

gatherings of any size on almost any subject with which I had any acquaintanceship, but in this place it is a lot different. Your words must be carefully chosen, your subject must be carefully chosen, the facts that you have must be carefully chosen and very thoroughly documented because there are ninety-six people sitting there who, among them, constitute experts on any subject which you care to mention. If you talk loosely or use facts that are not backed, you very quickly get called on them.

To say that my knees were rattling when I stood up would be to put it mildly. But I was confident that my words would float around in the eaves of the chamber, get briefly mixed up with the historic words of the great men who had spoken there before me, and be very quickly lost and forgotten. But they will not be forgotten by me, because that will be, as they say here, my maiden attempt, and now that it is over, I have a lot of the confidence in my ability to express myself in the future. Still, I plan to proceed from here very slowly, being careful to select the subjects I know something about, and waiting until I have a year or so under my belt before attempting any further major addresses with my floor appearances, other than helping in the general debate of subjects which are germane to my committees.

Journal Entry (March 12, 1953)

I am in my office. It is just about sundown. It's been a hot, muggy spring day, and as I look out to the northwest I can see the Washington Monument, and the low hanging clouds, and I am thinking about events that have transpired since I arrived here and what, if anything, I can begin to conclude from these experiences.

One thing giving me concern is an obvious lack of unity within the Republican Party. By this I don't mean lack of purpose rather a lack of unity along the lines that the Democratic Party displays so well in the Senate. They have discipline; we don't. We seem to lack aggressive, strong leadership willing to develop issues which are so clearly with us, and then bring them out on the floor. There is a lack of interest on the floor from the Republicans; there are very few members of our party on the floor during debate or during discussion. I don't know what it is. Perhaps it is the fact that we haven't been in power for

twenty years and have forgotten the organization that is needed to get things done, and it's most important we get organized for next year, 1954. I am not concerned to the point where I am going to give up hope for this unity, because there is evidence that it is going to come, and I think that as the newness of our reacquired power wears off, we will get down to business.

The big thing that has happened here in a legislative way since the last time I talked into this dictating device was the Tideland debate, which developed into a record breaking filibuster lasting some four and a half weeks. Because Peggy and the children are not with me this year, I am, therefore, one of the few unattached men, at least for the time being, so I volunteered my services for the night-time sessions of this debate. I was glad that I did because I got to hear a lot of it and I got to develop an idea in my own mind as to what this thing really was all about. In fact, I was there the night that Senator Wayne Morris of Oregon talked for twenty-two hours and some minutes. I remember that I went home at six in the morning and after taking a bath and changing my clothes, I returned to hear the finish of what is the longest speech in the history of the Senate, if it means anything. I personally would rather see a man spend more time thinking about what he is going to say than getting up and saying it for that length of time and accomplishing nothing.

Now there is a group of people in both parties that we like to refer to as New Dealers or Fair Dealers. They are neither regular Democrats nor regular Republicans, and we've got them in both parties. These are people who, by long association with the New Deal and the Fair Deal, have become inculcated with their ideas and principles to the point that they feel the federal government should have the power over everything, that the federal government should dominate the states, it should dominate business, it should control the economy and the unions and control the life of this country. I suspect that if I told any one of these men that, they would probably challenge me, but nevertheless, their actions speak louder than their thinking and in their expression. Now on the other side, you have members of both parties, particularly among the Southern Democrats, who believe in states rights and who believe that the federal government should be

out of the state and local government picture entirely, and out of the affairs of business as well.

I sense here a realignment of Southern conservative Democrats with Democrats and Republicans of the West and Middle West. The New Deal and Fair Deal folks are coming from the eastern seaboard, and it is alarming to me to see how far they have gone. They are controlled by the dictates of the labor unions, the dictates of the stronger minority groups are felt in almost every decision they make, in almost every debate they enter. This thinking is a far cry from that of the Western senator and the Southern senator who believe in the free enterprise system, who believe in the freedom of the individual and the freedoms of the states. After only four months, I am beginning to see a cleavage that is new, but nevertheless, I think it is going to develop as one of the major issues in the future and that will be the federal government against the states and individuals, and it should be an interesting one to pursue.

Since my last report, I have been to Springfield, Illinois to speak to the Federation of Retailers; up in Maine to speak to the young Republicans; and I gave talks here to the Tubercular Society, the Furniture Dealers Association meeting and the National Women's Republican Clubs meeting. On March 23rd I will stop in Minneapolis for a speech on my way home to Arizona. This spring I will give the graduation address at my old school, Staunton Military Academy, and a few days later I will give the graduation speech at a luncheon for the School of Retailing at New York University. So I have been kept fairly busy on the speaking circuit, so to speak.

Journal Entry (Late December 1953)

Goldwater at this time purchased a small 185-horsepower Beechcraft Bonanza aircraft to fly back and forth between Arizona and Washington. Soon he would find that the air force made their jets available to senators, which cut his travel time even more.

My how time flies. It is now nearly the end of December, just a little under a week until Christmas, and the family has gathered here today in Washington prior to departing to Phoenix the day after tomorrow

for the Christmas holidays. We'll all return on January 4th so the children can re-enter school and I can attend the opening of the second session of this 83rd Congress. It's been a long time since my last dictation about the happenings of this year, but I think I can remember vividly enough the important things to get them down in their order of importance to me. . . .

During the last two months of this first session, I engaged in several debates, most notable of which was the five-billion-dollar budget cut to the air force, and I know that the air force took a rather dim view of a former air force officer standing up to argue against them. At one point on the floor, I was openly challenged by Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri, who used to be the civilian head of the air forces at the Pentagon, who found it odd that an air force officer would want to cut the air force's appropriation. I reminded him that my first duty was to my country and my people and certainly not to the air force. I went on to support this cut, which went through. Now, I am pleased to say, after inspecting and watching the air force, that I feel we have a better and stronger air force than we did before, and the cut, instead of hurting them, made them work harder and as a result of that, we have something to show for it.

Just prior to the Fourth of July, during the appropriation hearings on foreign aid, I introduced an amendment on the portion of foreign aid which would give four hundred million dollars to France for their war in Indo-China. My amendment said that this money would be forthcoming only when France set a target date for the framing of a constitution and the establishment of independence for those states.* It seemed rather inconsistent to me, inconsistent certainly with the principles of this Republic, that we, who have fought so hard for freedom against Britain, would now be supporting openly a country like France with colonizing ambitions. My amendment caused quite a

* Goldwater's amendment stated, "That no such expenditure shall be made until the Government of France gives satisfactory assurance to the President of the United States that an immediate declaration will be made to the people of the Associated states [of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam] setting a target date for the adoption of a constitution for such States, and for the establishment of their complete independence."

commotion on the floor. The debate stretched on hour after hour, and all the time I knew, of course, that it didn't have a chance of passing, but as I say, it was a matter of principle and I wanted to introduce it, which I did. I did accept an amendment from Senator John Kennedy of Massachusetts, which, in effect, toned it down to practically no effect, and that was defeated; we only picked up seventeen votes.

I am not conceited enough, or should I say, I don't like to sound like I am conceited enough, to think that this action had anything to do with France's subsequent announcement that these states would be granted their freedom. But that has come about and now it only remains to be seen if France will keep her word. . . .

We received the tragic and dreadful news of the passing of Senator Bob Taft. I don't recall a time in history when a man like this was needed as badly as he was needed and is still needed today. While I did not support him in his candidacy for the presidency of the United States, nevertheless, I have always recognized his brilliance and leadership. And while we expected his death, the news of it came with a sobering shock and we realized that our work was made doubly difficult by his passing. He was the one man in the Senate who was able to control Eisenhower's wishes stemming from the president's lack of experience in politics, and prompted by the men who advise him, too many of whom have left wing tendencies. Bob would see to it that requests did not reach the Senate or the Congress when he knew they would be defeated, and he quietly guided the president's decisions wisely in all political matters. . . .

One thing developed during the first session, and it has become more evident in the months since, and that is the fact that the Republican Party does not have leadership at the top. The president has been very reluctant to assume such a leadership role. I am very hopeful that in the coming session he will do that, but through the past several months it has become more and more evident that he does not want to bother himself or indulge himself in the leadership that is necessary for this party.

In addition, the advice that he has been getting from his little circle of advisors seems to me to continue to be of the New Deal type. In fact, the question as the year ends is: What will the president's message indicate? Another New Deal type of program or a return to the

principles of the Republic? And of course, I hope it is the latter. If we had wanted more of the New Deal, we would have been much wiser to have kept the old administration in because they were quite adept at ignoring the concept of the Constitution and giving away the people's money and taking away their rights and privileges. I don't know who these advisors can be. I don't have too much faith in Tom Dewey or in Sherman Adams, and no faith whatsoever in some of the men who were taken directly out of the New Deal gang and have been retained in high places in this government. These holdovers are effecting too many decisions and I am hopeful that they will go. A lot depends upon what message the president delivers to us next January, and I will refrain from making any more remarks until after that time so we can judge the course that he chooses down which the Republican Party will be asked to go.

At the present time, the forty-seven Republicans seem to be going in forty-seven directions. But, happily the forty-seven Democrats are doing pretty much the same thing, and they also lack leadership, with the exception of former President Truman and Adlai Stevenson, both of whom are heaping discredit upon the Democratic Party, so as a Republican, I hope they continue to be that party's leaders. But for the sake of America, I am hoping that the Democratic Party finds new, vigorous leadership and will allow it to develop.

Much has been said the last few months about the influence of Senator Joe McCarthy on the Republican Party, and here in Washington it has bordered on hysteria. As I have traveled out over the country, I find that the people are pretty much in accord with what Joe has been trying to do. Some don't agree with his methods, but almost as a whole, they want to get rid of communists in government and they recognize that the job will not be easy and that it might take the methods employed by McCarthy and his committee. Unfortunately, this whole matter of McCarthy was allowed to develop into a fight between the president and his Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and McCarthy. This was certainly encouraged by the New Deal press and the left wing columnists who kept saying: "Let's you and him fight." And that finally came about. I think that Joe realizes the danger of any further utterances and I am hopeful that his present quietness

indicates a wise decision on his part to wait until January until we see what the program is going to be.

This whole thing of McCarthy is a stupid example of how American minds can be influenced by the press, by the left wing writings and by the New Deal chantings of the columnists and news commentators who hate McCarthy, in fact, who hate any Republican or conservative Democrats. I have learned some things in this year. I have learned that our fears in the West about people in this country wanting to circumvent the Constitution are certainly true. And I am just as fearful tonight as I was a year ago when I was heading to Washington that this could and might happen to this country. People here don't recognize rights of the states. Rather they laugh at them. The concept of government here is one of federal domination. It's one of federal operations doing everything. Now what remains to be seen is whether or not the Republican Party along with the conservative Democrats are going to go against this notion of the federal government doing everything. Members of Congress are so engrossed over international affairs, communism, the atom, and so forth, that they have lost sight of this basic fundamental concept of government that the power of the federal government stems from the states and the people, and not in the other direction. This is going to cause divisions in the party just as sure as I am talking, because those people on the eastern seaboard look beseechingly to the government for everything, while we in the West and the South want the government to look to us and stay away from us except in the fields that the Constitution says they should be of assistance to us.

I have learned too that you can't run government like you run a business. I believe you can put a lot of good business practices into the operation of committees and offices, but I don't think that the government as a whole, being the gigantic thing that it is, can be run along strict business concepts. Still, we can do a lot better than we have been doing. We don't have to spend the money that we have been spending. I think that we can balance the budget, but I think it is going to take a lot of hard work and a lot of guts to do it.

... My work on the Labor Committee has been most interesting, particularly working on the Taft-Hartley Act. I think every radical in the Democratic Party is on the committee—not to mention we have a sprinkling of such left wingers from our own party on it too—but

they all appear to have a very fair attitude about the law, and look both at management's side and labor's side, but most importantly, the public's side. . . . There has been a big clamor about agriculture for the past six months, as the prices received by farmers have dropped about eight and a half to nine points since this administration took office. But that doesn't compare with the nearly eighteen points that they dropped prior to our coming in. The farmer wants everything. The farmer wants to be supported. He wants a guaranteed profit, which is against the free enterprise system. . . . I have been very proud of the cattle people of Arizona during this whole clamor for price supports on beef. They have, almost to a man, opposed it, wanting the government to stay out, wanting to operate their own businesses with the laws of supply and demand governing their actions and prices. It is refreshing to find Arizona cattlemen, and I'll say this of Arizona farmers as well, acting like real, solid American business people. It is refreshing because here in the east, the eastern senators and representatives think only of what can be given to people that might gain them votes, not what can be given to people that will insure the continuance of our American system of government and our American system of free enterprise.

I have been on several television shows, have been in sixteen states and in general have done my little bit towards furthering the Republican cause, but chiefly trying to explain what we have done, what's been accomplished, because we have made definite inroads into the problems which existed when we came here. . . . My pride in this job grows with the passing of every day, and the realization of its problems increases daily, and my desire to do a good job continues to grow. I recognize the limitations that I have, but I'll do what I can to overcome them and I think in the years to come, I will have the privilege of living through an interesting development of American history, that God willing and the American people helping, we'll find this country once again solidly on the paths that the Republic was founded on.

Congress adjourned a few days after Bob Taft's death and we all went our separate ways into the country to mend our fences and talk to the folks at home. I flew the Bonanza back out to Phoenix and made the return trip in one day, but it meant fifteen hours of flying in one day and I hereby solemnly state that I will never do that again. I'm not as young as I used to be.

assure you, Bud, that under circumstances as they stand today, I feel that I not only could not get the nomination but that if I happened to get it, I could never be elected. I think the country might accept a Catholic, but I don't think they are ready to take a person who is Jewish, or half Jewish, and I wish you would keep that latter statement under your hat, but I am convinced of that.

Notes (July 29, 1959)

Before turning to the first notes that Goldwater would make regarding the book that would become The Conscience of a Conservative, the book itself needs to be placed in context, because it would become a political classic and there remains considerable confusion as to who did what and how. One commentator, for example, later wrote, "The truth is that Goldwater had almost nothing to do with the book that made him famous and launched his national political career." This is not correct.*

When flying west, Goldwater had jotted down his first thoughts for a book, which he thought he might do with L. Brent Bozell, Jr., a young conservative writer who had written speeches for him in the past. Bozell had been William Buckley, Jr.'s debate partner at Yale, had married Buckley's sister Patricia, and had worked with Buckley on his new publication the National Review. On this date, Goldwater dictated his first thoughts over the telephone to his secretary in Washington to give to Brent to start him thinking about the book project, which the senator would discuss with Bozell when he returned. These raw notes indicate that Goldwater had no clear vision of where he wanted the book to go, other than that it should somehow capture the emotions he felt about his country as he traveled it and about the everyday people who are the country and that the book should be as basic as our founding documents and speak to all Americans.

How many times have I flown across our county? I cannot even estimate but I am always eager for the thrill, for with it goes many emotions, among them that physical one of being up there among the clouds or alone in the blue of Heaven, and the mental one being my problem

* See John B. Judis, "The Man who Knew Too Little," Washington Post, September 24, 1995, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-srv/style/longterm/books/reviews/goldwater.htm>.

to get to the point I started for. I have always thought the spiritual feeling of seeing my America unrolled below me to be the strongest; the greenness of the valleys of California, the better known and loved beauties and canyons of Arizona; the Rockies, the flat Middle West, the streams and farms of the East, the hills that keep the East from the West. But in this emotion is the even stronger one wrapped up in the people who live in our country—the aircraft worker of California, the cowboy of my state, the miner in the Rockies, the farmer in Indiana, the businessman of the towns and cities, the doctor, lawyer, the automobile worker in Detroit, and the tobacco man of the South, the banker of New York and the professor in Princeton—what does he think of our country? This is what occurs to me as America unrolls as a gorgeous carpet beneath my flight. What is [the feeling of the American citizen as] he contemplates his responsibility to our country? Is it apathy or devotion, distrust or respect? Does he know that this freedom can only be kept by himself; that the answer of Franklin to the lady in Philadelphia, when asked what they had given our people, was "A Republic, if you can keep it," remains as important today as then? Does he know that Thomas Jefferson warned in the Declaration of Independence that "We are endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights" which is the great source of all we hold dear, of freedom, and that those words are the basis of man's search for sources of freedom through the ages? Does he know, as he sits in his comfortable home, the lights flickering across the now covered years, signaling his happiness to me above, that government cannot be the provider without being the master? Is he aware of the assessment of his freedom, his happiness—his own and his children's future—by those who, through intent or ignorance, are successfully hacking away at those vitals of freedom?

What, then, would I say to those who live in this land we love? Is there a difference between what I would say to the aircraft worker, the cowboy, the miner, the farmer, the businessman, the lawyer, the automobile worker, the tobacco man, the banker, the professor, or any man living in this land of ours? I don't think so. The words of our forefathers apply to all men, as do the words of this humble person whose love of country was born of a devoted mother. devoted to the

everlasting truths of faith in God's country and himself. This is what I believe.

Letter (August 12, 1959)

On August 12, 1959, Goldwater met with L. Brent Bozell, Jr., to discuss the book project, and Goldwater memorialized their meeting in a letter later that day. The book project did not get under way, however, until a publishing contract was signed several weeks later.

Dear Brent:

As I recall this is the approximate discussion we had today relative to the project:

We would open up with something along the lines that I suggested in the brief memorandum I wrote on the plane. Then, having recognized that the nefarious efforts of those opposed to our way of life have been rather successful in cataloguing and pigeon-holing [conservative] people in the last thirty years, we would start a series of discussions with the people under various groups as people. We might start with the aircraft worker, then go to the farmer, the businessman, the professional man, the old, the young, and those who precede their title of American with a hyphen, such as Spanish-American, etc.

Throughout this portion of the discussion we would treat generously the thought that the one hope and desire of all the people of this country is freedom. We could point up in the summation of this portion of the book the thought that all people today want this, and wanting it they should, therefore, think primarily of the powers that might threaten that freedom before they think of the material things they can gain from it.

We would follow this section by a discussion of the powers that are operating against freedom today, and in this we can take centralized government, big labor, big business, high taxation, the agricultural programs, etc., etc., and foreign policy.

I think the windup should be in the form of a recognition of the lessons of history that have shown us that all of the above powers, operating either singly or together at one time, have lowered the morals of the peoples of other countries to the point that internal collapse

resulted. The lesson to be learned is that we are in more danger of destroying ourselves from within than we are of being destroyed from without.

It was a pleasure having lunch with you. Let's repeat it often.

Letter (August 15, 1959)

In the following letter to Eugene Pulliam, Goldwater's friend who was the owner and publisher of the Arizona Republic and Arizona Gazette (among other newspaper holdings), Goldwater describes why he has not totally killed the efforts of Manion to assemble a draft-Goldwater committee.

Dear Gene:

Relative to your letter to Pat Manion of August 11th, I would like very much to discuss this with you when we can get together this Fall. I think that after our last meeting Pat understands fully my position in this, which coincides exactly with yours, namely, that any serious outward effort at this time to place my name in nomination would result in destroying whatever little usefulness I have to my country and to our party. The whole thing to me, if it is going to be, should be a matter of being prepared should a hole appear in the wall and through it we might run. I would violently oppose, for instance, the nomination of Rockefeller, as I believe that nomination would destroy good Republican senators and congressmen. I prefer Nixon and I am for him, but in the event something occurs that prevents his getting it and Rockefeller is suggested, then we must be ready to fight.

Letter (September 7, 1959)

The other person that Goldwater wanted to speak with was Stephen Shadegg, who had most recently served again as Goldwater's campaign manager in the 1958 reelection campaign. This letter to Shadegg needs a bit of context to explain what followed. During his vacation in December 1959, Goldwater met with the editorial board of the Los Angeles Times, who had been so impressed with the senator that they asked that he write a regular column. Goldwater explained to the Times that he was not a writer, not to mention that the demands on his time in the senate commanded his full attention. But it was agreed that Senator Goldwater would select a writer