clement talked about his accomplishments, he would include as many as seventeen points, as he did at Millington.[42] Thus he gave the impression to his audiences that to vote for him would be casting a ballot for hard work. A verse of a Clement song emphasized hard work:

> With the Lord as his guide, all out hearts fill with pride.
> At the work he has done day by day.
> So we will strike up the band for the best in the land.
> Give us Frank! Gov'nor Frank, all the way.[43]

Another way in which Clement symbolized hard work was in the campaign schedule he kept. In a report of his campaign one newspaper said: "Clement winds up a tedious week of 22 campaign speeches with four addresses Saturday. . ."[44] Flora Schreiber in _Coronet_ called Clement a "cyclonic campaigner."[45] Martin summarized the rigor of the campaign:

> In sixty days of campaigning he traveled 52,000 miles
> by plane and automobile, delivered as many as six hour-
> long speeches a day, and shook hands so frequently that
> a large callus sprouted between his forefinger and his
> thumb.[46]

Often he would start early in the morning and work late into the evening. Newspapers regularly reported this information to the public, and the voters were constantly reminded what a hard-working

person Clement was. Thus, to respect hard work was to identify with Clement.

A fourth way in which identification with Clement became an end to be achieved was through his portrayal as a humanitarian. He repeated frequently what he said in his opening speech at Lebanon:

> I hope that some day the opening paragraph of a Tennessee history yet to be written, will say of my administration: "During the humane administration of Frank G. Clement, Democrat of Dickson, from 1953-1959, the aged, the needy, the lame and the halt, the blind, and the mentally ill citizens of Tennessee, were the beneficiaries of unprecedented recognition and advancement. Clement was known as the humane governor."[47]

Wherever he spoke he stressed aspects of his humane program. In a television appearance at Johnson City, Clement emphasized his mental health program: "We have come far in the field of mental health, but must go further. Tennessee is pioneering in mental health and can set the standard for the nation."[48] The newspaper account of this speech continued: "Clement, who successfully sponsored a move by Southern governors for a regional study of mental health, announced a similar study has been inaugurated by states in the Great Lakes region."[49] In a speech at Waynesboro he related the history of his mental health program:

> . . .the history of the treatment of the mentally diseased in Tennessee is shocking and shameful. Until 1953, we isolated, segregated, and confined. When I took office, Tennessee was at the bottom of the list of all states in the care of the mentally diseased. Now we are taking the lead in attempting to correct, cure and restore our mentally diseased citizens to useful life.[50]

It is a common phenomenon for people to want to consider themselves concerned about other human beings. Clement sought to facilitate this end for his listeners by motivating them to vote for him. All references point to the conclusion that this concern

was not simply a political ploy, but a sincere endeavor on the part of Clement. As his eldest son commented to me when asked what his father liked about being governor: "I think, more than anything else, it was just being able to do something for so many people."[51]

A final way in which Clement's speaking encouraged his listeners to identify with him as an end goal was in epitomizing him as the "American Dream." In 1954, his was a storybook success story to which many people could relate. He grew up in modest surroundings, yet through hard work and ambition became successful at a youthful age. Achieving his childhood goal of being elected Governor at thirty-two impressed people. He was written about and talked about across the country. To be associated with his rise to fame could be considered an end. To be identified with Clement and to vote for him would in a sense mean being a part of a success story that one could not achieve on his own.

Being around people was for Clement one of the most enjoyable parts of campaigning. Having them respond to his speaking was of great importance to him. Except for his avowed enemies, there was mutual admiration between Clement and the public. There was strong identification when Clement came in contact through his speaking with the citizens of Tennessee.

IDENTIFICATION AS A MEANS OF DISSOLVING DIVISION

A third meaning of Burke's identification refers to seeking unity which will overcome division. To a large extent it is a matter

of reaching a level of abstraction or generality where two can agree. Clement sought identification in this way, first, by remaining general and ambivalent on the segregation issue, and, second, by his choice of words to describe the general goals of his campaign.

The issue on which Clement stated only the most obviously general views was that of racial segregation. He would not commit himself on it; no one could criticize his position since he did not take a stand. In his opening campaign address at Lebanon, in reacting to the Supreme Court's declaration that segregation was unconstitutional, he said:

> Inasmuch as no final decree has been entered--and in view of the fact that the court has invited participation by the states in further deliberation, no change is anticipated in our school system in the near future.
>
> It is obvious, therefore, that the greatest service we can render Tennessee at this hour is to refrain from making unnecessary political statements and, instead, address ourselves to the problem with the calm determination that we shall do everything possible to preserve and promote the neat progress Tennessee and Tennesseans have enjoyed in recent years.[52]

The Nashville Tennessean tried very hard to make Clement take a position on segregation. They would phone his office and send him telegrams but he held to his opening campaign statement. In reacting to the Nashville Tennessean's urging he said: "Making segregation a political issue in rabble-rousing speeches will do nothing to help find a logical solution."[53] Clement sought to maintain identification with the majority of the people of Tennessee by remaining general and ambivalent on this highly volatile issue. Had he taken a definite position for or against segregation, he would

have alienated segments of the voting population and destroyed
the identification between him and the public.

Noting that Clement identified with his audience by keeping
some statements ambivalent is not to say that this was a uniform
characteristic of his speaking. In many situations he developed
in detail support for his positions on problems of concern to the
citizens of Tennessee and thus maintained identification with them.
He liked a heated argument and never tried to avoid a lively dis-
cussion if the situation were appropriate. As Buford Ellington,
his campaign manager, said: ". . .he loved to scrap."[54] On at
least two occasions in the campaign he exchanged words with members
of his audience who questioned a particular statement or position.[55]
He dealt with specifics, but he also knew when it would be advan-
tageous to keep his statements general and more or less abstract.

The statement of goals of his campaign exemplified this form
of identification most vividly. Key words in his campaign were
honesty, decency, and morality. His concern was to maintain these
characteristics in the State's highest office. Most everyone could
agree on these points. Clement had a talent for relating many of
his positions and defenses to these words. A typical example was
a speech at Bradford where he said:

> The opposition can go to the gutter and gather up all the
> filth they want, but on Aug. 5 you, the people, will show
> them Tennessee stands for honesty, decency, and morality
> and those basic truths will come to light despite all at-
> tempts to cloud them with vilification.[56]

A most notable trait of Clement as an elected official was
his skill in platform speaking, and identification was a key factor

in his success. Clement needed positive feedback when he talked
to people. He liked to sense his audience become a part of him
as he talked about solving mutual problems together. He sought the
agreement of his audience when he spoke of honesty, morality, and
decency. When he was face to face with his listeners he could
sense the extent of his identification with them, and they with him.

Stephen D. Boyd (Ph. D., University of Illinois, 1972) is Assistant Professor of Speech at Northern Kentucky State College. The paper is derived from his doctoral dissertation under the direction of King Broadrick.

[1] _Dickson County Herald_, 6 November 1969.

[2] Wilma Dykeman, "Too Much Talent in Tennessee," _Harper's_, March 1955, p. 49.

[3] Through 1952 a governor could serve an unlimited number of two-year terms. A constitutional change in 1953, however, created a four-year term for governor and made it unlawful for a governor to succeed himself. Buford Ellington, a leading figure in the Clement organization, succeeded Clement in 1959. Clement succeeded Ellington in 1963, and finally Ellington succeeded Clement in 1967.

[4] William Raymond Majors, "Gordon Browning & Tennessee Politics," (Ph. D. dissertation, University of Georgia, 1967), p. 208.

[5] _Dickson County Herald_, 6 November 1969.

[6] Kenneth Burke, "Rhetoric--Old & New," _Journal of General Education_ 5(April, 1951): 203.

[7] Virginia Holland, _Counterpoint: Kenneth Burke and Aristotle's Theories of Rhetoric_ (New York: Philosophical Library, 1959), p. 27.

[8] Burke, _Journal of General Education_: 203.

[9] Kenneth Burke, _A Rhetoric of Motives_ (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1950), p. 55.

[10] Burke, _Journal of General Education_: 203.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Ibid., 204.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Marie Hochmuth (Nichols), "Kenneth Burke and the New Rhetoric," _Quarterly Journal of Speech_ 38(April, 1952): 137.

[15] Burke, _Rhetoric of Motives_, p. 22.

[16] Ibid., p. 21.

[17] Ibid.

[18] Burke, _Journal of General Education_: 204.

[19] Burke, _Rhetoric of Motives_, p. 46.

[20] Frank Clement, speech at Pulaski, Tennessee, 24 July 1954. A manuscript is located in Governor Clement's Papers in the Tennessee Library and Archives.

[21] _____, speech at Dyersburg, Tennessee, 12 June 1954. A manuscript is located in Governor Clement's Papers in the Tennessee State Library and Archives.

[22] _____, speech at Lebanon, Tennessee, 5 June 1954. A manuscript is located in Governor Clement's Papers in the Tennessee State Library and Archives.

[23] Interview with Douglas Fisher, Nashville, Tennessee, 14 August 1971.

[24] _Nashville Tennessean_, 10 June 1954.

[25] _Nashville Banner_, 14 June 1954.

[26] Interview with Bob Clement, Nashville, Tennessee, 21 August 1971. Subsequent references to Mr. Clement's remarks are drawn from this interview.

[27] _Nashville Tennessean_, 6 July 1954.

[28] _Daily Herald_ (Columbia), 12 July 1954.

[29] _Putman County Herald_ (Cookeville), 24 June 1954.

[30] Harold H. Martin, "The Things They Say About the Governor," _Saturday Evening Post_, 29 January 1955, p. 23.

[31] Mel Wax, "Young Man in a Hurry--Tennessee's Gov. Clement," _Chicago Sun-Times_, 19 June 1954.

[32] Clement, speech at Dyersburg.

[33] Clement, speech at Lebanon.

[34] _Putman County Herald_ (Cookeville), 17 June 1954.

[35] _Nashville Banner_, 4 August 1954.

[36] Ibid., 14 June 1954.

[37] Ibid., 31 July 1954.

[38]*Daily Herald* (Columbia), 12 July 1954.

[39]Clement, speech at Lebanon.

[40]*Nashville Banner*, 23 June 1954.

[41]*Chattanooga Times*, 3 August 1954.

[42]*Nashville Banner*, 4 August 1954.

[43]*Nashville Tennessean*, 11 June 1954.

[44]*Nashville Banner*, 16 July 1954.

[45]Flora Schreiber, "Tennessee's Political Evangelist," *Coronet*, July 1956, p. 98.

[46]Martin, *Saturday Evening Post*, p. 48.

[47]Clement, speech at Lebanon.

[48]*Nashville Banner*, 8 June 1954.

[49]Ibid.

[50]Ibid., 16 June 1954.

[51]Interview with Bob Clement.

[52]Clement, speech at Lebanon.

[53]*Nashville Tennessean*, 28 July 1954.

[54]Interview with Buford Ellington, Nashville, Tennessee, 18 August 1971.

[55]Following a speech at Benton when Clement had accused the sheriff, who was in the audience, of not cooperating with upholding the law, there was a confrontation. During a speech at Hartsville Clement had a confrontation with a member of the audience whom he had fired from a state office several months earlier.

[56]*Nashville Banner*, 26 July 1954.