71-23,716

CANFIELD, James Lewis, 1942-
THE WALLACE CAMPAIGN WORKER IN WAYNE COUNTY,
MICHIGAN.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1971
Political Science, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE WALLACE CAMPAIGN WORKER IN

WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

by
James Lewis Canfield

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Political Science)
in The University of Michigan
1971

Doctoral Committee:

        Professor Samuel J. Eldersveld, Chairman
        Professor Frank Grace
        Associate Professor Shaw Livermore, Jr.
        Assistant Professor Robert A. Schoenberger

ABSTRACT

THE WALLACE CAMPAIGN WORKER IN
WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN

by

James Lewis Canfield

Chairman: Samuel J. Eldersveld

This dissertation is concerned with the motivations of grass-roots Wallace activists in the 1968 presidential campaign. Interviews were conducted with 81 campaign workers in Wayne County, Michigan in order to determine the stimuli that attracted persons to a third party organization. The research design includes the following major variables: the socioeconomic background of Wallace campaign workers and the relevance of social explanations for third party behavior, the responses of Wallace activists to direct motivational questions and to possible satisfactions derived from third party activity, and the attitudes of these cadres toward the major parties and public policy.

The socioeconomic characteristics of the typical Wallace campaign worker include a working class occupation, high school education, Protestantism and Democratic party identification. In most of these attributes the Wallace activist resembles the Wallace voter except for the substantially higher income level of the activist. Social class incon-

sistencies exist in the cadre with the level of income substantially higher for most activists than the prestige of their occupation and education. However, other measures of social status anxieties reveal inconclusive evidence for this explanation of right-wing behavior.

The motivational patterns of Wallace campaign workers are strikingly in contrast to findings for major party activists. Wallace campaign workers are motivated by ideology--meaning political attitudes that are translated into policy concerns that the third party represents while, on the other hand, Republican and Democratic party activists often are attracted to a political party by economic and/or solidary incentives. Data on direct motivations, work satisfactions and attitudes toward the major parties emphasize the importance of the dissatisfaction of these third party workers with the issue positions of the major parties as well as their agreement with the principles of the Wallace party.

Two distinct groups emerge in the ideological concerns that have motivated persons to work for the Wallace party. Southern migrants, who comprise half of the respondents, are primarily dissatisfied with law and order problems which are highly correlated with their anti-Communist, anti-black and anti-civil rights attitudes. Concern over crime in the street, demonstrations, riots and inadequate law enforcement is greatest among southern migrants who also display substantial opposition to integration policy and equality of the races. The second group in the motivational patterns

of Wallace campaign workers can be labeled ultraconserva-
tives. Michiganders or natives of the state of Michigan
appear to be much more comprehensive in their range of policy
desires and in many areas closer to the goals of the radical
right.

This finding of two distinct groups in the ideology
of the Wallace cadre probably has great significance for
the organization of this third party, because the internal
and external activities of a minor party structure relate
to the motivations of its activists. Thus, we also comment
on the kinds of problems that are likely to occur or already
have emerged in the organization of the Wallace party.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

iii

iv

INTRODUCTION

Third parties have appeared with regularity on the American party scene but surprisingly little is known about the behavior of their cadres. While some empirical data exist in relation to voting support for third party movements, the activist level of these parties either has been ignored or too briefly examined. In addition, because research techniques have developed long after the appearance of most third parties at the national level, it has not been possible to gather evidence scientifically. However, with the presidential candidacy of George Wallace in 1968 an opportunity presented itself to study the political behavior of third party activists.

The focus of this research project is the cadre of the Wallace party. Interviews were conducted with campaign workers in Wayne County, Michigan in hope of gaining insight into the motivations and political concerns of persons who are attracted to the grass-roots level of a third party organization. Chapter I provides a theoretical framework for studying third party activists and presents major hypotheses that will be investigated in the study. Chapter II briefly examines the national level of the Wallace cadre and proceeds to explain the research design used in investi-

1

gating campaign workers in Wayne County, Michigan. Included in this design are the social and political characteristics of the area from which the respondents were drawn and the major variables employed in the analysis. Chapters III-VII contain the findings of the study with an emphasis on important subgroups in the party. Chapter VIII summarizes the main conclusions of the study and speculates on the implications of these findings for the future of the Wallace party.

This research project proceeds on the assumptions that third party movements have played an important role in the American party system and that a better understanding of such parties can be realized by examining the political behavior of their cadres. Also, the third party of George Wallace is a complex political phenomenon that includes different levels of political support, and it is hoped that a study of its campaign workers will add to the knowledge of the movement as a whole.

CHAPTER I

THE MOTIVATIONS OF THIRD PARTY ACTIVISTS

The organizational problems of a third party movement are many with the need for manpower resources, organizational continuity and leadership selection crucial for the operation of a minor party structure. The recruitment process is especially important, because no party can function adequately without a corps of activists that perform needed tasks for its organization. And the success that the party has in motivating individuals to its structure probably will determine the effectiveness of its recruitment goals. Thus the problem is to determine what kind of stimuli attract persons to a third party and to describe motivational patterns for minor party activists.

A political party, as an organizational system, can offer three types of incentives in order to attract persons to its ranks. One is material incentives--tangible rewards for party work in the form of jobs, food, money, wages and salaries. The second is solidary incentives--intangible rewards that have no monetary value and cannot be translated into anything that has such benefit. These rewards vary considerably and include a desire for political power, identity with the party, social friendships and status needs. The third is purposive incentives--ends or goals

3

that a party stands for induce the activist to join the party organization. Like solidary incentives these rewards are intangible but in the main are derived from the policies of the party rather than from the simple act of associating.[1]

Early empirical studies of party activists concluded that material incentives are crucial in luring persons to a party organization.[2] The political machine arose in the nineteenth century at the grass-roots level of the American party structure and within its mode of operation created economic enticements for party workers. Patronage was dispersed, most often in the form of the public payroll, to the party activist in return for getting out the vote:

> It has always been the theory of the Philadel-
> phia organization that the profits of the govern-
> ment payrolls was the only means by which the
> organization could be maintained in the state
> of efficiency, which has been the proud boast
> of the various political leaders. The idea is
> that the workers of any political organization
> must be paid to be dependable and efficient.
> Very few are willing to pull doorbells for the
> love of party.[3]

---

[1]Peter B. Clark and James Q. Wilson, "Incentive Systems: A Theory of Organizations," _Administrative Science Quarterly_ (September, 1961) VI, pp. 129-166. Also see Chester Barnard, _The Functions of the Executive_ (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), Chapter XI.

[2]Sonja Forthal, _Cogwheels of Democracy_ (New York: William-Frederick Press, 1946); Harold F. Gosnell, _Machine Politics: Chicago Model_ (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1937); David H. Kurtzman, _Methods of Controlling the Votes in Philadelphia_ (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943); and John T. Salter, _Boss Rule_ (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935).

[3]Kurtzman, _op. cit._, p. 40.

Although more recent research concludes that the patronage base of the party machine in the city has deteriorated, economic incentives still play an important role in the recruitment process of some party organizations. Peter H. Rossi and Phillips Cutright find that patronage in the form of jobs and money is still important in the industrial midwest, especially in heavily populated Negro areas where minority groups have a need for econômic rewards.[4] Another study discloses that the party activist in St. Louis is in some ways quite similar to the machine politician with 43% of the activists holding jobs on the public payroll.[5]

However, economic incentives do not appear to be attractive for third party activists. At the time that the machine was at its heighth in the cities, the rural Granger, Greenbacker and Populist movements included in their platforms proposals that opposed the corruption, favoritism and undemocratic methods of machine politics. Pointing towards more purposive goals, the 1892 platform of the Populists included a demand for the elimination of the selfish tendencies of structures that profited at the expense of the poor and demanded that the people control these organizations. Advocacy of the direct primary, secret ballot, initiative, referendum and recall was aimed at democratizing structures and

---

[4]Peter H. Rossi and Phillips Cutright, "The Impact of Party Organization on an Industrial Setting," in Morris Janowitz, editor, Community Political Systems (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1961), pp. 81-116.

[5]Robert H. Salisbury, "The Urban Party Organizational Member," Public Opinion Quarterly (Winter, 1965-66) XXIX, pp. 550-564.

removing patronage. Despite the fact that these insurgent

agrarian movements were based on economic grievances their

cadres expressed larger policy concerns:

> Fully aware of the habits of party bosses in
> manipulating nominating conventions, the Popu-
> lists veered more and more in the direction of
> direct primary elections, urging in some of
> their later platforms that nominations for
> President and Vice-President be made by direct
> vote.[6]

The Progressive movement of Robert M. LaFollette in

1924 echoed these requests for democratizing party machinery

by recommending the popular election of the judiciary, the

direct nomination and election of the president and the

use of popular referenda in making public policy. Arising

out of the postwar economic grievances of the laborer and

farmer over their inattention by the controlling business

community, the Progressive party activist aspired to pur-

posive goals prophetic of the New Deal:

> At a time when the great majority of the Ameri-
> can citizenry was too engrossed with the making
> of money and the promotion of its own economic
> advantages, a group of respectable farm and
> labor leaders, together with a scattering of
> intellectuals and practical politicians risked
> their political futures as they stood, like
> Canute, against the rising flood of Coolidge
> complacency.[7]

Thus, third party movements were responsible for initia-

ting reforms in political organization that eventually became

law and destroyed a large portion of the patronage utilized by

---

[6]John D. Hicks, The Populist Revolt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931), p. 406.

[7]Kenneth Campbell MacKay, The Progressive Movement of 1924 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947), p. 16.

city, party and political machines. Even though the Populists

and Progressives were concerned about economic grievances of

their own, their motivations appear to be more goal orientat-

ed and repugnant to personal economic rewards for party

activity. The direct primary, civil service and social

welfare proposals, originated by third parties, were respon-

sible for the decline of patronage in the American party

organization and the deterioration of machine politics.

Recent studies of party recruitment have emphasized that

solidary incentives are essential in understanding the attrac-

tion of activist to political party. Harold Lasswell believes

that American parties are founded on political power which

in turn implies that individuals are motivated to party

organization in order to receive office-holding rewards.

Political man accentuates power, demands power for the self

and acquires a maximum proficiency in the skills of power,

explains Lasswell, and has a political personality that

naturally gravitates to a power-based organization like a

political party.

> We speak of political participation when we are
> describing various roles involved in the making
> and execution of decisions. Furthermore, there
> are linkages of many kinds, strong or weak, be-
> tween the playing of these roles and the nuclear
> drives of any given personality.[8]

---

[8]Harold D. Lasswell, "Effects of Personality on Political
Participation," in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda, editors,
Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Person-
ality (Glencoe: Free Press, 1954), p. 197. This approach
is linked to the authoritarian personality in Louise Harned,
"Authoritarian Attitudes and Party Activity," Public Opinion
Quarterly (Fall, 1961) XXV, pp. 393-397.

Thinking along similar lines other scholars have formulated
the concept of a political career in relation to this desire
for power.[9] Advancing the hypothesis that party workers
are aspiring not only to gain public office but to enhance
their power within the party itself, the activist is seen as
a shrewd calculator in relation to his possibilities for
advancement. Evidence for the two major parties lends sup-
port to this supposition with many precinct leaders in Detroit
desiring to move up in the party as their reward for partici-
pation.[10] Also, rural workers in downstate Illinois hope
to utilize their party activity for achieving power positions.[11]

Another solidary incentive that has been discovered in
political recruitment studies is identity with the party
through the socialization process. According to this view,
the family plays an important role in activating the indivié-
ual because it implants a value system receptive to the
party label and requires only a small stimulus from the party
organization itself.[12] Many empirical studies have detected

[9]Joseph A. Schlesinger, "Political Careers and Party
Leadership," in Lewis J. Edinger, editor, Political Leader-
ship in Industrialized Societies (New York: John Wiley and
Sons, 1967), pp. 266-293.

[10]Samuel J. Eldersveld, Political Parties: A Behavioral
Analysis (Chicago: Rand McNally Company, 1964), pp. 118-175.

[11]Phillip Althoff and Samuel C. Patterson, "Political
Activism in a Rural County," Midwest Journal of Political
Science (February, 1966) X, pp. 39-51.

[12]Herbert Hyman, Political Socialization (Glencoe: Free
Press, 1959), p. 85; and John Wahlke, Heinz Eulau, William
Buchanan, and LeRoy Ferguson, The Legislative System (New
York: John Wiley and Sons, 1962), p. 79 and p. 94.

the influence of the family in the recruitment of activists
with at least one maintaining that this variable is the
underlying motivation for party workers:

> Our findings suggest that much political be-
> havior is to be explained as habitual. It
> is not directly derived from the intellectual,
> economic, social or characterological features
> of the actors. It is an aspect of life style
> that has been accepted uncritically since child-
> hood by a relatively small number of people in
> society.[13]

Social rewards are an important incentive in the re-
cruitment of party cadres. Samuel J. Eldersveld describes
the primary motivation for Detroit precinct leaders as
social group benefits such as a desire for good fellowship,
excitement, social recognition, prestige and friendship.
Eldersveld concludes that in the early stages of party
activity the cadre may have been idealists but through
exposure to the party they were soon acclimated and social-
ized to expect personal satisfactions and to stay in the
party because of them.[14] Also, Rossi and Cutright find
that in an area where remnants of a party machine exist,
sociability is a significant variable in the recruitment
process, especially among middle-class whites where economic
rewards are no longer attractive.[15] In addition, the status
argument has been employed to explain the motivations of

---

[13]Salisbury, op. cit., p. 564.

[14]Eldersveld, op. cit., Chapter 11.

[15]Rossi and Cutright, op. cit., pp. 81-116.

a number of party recruits. Dwaine Marvick and Charles
Nixon conclude that the Democratic party in Los Angeles
has faced a variety of problems because of the need among
its activists for status recognition while the Republican
party in the same city has avoided structuring party activi-
ties around status recognition.[16] Several other studies
find that party workers tend to be upper-status individuals
which consequently shapes the incentives offered by the
party.[17]

However, for third parties, solidary incentives may have
limited applicability. First, it is acknowledged that be-
cause of the single member district system of election the
chances for a minor party to gain elective office are slim.
Consequently, the possibility of an activist achieving an
office-holding reward for his participation appears to be
equally remote. Certainly it is erroneous to label third
parties in the American election system as power-laden
political structures. Second, because third parties have
not remained on the political scene for a long period of
time, the socialization process and social group relation-
ships may not have had time to develop. Familial influence

---

[16]Dwaine Marvick and Charles Nixon, "Recruitment Contrasts
in Rival Campaign Groups," in Dwaine Marvick, editor, Political
Decision-Makers: Recruitment and Performance (New York: Free
Press, 1961), pp. 193-217.

[17]Lewis Bowman and G. R. Boynton, "Recruitment Patterns
Among Local Party Officials: A Model and Some Preliminary
Findings in Selected Locales," American Political Science
Review (September, 1966) LX, pp. 667-676; Gerald Pomper, "New
Jersey County Chairmen," Western Political Quarterly (March,
1965) XVIII, pp. 186-197; and Samuel C. Patterson, "Char-
acteristics of Party Leaders," Western Political Quarterly
(June, 1963) XVI, pp. 332-352.

requires that a party remain on the political scene for a number of years in order to transfer the values of the parent to the child. And social needs for minor party activists probably are limited because of the rudimentary stage of social relationships in the party structure. Eldersveld concludes that cadre motivations are more often of an ideological nature in the beginning stages of party recruitment than after exposure to the party organization for a number of years.[18]

Another view of party recruitment emphasizes that a study of purposive incentives is essential to comprehension of the motivations that attract party activists to party organization. An individual party actor has certain political attitudes that are translated into policy concerns that the party represents, and he works for the party in order to move the governmental system towards those goals. This type of reward is intangible in nature and transcends personal needs in order to fight for societal causes. One study of national party convention delegates of the Republican and Democratic parties proceeds on the assumption that parties "are not simply spokesmen for other interest groups, but are in their own right agencies for formulating, transmitting and anchoring political opinions, that they attract adherents who in general share those opinions."[19] In short,

---

[18]Eldersveld, op. cit., p. 288.

[19]Herbert McCloskey, Paul J. Hoffmann and Rosemary O'Hara, "Issue Conflict and Consensus among Party Leaders and Followers," American Political Science Review (June, 1960) LIV, p. 407.

members of a party organization are brought together on
the basis of ideological agreement:

> No more conclusive finding emerges from our
> study of party issues than those growing out
> of comparisons between two sets of party lead-
> ers. Despite the brokerage tendency of the
> American parties, their active members are
> obviously separated by large and important
> differences. The differences, moreover con-
> form with the popular image in which the Demo-
> cratic party is seen as the more progressive
> or radical and the Republican party as the more
> moderate or conservative of the two.[20]

Other works demonstrate the significance of political
attitudes in the recruitment of party cadre. James Wilson,
in a study of a new kind of amateur politician in the Demo-
cratic party, finds issue concerns the primary motivation
for political activity. Amateurs emphasize ideas and prin-
ciples of the party rather than concerning themselves with
winning or losing and thus project an opposite image from
the professional politician in a party machine.[21] Another
study of the political activist in New York City concludes
that the nature of political motivation and the character
of political activity have changed and that the contemporary
party organization is "an instrument for effectuating policy
rather than a haven of personal security".[22]

For the major parties this view of party recruitment

---

[20]*Ibid.*, p. 410.

[21]James Wilson, *The Amateur Democrat: Club Politics
in Three Cities* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
1962), Chapter V.

[22]Robert S. Hirschfield, Bert E. Swanson and Blanche D.
Blank, "A Profile of Political Activists in Manhattan," *Western
Political Quarterly* (September, 1962) VI, p. 505.

overstates the case. More integrative approaches suggest that ideology is important in the recruitment of party activists, but that social friendships and political socialization are also significant contributing factors.[23] Eldersveld finds very little ideological motivation among precinct leaders in Detroit, although at higher levels of the party political attitudes toward public policy are important incentives. Thus, what emerges in the recruitment patterns of the traditional parties is a kind of "motivational pluralism" with ideology important for the political activity of some leaders while for others solidary incentives are more salient.[24]

For American third parties, however, the hypothesis can be advanced that political attitudes are key variables in the recruitment process. Third parties are quite different from the larger parties in that they arise to express concerns over critical issues that the major parties are either ignoring or answering with unsatisfactory solutions. The entire existence of a third party appears to be based on the premise that the policy positions of the regular parties have to be changed and more purposive goals attained. While the Republican and Democratic parties often have to act as brokers of a variety of ideological positions within their cadres, third parties are formed on the basis of

---

[24]Eldersveld, op. cit., Chapter XI. For a summary of incentives for the major parties see Frank J. Sorauf, Party Politics in America (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1968), Chapter IV.

homogeneous political attitudes; consequently the third party

is able to take stronger positions on public policy:

> A marked upthrust of minor party strength is
> symptomatic of an incapacity of one or the other
> of the major parties to cope with the issues
> of the moment in a manner to maintain party
> unity....
> An outburst of third party activity occurs to
> realign the parties, reorient their policies,
> or perhaps to redirect one of the major parties.[25]

When any organization is formed for the first time

it must rely on purposive incentives because it has few

resources other than its goals. In the case of political

parties they arise in their formative stages on the basis

of policy positions, but over the course of many years

formulate additional material and solidary incentives with

changes in activist motivations. The hypothesis is that

as a party develops purposive incentives decline and material

and solidary incentives increase because the needs of its

potential cadre have changed. In the case of the third

party, purposive incentives are important because these

other factors have not had time to develop.

Therefore, while the major American parties recruit

activists from a variety of motivational concerns that

often serve to blur or mute ideological differences, third

parties appear to thrive on policy concerns, accentuate

issue positions and exist on the basis of ideological differ-

ences from the larger parties. Because these minor parties

---

[25]V. O. Key, _Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups_
(New York: Crowell Company, 1964) fifth edition, p. 281.
All of Chapter X concerns minor parties in the American
party system.

are short-lived in nature and lack an established structure,
the organizational incentives that characterize the tradi-
tional parties, such as material and solidary rewards, are
difficult to offer. A third party probably exists on the
basis of its policy appeal because it has little else to
offer.

While empirical studies are fragmentary in relation
to third party cadres, some evidence can be drawn to lend
support to these hypotheses. Activists in the Populist
movement were motivated by a party ideology based on economic
grievances. Midwestern and southern farmers saw their prices
dropping, overproduction, and debts accumulating, and turned
to the political system for assistance. At first seeking
a panacea in an easy money policy, the farmer joined the
Granger and Greenbacker movements but as the situation
worsened the Populist party articulated his economic griev-
ances into a comprehensive political ideology. The demands
for government ownership of the railroads, regulation of
corporate structures and deficit financing for the farmer
were aimed at removing the plutocracy which the Populists
felt was destroying the government. The desire for a direct
primary, initiative, referendum and recall would be a first
step to democratize the party and governmental system to
achieve those policy goals.

> The Populist philosophy boiled down to two
> fundamental propositions. Government must
> restrain selfish tendencies of those who
> profited at the expense of the poor and needy

and that the people not the plutocrats must control government.[26]

The desire for transformation of public policy also characterized the Progressive movement of 1924 and the Dixiecrats of 1948. The activist in the Progressive party was disturbed by policy directions of the federal government that were helping the business community and not accounting for the plight of the farmer and the laborer after World War I. Advocating policy positions prophetic of the New Deal, the Progressives demanded social welfare measures, government regulation of industry and democratization of political structures.[27] The Dixiecrats of 1948 also were concerned about national policy trends and in their case one specific policy--civil rights:

> Among the leaders of the Dixiecrats were many zealots. They saw readily that their greatest chance for sure, if limited, popular appeal lay in the South's ancient fears of race. They translated their whole opposition to the Democratic party's economic and social programs into warnings against civil violence and enforced social intermingling between the races.[28]

Subsequently, the Populists and Progressives saw a number of their policy proposals adopted by the major parties and thus led to the disbanding of their movements. The Dixiecrats failed to receive a clear denunciation of civil rights

---

[26]Hicks, op. cit., p. 406.

[27]MacKay, op. cit., p. 11.

[28]Alexander Heard, A Two-Party South (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1952), p. 161.

policy by either major party but eventually were accomodated in the larger party ranks when the racial question was downplayed in future party platforms.[29]

Other studies of third party behavior substantiate the view that political attitudes play an important role in the recruitment of party activists. Hirschfield, Swanson and Blank find that the cadre of the Liberal party in New York City voice issue positions as their motivation for party activity. Liberal attitudes toward established institutions and ideas, social change, governmental power and minority groups are responsible for their recruitment, according to Hirschfield, et. al., and is the one distinguishable difference between the Liberal party and the larger parties.[30] Robert A. Schoenberger, in an analysis of the political attitudes of Conservative party members and activists in an upstate New York county, concludes that both elements of this party are primarily opposed to the expansion of the federal government in domestic economic affairs.[31] In short, third parties at the state level depend on policy considerations for their incentive systems.

The conjecture is more vivid for what Key labels "doctrinal"

---

[29]Key, _op. cit._, Chapter X.

[30]Hirschfield, Swanson and Blank, _op. cit._, pp. 500-505.

[31]Robert A. Schoenberger, "The New Conservatives: A View from the East," in Robert A. Schoenberger, editor, _The American Right-Wing_ (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969), pp. 280-298.

minor parties in the American system. These parties, unlike the non-recurring third party movements, are based on ideologies of an extreme nature.[32] The Socialist, Socialist Labor and Communist parties expound policy preferences that are far to the left of the other American parties and therefore have found little success in getting their commitments fulfilled. This situation has resulted in a number of problems for the doctrinaire minor party. First, their organizations have been plagued by internal strife, with one faction trying to place the blame on another's policy statements for their lack of success. Second, attracting activists over a long time period, predominately on the basis of ideology, has resulted in recruitment disagreements over what kinds of individuals are philosophically acceptable to the party cause.[33]

> The history of the fissions and internal battles
> of the socialist movement makes a complex story
> that is recounted with great solemnity by partici-
> pants in the movement. Spokesmen for each faction
> and splinter acclaim themselves as the true apos-
> tles of Marx and denounce each other as traitors
> to the master, all with little effect on the Ameri-
> can political scene.[34]

In summary, the following hypotheses can be advanced concerning the motivational patterns of third party activists. First, persons are attracted to a third party organization

---

[32]Key, op. cit., pp. 267-273.

[33]J. P. Cannon, The Struggle for a Proletarian Party (New York: Pioneer, 1943); David A. Shannon, The Socialist Party of America (New York: Macmillan Company, 1955); and Theodore Draper, The Roots of American Communism (New York: Viking Press, 1957).

[34]Key, op. cit., p. 268.

primarily on the basis of purposive rather than material or solidary incentives. In contrast to the recruitment of major party activists, who often receive economic and social rewards in return for party labor, third party cadres are motivated by ideological commitment. Second, profound disagreement with the issue stands of the major parties will be in evidence in the political views of third party activists, revealing their distaste for the ideological boundaries of traditional structures. On the other hand, the issue positions expounded by the third party organization will be in harmony with the political beliefs of its cadres and further divulge the importance of purposive incentives for inducing party activism. Third, the content of the political attitudes of minor party activists will describe the kind of alienation on which these motivational patterns are based. Thus, an understanding of third party cadres necessitates an intensive analysis of political attitudes in order to determine how these attitudes constitute an ideological framework.

CHAPTER II

THE WALLACE CADRE: NATIONAL ORGANIZATION,

INTERNAL CONFLICT AND RESEARCH DESIGN

The appearance on the American political scene of a

third party that received 13.5% of the popular vote in

1968 has renewed scholarly interest in third party behav-

ior.[1] George Wallace not only received the largest per-

centage of the vote since LaFollette in 1924 and the largest

number of votes in the history of American third parties,

but also recruited a party cadre who worked on his behalf

in the presidential campaign.[2] Yet fragmentary evidence

exists as to the political behavior of Wallace activists

and the alienation that lies at the base of their recruit-

ment. What are the political attitudes of the Wallace

cadre and how do these attitudes relate to the campaign

appeal of the candidate from Alabama? What kinds of policy

---

[1]Philip E. Converse, Warren E. Miller, Jerrold G. Rusk and Arthur Wolfe, "Continuity and Change in American Politics: Parties and Issues in the 1968 Election," unpublished paper presented at the American Political Science Association Meeting, New York City, 1969; and James McEvoy, III, The American Right-Wing (Forthcoming Publication), Chapter V.

[2]The only studies of the Wallace movement that mention his cadre and then very briefly are Seymour Martin Lipset, "George Wallace and the U. S. New Right," New Society (October 31, 1968) XXI, pp. 477-483; and Seymour Martin Lipset and Earl Raab, "The Wallace Whitelash," Transaction (December, 1969) VII, pp. 23-32. Reprinted by the Anti-Defamation League, pp. 1-12.

goals do Wallace activists voice in their apparent disagreement with the issue stands of the major parties?

Internal conflict characterizes the Wallace cadre at the national level with two distinct rival organizations claiming to be the national spokesman of the party. The first group, the American Party, was formed on May 3 and 4, 1969, in a meeting of 160 delegates from 38 states. A Virginian, T. Coleman Andrews, long active on the ultra-conservative front, was chosen chairman and announced that the new party would embrace what previously was the American Independent party, the Association of George C. Wallace Voters, the Wallace party, the Courage party, and the old state-level American party. Wallace's proclamation of this party as his official national organ was reflected in the number of top Wallace aides that attended this meeting: Robert Walter, who represents Wallace in California; Tom Turnipseed, a major figure in the Wallace presidential effort; Dan Smoot, radical right radio commentator; and Kent Courtney, editor of the Conservative Journal.[3]

The second national group is the National Committee of Autonomous State Parties officially named the American Independent party, American party, Independent party, Conservative party, Constitutional party.[4] This organization

---

[3]Lipset and Raab, op. cit., p. 2. See also New York Times, June 22, 1969, p. 13.

[4]Ibid., p. 2.

met in February, 1969, and convened for a second larger gathering in December of the same year. The national chairman of this group, William K. Shearer of California, emphasized that his organization was a national conservative party composed of autonomous state parties, and not a personal tool of George Wallace. Shearer admitted that Wallace was their present choice for national leadership but expressed some doubts about Wallace controlling their party organization:

> Governor Wallace has not shown any interest in
> a national party apart from a personal party.
> A candidate properly springs from the party and
> not the party from the candidate. While we
> have great respect for Mr. Wallace, we do not
> think there should be a candidate-directed sit-
> uation. We want our party to survive regardless
> of what Mr. Wallace does.[5]

In their second meeting in Indianapolis, Indiana, the Shearer group passed four major resolutions that elucidate their differences with the other national organization, the American party. First, a measure was passed creating a new party substructure in Alabama on whose ticket Wallace might run for governor in 1970. (Wallace subsequently refused and ran on the Democratic party ticket.) Second, an effort would be made to secure the support of Wallace for a new united organization that would convene before 1972, drafting a platform and endorsing his candidacy. (Wallace did not reply.) Third, an acknowledgement was directed at the respect that

---

[5]Ibid., p. 2.

Wallace had shown in the past for an organization of separate political structures and a reminder to him that his pledge was not to interfere with the internal affairs of the party. Finally a denunciation was made of the new American party which contained a denial that T. Coleman Andrews was the true national chairman of the Wallace movement.[6]

Behind the animosity over Wallace's controlling the party organization lie economic differences between the two rival party structures. During the convention of Autonomous State Parties Wallace was criticized as being "too liberal" for his advocacy during the campaign of enlarged social security benefits. On the other hand, the rival American party endorsed the entire range of ideas promulgated by Wallace and pledged to continue the struggle for economic reform that assists the working man.

This dispute over social welfare policy goes back to the 1968 platform of the American Independent party. In what was largely a personal document made public by Wallace on October 14, 1968, it was urged that social security payments be increased by 60% with the setting of a minimum of $100 a month for each beneficiary. Also, wider medicare benefits were advocated along with greater federal involvement in pollution problems.[7] Presumably, the more conservative

---

[6]New York Times, December 7, 1969, p. 38.

[7]New York Times. October 14, 1968, p. 1.

Shearer group now believes that these ideas are too liberal and as a result does not want to be tied to George Wallace.

Acceptable in the platform to both national organizations are the demand for an end to minority appeasement and federal intervention into the affairs of schools, the desire for greater use of the police to maintain domestic order, the demand for a stiffer defense policy with increased reliance on military expertise, and a proposal aimed at making the federal judiciary more responsive to popular opinion by periodically subjecting judges to reconfirmation by the Senate.[8]

What is in evidence in the national cadre of Wallace is a split between the ultraconservative camp that opposes social welfare policy and the racial conservative camp that has adopted a Populist flavor along with opposition to civil rights legislation. In the Wallace platform the emphasis is clearly on the latter with a multitude of benefits outlined for the aged and downtrodden, which is repulsive to the economic conservative. On the other hand, substantial agreement with Wallace on a number of other issues still makes him an attractive national figure.

Many noted conservatives would not join the Wallace campaign for president because of their concern over his liberal ideas on social welfare policy. In an article entitled "Don't Waste a Vote on Wallace," Barry Goldwater

---

[8]Ibid., p. 41.

explains that while Wallace has much appeal to conservatives with his clamors for patriotism, law and order and anti-Communism, he is basically a liberal on economic issues and does not desire to return to a free enterprise system.[9] The *National Review*, noted conservative publication of William Buckley, concludes that Wallace was a big spender while he was governor of Alabama when "he tripled the state's debt, promoted public handouts and only harped on the racial issue".[10] Another author, writing in this same publication, charges that Wallace is against the power of the federal government because of its racial policies, but otherwise he is not a strict constructionist, favors governmental spending and lacks respect for institutions like the two-party system. "Except for the race issue, there is no reason why we could not have a Hubert Humphrey-George Wallace ticket in 1968."[11]

What distinguishes the ultraconservative, who is attracted to Wallace, from the more traditional conservative is an emphasis on destroying the internal Communist conspiracy which lessens his reverence for traditional structures. Wallace, despite the fact that he urges social welfare measures, advocates separation of the races, fighting the Communist conspiracy and creating new political structures, all of which pleases

---

[9]Barry Goldwater, "Don't Waste a Vote on Wallace," *National Review* (October 22, 1968) XX, pp. 1060-1079.

[10]Frank S. Meyer, "The Mandate of 1968," *National Review* (November 19, 1968) XX, p. 1170.

[11]John Ashbrook, "And Anyway is Wallace a Conservative?", *National Review* (October 22, 1968) XX, pp. 1048-1049.

the radical right. In short, the ultraconservative is willing to put up with Wallace on economic issues because of agreement on other issues fundamental to his ideology.

The influence of the radical right and its conspiracy theory of history is a theme that appears to be important in explaining the political concerns of the Wallace cadre. T. Coleman Andrews, chairman of the economically more liberal of the two main national organizations, announced that he believes in the conspiratorial theory of history as promoted by the John Birch Society:

> I believe in the conspiratorial theory of History... The Birch Society has been responsible, respectable. People are beginning to see that its original theories were right... There is an international conspiracy.[12]

The New York Times reports that members of the radical right played leading roles in the Wallace campaign, especially in the western states. Specifically, in Idaho the Wallace party's state chairman was a former field representative of the Liberty Lobby; in Colorado, of the six electors pledged to Wallace in the 1968 election, two were members of Citizens Councils and two were members of the John Birch Society; in California the John Birch Society created 70 special registrars who signed up an estimated 3,900 third party members; and in Nevada all three of the electors

---

[12]Lipset and Raab, op. cit., p. 12.

pledged to Wallace were members of the Birch society.[13]

Although Wallace was careful during the presidential campaign not to be allied with radical right organizations, he was supported in 1968 by Robert Shelton's Ku Klux Klan, White Citizen Councils and drew praise in the official publication of the John Birch Society, American Opinion.[14] Finally, on August 3, 1969, Wallace for the first time endorsed publicly a radical right organization, the Christian Crusade of Billy James Hargis. Hargis, who considers himself the religious savior in the holy war against Communism, introduced Wallace to a Tulsa, Oklahoma crowd with an appeal to "keep this man going with financial contributions for his campaign".[15] Wallace in his address said, "it's a pleasure to be associated with him(Hargis) and to endorse the work the Christian Crusade carries on against Communism".[16] Also, Wallace attended the meeting of the Citizens Councils of America on August 30, 1969, in Jackson, Mississippi and endorsed the law and order theme of that segregationist organization.[17]

Bringing together every conceivable kind of right-wing support has posed a number of problems for George Wallace. The fact that he refused to allow any other candidates on

[13]New York Times, September 29, 1968, p. 75.

[14]Lipset, op. cit., p. 478.

[15]New York Times, September 29, 1968, p. 75.

[16]Ibid., p. 75.

[17]New York Times, August 31, 1969, p. 34.

his party ticket in 1968 probably reflected his concern that a number of embarassing candidates from radical right organizations would arise at the state and local level. Judging from fragmentary evidence he was probably correct in his analysis. Nevertheless, Wallace keeps pursuing ultraconservative support and as a result his national organization has continued to be plagued by internal strife.

Therefore, what emerges from the Wallace cadre at the national level is that the issues of social welfare and anti-Communism as well as race are important in analysing this third party movement. Social welfare policy is apparently an area of internal conflict between the two main national organizations and may indicate a deep split that characterizes activists in the party. The anti-Communism issue shows the influence of the radical right in the Wallace movement and adds a dimension to the party cadre that may be less important in the electoral support of George Wallace.[18] The civil rights issue, which is the key variable in explaining the Wallace vote, is also evident in the racist attitudes of some party activists.

Research Design: The Wallace Campaign
Worker in the Industrial North

Like the traditional American political parties, the

---

[18]Anti-Communism is not a strong predictor of the Wallace vote except among those with high school or greater educational levels. Because party activists usually have more educational skills this may account for more rightist influence at the cadre level of the party. See McEvoy, op. cit., p. 174.

bulk of the party organization of the Wallace movement exists at the state and local level. The national party structures were formed after the 1968 presidential election and have convened only a few times with an emphasis on maintaining local autonomy. Thus, it is correct to characterize the cadre as a grass-roots movement, originating at the local level to work for Wallace in the presidential campaign, and continuing to function as a possible vehicle for his future plans. The importance of this grass-roots activist is illustrated in the fact that Wallace was able to get on the ballot in all fifty states in 1968, which required considerable dedication and work by lower level party members.[19] However, very little is known about this essential portion of the Wallace cadre.

The focus of this study is the grass-roots level of the Wallace cadre in the industrial north: the campaign worker in the Fifteenth Congressional District in Wayne County, Michigan. At the time of the 1968 presidential campaign the party structure in Michigan was named the American Independent party(AIP) and soon after the election became a part of the American party at the national level, while retaining its original name at the state level in

---

[19]The most difficult state for Wallace was Ohio. The Supreme Court of the United States finally ordered Wallace's name placed on the Ohio ballot and invalidated state laws which were considered too stringent. Ohio law originally required petitions bearing the signatures of fifteen percent of those who voted in the last gubernatorial election to form a third party. After the Supreme Court ruling the Ohio legislature reduced this to seven percent. Most states require two or three percent of those who voted in a previously specified election.

order to avoid further ballot complications. Eighty-one
oral interviews were conducted with Wallace campaign workers
in the November, 1968 election during the following four
months. The average interview lasted two hours during which
time a series of open-ended questions were asked of the
respondent.[20] These party workers either passed out litera-
ture for the party during the November election or served
as precinct challengers at the polls, and in some cases
performed both tasks. A list of 114 party workers of the
Fifteenth Congressional District served as the universe of
this study with 81 of this total agreeing to be interview- .
ed(71%).

Some mention should be made of the area from which
these party workers are drawn. The Fifteenth Congressional
District is a suburban environment just outside the city of
Detroit and is composed of thirteen cities(some called town-
ships) all lying within Wayne County, Michigan. The dis-
trict is in a period of great transition with many newcomers
entering the area in the past twenty years. The population
was 313,573 in 1960--an increase of 188,200 from 1950. Al-
though no figures are available since 1960 the indications
are that this area is still booming in terms of population
growth. The 1960 census showed that 51% of the population
was new to this area in the years 1955-1960, with 45% enter-
ing the area from other parts of Michigan and another 6%

---

[20]The interview schedule is included in the Appendix.

Table 1

Population Characteristics of the 15th Congressional
District, Wayne County, Michigan
for the Year 1960

Characteristic	Percentage
Race	
White	95%
Negro	5
Education(25 years or older)	
Less than 5 years of school	4
Completed 4 years of high school or more	42
Completed 4 years of college or more	5
Median years of school completed	11 years
Occupation	
Professional, technical	12
Other white collar; sales, managers, clerks	29
Blue collar; foremen-plants, craftsmen, operatives, service, laborers	59
Nativity	
Total foreign stock	24
Foreign born	6
Native of foreign born or mixed parents	18
Migration: Residence in 1955	
Same house as 1960	47
Different house--same state	45
Different state or abroad	6
Population	
413,573	

migrating from a different state or abroad. The number of

people of foreign birth or from foreign parentage was 25%

in 1960(Table 1).[21]

---

[21]Supplement to the Congressional District Data Book:
Redistricted States (Washington D. C.: United States Govern-
ment Printing Office, 1965), pp. 15-19. The fifteenth district
was re-districted in 1962 by the Michigan Constitutional Con-
vention.

Table 2

Percentage of the 1968 Presidential Vote--15th
District, Wayne County, Michigan

City	Party Ticket		
	Humphrey-Muskie	Nixon-Agnew	Wallace-Griffin[22]
Allen Park	55%	33%	12%
Belleville	35	52	13
Dearborn Heights	53	33	14
Garden City	55	27	17
Lincoln Park	59	23	16
Melvindale	61	19	18
Taylor	52	24	22
Wayne	48	35	17
Westland	54	30	15
Romulus Township	55	24	18
Sumpter Township	57	19	22
Van Buren Township	41	38	20
Huron Township	48	24	20
Total	54	29	17
Detroit(suburbs)	53	34	13
Detroit(city)	70	20	8
Michigan(state)	49	41	10

The Fifteenth Congressional District is heavily popu-
lated by blue-collar workers. That many automobile companies
have located plants either in or close to this region is
reflected in the occupational breakdown of the district: 59%
blue-collar, 29% white-collar, and 12% professional. Also,
the district contains few Negroes.(95% of the population is
white and 5% Negro.) This area is experiencing the common

[22]Marvin Griffin, former governor of Georgia, was se-
lected by Wallace in February, 1968, as his temporary running
mate in order to meet ballot requirements in Michigan and
several other states. On October 4, 1968, Curtis E. LeMay,
former Air Force Chief of Staff, was designated by Wallace
as the official Vice-Presidential candidate of the party.

Table 3

Percentage of the Wallace Vote in Fifteen
Leading Detroit Suburbs

Suburb	Wallace-Griffin Percentage of Total Vote Cast
Taylor*	22.2
Sumpter Township	22.1
Brownstown Township	21.1
Woodhaven	20.9
Canton Township	20.4
Van Buren Township*	20.3
Huron Township*	20.1
Romulus*	18.2
Melvindale*	17.8
Garden City*	16.7
Wayne*	16.6
Lincoln Park*	16.4
Southgate	15.6
Westland*	15.2
Flat Rock	14.2

*Note: City or township in the 15th Congressional
District, Wayne County, Michigan

urban flight of the white population to the suburbs to escape

the crime and race problems of the inner city. It also should

be noted that several black communities bordering on the dis-

trict could very well pose a threat in terms of housing and

jobs to the area's white population.

The substantial support for Wallace at the polls in the

Fifteenth Congressional District is one of the primary factors

in its selection for this research project. Table 2 shows

that the Wallace-Griffin ticket received 17% of the vote in

the district compared to 13% in all the Detroit suburban

areas in Wayne County(including the 15th district) and 8%

for the city of Detroit. The vote for the thirteen cities

that compose the fifteenth district ranged from 12% to 22% in support of the Wallace party; this is considerably better than voter strength for the rest of the Detroit area and the state of Michigan as a whole. This fact is confirmed when the top fifteen cities and townships in Wayne County that supported Wallace are charted(Table 3).

The major objective of this research project is to determine the motivations for party activity of Wallace campaign workers in a northern industrial environment. Chapter III describes the social and political background of Wallace activists, emphasizing important subgroups that are analyzed in the study. Chapter IV delves directly into the motivational question by investigating why these persons initially became attracted to a third party organization and what kinds of rewards and satisfactions they receive from party labor. Chapter IV is concerned with the attitudes of Wallace activists toward the issue positions of the major and minor parties in the 1968 campaign. Chapters V and VI explore the political attitudes of campaign workers in the policy areas of civil rights, Communism, social welfare and foreign affairs. Chapter VIII summarizes the major findings of the study and speculates on the implications of the data for the viability of the Wallace party organization.

The study of motivation is indeed a complex and difficult undertaking. Especially in investigating minor party activists, motivational questions must recognize the close

relationship between minority parties and a larger political environment. Third parties arise and operate within the scope of activities and events in the traditional parties and governmental system. As a result, in addition to investigating the initial drives, rewards and satisfactions that lure persons to the Wallace party organization, this research design includes the attitudes of activists toward the major parties and public policy.

CHAPTER III

SOCIAL AND POLITICAL BACKGROUND OF
WALLACE CAMPAIGN WORKERS

The attraction of blue-collar workers to the Wallace
activist ranks is strong in the 15th district(Table 4).
Over 71% of the campaign workers are from blue-collar occu-
pations, 22% are from white-collar jobs such as salesmen
or clerks and 5% have professional vocations. Within the
blue-collar classification all but a small proportion of
the respondents are factory workers; 54% of the party cadre
belong to labor unions. During the 1968 presidential race,
concern of labor union leaders in the Detroit area that the
Wallace candidacy might cut into their usual rank and file
support for the Democratic party resulted in a massive
propaganda campaign to support the Democratic party candi-
date, Hubert Humphrey. Despite the fact that the union
endeavor was successful in securing electoral support for
the Democratic candidate, some labor union members were
attracted to the Wallace party.

Educational levels reflect this working class back-
ground of Wallace activists. Most campaign workers fall
in the high school category with almost 50% graduating
from high school and another 19% completing one or more
years of secondary schooling. The extremes are fairly

36

even with 14% having no education past the eighth grade
and 19% having some college experience. The median of
11.2 years of school for Wallace activists closely paral-
lels the 11.2 years in the general population of the Fif-
teenth Congressional District while the 71% working class
support for Wallace is greater than the 59% figure for the
area.[1]

Family income is relatively high in the Wallace cadre
with 70% of the campaign workers earning $10,000 or more
and almost 25% in the over $15,000 category. An initial
response to this finding is to conclude that a case of
status inconsistency exists among the workers because of
their high income and low educational and occupational
levels.[2] Studies of party recruitment have concluded that
status characteristics are important in explaining motiva-
tions for political activity.[3] Moreover, Seymour Martin
Lipset postulates that status anxieties lie at the base
of the right-wing alienation of the Wallace movement. Unlike

---

[1]See page 31 for the socioeconomic characteristics of
the population of the Fifteenth Congressional District.

[2]The income level for the Wallace voter is substantial-
ly lower with 59% below the $10,000 level. The occupational
and educational levels are similar for voters and activists
with slightly more blue-collar workers and yet higher educa-
tional levels for the campaign workers(Table 5). The best
single source of 1968 data on the Wallace vote is Arthur
C. Wolfe, "Challenge From the Right: The Basis of Voter
Support for Wallace in 1968," unpublished paper presented
at the American Psychological Association Meeting in
Washington, D. C., 1969.

[3]Marvick and Nixon, op. cit., pp. 193-217; and Patter-
son, op. cit., p. 332.

38

Table 4

Socioeconomic Characteristics of
Wallace Campaign Workers

Social Characteristic	All Campaign Workers N=81	Southern Migrants N=41	Michiganders N=40
Occupation			
Professional	5%	2%	8%
Other white-collar	22	12	33
Blue-collar	72	85	59
Education			
No high school	14	24	3
9-11 years	19	24	13
Completed high school	49	37	63
Some college	19	15	23
Income			
$4,000-5,999	4	3	5
6,000-7,999	11	18	5
8,000-9,999	15	13	19
10,000-14,999	42	40	49
Over 15,000	28	28	27
Nativity			
English, French, German	44	46	43
Scotch, Irish	36	49	23
Central, South European	20	5	35
Religion			
Protestant	83	94	69
Fundamentalist	3	6	0
Catholic	14	0	31
Age			
21-30	25	22	28
31-40	43	37	50
41-50	25	27	23
Over 50	7	14	0
Former Party Identification			
Democrat	52	61	43
Independent	32	24	40
Republican	16	15	18

Table 4--Continued

Social Characteristic	All Campaign Workers	Southern Migrants	Michiganders
Group Membership-Number			
0-1	24	25	23
2-3	59	54	65
4 or more	17	22	13
Member of labor union			
Yes	54	68	40
No	46	32	60

the more status-bound, class ridden societies of the old world, explains Lipset, status insecurity has been an enduring characteristic of extremism on the American scene.[4] Further, Lipset believes that the Wallace activist exhibits these insecurities that have characterized past deviant behavior.[5]

One of the problems with testing status theory is that a variety of components can be used to denote social inconsistencies. Should you employ income and education, ethnic background and occupation, present occupation and father's occupation, or some combination of the above?[6] One possibility is that the present occupation of an individual may

[4]Lipset, op. cit., pp. 477-483.

[5]Ibid., pp. 477-478.

[6]For a summary of debate over methodology see James W. Geschwender, "Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance," Social Forces (October, 1967) XLIV, pp. 160-172.

Table 5

Socioeconomic Characteristics of
Wallace Voters*

Social Characteristics	Wallace Voters N=117
Social Class	
Middle	36%
Working	64
Education	
Grade	25
High School	58
Some College	18
Income	
Under $3,000	15
3,000-5,000	4
5,000-7,000	14
7,000-10,000	26
10,000-15,000	19
Over 15,000	12
Religion	
Protestant	71
Fundamentalist	9
Catholic	15
Age	
Under 30	20
30-49	41
50 and over	39

*Data from the 1968 election study, Survey Research
Center, University of Michigan

differ substantially from his father's occupation and, as

a result, a case of status anxiety based on class mobility

exists. A corollary suggests that a person may be downwardly-

mobile, meaning that his present occupation is of a lesser

prestige than the vocation of his father. If the present occu-

pation of an individual is considerably more prestigious than

the vocation of his father, their inconsistency may be of an upwardly-mobile nature. Either of these phenomena is supposed to induce extremist behavior.

The Wallace campaign worker does not exhibit these propensities. Over 60% of the activists who have come from a working class background are still in that occupational category. Another 16% have remained in a middle class vocation making a total of 76% of the Wallace activists that do not have inconsistencies in terms of class mobility. The one status anxiety that is slightly in evidence is of an upwardly-mobile nature with about 20% of the respondents engaged in a middle class occupation while their parental vocation was of a working class nature(Table 6).

Another variable often incorporated in status theory is the nativity of the respondent. The reasoning is that those individuals with an ethnic background of low prestige will tend to be more susceptible to status anxieties because of an inherent sense of inferiority toward other social groups.[7] However, Wallace campaign workers show a predominance of high-prestige nationalities with only a small number of activists coming from Central or Southern European heritages. In addition, Anglo-Saxon predominance in the party is indicated by the fact that 79% of the workers prefer the Protestant denomination(Table 4).

---

[7]Lipset, op. cit., pp. 477-483; and Marvick and Nixon, op. cit., pp. 193-217.

Table 6

Class Mobility of Wallace Activists:
Father's Occupation and Present Occupation

		Working-Middle	Working-Working	Middle-Middle	Middle-Working
Wallace Campaign Workers	N=81	19.6%	60.6%	16.2%	3.6%

Therefore, while the income and educational levels of Wallace campaign workers lend some support to status inconsistency theory, other evidence does not confirm this explanation of right-wing behavior. Nevertheless, our data suggest that social anxieties may have some relationship to Wallace party activism, and this variable merits further examination as a factor in the recruitment of third party cadres.

Many young people are attracted to the Wallace party organization. Approximately 25% of the activists fall in the 21-30 age group and another 43% in the 31-40 category. Data on the Wallace voter also reveal that the younger generation is attracted to this third party movement in large numbers and may indicate that polarization in the American political system is as great within the younger age groups as it is between the younger and older generations.[8]

A significant number of Wallace activists were previous

---

[8]Converse, Miller, Rusk and Wolfe, op. cit., p. 28. These authors explain that the cleavage within the younger generation is between the college age youth who lean to the left and the blue-collar workers with a high school educacation who are more likely to be attracted to the Wallace candidacy.

Democratic party identifiers. Before their attraction to
the third party, 52% formerly identified with the Democratic
party, 32% were Independents, and 16% identified with the
Republican party. This finding is similar to survey re-
search data on the Wallace vote in the north(46%-Democrats,
20%-Independents, and 34% Republicans). (Table 8)

To sum up, socioeconomic characteristics of the Wallace
campaign worker include a working class occupation, high
school education, Protestantism and Democratic party identi-
fication. In most of these attributes the Wallace activist
resembles the Wallace voter except for the substantially
higher income level of the activist. Social class incon-
sistencies are inconclusive for the Wallace activist but
may provide a useful alternative approach for analysing
our data.

Southern Migrants and Michiganders

The similarities and differences of <u>Southern Migrants</u>
and <u>Michiganders</u> are crucial to this research project. Of
81 campaign workers interviewed, 41 are southern migrants
who have moved from southern states to the state of Michigan
and 40 are Michiganders or natives of the state of Michigan.
This finding in the Michigan cadre of the Wallace movement
is substantially higher than data on the Wallace vote where
only 10% of his northern supporters have a southern background.[9]

---

[9]<u>Ibid.</u>, p. 26. This 10% finding in the electorate is
dubious in light of the small number of Wallace voters in
the 1968 survey research sample. 116 interviews were con-
ducted with Wallace voters, of these 50 respondents were from
northern states and 5 of these 50 northern voters were south-
ern migrants(Table 8).

Table 7

Southern Migrants in the Wallace Cadre

Background	Percentage
Where Most of Life was lived before coming to Detroit:	
Deep South	<u>22</u>
Alabama	12
Florida	2
Georgia	5
Mississippi	2
Southern Border	<u>78</u>
Delaware	2
Kentucky	27
Maryland	2
Tennessee	27
Virginia	5
West Virginia	12
Missouri	2
Number of Years in Detroit Area	
1-10	7
10-20	61
20-30	24
Over 30	7
Age of Migrant upon arrival	
5 Years or Less	10
6-10 Years	10
10-15 Years	10
16-20 Years	42
21-30 Years	24
Over 30 Years	5
Migration Town Size	
Farm	76
Less than 2500	7
2500-25,000	5
Over 100,000	7

While this study of campaign workers in Detroit, Michigan is not a sample survey of the northern cadre of the Wallace movement, the conclusion still may be valid that southern

Table 8

Wallace Vote by Region:
Party Identification and Region of Rearing

Characteristic	Wallace Voters in North N=50	Wallace Voters in South N=66
Party Identification		
Democrat	46%	69%
Independent	20	12
Republican	34	18
Region of Rearing		
Northeast	22	3
Midwest	54	2
South	10	91
West	8	2
Other	6	3

*Data from the 1968 election study, Survey Research Center, University of Michigan

migration is more important in the northern portion of the party than previous studies have indicated.

Before embarking upon the task of contrasting the social background of these two subgroups of the Wallace party, some attention must be given to the kinds of southern migrants involved here(Table 7). The southern border states are more heavily represented in the cadre than the deep south with 78% of the southern migrants coming from the fringe areas and 22% from the so-called deep southern states. Most of these southern migrants came to the Detroit area from ten to thirty years ago with 60% of these people migrating in the 1950's and another 25% moving during the 1940's. Most migrants were in the 16-20 and 21-30 age groups when

they came north indicating that they were exposed to at least a marginal southern environment in their early years. Also, the fact that a high percentage of migrants lived on a farm(76%) suggests the rural nature of their southern experience.

The social characteristics of southern migrants and Michiganders reveal several differences. In terms of party identification more former Democratic identifiers are southern migrants and more Independents are Michiganders. The strength of the Democratic party in the south explains this attraction among southern migrants while the more independent stance of Michiganders may reveal a longer period of dissatisfaction with the policies of the major parties. Also, southern migrants are strongly blue-collar with over 85% of the southerners compared to 59% of the Michiganders being members of the working class. Data on education follow this occupational pattern with southern migrants ranking lower on the number of school years completed(Table 4).

Religious affiliations of all southern migrants are Protestant while two-thirds of the Michiganders belong to this denomination. Seymour Martin Lipset believes that Wallace activists are "alienated adherents of religious and secular fundamentalism" who are frustrated over the disruption of traditional values.[10] Another study speculates that the conclusions of Lipset may be more valid for

---

[10]Lipset, op. cit., pp. 477-483.

Wallace supporters with a southern background because of
the domination of fundamentalist doctrines in this region
of the country.[11] Our data reveal very few campaign workers
of this religious description, either southern migrants or
Michiganders, with only two activists expressing a prefer-
ence for a fundamentalist sect(Table 4).[12]

In short, southern migrants active in the Wallace
party are more likely to have the pro-Democratic, blue-
collar, lesser educated, Protestant traits that character-
ize the Wallace activists as a group. Michiganders are
not notably different from southern migrants in their social
background, but they do contain more Independents, white-
collar workers, and the better educated. One significant
difference between these two subgroups is the high percentage
of former southerners with a farm background, 85%, compared
to 31% of the Michiganders.

Previous Partisan Activity

Data concerning the past partisan activity of Wallace
activists can answer a number of important questions. Are
these workers new to campaign activity or are they exper-
ienced professionals? Have Wallace activists held leader-
ship positions in the major parties which may indicate a
background of a desire for personal power?

---

[11]Robert T. Riley and Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Relative
Deprivation and Wallace's Northern Support," an unpublished
paper presented at the American Sociological Association
Meeting, San Francisco, 1969, pp. 1-7.

[12]Survey data also disclose a lack of religious funda-
mentalism in the background of Wallace voters with only 8.8%
of the respondents falling in this category.

Table 9

Political Party Experience of Campaign Workers
Before the Wallace Movement

Party Experience	Percentage
Campaign Work Before Wallace	
Republican	11%
Democrat	20
None	69
Leadership Position in Republican or Democratic Parties	
Yes	7
No	93
First Campaign(all Previous Workers)	
1966	9
1964	22
1960	22
1952-56	22
1940-48	13
Before 1940	13
Last Campaign(all Previous Workers)	
1966	22
1964	39
1960	22
1952-56	17

Most Wallace activists are new to campaign activity; only one-third have worked in the past for one of the major parties. The Democratic party was the most popular for experienced workers by an almost two to one margin over the Republican party. But they cannot be considered experienced professionals because over one-half of the previous workers have no partisan activity prior to 1960. In addition, very few Wallace campaign workers have held a leadership position in the Republican or Democratic parties. Only two respondents held a previous party position at or above the

precinct level with the vast majority describing their only

participation as handing out literature at election time.[13]

In summary, Wallace campaign workers are working class

activists with limited experience in partisan activities.

Rejecting their previous identification with the traditional

parties, these amateur politicians have worked for a third

party organization to express concerns that cannot be in-

ferred from socioeconomic factors alone. The large number

of southern migrants in the Michigan organization of the

party indicates the possible importance of the regional

factor in accounting for activism in the north. However,

we must proceed to motivational questions for a comprehensive

understanding of the attraction of activists to the Wallace

party organization.

---

[13]One view of the Wallace voter believes that marginal
participation or withdrawal from social and political activi-
ty characterizes third party behavior. While the limited
nature of partisan experience at the cadre level may lend
support to this hypothesis, other evidence casts doubt on
this explanation. Activism in social and political groups
other than political parties is substantial in the Wallace
cadre with 59% belonging to two or three groups, and 17% be-
longing to four or more organizations--making a total of over
three-quarters of the workers having membership in two or
more communicative groups other than the Wallace party. For
an explanation of marginal participation theory see McEvoy,
op. cit., Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

MOTIVATIONAL PATTERNS

The third party offers different incentives from those
of the major parties to attract persons to its organization.
While the traditional parties have established structural
frameworks that have the capacity to dispense material and
solidary rewards to party workers, the minor party relies
on its ideological appeal. The issue positions of a third
party are critical in the recruitment process, because
social relationships are in a rudimentary stage and patron-
age is not available through governmental structures. The
motivational patterns of Wallace campaign workers lend sup-
port to these hypotheses concerning third party behavior.

The socialization process is not as important in the
recruitment of Wallace activists as it is in accounting
for activism in the traditional parties. One of the most
consistent findings in the motivational patterns of Republi-
can and Democratic cadres is that family background estab-
lishes party identity and encourages partisan activity by
infusing relevant values into individuals at an early age.
The political habits of the father are very important with
individuals often patterning their behavior after the male
parent.[1] Wallace campaign workers do not conform to this

---

[1]Hyman, op. cit., p. 85; and Salisbury, op. cit., p. 564.

pattern; 70% of the activists note that their father was
not active at all in politics while only 6% remember a
very active father. An additional one-quarter of the cam-
paign workers perceive their father as somewhat active,
which makes a total of less than one-third of the respond-
ents who have come from a family of past partisan activity
(Table 10).

Table 10

Father's Background in Politics

Background	Percentage
Political Activism	
Very Active	6%
Somewhat Active	24
Not Active At All	70
Party Affiliation	
Democratic	56
Independent	20
Republican	25

The socialization process requires that a party organi-
zation remain on the political scene for a number of years
in order for the attractiveness of a party to be passed on
from parent to child. The Wallace movement has just arisen
on the political scene with the result that the socializa-
tion process has not established a positive orientation
toward the party as a symbolic structure. Moreover, the
lack of substantial partisan activity in the family back-
ground of Wallace activists suggests that prior participa-
tion of a parent in the traditional parties is not important

Table 11

Reasons for Becoming Active
in the Wallace Party

Reason	Wallace Campaign Workers
Wallace, the man	19%
Issues--platform of the party	48
Direction of the country-- its deterioration	27
Communism in the country	3
Dissatisfaction with major party candidates	9
Family, friends	3

in accounting for third party motivational patterns.

When asked directly why they became active in the Wallace movement, the campaign workers reveal, on the one hand, much dissatisfaction with the ideological direction of the political system and, on the other hand, great confidence in the issue solutions of their third party. Specific issues that the Wallace party stands for motivate 48% of the respondents to work for the third party while disagreement with the direction of the country accounts for another 27%. Even the 19% that mention Wallace, the man, as their reason for party activity believe in his platform and ideas (Table 11).

These almost exclusively purposive incentives for third party activists are sharply in contrast to the motivations

for Republican and Democratic precinct leaders in Wayne County, Michigan. Samuel J. Eldersveld finds that nonpolitical reasons such as formal non-party groups, relatives, friends and accidental involvement account for over 70% of the motivations of traditional party leaders. The author concludes that social rewards for party activity are important elements in achieving cohesiveness in the organization of these parties in the Detroit area.[2] For Wallace activists, however, solidary incentives do not appear to be as important; family, friends and outside social forces generate a limited response with respect to a direct motivational question.

The differences between activists in the minor and major parties become more vivid when a rating of the most important reason for party activism is examined. Very few Wallace activists list social influence as the most important reason for their participation when presented with a number of alternatives. Over two-thirds of the Wallace campaigners cite the influence that their party work might have on governmental policy as the best reason for working in the third party, while personal friendships, social contacts and the desire for power are rarely mentioned(Table 12). In contrast to these findings Republican and Democratic leaders more often choose solidary rather than issue-orientated compensations as their most important reason for partisan involvement.[3]

---

[2]Eldersveld, op. cit., Table 11.1, p. 278.

[3]Ibid., p. 132.

Table 12

Ratings of the Most Important Reason for Becoming
Active of Minor and Major Party Activists
in Wayne County, Michigan

Reason	Party	
	Wallace Campaign Workers	Republican and Democratic Precinct Leaders*
Personal friendship for a candidate	0%	12%
Political work is part of my way of life	1	11
Strong attachment to the party	6	13
Social contacts and friendships	4	5
Fun and excitement of politics	5	7
Want to build a personal position in politics	0	2
Influence governmental policy	67	21
Being close to influential people	1	3
Party work helps in business contacts	1	1
Helps fulfill my community obligations	15	20
Gives me a feeling of recognition in my community	1	2

*Data from Eldersveld, op. cit., Table 6.6, p. 132.

Another approach that is useful in understanding the motivational patterns of an activist is to ascertain the kinds of satisfactions that he receives from his party activity. When asked what they would miss the most if they had to drop out of political activity tommorrow, most Wallace campaign workers mention not pursuing ideological goals or particular issues that they believe are in the best interest of American society and government(Table 13). Over one-half of the respondents perceive the loss of moral, philosophical or societal goals that they desire to be implemented in the political system. Again, this view contrasts with the explanations given by Republican and Democratic leaders where over three-quarters of the Democrats and one-half of the Republicans mention the loss of personal rewards.[4] In short, Wallace campaign workers derive goal oriented benefits from their activity that transcend personal satisfactions that often induce major party activism.

An additional variable in the study of the recruitment process should be mentioned in relation to third party behavior. Whether activists are self-starting or attracted to the party by external forces has been used to explain motivational patterns. A self-starting individual is one whose stimulus for party work lies within himself while the external worker has been exposed to party activity by party

---

[4]Ibid., p. 278.

Table 13

Current Satisfaction from Party Work
at the Precinct Level*

Satisfaction	Wallace Campaign Workers	Democratic Precinct Leaders**	Republican Precinct Leaders**
Personal rewards:			
Social contacts	9%	63%	47%
Political fun, excitement	5	12	8
Business, economic gain	0	1	1
Political rewards:			
Moral, philosophical	20	4	3
Ideological, issues	32	3	7
Couldn't drop out, no satisfactions	34	15	22

*Based on "What would you miss the most if you had to drop out of political activity tomorrow?"
**Data from the Wayne County, Michigan study of Eldersveld, _op. cit._, Table 11.1, p. 278.

leaders, friends, relatives or social contacts.[4] Studies of the traditional parties have found that external factors most often explain the recruitment of activists. However, all but two of the Wallace campaign workers reply that they volunteered without outside influence, for third party activity. The explanation may be that persons motivated by ideological considerations require less stimuli by the party or other external forces and as a result the minor party

[5]Altoff and Patterson, _op. cit._, pp. 39-51; Bowman and Boyton, _op. cit._, pp. 667-676; and Eldersveld, _op. cit._, Chapter 6.

organization does not have to seek recruits actively as do the larger parties.

Therefore, the Wallace party organization has lured persons to its ranks on the basis of purposive rather than solidary or material incentives. The motivational drives and work satisfactions of Wallace activists reveal a group of individuals who are concerned about ideological questions that they believe their third party can answer satisfactorily. While for the traditional parties social fun and personal rewards are important motivational factors, the third party thrives on policy concerns that attract persons to its organization on a voluntary basis.

CHAPTER V

CAMPAIGN ISSUES AND ATTITUDES

TOWARD THE MAJOR PARTIES

Third party activists want different policies from
the ones traditional parties pursue. The Populists believed
that a corporate plutocracy was controlling the major par-
ties with the result that the problems of the farmer were
ignored in party platforms.[1] The Progressives of 1924 voiced
a similar concern with the policies of the larger parties
and demanded the recognition of postwar grievances of the
farmer and the laborer.[2] The Dixiecrats were disturbed
about one central issue—the backing of integration policy
by the 1948 Democratic platform.[3]

George Wallace directed his 1968 campaign around the
familiar theme that the larger parties were not offering
adequate solutions to important political problems. Further,
Wallace argued that the Republican and Democratic parties
were almost indistinguishable in terms of their issue posi-

---

[1] Hicks, op. cit., p. 406.

[2] MacKay, op. cit., p. 16.

[3] Heard, op. cit., p. 161.

58

tions and therefore could be characterized as "Tweedledum

and Tweedledee":

> There's not a dimes worth of difference in the
> way the leaders of both parties think. They've
> been guilty of the same high crimes and misde-
> meanors--both parties have encroached on state's
> rights, on property ownership, on private enter-
> prise.[4]

Consequently, Wallace took positions on issues that direct-

ly opposed those of the traditional parties. His third

party platform called for local control of the public school

system, a tougher stand on law enforcement in order to com-

bat crime, a heavier reliance on the military in fighting

the war in Vietnam and an end to the growth of the federal

bureaucracy:

> The federal government has in the past three
> decades seized and usurped many powers not
> delegated to it, such as among others; the
> operation and control of the public school
> system of the several states...
> We urge full support for law enforcement
> agencies and affairs at every level of gov-
> ernment and a situation in which their actions
> will not be unreasonably fettered by arbitrary
> judicial decrees...
> We feel that the prompt and effective appli-
> cation of military force could achieve this
> objective(win the war in Vietnam) with mini-
> mized loss of life, and the tactical employ-
> ment of this force will be left in the hands
> of the military commanders...[5]

Although Wallace claimed that none of his disagreements

with the major parties centered directly on racial questions,

---

[4]Mc Evoy, _op. cit._, p. 138.

[5]New York _Times_, October 14, 1968, p. 41.

most of his domestic proposals implied policy goals that
would repudiate recent civil rights legislation. The demand
for states' rights and local control of public institutions
meant that national policy aimed at integration of schools
and equal voting rights would have to be abandoned. The
heavier emphasis on law and order suggested that race riots
in the urban areas would no longer be tolerated. And the
desire for the protection of property rights implied that
national policy advocating open housing would be discarded.
In short, Wallace opposed most of the civil rights legis-
lation passed by the federal government in the last twenty
years.

The question arises as to whether grass-roots activists
in this third party movement express concerns similar to
those expounded by their candidate for the presidency. The
Wallace campaign worker is disturbed by the policy positions
of the major parties and desires new solutions to political
and social problems. Over 90% of the activists perceive
no differences between the issue positions of the Republican
and Democratic parties in the 1968 campaign--agreeing with
the "Tweedledum and Tweedledee" characterization of the
larger parties(Table 14). Most workers conclude that the
parties are similar on every policy question with the fol-
lowing issues mentioned the most frequently: the irrever-
sible growth of the federal bureaucracy, a political power
orientation, liberal and socialistic trends in the parties,

Table 14

Activist Views of the Republican and Democratic Parties in the 1968 Presidential Campaign

View	Percentage
No differences between Republicans and Democrats in the last campaign	94%
How the major parties are similar:	
On every policy and issue	48
Growth of the federal government	14
Only interested in political power	7
Socialism in the parties	6
Liberalism in the parties	6
Inadequate law enforcement	4
Pro-Civil Rights	4
Vietnam	10
What Presidential candidate did you support in 1964?	
Johnson	32
Goldwater	58
Neither	10

similar views on Vietnam and inadequate law enforcement.

Many Wallace campaign workers supported Barry Goldwater in 1964--apparently on the basis of agreement with his political views. Table 14 reveals that 58% of the Wallace activists supported Goldwater in the previous election despite the fact that a majority were identifier's with the Democratic party.[6] The implication is that with the massive defeat of a conservative ideology in 1964 these people could no longer remain within the ranks of the larger parties and instead decided to work for a third party that more accurately represented their political views.

[6]52% of the campaign workers identified with the Democratic party before the 1968 campaign.

Table 15

Activist Likes for the Democratic and
Republican Parties

Likes	Democratic Party	Republican Party
Nothing at all	66%	69%
Conservatism in the party	3	10
Way party is organized	3	3
Party is for the working man	15	0
Good times, prosperity under the party	4	0
Wallace came from this party	6	0
More for law and order	0	4
Fiscal responsibility	0	6
Kenneay	3	0
Goldwater	0	5

Another measure of the degree of ideological disagreement between the Wallace campaign worker and the major parties is to ascertain whether the third party activists like anything about the traditional parties. Over two-thirds of the workers find nothing that they like about these familiar party labels(Table 15). Of the one-third that specify something positive about the Democratic party, the most frequent response is that the party is more for the working man. Those that had kind words for the Republi-

can party praised most often the conservatism of the party.
However, the Wallace activist generally responds negatively
to the traditional parties because he can find very few
policies of either party that are acceptable to his politi-
cal ideology.

More difficult to ascertain are the specific issues
that motivate a person to abandon his identification with
the major parties and become a campaign worker for a third
party movement. What specific disagreements on issues do
Wallace activists have with the traditional parties and
how do their policy views relate to their perception of
the new third party? Are the pronouncements of George
Wallace in the 1968 campaign similar to the disagreements
that his activists have with the larger parties?

An almost unanimous 99% of the campaign workers believe
that there are important differences between the Wallace
party and the Democratic party. One specific concern is
the observation that Communists have entered the Democratic
party while the Wallace movement is free of this kind of
influence. Also, the third party stand on states' rights
or constitutional government is a designated difference
with the Democrats viewed as favoring federal interference
into areas meant for state control. The list of other
disparities reads like the policy statements of George
Wallace in the 1968 campaign: the desire for a more honest,
moral approach to government, the need to eliminate social-

64

Table 16

Perception of Issue Differences between the Wallace Party and the Democratic Party

Differences	Southern Migrants	Michiganders
Democracy—getting government back to the people	11%	14%
Dishonesty in government by the Democratic Party	3	11
Communism in the Democratic Party	27	19
Socialism in the Democratic Party	5	8
Crime in the street	16	11
Civil rights	14	0
Vietnam	3	5
Constitutional government	14	22
Foreign aid	8	11
Percentage that perceive differences between the Wallace Party and the Democratic Party		99%

istic trends in the party, the necessity of reducing foreign aid, winning the war in Vietnam and opposing integration policy. In a breakdown of southern migrants and Michiganders in the activist corps, the only significant difference is that 14% of the former southerners mention civil rights policy directly in their estrangement from the Democratic party while none of the Michiganders explicitly state this view(Table 16).

Table 17

Perception of Issue Differences between the
Wallace Party and the Republican Party

Differences	Percentage
Same response as for the Democratic Party	65%
Wallace Party is for the working class, not big business like the Republican Party	10
Liberalism and Socialism in the Republican Party	8
Other	18
Percentage that perceive differences between the Wallace Party and the Republican Party	98

With regard to the perception of differences between

the Wallace party and the Republican party, 98% of the

respondents reply that there are significant issue distinc-

tions. When asked to specify these policies almost two-

thirds of the activists believe that the differences are

the same for the Republican party as for the Democratic

party. The only policy distinction concerning the Republican

party that does not appear in response to the Democratic

party is that several activists believe that their third

party represents the working man while the Republican party

is favorable to big business(Table 17).

Thus, the Wallace campaign worker is disturbed about

a variety of issues that he believes the larger parties are

answering unsatisfactorily. However, the central variables
in this ideological dissatisfaction are difficult to dis-
cern from these responses, perhaps because the campaign
appeal of George Wallace was often immersed in campaign
issues that disguised more fundamental political concerns.
But certainly the lower level activist agrees with the
assessment of Wallace that the larger parties offer no
real choice in terms of issue positions and that only a
third party movement can provide satisfactory solutions
to important political problems.

When asked directly what is the most important issue
in the 1968 presidential campaign, law and order is the
response of over one-half of the campaign workers(Table 18).
The belief that the traditional parties have not taken a
strong enough position on law enforcement and combating
crime predominates in the Wallace cadre, along with the
corresponding attitude that the third party could solve
this problem by its tougher law and order stand. In this
concern about the crime problem, the activist believes
that the court system has emphasized criminal rights at
the expense of proper law enforcement and that only George
Wallace calls for proper legal support of the police.
Further, this phrase appears to denote dissatisfaction
over a number of other policy questions associated with
the lack of respect for law and order. The civil rights
movement with its demonstrations and disruptive tactics

Table 18

Most Important Issue in the 1968
Presidential Campaign

Issue	Southern Migrants	Michiganders	Total
Law and Order	71%	39%	55%
Vietnam	10	31	20
Constitutional Government	2	8	5
Anti-Communism	5	5	5
Civil Rights	7	8	8
Other	5	8	6

is disturbing for the activist; many believe that a stronger law and order stand would eliminate these agitations. The same conclusion applies to student and left-wing radicals whom the campaign worker perceives as operating without adequate legal control. One respondent summed up the feelings of many of his fellow workers on the law and order issue by commenting that "most of the trouble and disorder in this country is caused not so much by criminals and agitators themselves but by the failure of political structures to take necessary steps to prevent further disruptions".

In the breakdown of southern migrants and Michiganders we find that substantially more former southerners perceive this law and order issue as most important in the 1968 campaign(Table 17). Over 70% of the southern migrants compared

to 39% of the Michiganders believe that this symbol encom-
passes their main concern about national policy trends.
Perhaps the high number of migrants listing this issue as
critical implies an anti-Black feeling in their concept-
ualization of law and order. Detroit's race riot in the
summer of 1966 may have contributed to the identification
of the Black community with lawlessness, nor should one
forget the high crime rate in the primarily Black inner
city and its effect on the nearby surburban areas. There-
fore, an hypothesis that deserves examination is that the
former southerner is exposed to a crime and disorder problem
that relates to prejudices that he has acquired in his
southern background and thus he, more readily than the
Michigander, expresses these frustrations through the law
and order slogan.

Vietnam is also an important issue for Wallace campaign
workers and especially for those who have grown up in the
state of Michigan. Approximately 10% of all the activists
and 31% of the Michiganders believe this issue is the most
critical in the 1968 election. The so-called hawkish view
of the war or the belief that the United States has the
ability to win the war with the proper use of its military
power appears to predominate in the cadre. George Wallace
in his campaign platform emphasized that a freer hand should
be given to the Joint Chiefs of Staff in running the war--
a view accepted by many of his campaign workers. One acti-

vist articulated the majority view of the party workers

on the Vietnam war with the following statement:

> The United States can win the war in Vietnam
> if less attention is paid to public opinion
> and a heavier reliance is placed on our mili-
> tary commanders in the field. The trouble
> with Lyndon Johnson is that he relied too
> much on the advice of politicians who were
> not qualified in the area of military strat-
> egy.

To sum up, the Wallace campaign worker in Wayne County,

Michigan has many of the same policy concerns that George

Wallace advanced in his campaign for the presidency. Dis-

satisfaction with the policy trends of the major parties

is great; his workers therefore believe that only the Wallace

party can provide correct solutions to important political

problems. Law and order is the salient campaign issue for

the Wallace cadre and especially for southerners who have

migrated to the state of Michigan. Vietnam is also an

important issue with activists taking a hawkish view on

the war. However, because many of these campaign issues

imply deeper concerns involving race, left-wing agitations

and foreign policy, we must proceed to a more detailed

explanation of specific political attitudes.

CHAPTER VI

RACE, CIVIL RIGHTS AND COMMUNISM

Because of the massive southern support for George

Wallace in 1968 and his record as governor of Alabama prior

to the presidential campaign, the question of the Black

man and civil rights must be examined in relation to the

recruitment of his third party cadre. Several excellent

studies have stressed the importance of the racial issue

in southern politics and it might be speculated that Wallace

has extended the desire for segregation or some form of

racial prejudice into a northern activist environment.[1]

This would not be the first time a national movement included

southern attitudes toward racial questions in its ideology.

Accompanying the Populist movement were a number of discrim-

inatory practices toward the Negro that have had a lasting

influence on government in the twentieth century.[2] More

recently, the Dixiecrats broke from the regular Democratic

party over the civil rights plank pushed by Harry Truman

---

[1]V. O. Key, Southern Politics in State and Nation (New
York: A. A. Knopf, 1949). For a more recent analysis of
racial attitudes and the south see Donald R. Mathews and
James W. Prothro, Negroes and the New Southern Politics
(New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966).

[2]Hicks, op. cit., p. 406.

70

at the 1948 convention, and ran J. Strom Thurmond for President of the United States.[3]

Before examining the racial attitudes of Wallace campaign workers in Wayne County, Michigan, some attention should be paid to Wallace himself and the kind of appeal that he has generated in running for public office. Wallace quickly learned that the road to political success in southern politics was to capitalize on the racial issue. When he was defeated in his first campaign for governor of Alabama in 1958 by segregationist candidate, John Patterson, Wallace commented, "John Patterson out-niggered me. And boy, I'm not going to be out-niggered again."[4] Wallace kept his pledge and in his 1962 inaugural address relected the segregationist campaign that he ran in attaining the governorship:

> Today I have stood where Jefferson Davis stood,
> and took an oath to my people. It is very
> appropriate then from this cradle of the con-
> federacy, this very heart of the great Anglo-
> Saxon southland that today we sound the drum
> for freedom... And I say, Segregation now!
> Segregation tomorrow! Segregation forever![5]

Wallace persevered in the fight for segregation during his

---

[3]Heard, op. cit., p. 161.

[4]Marshall Frady, Wallace (New York: The World Publishing Company, 1969), p. 127. This book presents many facts concerning Wallace as a youth and his political campaigns in Alabama prior to 1968.

[5]Ibid., p. 142.

first term as governor by dispatching troops to Birmingham
to break up civil rights demonstrations led by Martin Luther
King, Jr., standing in the doorway at the University of
Alabama in 1963 in order to bar Negro students from attending
classes, and defying a number of federal court orders demand-
ing integration of local schools.

The more recent 1970 campaign of Wallace for governor
again brought the racial issue to a climax in Alabama poli-
tics. Wallace charged that a bloc vote of Negroes supported
his opponent, Albert Brewer, in the primary and if Brewer
were elected, Blacks would take over the political structure
of the state.[6] After running second to Brewer in the initial
Democratic primary, Wallace emphasized the racial issue,
causing an increased registration of white voters for the
runoff primary, and ultimately a narrow margin of victory
over his opponent. One commentary on this continuing Wallace
appeal in the south maintains that he personifies a new
southern populism based on keeping the Black man in his
place. According to this view Wallace reconciles a devotion
to democracy with a corresponding denial of democracy to
the Negro through irrational contentions such as "our
Negroes are happy" and "the Supreme Court's decisions are

---

[6]George C. Wallace, "Bloc Voting Contrary to Good
Government," The George C. Wallace Newsletter (May, 1970),
p. 1. This publication is the official newsletter of Wallace
and has an estimated circulation of one million. The sub-
scription address in Montgomery, Alabama changed after
the 1968 election from Box 1968 to Box 1972.

unconstitutional".[7] One can argue the point as to whether this kind of campaign appeal is new to the deep south but at least the conclusion is valid that Wallace has personified opposition to equality of the races in most of his campaigns in Alabama.

At the national level Wallace launched a brief campaign for the presidency in 1964 which has been linked to the racial issue. Running as a Democrat, Wallace entered three presidential primaries in the spring of 1964 in order to test his support outside the south. The results were surprising at the time with his candidacy receiving 42.7% of the vote in Maryland, 31.6% in Indiana and 33.8% in Wisconsin. One study of aggregate voting statistics in the Wisconsin primary finds that the middle-class appeal of Wallace was probably based on the fear of Negroes taking over white suburban neighborhoods.[8]

Survey data from the 1968 presidential election also reveal the importance of the racial issue in accounting for Wallace support. Converse, Miller, Rusk and Wolfe conclude that in the south the most generic question on civil rights policy shows a relation of .49(gamma) with Wallace reactions; the most generic question on law and order shows a .39; and

[7]Reese Cleghorn, Radicalism-Southern Style: A Commentary on Regional Extremism (New York: American Jewish Committee, 1969), pp. 1-33.

[8]Michael Rogin, "Wallace and the Middle Class: The White Backlash in Wisconsin," Public Opinion Quarterly (Spring, 1966)XV, pp. 98-108.

the central Vietnam question shows a relationship of .30.
Outside the South patterns are somewhat different with .27
(law and order), .25(civil rights), and .25(Vietnam).[9]
In another analysis Seymour Martin Lipset finds racial
prejudice arising out of status anxieties an important
factor in accounting for Wallace support.[10] A study of
the Wallace vote in the north(Gary, Indiana) concludes
that his supporters feel deprived in relation to governmental
programs that have benefited the Negro and thus exhibit a
material form of racial prejudice.[11]

Therefore, the question arises as to whether the Wallace
campaign worker in Wayne County, Michigan exhibits racial
attitudes similar to those expressed in the past campaigns
and 1968 voting support of George Wallace. Do we find
prejudice towards the Negro and a distaste for integration
at the activist level of this third party movement and is
there any evidence that these attitudes play an important
role in the recruitment process?

Opposition to Blacks and civil rights policy is signifi-
cant among Wallace campaign workers. Almost two-thirds of
the activists indicate prejudice by contending that the Negro

---

[9]Converse, Miller, Rusk and Wolfe, op. cit., pp. 18-20.

[10]Lipset, op. cit., pp. 477-483.

[11]Robert T. Riley and Thomas F. Pettigrew, "Relative
Deprivation and Wallace's Northern Support," unpublished
paper presented at the American Sociological Association
Meeting, San Francisco, 1969.

Table 19

The Wallace Campaign Worker and
Civil Rights

Attitude	Agree
1. Despite advances by the Negro, he is still by nature inferior in intelligence to the white man.	60%
2. The south is right to oppose integration	66
3. The Negro's charge that he has consistently suffered oppression and discrimination in a white society is basically unwarranted.	66
4. There are no important differences between the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Black Power Movement.	59

is by nature inferior in intelligence to the white man(Table 19).

Furthermore, over 60% of the workers deny that the Negro has

suffered oppression and discrimination in a white society.

Two-thirds of the activists also believe that the south is

right to reject national policy trends advocating integration

of the races. This opposition to integration is often ex-

plained in terms of states' rights' or constitutional govern-

ment by the campaign workers, but still denotes a refusal

to accept integration policy proclaimed by the Supreme Court,

Congress and the Presidency over the last fifteen years.

Wallace activists also fail to distinguish between moder-

ate and more extreme groups in the Black community. Approxi-

mately 60% of the respondents see no difference between the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the Black Power Movement despite recognized differences in their goals and methods. Apparently, opposition to integration of the races has resulted in an inability among Wallace activists to see ideological differences in Black political structures(Table 19).

Differences between southern migrants and Michiganders on these racial issues are very significant. Over three-quarters of the former southerners fall in the "Anti-Civil Rights" category scoring unfavorably on three or more of the previous questions asked concerning the Black man and civil rights. On the other hand, only one-third of the Michiganders are in this extreme classification with most falling in the category of "Somewhat Anti-Civil Rights"(Table 20). Activist opinions of Martin Luther King further reveal the stronger opposition to the civil rights movement by southern

Table 20

Civil Rights Index

Index	Southern Migrants	Michiganders
0 Pro-Civil Rights	0%	9%
1 2 Somewhat Anti-Civil Rights	24	55
3 4 Anti-Civil Rights	76	36

Table 21

Activist Opinions of Martin Luther King

Opinion	Southern Migrants	Michiganders	Total
Favorable—non-violent, Negroes needed him	6%	53%	29%
Against—too far on integration, radical	94	47	69
Communist instigated or inspired	56	31	43

migrants; over one-half of the Michiganders speak favorably of the slain civil rights leader while only 6% of the former southerners express such an opinion. Also, over one-half of the southern migrants observe some Communist influence behind the goals that King promoted while only one-third of the Michiganders see such a conspiracy(Table 21).

Racial attitudes appear to be related to the issue of anti-Communism for many Wallace activists. Along with significant opposition to civil rights policy there is a strong reaction against the Communist threat. Almost all of the campaign workers(94%) believe that the danger to the American system is greater from internal subversive forces than from an international Communist threat. Also, this conspiratorial view applies to the major parties, according to the activists, with 89% seeing Communist influ-

Table 22

The Wallace Campaign Worker and the
Communist Threat

Communist Threat	Disagree
1. The danger to the United States from Communists living here is not as great as the danger from Russia or China.	94%
2. Communists do not have very much influence within the Democratic party.	89
3. Communists do not have very much influence within the Republican party.	77
4. Communist professors do not have very much influence in American colleges and universities.	91

ence in the Democratic party and 77% observing a similar pattern in the Republican party. In addition, most respondents perceive a Communist danger in higher education with 91% of the activists observing infiltration in American colleges and universities(Table 22).

More significant, almost all of the southern migrants see an internal threat from Communism in the major parties and other internal structures of the country. 97% of the southern migrants fall into the "High Communist Threat" category by agreeing with three or more of the conspiratorial questions, compared to 79% of the Michiganders in this same classification(Table 23). The internal Communist threat appears to be a conceptual framework that enables

Table 23

Anti-Communism Index

Index	Southern Migrants	Michiganders
0 Low Communist Threat	3%	3%
1 Medium Communist Threat	0	18
2		
3 High Communist Threat	97	79
4		

the Wallace activist to express his extreme dissatisfaction with policy commitments of traditional political structures. Southern migrants, strongly opposed to civil rights policies adopted by the government and the major parties, use this Communist label to discredit institutions from which these policies originate. Michiganders also are disturbed by the policy directions of political structures and express their frustrations through their belief in the Communist conspiracy, but the central issue for them does not appear to center around the Negro. At least the magnitude of this issue is not as strong for Michiganders as it is for southern migrants.

Wallace activists do not view the Communist conspiracy as an immediate threat by an outside subversive force, as in the McCarthy syndrome.[12] The symbol is here used to express dissatisfaction over policy goals that are not necessarily associated with the direct threat of Communism. The southern

[12]Michael Rogin, The Intellectuals and McCarthy: The Radical Specter (Cambridge: M. I. T. Press, 1967), pp. 216-260.

migrants are concerned about law and order and civil rights
and not the immediate takeover of the country by Communists.
The same conclusion applies for Michiganders although the
range of policy concerns in their case is probably more
extensive than the racial issue.

The law and order issue appears to be related to both
racial and anti-Communist attitudes with southern migrants
scoring high in all three of these issue categories. Earlier
we speculated that anti-Black attitudes may be important in
explaining the law and order campaign slogan. The fact that
southern migrants frequently mention the importance of law
and order and also display the greatest opposition to civil
rights policy lends support to this argument. Also, the
lack of order in society appears to encompass anti-Communist
concerns that help the Wallace activist account for the lack
of success that traditional structures have had in combat-
ing disruptive forces in society.

In summary, racial attitudes provide insight into the
motivations for party activity of at least one subgroup of
the Wallace cadre. Southern migrants, who view the law and
order issue as the most important in the 1968 campaign, also
display anti-civil rights attitudes that have apparently
been associated with this campaign slogan. Rioting and
crime problems in the primarily Black inner city have no
doubt been responsible for this positive correlation between
civil rights attitudes and the law and order issue. The

racial question is not as much in evidence for Michiganders with significantly less opposition to civil rights policy in this subgroup of the third party. Both southern migrants and Michiganders believe in the internal Communist conspiracy but probably for different reasons--the former southerners are primarily worried about disruption in society and civil rights while native state residents, although disturbed about these problems, apparently have additional policy concerns.

CHAPTER VII

ULTRACONSERVATISM, SOCIAL WELFARE AND

FOREIGN POLICY

The possible influence of ultraconservatives in the
Wallace movement raises a number of questions that deserve
further consideration in relation to the Wallace cadre.
One observer explains that the presidential candidacy of
George Wallace has brought together a multitude of right
wing groups that previously were unable to reconcile their
differences and unite in a national campaign.[1] Another
author speculates that George Wallace was not only supported
by many radical right organizations but that members of the
John Birch Society, Liberty Lobby and other extremist groups
played important roles in the Wallace party structure.[2]
Moreover, because of the high percentage of Wallace campaign
workers in Wayne County, Michigan who believe in the inter-
nal Communist conspiracy, we must examine the hypothesis
that the ideological concerns of these activists are an

---

[1]Lipset, op. cit., p. 478.

[2]New York Times, September 29, 1968; p. 75; and Lewis
Chester, Godfrey Hodgson and Bruce Page, "George Wallace
against the Labor Unions," in David Bell, Karl Deutsch and
Seymour Martin Lipset, editors, Issues in Politics (New
York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970), pp. 80-85.

extension of ultraconservatism into a third party movement.

The ideology of the radical right is difficult to characterize because of the diversity of individuals and organizations that could be classified in the extremist camp. The belief in an internal Communist threat has been utilized as the single most reliable political attitude of the ultraconservative, but this view neglects the broad dissatisfaction with public policy expressed by the extremist. Certainly the multitude of radical right organizations that arose in the 1960s have expanded the Communist fears of the McCarthy syndrome into a more comprehensive political ideology. In fact, right wing radicals oppose most policy positions that the American political system has taken in the last forty years.[3] The following issues appear to be the most prominent: socialistic trends in governmental policy that the extremist believes are destroying the free enterprise system and ultimately leading the country down the path to Communism; the growth of the federal government with its increased

---

[3]Two comprehensive works on ultraconservatism are Daniel Bell, editor, The Radical Right (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1963), and Robert A. Schoenberger, editor, The American Right-Wing, op. cit.. Other significant works include Arnold Forester and Benjamin Epstein, Danger on the Right (New York: Random House, 1964); J. Allen Broyles, The John Birch Society (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1964); Raymond E. Wolfinger, et. al., "America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology," in David E. Apter, Ideology and Discontent (London: Free Press of Glencoe, 1964), Chapter VII; Nelson W. Polsby, "Toward an Explanation of McCarthyism," Political Studies (October, 1960) XI, pp. 250-271; and the Journal of Social Issues (April, 1963), whole issue devoted to extremism in the 1960s.

regulation of industry and disregard for a balanced budget; the lack of a strong stand against Communism in the international arena with the Korean and Vietnam wars producing something less than victory over the enemy; and strong opposition to United States participation in international organizations that may aid the Communist conspiracy.

Recent goals of ultraconservative organizations that have been reported as influential in the Wallace cadre demonstrate the deep dissatisfaction that extremists exhibit with national policy trends. The John Birch Society has called for the impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Earl Warren, the removal of the United States from the United Nations and the repeal of the nuclear testban treaty.[4] The Liberty Amendment Committee(Liberty Lobby) has the backing of the John Birch Society in its goals of abolishing the income tax, decentralizing governmental activities and reducing the national debt by sixty-five billion dollars.[5] Thus the question arises as to whether Wallace campaign workers in Wayne County, Michigan support these policy goals advocated by ultraconservative organizations.

Wallace activists agree with many of the policy positions of the radical right. Over two-thirds of the campaign workers perceive no significant differences between Social Welfarism,

[4]Broyles, op. cit., Chapters I-VII.

[5]Forester and Epstein, op. cit., p. 127.

Table 24

Attitudes toward Ultraconservative Issues

Attitude	Southern Migrants	Michiganders	Total
1. Social welfare measures such as social security benefits and payments to the poor are not much different from Socialism and Communism.	57%	82%	67%
2. The impeachment of the Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court, Earl Warren, would be fully justified.	77	78	78
3. It seems quite clear that the United States is on its way to becoming a Socialist country.	81	88	84
4. With the possible exception of major wars, the budget should be balanced every year.	88	89	89
5. The country would be better off if the federal income tax were abolished.	30	42	36
6. The United States should not have signed the nuclear test-ban treaty.	57	61	59
7. The United States ought to withdraw from the United Nations.	41	52	46

Socialism and Communism while an even greater number(85%)

believe that the United States is on its way to becoming a

Socialist country. Also, 90% of the activists desire that
the national budget be balanced every year expressing frustra-
tion over increased governmental growth and spending. Further,
one of the goals of the John Birch Society, the impeachment
of Earl Warren, is supported by over three-quarters of the
Wallace campaign workers. In addition, one-third of the
activists back recent efforts of the Liberty Lobby to elimin-
ate the federal income tax through the passage of a consti-
tutional amendment. Finally, in foreign policy one-half of
the workers agree with ultraconservative proposals that call
for the United States to reject the conditions of the nuclear
test-ban treaty and to withdraw from the United Nations(Table 24).

More significant are differences between southern migrants
and Michiganders on these issues. Michiganders express great-
er sympathy with right wing proposals, especially the more
radical ones such as abolishing the income tax and United
States removal from the the United Nations. In addition,
many more of the native state residents see no significant
differences between Social Welfarism, Socialism and Commu-
nism(Table 24). Moreover, by constructing an index of agree-
ment with ultraconservative issues, we find that substantially
more Michiganders(48%) agree with at least six of the seven
items advocated by the radical right while only 35% of the
southern migrants agree(Table 25).

The social welfare issue provides a clearer explanation
of the reason for the greater attraction of Michiganders to

Table 25

Ultraconservative Index

Index	Southern Migrants	Michiganders
0 1 Low Agreement 2	5%	3%
3 4 Moderate Agreement 5	59	49
6 7 High Agreement	35	48

the ultraconservative camp. In response to the specific question of whether the government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost, over 60% of the Michiganders disagree with that proposal while 60% of the southern migrants take the opposite view(Table 26). The Michigander appears to be intense in his opposition to this issue with over one-third strongly disagreeing. Further, when asked whether the government is going too far, doing less than it should or going at about the right pace with regard to governmental aid for doctor and hospital care, many more Michiganders(62%) than southern migrants(34%) express the view that the government is going too far in promoting health care benefits.

Attitudes toward the social welfare issue are important in defining a "conservative" in the American political system. Several studies of right wing organizations suggest that the

Table 26

Social Welfare Attitudes

Attitude	Southern Migrants	Michiganders	Total
I. The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost.			
Agree Strongly	10%	8%	9%
Agree	51	15	33
Not Sure	0	18	9
Disagree	27	25	26
Disagree Strongly	12	35	24
II. On this question of government helping people get doctors and hospital care at low cost, is government going too far, doing less than it should, or going at about the right pace?			
Too Far	34	62	47
Less Than Should	25	10	19
About Right	39	28	34

longing for the past that accompanies opposition to social welfare legislation is a key variable in the ideology of conservatives and further may be a common link between the moderate and extreme factions of the right wing.[6] As one moves to the fringes or ultraconservative portion of the right, the opposition becomes more intense and the anti-Communist conspiracy is invoked to question the legitimacy of institutions that are promoting socialistic policy at the expense of individual freedom. The

[6]Ibid., p. 184.

Michigander in the Wallace party exhibits many of the char-
acteristics of the ultraconservative with his agreement with
extremist goals, opposition to social welfare legislation
and belief in an internal Communist conspiracy. However,
the southern migrant favors increased benefits in the social
welfare area, is less intense in supporting radical right
policy positions and therefore does not entirely belong in
the ultraconservative camp.

It was demonstrated earlier that the social welfare
issue has caused great difficulty in attempts for national
unification of the Wallace party. One national organization,
the National Committee of Autonomous State Parties, even has
disavowed policy positions that George Wallace proclaimed
on medicare and social security because of their liberal
content. Soon after the 1968 election the Wallace party in
Michigan also experienced a number of divisive factional
struggles centering around the social welfare issue and the
so-called conservatism of the party. One group, represented
by a western Michigan activist, Gale Aikens, called for
responsible conservatives to leave the third party and
seek a more respectable party on economic issues. Disturbed
by the liberal stand taken by the party on medicare and
social security at the state convention, Aikens further
charged that racists had gained control through the assistant
state chairman of the party and leader of the Michigan Ku
Klux Klan, Robert Miles. The state chairman of the party in

Michigan, James Hall, replied to these charges by explaining that the views of Aikens on social welfare issues were in a minority in the party, and that his charges of racism in the party were founded on the defeat of his viewpoint rather than over policy concerns centering around the Negro.[7]

Therefore, social welfare policy is an area of disagreement for Wallace campaign workers with Michiganders much more conservative on this issue than their southern migrant counterparts. The Michigander believes that social welfare programs represent a national policy trend towards Socialism and Communism and therefore must be rejected. On the other hand, the former southerner takes a more Populist position on this issue, supporting economic benefits for the working man that are associated with social welfare measures. Consequently, the Wallace party organization has experienced internal conflict at the grass-roots level that may be related to the differing viewpoints of its cadres on this issue.

Foreign policy attitudes reveal a paradox in the thinking of Wallace campaign workers. Strong support exists in the party for a more "hawkish" Vietnam war policy and at the same time the activists call for a more isolationist stand on foreign aid(Table 27). Almost unanimous agreement exists among the activists that the United States should rely more heavily on its military leaders and pursue a strategy to win the war in Vietnam. Michiganders are most intense

[7]The Detroit Free Press, August 9, 1970, p. 13.

Table 27

Foreign Policy Attitudes

Attitude	Southern Migrants	Michiganders	Total
I. The United States should rely more heavily on the judgment of its military leaders and pursue a strategy to win the war in Vietnam.			
Agree Strongly	78%	94%	86%
Agree	12	4	8
Not Sure	5	2	4
Disagree	5	0	3
Disagree Strongly	0	0	0
II. The United States should give help to foreign countries even if they are not as much against Communism as we are.			
Agree Strongly	0	2	0
Agree	5	7	6
Not Sure	8	7	7
Disagree	40	20	30
Disagree Strongly	48	63	56
III. On this question of United States giving help to countries that are not as much against Communism as we are, is the governmental policy going too far, doing less than it should, or pursuing about the right course?			
Too Far	92	95	94
Less Than Should	5	2	4
About Right	3	2	3

on this issue with 94% of the state natives agreeing strongly with a "win the war" policy. On the other hand, the campaign workers take a more isolationist view with respect to foreign aid by opposing United State's aid to foreign countries unless they are as much against Communism as we are. Over 80% of both Michiganders and southern migrants disagree or disagree strongly on giving foreign aid to countries less opposed to Communism with Michiganders slightly more likely to take a stronger stand. In addition, 94% of all activists believe that the government is going too far in its present policy of aiding nations less committed against Communism.

By taking into account the strong opposition to Communism by Wallace campaign workers, this apparent inconsistency of a hawkish view on Vietnam and opposition to foreign aid can be explained. The war in Vietnam is a direct confrontation between the United States and Communism which in the mind of the Wallace activist calls for an all-out effort for victory over the enemy. However, giving aid to countries that may assist the Communists in Vietnam is perceived as damaging Vietnam policy and only by looking out for the interests of the United States first can ultimate victory over the enemy be realized.

In summary, the hypothesis that a strong belief in the internal Communist conspiracy has a positive correlation with support for ultraconservative ideology appears to be true for at least one subgroup of the Wallace party. Campaign

workers with a native Michigan background display substantial agreement with ultraconservative issue positions, professing profound disagreement with policy trends of the political system over the last forty years. Disapproval of social welfare policy is intense by Michiganders with many equating social welfare measures with the internal threat of Communism. In addition, foreign policy views reveal the conservative nature of Michiganders with their strong demands for total victory over the Communists in Vietnam and elimination of foreign aid to countries that could aid the enemy.

The other subgroup of the Wallace cadre, southern migrants, exhibit some agreement with ultraconservative issue positions, but apparently their strong belief in the Communist conspiracy is more closely related to the racial issue than other right wing policy views. Obviously agreeing with the increased medical and social security benefits that George Wallace proposed during the 1968 campaign, this subgroup of the third party is less inclined to support policy that would decrease these economic benefits for the working man.

CHAPTER VIII

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR

FUTURE RESEARCH

The Motivations of Wallace Campaign Workers

Many of our hypotheses concerning the motivations of
third party activists are supported by the political behavior
of Wallace campaign workers in Wayne County, Michigan.
Wallace activists are compensated by purposive rather than
by material or solidary rewards in return for their party
activity. Data concerning initial party involvement and
work satisfactions reveal a Wallace cadre determined to
strive for issue goals and not interested in procuring immedi-
ate personal benefits. Moreover, in contrast to the motiva-
tions of activists in the major parties, Wallace campaign
workers have voluntarily sought their party organization,
are relatively inexperienced in terms of political background
and profess profound concern about the ideological direction
of the political system.

Grass-roots activists in the Wallace party also express
great dissatisfaction with the issue positions of the major
parties and correspondingly view the policy statements of
their presidential candidate, George Wallace, as much more

94

in harmony with their political convictions. Wallace campaign
workers perceive no differences between the Republican and
Democratic parties in the 1968 campaign while at the same
time observe vast issue discrepancies between the larger
parties and the Wallace party. The intensity of this ideologi-
cal dissatisfaction is demonstrated in the finding that most
Wallace activists perceive Communist influence in the major
parties--a rationalization for denying the legitimacy of
traditional structures that are expounding disagreeable
policy goals.

Two distinct groups emerge in the ideological concerns
that have motivated persons to work for the Wallace party
organization. The racial reactionary is primarily dissatis-
fied with law and order problems which are highly correlated
with his anti-Black and anti-civil rights attitudes. Concern
over crime in the street, demonstrations, riots and inade-
quate law enforcement is greatest among southern migrants
in the party who also display substantial opposition to
integration policy and equality of the races. In short,
activists who have migrated to a northern from a southern
state are most disturbed about urban disorders and identify
these disruptions with the Black community.

The ultraconservative in the Wallace party does not
disagree with the concerns of the racially motivated activist
about crime and disorder, but the range of his policy desires
appear to be much more comprehensive and in many areas closer

to the goals of the radical right. The ultraconservative calls for the elimination of domestic and foreign policy decisions that the political system has produced over a long period of time, including social welfare policy, the income tax, increased governmental spending, the United State's participation in the United Nations and increased foreign aid. A distinct area of disagreement for the ultra-conservative and the racial reactionary is the social welfare issue where increased benefits in social security and medi-care, advocated by the racial reactionary, are opposed by the more conservative activists. Michiganders or natives of the state of Michigan exhibit these ultraconservative convic-tions and, as a result, are often in disagreement with southern migrant workers over social welfare policy.

In their frustration over public policy both the racial reactionary and the ultraconservative exhibit a longing for the past that unites them in a common desire to reverse issue trends of traditional structures and return to a time when America was taking "correct" policy stands. The racial reactionary calls for a society free of urban disorders and the civil rights movement. The ultraconservative desires a society and political system that is in many ways pre-New Deal in foreign and domestic policy. Thus, perhaps the term "reactionary" describes ideological agreement in both sub-groups of the third party.

Foreign policy is another area of concurrence for Wallace

activists with a strong conviction existing that the United
States ought to rely on its military advisors in pursuing a
strategy to win the war in Vietnam. In addition, strong
sentiment exists to eliminate foreign aid to countries that
do not take a strong stand against Communism. Further, the
internal threat of Communism in the major parties and govern-
mental system is perceived by many activists, indicating a
lack of trust in present structures that fail to provide
adequate solutions for important societal problems.

However, the belief in an internal Communist threat
also reveals a difference in the interpretation of this
threat. The racial reactionary believes that institutions
which have taken unsatisfactory stands on civil rights and
societal disorders are Communist-inspired. The ultraconserva-
tive applies the same label to discredit these institutions
for additional or different reasons--namely, the socialistic
trends in the political arena with increased governmental
growth and spending.

The political attitudes of Wallace activists are differ-
ent in several respects from Wallace voters. A much higher
proportion of activists believe in the internal Communist
threat, revealing their deeper distrust of traditional struc-
tures. More important, the influence of ultraconservative
ideology is much greater in the Wallace cadre with one impor-
tant subgroup opposing social welfare proposals that Wallace
voters, north and south, support. The racial reactionary at
the activist level is in many ways similar to the Wallace

voter in 1968 with his strong opposition to civil rights legislation and concern about urban disorders, but his additional belief in the Communist conspiracy reflects less confidence in the political system.[1] In short, Wallace activists are much more dissatisfied with the performance of the major parties and governmental system than Wallace voters and, in some policy areas, favor additional radical right goals.

Therefore, political alienation based on issue concerns has motivated persons to work for the Wallace party structure. The nature of this ideological dissatisfaction reveals two subgroups in the Wallace cadre, the racial reactionary and the ultraconservative, both of whom are opposed to the present issue positions of the major party organizations. Opposition to policy trends in civil rights, crime and law enforcement, anti-Communism and foreign affairs has united these activists in their desire to return to a past age when the party and governmental structures were pursuing "correct" policy goals. However, the racial reactionary and the ultraconservative disagree on the point of emphasis in their political concerns, and, as a result, must be characterized in different motivational terms.

Suggestions for Future Research:

Organizational Viability

The kinds of incentives that a third party offers its

---

[1]For an analysis of the political attitudes of Wallace voters see Wolfe, op. cit., pp. 1-14.

cadres are important variables that affect the behavior of that organization. Much of the internal and external activity of a minor party structure may be based on the motivations of its activists and the tangible or intangible rewards that are offered in return for party labor. Thus, on the basis of our findings concerning the motivations of Wallace party activists, we can speculate on the problems that the Wallace party organization is likely to encounter.

The hypothesis can be advanced that the Wallace party will shape its organizational framework on the basis of purposive rather than material or solidary rewards. Founded on the desire of its activists for policy changes in the governmental system, the minor party structure will be primarily concerned with working out issue positions and enumerating exactly what the party stands for. While other parties have internal tasks of distributing patronage or providing social group rewards, the Wallace party probably exists to create and state the desired policy goals of its cadres.

Also within the policy consensus of this third party lies a source of potential cleavage with which the Wallace party organization must grapple. Individuals motivated by ideological considerations often disagree rather vehemently over exact enumeration of principles, and this situation prophesies that internal conflict will plague any third party structure. Several studies suggest that internal disputes have already disrupted the Wallace party organiza-

tion at both the national and state levels. At the national
level two rival organizations have been formed, each claiming
to be the true spokesman for the third party, because of
apparent disagreement over policy questions. Also, ultra-
conservatives in the state of Michigan have charged that the
third party is controlled by racists or even the Ku Klux Klan
when party organization has failed to adopt domestic welfare
goals of which they approve. The racial reactionary refuses
to abandon his demands for increased welfare benefits and
a strong anti-civil rights stand and, as a result, often
compels the ultraconservative to choose between abandoning
the party and remaining to pursue other issue goals. Limited
evidence for the Wallace party in Michigan reveals that the
racial faction has triumphed on most issues and that the
ultraconservative, despite some policy disagreements, is
willing to live with the party on the basis of other common
goals.

An established organizational framework will not be as
much in evidence for the Wallace party as it is for the
major parties. Partially because of its short-lived exist-
ence and primarily because of its reliance on policy goals,
it can be hypothesized that established institutional chan-
nels will be secondary to purposive objectives. Thus, an
inquiry into the decision-making process of the Wallace party
probably will reveal the loose structure of a party founded
on consensus. Such an inquiry should disclose a lack of
reverence for organization, an emphasis on ideas rather than

power and a resultant difficulty in researching party frame-work.

Thus, we can speculate that viability will be a major problem for the Wallace party organization. Despite agreement on the need to reverse policy trends in the party and governmental systems, disagreement will exist over the determination of policy objectives. The racial reactionary and the ultraconservative will differ, not only on where the point of emphasis ought to be in pursuing party goals, but over correct positions on issues in some areas. The strong distrust of traditional structures and the desire for a past society is what may hold these factions together in their quest for ideological satisfaction, but this consensus will be disrupted by conflict of a significant magnitude.

Further, the successful attainment of a number of the policy goals of the Wallace party probably will eliminate the need for the organization to exist. On the other hand, the failure to procure stated ends will increase intraorganizational conflict with members likely to condemn each other for the failure to achieve support. One characteristic of sporadic third parties in the American system is their eventual assimilation by the major parties. Sensing that a sizable portion of the electorate can be lured from the third party, the Republican and Democratic parties often have adopted minor party policy positions and thereby eliminated the necessity for the smaller parties to continue. However, other minor parties such as the Socialist, Socialist Labor

and Communist parties that have not been absorbed by the major parties are characterized by great internal strife. The Wallace party appears to fall within the category of a sporadic third party but probably will experience increasing internal strife if its policy goals are not adopted by the traditional parties.

APPENDIX

Interview Schedule for Wallace

Campaign Workers

1. Let's start with some questions about your background
in politics. Before you joined the Wallace party what
party did you identify with? That is, did you consider
yourself a Republican, Democrat, or what?
1. Republican   2. Democrat   3. Other _____
1a. What made you leave this party? _____

---

2. Have you ever worked for the Republican or Democratic
parties?
1. Yes-Republican   2. Yes-Democratic   3. No
(If Yes)
2a. In what year did you first campaign for this party?
_____

2b. In what year did you last campaign for this party?
_____

2c. Have you ever held a leadership position in this
party?
1. Yes   2. No
(If Yes)
2d. What was the nature of this position? _____

3. What led you to become active in the Wallace party? ___

---

4. Before you actually got into party work, how did you
first develop an interest in political matters? _____

---

5. What presidential candidate did you support in 1964?
1. Lyndon B. Johnson   2. Barry Goldwater   3. Other
5a. Did you actively work in support of this candidate?
1. Yes   2. No
(If Yes)
5b. In what city, state did you work? _____

103

6. On this card are a number of reasons that are often given for why people become active in party work. Taking each reason separately in explaining why you became active would you say that it is (1) Very important (2) Somewhat important, or (3) Not very important?

Card I   Rating

a. I had a personal friendship for a candidate _____
b. Political work is part of my way of life _____
c. I am strongly attached to my political
   party _____
d. I enjoy the friendships and social contacts
   I have with other workers _____
e. I like the fun and excitement of the
   campaign contest _____
f. I am trying to build a personal position
   in politics _____
g. I see campaign work as a way of influencing
   the policies of government _____
h. I like the feeling of being close to people
   who are doing important things _____
i. Party work helps me make business contacts _____
j. Party work helps me fulfill my sense of
   community obligation _____
k. Party work gives me a feeling of recogni-
   tion in my community _____
6a. Which one of the reasons on this card do
   you think best explains why you became active?

---

7. Here is a list of the different kinds of clubs and organi-
zations that are found in greater Detroit(Show Card II).
Which of these kinds of groups do you belong to? (Record
if Member)

Card II	If Member	If Officer
Labor unions	___	___
A church	___	___
Church-connected groups	___	___
Fraternal organization of lodges	___	___
Veteran's organization	___	___
Business or civic groups	___	___
Parent-Teachers associations	___	___
Neighborhood clubs or community centers	___	___
Organizations of people of the same nationality background	___	___
Sport teams	___	___
Professional groups	___	___
Political clubs or organizations	___	___

7. Continued

Neighborhood improvement associa-
tions
Women's clubs   ___   ___
Charitable and welfare organiza-
tions

7a. Are you on a committee or do you hold any office in
    this organization? (Record)

8. How much say do you believe precinct workers generally
    have in running your party's organization: <u>very little</u>,
    <u>some</u>, <u>a fair amount</u>, or <u>a great deal</u>?
    1. Very little   2. Some   3. Fair amount   4. A great deal
    8a. Do you think that precinct workers generally should
        have more say than they do in running the party's
        district organization...is it about right now...or
        should they have less say?
        1. More   2. About right   3. Less

9. In your opinion, was there a fairly clear plan for your
    party in Wayne County for the types of activities to be
    followed during the campaign?
    1. Yes   2. No
    (If Yes)
    9a. How were you informed about this plan? _____
    9b. Did you ever have meetings with precinct leaders to
        discuss this plan?
        1. Yes   2. No

10. During this campaign, about how many meetings with pre-
    cinct leaders have you had in this district?

    _____

11. How many meetings have you had with the district chairman?

    _____

12. What do you consider to be your most important job or
    task as a precinct worker? _____

13. If you had to drop out of political activity tomorrow,
    what things would you miss the most from such work?

    _____

14. Which one of these occupational groups would you say the
    Wallace party appeals to most in your precinct--Profession-
    al and Business people, or Other White Collar people like
    salesmen and clerks, or Working Class people?
    1. Professional Business 2. Other White Collar 3. Working
                                                         Class

15. With respect to your general viewpoint on current issues, how do you feel about the statement that "The government ought to help people get doctors and hospital care at low cost."
    1. Agree   2. Agree   3. Not   4. Disagree   5. Disagree
       Strongly   Sure   Strongly
    15a. On this question of government helping people get doctors and hospital care at low cost, is the government going too far, doing less than it should, or going at about the right pace?
        1. Too far   2. Less than should   3. About right

16. How about this statement: "The United States should give help to foreign countries even if they are not as much against Communism as we are?"
    1. Agree   2. Agree   3. Not   4. Disagree   5. Disagree
       Strongly   Sure   Strongly
    16a. On this question of the United States giving help to countries that are not as much against Communism as we are, is the government going too far, doing less than it should, or pursuing about the right course?
        1. Too far   2. Less than should   3. About right

17. What would be your reaction to this statement: With possible exception of major wars, the national budget should be balanced every year.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

18. There should be a law to prevent people from making speeches against our form of government.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

19. It is not reasonable to suspect the loyalty of a lawyer who represents accused Communists before a Congressional committee.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

20. Communist professors do not have very much influence in American colleges and universities.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

21. The United States should not have signed the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

22. The United States should rely more heavily on the judgment of its military leaders and pursue a strategy to win the war in Vietnam.
    1. Agree   2. Agree   3. Not   4. Disagree   5. Disagree
       Strongly   Sure   Strongly

23. The impeachment of Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren, would be fully justified.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

24. It seems quite clear that the United States is on the way to becoming a Socialist country.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

25. Social welfare measures such as social security benefits and payments to the poor are not much different than Socialism and Communism.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

26. The danger to the United States from Communists living here is <u>not</u> as great as the danger from Russia or China.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

27. Communists do <u>not</u> have very much influence within the Democratic party.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

28. The United States ought to withdraw from the United Nations.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

29. Communists do not have very much influence within the Republican party.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

30. The government is acting properly when it refuses a passport to a Socialist.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

31. The south is right to oppose integration.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

32. The Negro's charge that he has consistently suffered oppression and discrimination in a white society is basically unwarranted.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

33. This country would be better off if the federal income tax were abolished.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

34. When the police are looking for evidence against a suspected criminal they should <u>not</u> have to have a warrant to search a house.
    1. Agree   2. Disagree

35. Legislative committees should not investigate the politi-
cal beliefs of university faculty members.
1. Agree   2. Disagree

36. Books which oppose churches and religion should be removed
from local public libraries.
1. Agree   2. Disagree

37. There are no significant differences between the National
Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the
Black Power Movement.
1. Agree   2. Disagree

38. What is your opinion of Martin Luther King? _____

39. Would you say that despite advances by the Negro that he
is still basically inferior in intelligence to the white?
1. Agree   2. Disagree

40. Would you say there are important differences between
the Republican and Democratic parties in this campaign,
or do you think they are pretty much the same?
1. Different   2. Same
(If Different)
40a. What are the major differences you see?

(If Same)
40b. What are the similarities?

41. Would you say there are important differences between the
Wallace party and the Democratic party?
1. Yes   2. No
41a. What are the major differences?

42. Would you say there are important differences between the
Wallace party and the Republican party?
1. Yes   2. No
42a. What are the major differences?

43. What, if anything, do you like about the Democratic party?

44. What, if anything, do you like about the Republican party?

45. In your opinion, what was the most important issue in
the presidential campaign?

45. Continued
45a. How does the Wallace party stand on this issue?

_____

46. (By observation) 1. Race: 1. White 2. Negro 3. Other
                       2. Sex: 1. Male   2. Female

47. How old are you? _____

48. Are you married, single, divorced, separated or widowed?
     1. M   2. S   3. D   4. Sep.   5. Wid.

49. What was the highest grade of school you completed?
     0. None 1. 1-4 yrs. 2. 5-6 yrs. 3. 7 yrs. 4. 8 yrs.
     5. 9-11 yrs. 6. Completed high school 7. 1-3 yrs. college

50. What is your religious preference?
     1. Catholic 2. Protestant 3. Jewish 4. Other _____
                                                       Specify

51. What is the original nationality of your family on your
     father's side? _____
     51a. Was your father born in the United States?
           1. Yes   2. No

52. How long have you lived in the Detroit area? (If needed)
     The "Detroit area" is anywhere in Wayne, Macomb or Oak-
     land Counties. _____
     52a. Where did you live most of your life before you
           came here?
           _____Town _____State
     52b. Where were you born?
           _____Town _____State
     52c. Have you ever lived on a farm? 1. Yes 2. No (If Yes)
     52d. Where? _____State
     52e. Between what ages? _____to_____

53. What was your father's usual occupation while you were
     growing up. (Be Specific) _____

54. What was your father's political preference? That is,
     did he consider himself a Republican, a Democrat, or what?
     1. Republican   2. Democrat   3. Other _____
                                                       Specify

55. Would you say your father was very active in politics,
     quite active, or not active in politics?
     1. Very   2. Quite   3. Not

56. What do you believe your total family income will be in
    1968, considering all sources such as rents, profits,
    wages, interest and so on?   (Card IV)
    1. Under 2,000   2. 2,000-4,000   3. 4,000-6,000
    4. 6,000-8,000   5. 8,000-10,000 6. 10,000-15,000
    7. Over 15,000

57. What is your occupation? (If Needed) That is, what sort
    of work do you do?   (Be Very Specific)

    (If Retired or Unemployed)
    57a. What did you do when you were working?

    57b. What is your husband's occupation?   (If respondent
          is married)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Apter, David E. <u>Ideology and Discontent</u>. London: Free
    Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Barnard, Chester. <u>The Functions of the Executive</u>. Cambridge:
    Harvard University Press, 1958.

Bell, Daniel (ed.). <u>The Radical Right</u>. New York: Doubleday
    and Company, 1963.

Broyles, J. Allen. <u>The John Birch Society</u>. Boston: The
    Beacon Press, 1963.

Cain, Edward. <u>They'd Rather Be Right</u>. New York: Macmillan
    Company, 1962.

Cannon, J. P. <u>The Struggle for a Proletarian Party</u>. New York:
    Pioneer, 1943.

Cleghorn, Reese. <u>Radicalism-Southern Style: A Commentary
    on Regional Extremism</u>. New York: American Jewish
    Committee, 1969.

Draper, Theodore. <u>The Roots of American Communism</u>. New York:
    Viking Press, 1957.

Duverger, Maurice. <u>Political Parties</u>. New York: Wiley and
    Sons, 1954.

Eldersveld, Samuel J. <u>Political Parties: A Behavioral
    Analysis</u>. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1964.

Forthral, Sonja. <u>Cogwheels of Democracy</u>. New York: William-
    Frederick Press, 1946.

Gosnell, Harold F. <u>Machine Politics: Chicago Model</u>. Univer-
    sity of Chicago Press, 1937.

Heard, Alexander. <u>A Two-Party South</u>. Chapel Hill: University
    of North Carolina Press, 1952.

111

Hicks, John D. The Populist Revolt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931.

Hyman, Herbert. Political Socialization. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1959.

_____. Survey Design and Analysis. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.

Key, V. O. Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups. New York: Crowell Company, 1964. Fifth Edition.

_____. Southern Politics in State and Nation. New York: A. A. Knopf, 1949.

Kurtzman, David H. Methods of Controlling the Votes in Philadelphia. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1943.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. Political Man. New York: Doubleday and Company, 1960.

MacKay, Kenneth Campbell. The Progressive Movement of 1924. New York: Columbia University Press, 1947.

McEvoy, James III. The American Right Wing. Forthcoming Publication.

Nash, Howard P. Third Parties in American Politics. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1959.

Overstreet, Harry and Overstreet, Bonoro. The Strange Tactics of Extremism. New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 1964.

Prothro, James W. Negroes and the New Southern Politics. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Ranney, Austin and Kendall, Willmoore. Democracy and the American Party System. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1956.

Salter, John T. Boss Rule. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1935.

Schattschneider, Elmer E. Party Government. New York: Rinehart and Company, 1942.

Schmidt, Karl M. Henry A. Wallace: Quexotic Crusade, 1948. New York: Syracuse Union Press, 1960.

Schoenberger, Robert A. (ed.) The American Right Wing.
     Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1969.

Shannon, David A. The Socialist Party of America. New York:
     Macmillan Company, 1955.

Sorauf, Frank J. Party Politics in America. Boston: Little,
     Brown and Company, 1968.

Supplement to Congressional District Data Book: Redistricted
     States. Washington, D. C.: United States Government
     Printing Office, 1965.

Wahlke, John; Eulau, Heinz; Buchanan, William and Ferguson,
     LeRoy. The Legislative System. New York: John Wiley
     and Sons, 1962.

Wilson, James Q. The Amateur Democrat: Club Politics in
     Three Cities. Chicago: University of Chicago Press,
     1962.

Articles

Althoff, Phillip and Patterson, Samuel C. "Political Activism
     in a Rural County," Midwest Journal of Political Science
     (1966) X, pp. 39-51.

Ashbrook, John. "And Anyway is Wallace a Conservative,"
     National Review (1968) XX, pp. 1048-49.

Bowman, Lewis and Boynton, G. R. "Recruitment Patterns Among
     Local Party Officials: A Model and Some Preliminary
     Findings in Selected Locales," American Political Science
     Review (1966) LX, pp. 667-676.

Chester, Lewis, Godfrey, Hodgson and Page, Bruce. "George
     Wallace Against the Labor Unions," in David Bell, Karl
     Deutsch and Seymour Martin Lipset, editors, Issues in
     Politics. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1970,
     pp. 80-85.

Clark, Peter B. and Wilson, James Q. "Incentive Systems:
     A Theory of Organizations," Administrative Science
     Quarterly (1961) VI, pp. 129-166.

Converse, Philip E., Miller, Warren E., Rusk, Jerold G. and
     Wolfe, Arthur. "Continuity and Change in American
     Politics: Parties and Issues in the 1968 Election,"
     an Unpublished Paper presented at the American Political
     Science Association Meeting, New York City, 1969, pp. 1-30.

Geschwender, James W. "Continuities in Theories of Status Consistency and Cognitive Dissonance," _Social Forces_ (1967) XLVI, pp. 160-172.

Goldwater, Barry. "Don't Waste a Vote on Wallace," _National Review_ (1968) XX, pp. 1060-1079.

Harned, Louise. "Authoritarian Attitudes and Party Activity," _Public Opinion Quarterly_ (1961) XXV, pp. 393-397.

Hirschfield, Robert S., Swanson, Bert E. and Blank, Blanche D. "A Profile of Political Activists in Manhatten," _Western Political Quarterly_ (1962) XV, pp. 500-505.

Journal of Social Issues (April, 1963). Entire Issue.

Kolack, Shirley. "A Study of Status Inconsistency Among Social Work Professionals," _Social Problems_ (1968) XV, pp. 365-376.

Lasswell, Harold. "Effects of Personality on Political Participation," in Richard Christie and Marie Jahoda, editors, _Studies in the Scope and Method of the Authoritarian Personality_. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954, pp. 166-197.

Lenski, Gerhard. "Status Crystallization: The Non-Vertical Dimension of Social Status," _American Sociological Review_ (1954) XVIII, pp. 405-413.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. "George Wallace and the U. S. New Right," _New Society_ (1968) XXI, pp. 477-483.

Lipset, Seymour Martin and Raab, Earl. "The Wallace Whitelash," _Transaction_ (1969) VII, pp. 23-32.

McCloskey, Herbert, Hoffman, Paul J., and O'Hara, Rosemary. "Issue Conflict and Consensus Among Party Leaders and Followers," _American Political Science Review_ (1960) XXII, pp. 276-294.

McEvoy, James, Chesler, Mark and Schmuck, Richard. "Content Analysis of a Super-Patriot Protest," _Social Problems_ (1967) XIV, pp. 455-463.

Marvick, Dwaine and Nixon, Charles. "Recruitment Contrasts in Rival Campaign Groups," in Dwaine Marvick, editor, _Political Decision-Makers: Recruitment and Performance_. New York: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 193-217.

Meyer, Frank S. "The Mandate of 1968," National Review (1968) XX, p. 1170.

Patterson, Samuel G. "Characteristics of Party Leaders," Western Political Quarterly (1963) XVI, pp. 332-352.

Polsby, Nelson W. "Toward an Explanation of McCarthyism," Political Studies (1960) XVI, pp. 250-271.

Pomper, Gerald. "New Jersey County Chairmen," Western Political Quarterly (1965) XVI, pp. 250-271.

Riley, Robert T. and Pettigrew, Thomas F. "Relative Deprivation and Wallace's Northern Support," an Unpublished Paper presented at the American Sociological Association Meeting, San Francisco, 1969, pp. 1-7.

Rogin, Michael. "Wallace and the Middle Class," Public Opinion Quarterly (1966) XXX, pp. 98-108.

Rossi, Peter and Cutright, Phillips. "The Impact of Party Organization in an Industrial Setting," in Morris Janowitz, editor, Community Political Systems. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1961, pp. 81-116.

Rush, Gary B. "Status Consistency and Right-Wing Extremism," American Sociological Review (1967) XXII, pp. 86-92.

Salisbury, Robert H. "The Urban Party Organizational Member," Public Opinion Quarterly (1965-66) XXIX, pp. 550-564.

Schlesinger, Joseph A. "Political Careers and Party Leadership," in Lewis J. Edinger, editor, Political Leadership in Industrialized Societies. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1967, pp. 266-293.

Schmuck, Richard and Chesler, Mark. "On Super-Patriotism: A Definition and Analysis," Journal of Social Issues (1963) XVIII, pp. 31-50.

Wallace, George. "Bloc Voting Contrary to Good Government," Wallace Newsletter (1970), p. 1.

Wolfe, Arthur C. "Challenge From the Right: The Basis of Voter Support for Wallace in 1968," an Unpublished Paper presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting in Washington D. C., 1969, pp. 1-14.

Wolfinger, Raymond E., Wolfinger, Barbara Kaye, Pruitt, Kenneth and Rosenback, Shiela. "America's Radical Right: Politics and Ideology," in David Apter, editor, Ideology and Discontent. New York: The Free Press, 1964, Chapter VII.