Linfield College
DigitalCommons@Linfield

Faculty Publications | Faculty Scholarship & Creative Works

1-1-2007

Editing Conservatism: How *National Review* Magazine Framed and Mobilized a Political Movement

Susan Currie Sivek
Linfield College

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.linfield.edu/mscmfac_pubs

Part of the Journalism Studies Commons, and the Social Influence and Political Communication Commons

DigitalCommons@Linfield Citation

Sivek, Susan Currie, "Editing Conservatism: How *National Review* Magazine Framed and Mobilized a Political Movement" (2007). *Faculty Publications.* Accepted Version. Submission 4.
http://digitalcommons.linfield.edu/mscmfac_pubs/4

This Accepted Version is brought to you for free via open access, courtesy of DigitalCommons@Linfield. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@linfield.edu.

Editing Conservatism:

How *National Review* Magazine Framed and Mobilized a Political Movement

Submitted to *Mass Communication & Society*
Revised September 7, 2007

Abstract (100 words):
This paper examines how *National Review* magazine helped to spark the 1960s American conservative movement through its particular framing of conservatism, and how the magazine has worked to sustain that influence even until today. Using research on frame alignment in social movements, the first issue of *National Review* is analyzed and placed in context with contemporaneous events and publications. The creation and editing of the magazine is found to parallel the creative and deliberate framing of the early conservative movement. The implications of *National Review*'s success for today's political movements and for creators of political media messages are also discussed.

Key words:
National Review
Framing
Social movements
Political movements
Magazine publishing
Political magazines
Conservatism

In tales of American political history, the magazine *National Review* is often cited as a significant force in forging the 1950s conservative movement. Some historians view the magazine as crystallizing a nascent movement, bringing together disparate aspects of an otherwise disjointed but plausible conservative ideology that was taking shape in America:

> [I]f *National Review* (or something like it) had not been founded, there would probably have been no cohesive intellectual force on the Right in the 1960s and 1970s….the history of reflective conservatism in America after 1955 is the history of the individuals who collaborated in…the magazine William F. Buckley, Jr. founded. (Nash, 1976, p. 153)

It's rare to see a magazine credited with such influence, and it seems odd that one political magazine would be singled out among many published at the time as having had a special impact. The other conservative magazines of the era are little mentioned in political history. In this paper, I will examine the first issue of *National Review*, published in November of 1955, to determine how it initiated a strategic framing of conservatism that could effectively launch a movement, and how it aligned that belief system with the needs of a previously unmobilized audience.[1] This episode demonstrates the power a political magazine may possess, and, as I will also argue, carries lessons for those interested in the political role of journalism today.

Scholars who have studied social movements have identified specific actions that those involved must undertake in order to unite, mobilize others, and eventually effect change. Among the first of these actions is the establishment of a coherent, unique, and relevant collective identity for the movement. This undertaking has been summarized as "conscious strategic efforts by groups of people to fashion shared understandings of the world and of themselves that legitimate and motivate collective action" (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996, p. 6). In other words, the group must construct a sense of common ground that allows them to act as a group to cause the change they desire. Additionally, an important part of establishing this identity is determining who is *not* in the group, and more particularly, who or what is a barrier preventing the desired changes. The movement members must therefore set up "boundaries,"

which do not have to be literal or formally organizational in nature, but can be composed symbolically through language to help define the movement's collective identity (Reger, 2002, p. 173).

Little research has been done on magazines' role in aiding this process of definition for social movements, and while much research exists on the development of the conservative movement, none have specifically detailed the role of *National Review* in this process. Considering the genre of opinion magazines more broadly, Victor Navasky, publisher emeritus of *The Nation*, has written of the potential of these publications to provide readers a larger context and sense of community, beyond mere news and information: "Over the long haul, these magazines provide their own narratives, a long-running moral/political/cultural paradigm complete with its own heroes and villains" (2005, p. 21-22). Navasky argues that opinion magazines' thoughtful presentation of a specific "paradigm" of political thought is unavailable in other media. These magazines also offer their audiences the opportunity to feel part of a community of readers engaged in that paradigm.

However, only a few case studies explore magazines' community-building capabilities, and magazines' role in aiding the formation of political movements is not often addressed. For example, Sender (2001) describes how *The Advocate* magazine helped form an image of the gay consumer and community. That image, Sender argues, possessed the potential to empower politically the magazine's audience, but was not utilized due to advertisers' preference for an apolitical audience. Similarly, Théberge (1991) discusses how musicians' magazines in the 1980s aided in the creation of musicians as a desirable target market, and created a feeling of community among this group. However, neither of these studies addresses the connections between the crafting of magazine content and its capability to mobilize an audience for political action, as I will argue occurred in the case of *National Review*.

Editing Conservatism

In the mid-1950s, when *National Review* was founded by William F. Buckley, Jr., the political scene lacked clear boundaries. While there were of course political parties with members who subscribed to particular ideologies, these ideologies were general and not always clearly linked to specific policy goals. Most Republicans were considered "conservative," but there did not exist a widely shared, easily

stated definition of conservatism that could serve as a basis for collective action. Instead, at this time, three main forces could be identified as "conservative": traditionalism, anti-communism, and libertarianism. Traditionalists sought a reestablishment of traditional moral and religious absolutes, and an avoidance of moral relativism. Anti-communists argued that the West had to aggressively fight communism, which they viewed as a grave enemy of Western civilization. Finally, libertarians pressed for less state involvement in citizens' lives and for free enterprise (Nash, 1976, p. xiii). Individuals could of course subscribe to more than one of these beliefs, but a cohesive perspective and label that united all of them was more elusive.

National Review had limited space in which to address these three strands of conservatism, yet its staff was composed of individuals passionate about each of them. Buckley faced a challenge as an editor and manager; he "expended extraordinary amounts of personal energy mediating among the many people of extreme moods and ideologies who filled his journal's editorial chairs" (Nuechterlein, 1988, p. 36). Many of the *National Review* staff were in fact former "radicals" of one variety or another, including Willi Schlamm, James Burnham, Willmoore Kendall, and Whittaker Chambers. This range of ideologies among the staff created an "unstable compound" of the three strands of conservatism Nash describes (Anderson, 1990, p. 293; Lora, 1999, p. 517).

However, the situation Buckley faced was like that of many beginning social movements, in which members must negotiate varying concepts of the group's intended purpose, meaning, and goals. Reaching a consensus is "typically a contentious internal process," and that is exactly what Buckley had to manage as the editor of *National Review* (Gamson & Meyer, 1996, p. 283). Creating a coherent magazine out of these varying individuals' contributions mirrored the process of framing a coherent political philosophy that could mobilize a conservative movement. The negotiation among the staff's views required the editor to create a political perspective that could encompass their variety, yet not become too philosophically wide-ranging. As the magazine itself described this process in its fortieth anniversary issue,

> *National Review* provided a hospitable venue for the gorgeous variety of conservative thought: traditionalists, libertarians, economists, anti-communists, skeptics, constitutionalists, philosophers, even monarchists….The controversies within conservatism were many and profound, and through those controversies the various conservatives tended to arrive at terms of practical amity…generating a rich literature of political thought. ("We Have," 1995, p. 24)

Buckley's task, although ostensibly to create a magazine, also required weaving a fabric consisting of the three major threads of conservatism that could clothe those who were sympathetic to the conservative cause, but who might have been discouraged by one of its less-appealing incarnations (such as the John Birch Society, to be addressed later). The magazine's first issue provides evidence of the ways in which the magazine staff sought to define and delimit its position on the three strands of conservatism, and clearly states that its position is to be interpreted as more than an editorial perspective: it is, in fact, a call to arms.

Traditionalism and Christianity. A crucial aspect of the magazine's success among traditionalist conservatives was its construction of a historical and religious foundation for political conservatism. The magazine also frequently invoked the philosophical nature and history of "Western civilization" and tradition in order to reinforce its staff's assertion of the existence of moral absolutes, and their refusal to accede to the purported relativism of the modern age. "The Magazine's Credenda," a general statement of the staff's beliefs in the first issue, also portrays them as "disciples of Truth, who defend the organic moral order" against "Social Engineers, who seek to adjust mankind to conform with scientific utopias" ("The Magazine's Credenda," 1955, p. 6). In the first issue's "Publisher's Statement," Buckley argues that the relativism of the so-called "social engineers" has taken over America:

> Instead of covetously consolidating its premises, the United States seems tormented by its tradition of fixed postulates having to do with the meaning of existence, with the relationship of the state to the individual, of the individual to his neighbor, so clearly enunciated in the enabling documents of our Republic. (Buckley, 1955, p. 5)

Buckley here elevates the United States' "tradition" above dissent regarding its founding beliefs, and privileges the "traditional" beliefs that have withstood the test of time, in his view.

Moreover, references to "tradition" permeate the first issue of the magazine, even in its theater review (which contains references to Aristotle) and in three of its book reviews. One book review laments France's lack of "liberal tradition…[the country] lacks even such an elemental civil liberty as *habeas corpus*" (Utley, 1955, p. 28). Another critic reviews a book titled *History and Liberty: The Historical Writings of Benedetto Croce.* Croce is criticized for his view of liberty that "has no rational nor universal principle, and is to be found only in the actual historical development of society[.] Where is the liberty of the individual person, living in the tension between his spiritual being and the real natural world…?" (Meyer, 1955, p. 30). The critic clearly seeks a more essentialist view of human liberty, universal and unchanging. Finally, the last book review is of a biography of Saint Thomas à Becket, whose life can, for the *National Review* critic, serve as "a classic example of the meaning of tyranny on the one hand, and of loyalty to principle on the other" (P. Burnham, 1955, p. 30). The magazine's first issue evokes the Western tradition and seeks to establish for readers the continuity of its own conservatism with these historically-based principles, beginning with politics and extending even to art.

At the same time, the magazine's first issue sets out an explicitly Christian conservatism: this magazine's political view reflects not just tradition, but Christian tradition. William F. Knowland, then the Republican leader in the Senate, wrote an article in the first issue about the American response to communism. He argues that the fight against communism represented "the confrontation of two worlds, with two irreconcilable faiths….We adhere to our Christian-democratic belief in freedom and humanity" (Knowland, 1955, p. 11). Knowland's neologism unambiguously links Christian faith with democracy. He simultaneously elevates American democracy to the level of religion and implies that Christianity is fundamental to that governmental system. Buckley, founder of the magazine, would likely have agreed, given his view that not just theism, but a specifically Christian faith, is essential to true American conservatism:

> The pro-religious conservative can therefore welcome the atheist as a full-fledged member of the conservative community even while feeling that at the very bottom the roots do not interlace, so that the sustenance that gives a special bloom to Christian conservatism fails to reach the purely secularist conservatism. (qtd. in Allitt, 1993, p. 101)

As Brinkley also notes, Buckley was one of the key figures in a trend of "Catholic social conservatism in the early postwar period," as he and others advocated for a world in which "the bonds of community were sustained by timeless values protected by the church" (1994, p. 421). Likewise, the first issue of *National Review* deliberately locates its emerging conservatism securely in the Western tradition and in the Christian faith. Readers seeking confirmation of the magazine's conformity to those ideals would be reassured by frequent references to tradition and religion, and would be more likely to accept other ideas advanced by the magazine.

Anti-Communism. National Review also needed to firmly engage anti-communist conservatives, lest the magazine be perceived as infused with the "Spirit of Geneva" (portrayed in a cartoon in this issue as a Holy Spirit-like figure, gazing down from above).[2] The "communist threat" was repeatedly mentioned throughout this first issue, and was addressed at length in a number of articles. Knowland's lengthy article, "Peace – with Honor," carefully sets out his beliefs on the status of communism, and describes why he views the Soviet Union as one of the biggest threats to the world. He argues that the Soviets used "a strategy of propaganda, deception, aggression or threats of aggression, and internal subversion of free governments" to spread communism (Knowland, 1955, p. 11). James Burnham's column "The Third World War," despite its rather extravagant title, retains a relatively moderate tone in its evaluation of communism (1955, p. 20). One of the first issue's advertisements – for Gray Manufacturing Company, a maker of "Audograph and PhonAudograph 'Pushbutton Dictation' Equipment" – mentions communism, and manages to do so in a more overtly strident tone than the magazine's own authors: "Peaceful coexistence – bunk!...Freedom will never die…Tyranny always causes its own destruction." This first issue of the magazine sets out a strong anti-communist frame that

would likely appeal to those conservatives eager to battle, as Buckley was, "the jubilant single-mindedness of the practicing Communist, with his inside track to History" (Buckley, 1955, p. 5).

What is significant in these references to communism, however, is that while they are stridently anti-communist, they are thoughtfully so, even intellectually so (with the exception of the advertisement). The authors inveighing against communism in this first issue provide facts and logical argumentation. The establishment of a more cerebral anti-communism in this first issue was meant not only to appeal to intellectuals – the audience targeted for conversion to the magazine's rendition of conservatism – but to frame *National Review*'s anti-communism in a particular way. At the time of *National Review*'s founding and well beyond, there was a serious anti-communist movement in America, and the public was well familiar with McCarthyism's "vocabulary of angry awakened patriotism" (Burner, 1996, p. 90). Such vitriolic anti-communism would be revived with the John Birch Society's founding in 1958 by Robert Welch; the Society sought to draw attention to an alleged massive communist conspiracy growing within the U.S., which allegedly tried to influence everything from the civil rights movement to taxes to education to the fluoridation of municipal water supplies (Perlstein, 2001, p. 115). One notices in the first issue of *National Review*, however, that although the authors clearly feel strongly about preventing communism from taking hold in the U.S. and in other non-communist states, they always adopt a clear-headed, less emotional tone than that seen in the rhetoric of McCarthy and especially of Welch. As the examples throughout this analysis demonstrate, even while discussing a range of controversial issues, the magazine consistently presents its arguments carefully, explicitly delineating its perspective and using deliberate, self-reflective diction and tone.

When the magazine presented its anti-communist perspective, its fact-based argument and reasonable tone were in fact part of a concerted effort to distance its views from those of more extreme anti-communist conservatives. This effort culminated in 1962, when Buckley wrote a carefully worded editorial for the April 22 issue of *National Review*, stating that Robert Welch, head of the John Birch Society, "persists in distorting reality and in refusing to make the crucial moral and political distinction…between 1) an *active pro-Communist*, and 2) an *ineffectually anti-Communist*

liberal….There are bounds to the dictum, Anyone on the right is my ally" (italics in original; qtd. in Judis, 1988, p. 199).

In this passage, Buckley clearly differentiates between those who are helping the conservative cause and those who are not, and places Welch and his Society in the latter group for their extremism and lack of logical rigor. He viewed Welch as a resident of "crackpot alley" (qtd. in Judis, 1988, p. 200). This ultimate move to disassociate *National Review*'s conservatism from the extremism of the Welches and McCarthys of the country was the final brick in the magazine's defensive wall against extremism. As when it defined its traditional Christian views of the world, *National Review* set out boundaries for its strategically framed conservatism in order to create "a responsible dissent from the Liberal orthodoxy" that was still righteously anti-communist, without its egregiously radical elements (Buckley, 1955, p. 5). This was a frame that those intellectuals who embraced the *National Review*'s rational conservatism could defend to those who might question them.

Libertarianism. Finally, a third strand of conservatism required integration into *National Review*'s perspective: libertarianism. The staff explicitly included libertarianism in the very first item of the philosophical statement in this first issue:

> It is the job of centralized government (in peacetime) to protect its citizens' lives, liberty and property. All other activities of government tend to diminish freedom and hamper growth. The growth of government…must be fought relentlessly. In this great social conflict of the era, we are, without reservations, on the libertarian side. ("The Magazine's Credenda," 1955, p. 6)

The statement also reinforces libertarian economic views, stating that "The competitive price system is indispensable to liberty and material progress…*National Review* will explore and oppose the inroads upon the market economy…and it will tell the violated businessman's side of the story" ("The Magazine's Credenda," 1955, p. 6). Articles in the rest of the first issue do precisely that. The labor column, by Jonathan Mitchell, criticizes unions, and offers a particularly negative characterization of Walter Reuther, head of the United Automobile Workers. Mitchell says that Reuther's mind "is as aggressive as Rommel's, filled with towering thoughts" (1955, p. 19). A book review also provides an

outlet for a libertarian view. An author who stated that Franklin Roosevelt deserved credit for eliminating sweatshops receives this response from reviewer John Chamberlain: "Well, who actually got rid of the sweatshops, the politicians who passed laws or the industrialists who showed how labor could become more and more productive with better tools under a rising pay scale?" (1955, p. 27). The "violated businessmen" deserve the credit, according to *National Review*'s libertarian perspective.

But the frame of libertarianism set out by the magazine was soon to be again strategically delimited. The magazine set a boundary on this aspect of its professed beliefs by openly rejecting the "objectivism" of Ayn Rand, which was a type of extreme libertarianism. Rand's atheism and her placement of self-interest and personal financial gain above all other priorities could not be reconciled with *National Review*'s otherwise traditionalist and Christian philosophy. The magazine would in its second year of publication explicitly denounce Rand's perspective, publishing Whittaker Chambers' review of *Atlas Shrugged*, in which he decried Rand's message and her "overriding arrogance" (qtd. in Nash, 1976, p. 157). Therefore, *National Review* was able to unite libertarian economic and political perspectives, as described in the article excerpts above, with its own Christian conservatism – while excising Rand's atheistic objectivism from its definition of conservatism. The conservative movement, as seen in the pages of *National Review*, would not descend into Rand's libertarian extremism, just as it would avoid Welch's conspiracy theory-laden anti-communism. As Noble (1978) describes, "the ability of the *National Review* at the end of the 1950s to define Robert Welch and Ayn Rand as conservative heretics was an indication of the remarkable growth of new conservatism and libertarian conservatism from 1945 to 1955" (p. 647).

Constructing the Liberal Enemy

By both strategically engaging and limiting its framing of these three strands of conservatism, *National Review*'s first issue was able to construct a symbolic collective identity that its readers could easily identify with, should they already have a sympathy for the conservative perspective but not be prepared to engage its more radical components. However, the editorial staff took one more step to make this first issue not just a philosophical statement that would result in little action, but an actual "mission

statement" for a real political movement. *National Review*'s readers, were they to be mobilized into a political movement, would need not just ideas to fight for, but something tangible to fight against. The first issue of the magazine was eager to provide that enemy, and to do so with flair.

In contemporary political discourse, the vague terms "conservative" and "liberal" are often employed by both groups to create political distinctions – and demons. *National Review*'s first issue represents an earlier deployment of this idea, and contains a unusually stringent and deliberate construction of the liberal "enemy." (Notably, when used to refer to individuals of that political persuasion, "liberal" is capitalized throughout the magazine to draw even more attention to its use; "conservative" is not capitalized.) Indeed, even in this first issue of what would become the leading conservative magazine, one can see in Willmoore Kendall's "The Liberal Line" column the ideational progenitors of today's conservative discourse about "liberals." In a sidebar, there is a statement of what "The Editors of National Review Believe" regarding liberals:

1. That there *is* a Liberal point of view on national and world affairs, for which the word "Liberal" has been appropriated;
2. That the point of view consists, on the one hand, of a distinctively Liberal way of looking at and grasping political reality, and on the other hand of a distinctively Liberal set of values and goals;
3. That the nation's leading opinion-makers for the most part share the Liberal point of view, try indefatigably to inculcate it in their readers' minds, and to that end employ the techniques of propaganda;
4. That we may properly speak of them as a huge *propaganda machine*, engaged in a major, sustained assault upon the sanity, and upon the prudence and the morality of the American people – its sanity, because the political reality of which they speak is a dream world that nowhere exists, its prudence and morality because their values and goals are in sharpest conflict with the goals and values appropriate to the American tradition;

5. That *National Review* must keep a watchful eye on the day-to-day operations of the Liberal propaganda machine: the theses it puts forward, the arguments (if any) it advances in their support, and the (implicit or explicit) policy recommendations it urges on us – in a word, on the *Liberal Line*. (italics in original; Kendall, 1955, p. 8)

There are a number of interesting characteristics of this precisely worded analysis of the liberal perspective and goals. First is the repetition that liberals are decidedly different, with a "distinctive" worldview and value system. The next is the implied criminality of "appropriating" the term liberalism (which is also used in a rather different context, as in the idea of "liberal democracy") to describe this political perspective. Presumably, the offense here is against *tradition*, particularly the American tradition cited in point four, which would have held "liberal" values close to heart had the word not been stolen. Third, there is a strong suggestion of liberal irrationality here – in contrast to the intellectualism provided by *National Review*, in its own judgment – within the statement that liberals live in a political "dream world" and appear unlikely to present good arguments ("if any") to support their goals.

Perhaps most significantly, though, this statement regarding the liberal enemy appears to echo statements that were made about communists at the time. Consider the following passage from a speech given by Senator Joseph McCarthy to the Senate in 1951:

> I, and countless other Americans, discovered a traitorous and insidiously clever campaign of propaganda to persuade us the Americans, that our friends were our enemies and our enemies were our friends. It was a campaign to persuade us…that all the leaders friendly to America and to our way of life were corrupt, greedy, degenerate men… (McCarthy, 1951, p. 187)

As McCarthy's words demonstrate, *National Review*'s suggestion of a hidden conspiracy, using secret propaganda to influence hearts and minds and to draw Americans away from cherished American traditions and "our way of life," was nothing new. However, such imagery and language had previously been utilized for communists, not for liberal political rivals. The excerpt from Knowland's article, provided above, is similar in tone and narrative. But the identification of liberals with communists in *National Review*'s pages is perhaps not so farfetched. In 1958, Frank Meyer would make this assertion:

> contemporary liberalism is in agreement with Communism on the most essential point – the necessity and desirability of socialism; that it regards all inherited value – theological, philosophical, political – as without intrinsic value and authority. (qtd. in Anderson, 1990, p. 294)

Here, liberalism is characterized as on par with communism for its disrespect for tradition and religion, and might activate the same heuristics among those tending toward *National Review*'s perspective. As such, this characterization was functional for the magazine and the conservative movement it sought to activate. This may have especially been true for more ardently anti-communist readers who would likely respond to such familiar suspicions, either consciously or subconsciously. Given the liberals' presumed dominance, their sinister goals, and the desperate need to fight them, Buckley was willing to openly declare war so that *National Review*'s logically superior conservatism could vanquish them: "Once we prove that we can take any comer, once we have engaged in hand-to-hand combat with the best the Liberals can furnish, and bested them, then we can proceed to present a realistic political alternative" (qtd. in Judis, 1988, p. 140).

With many social movements, it is difficult to judge how consciously the members are engaging in a process of strategically framing their message to best mobilize many potential adherents. In most social movements,

> we can expect the initial framing processes to be less consciously strategic than later efforts. In fact, at the outset, participants may not even be fully aware that they are engaging in an interpretive process of any real significance. This is certainly not the case later on as various factions and figures within the movement struggle endlessly to determine the most compelling and effective way to bring the movement's "message" to the "people" (McAdam, McCarthy, & Zald, 1996, p. 16)

Interestingly, *National Review* and the conservative movement that it launched seem to have been excepted from this typical order of events. The act of creating a media product around a clearly defined political message – although it had been done before – and the fact of the staff's political diversity and the

need to accommodate them both seem to have contributed to a virtual "editing" of conservatism, an interpretive process that required the framing of a cohesive identity out of many elements.

In this situation, Buckley, aided by his staff, was what Zald calls a "moral entrepreneur," a journalist who engaged in this framing process in order to spearhead "action and policy imperatives" (1996, p. 269). Bringing the "message" to the "people" was the *primary* goal of this first issue of *National Review*, not a later goal. The editorial negotiation required to attain that primary goal may have increased the rapidity of the conservative movement's message framing process. Perhaps every aspiring political movement should start its own magazine to help quickly establish a coherent collective identity.

Mobilizing "the People"

Creating a collective identity based on strategic frames of issues and events is not enough to form a successful social movement, however. In order to inspire readers of *National Review* to actually take political action based on the magazine's messages, the framing of those messages needed to "align" with the existing frames held by audience members. This process, called "frame alignment," has been defined as "the linkage or conjunction of individual and social movement organizations' interpretive frameworks," and must occur prior to an individual's participation in a social movement (called *micromobilization*) (Snow, Rochford, Worden, & Benford, 1986, p. 467).

Books and magazines have been cited by activists on both the left and right as having reinforced and informed their own framing of issues, and so could be key to this process of frame alignment and the resulting micromobilization (Klatch, 1999, p. 67). Researchers of social movements describe frame alignment as consisting of four potential sub-processes, which may not all happen for each participant; however, some must occur to some degree in order for micromobilization to succeed. The frames already held by these potential participants were already shaped by forces other than *National Review*, of course. For example, studies of young people who participated in the conservative movement in the 1960s have revealed that other important factors contributed to their decision to act politically, such as peer influence and the size of the organizations they sought to join (as described by Klatch, 2002). However, these young people were growing up in a society and with parents who were already influenced, to some

degree, by the brand of conservatism provided by *National Review* and by politicians who advocated a similar perspective. *National Review*'s strategic construction of particular frames of conservatism, beginning in this first issue, and the magazine's resulting ability to satisfy these sub-processes of frame alignment among the audience especially help to explain the magazine's success as a mobilizing force for the conservative movement.

Frame Bridging. The first frame alignment process is called *frame bridging*, and is considered the most common frame alignment strategy used by nascent social movements (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 625). In the context of micromobilization, frame bridging refers to the connection of a social movement's frames of issues with the frames already held by "unmobilized sentiment pools," or "individuals who share common grievances and attributional orientations, but who lack the organizational base for expressing their discontents and for acting in pursuit of their interests" (Snow et al., 1986, p. 467). In the case of *National Review*, some anecdotal data exist to support the notion that the magazine was key to creating a sense of a conservative community for people who already held those beliefs, but did not know that there were others like them and that there was an outlet for their political desires. Some of the members of Young Americans for Freedom (YAF; a conservative organization for youth organized in 1960) had their political perspectives reinforced by their parents' subscriptions to *National Review*: "We got *National Review* and when each issue…came, it was like the [high] point of the week," said YAF member Mary Fisk (qtd. in Klatch, 1999, p. 67). These young people identified with the messages of *National Review*, and didn't feel alone in their ideas as a result of exposure to the magazine. This sense of solidarity with other conservatives nationwide likely increased the chance these young people would take political action themselves. Many YAFers attended a YAF conference in Sharon, Connecticut, at the Buckley family estate, where they met other young conservatives in person (Perlstein, 2001, p. 105). They also participated in Republican political activities, beginning with the Goldwater campaign.

Peggy Noonan, eventually a speechwriter for Reagan and George H. W. Bush, began reading *National Review* in the late 1960s, and said,

> …it sang to me. They saw it the way I was seeing it: America is essentially good…the answer to every social ill is not necessarily a social program…and God is as real as a rock. I was moved….Later I found that half the people in the Reagan administration had as their first conservative friend that little magazine. (qtd. in Allitt, 1993, p. 304)

Clearly, the unified traditionalist and libertarian themes of the magazine had been strategically framed in a way that resonated for Noonan, and by her account, for other Reagan-era conservatives as well, helping them construct conservative identities for themselves upon which they would later act. Numerous people evidently felt the same identification with *National Review*'s constructed community: in 1960, just five years after its founding, the magazine had a circulation of 34,000, and that number increased to 90,000 by 1964 (Micklethwait & Woolridge, 2004, p. 51).

Frame Amplification. The sub-process of frame alignment called frame amplification involves the strategic "idealization, embellishment, clarification, or invigoration of existing values or beliefs" (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 624). This reinforcement may make individuals who already identify with particular frames more likely to join a social movement.

Frame amplification may occur through an emphasis on the significance of particular values or beliefs. Value amplification, more specifically, refers to the augmentation of sentiment regarding the importance of "modes of conduct or states of existence that are thought to be worthy of protection and promotion" (Snow et al., 1986, p. 469). In the case of the first issue of *National Review*, the invocation of the language of religion and Western/American tradition may have activated readers' existing reverence for these values. Providing a religious and traditional foundation would reinforce readers' already strong feelings about the importance of these values – as in the case of the conservative traditionalists – or may have awakened these sensations in those for whom such values were latent. Additionally, such invocations of religious authority "reserve and preserve authority"; they are often intended to "shut down debate by offering a final irrefutable authority" (Williams, 2002, p. 262). Using these religious terms, then, might not only "invigorate" the political ideas presented in the first issue of *National Review* with

more profound religious significance, but also implied an argumentative confidence about the universal certitude of these ideas, resulting in a type of frame amplification.

Belief amplification, on the other hand, does not necessarily refer to moral or spiritual beliefs, but can strengthen feelings regarding the true nature of one's antagonists or the causes of one's discontent, among other types of beliefs (Snow et al., 1986, p. 470). In the first issue of *National Review*, the parallel narrative constructed between the liberal enemy and the more familiar communist enemy allows for the amplification of readers' beliefs regarding the risks to their dearly held American "way of life" and the strategies being employed by the individuals posing that threat. While the view of liberals suggested in this first issue is not particularly nuanced or subtle, it does effectively amplify some existing heuristics that readers may already have accepted, especially those who also held strong anti-communist beliefs. Therefore, a strategic frame alignment through the processes of value and belief amplification was also underway in the first issue of *National Review*, creating links between the magazine's political paradigm and the existing ideas and narratives that readers may previously have possessed.

Frame Extension. In most social movements, the process of frame extension is defined as the depiction of the movement's own frames as extending beyond obvious constituencies to encompass the ideational needs of other potential movement participants (Benford & Snow, 2000, p. 625). Researchers have noted that such frame extension is often difficult for social movement leaders to enact effectively due to "turf wars" and the confusion of their messages. *National Review*, at least in this first issue, appeared to avoid these obstacles. In fact, over time, *National Review* sought to expand the conservative movement by refusing to identify itself with groups that, in its view, would not increase its potential participant pool but would instead decrease the movement's intellectual and moral credibility, and reduce its impact among those seeking a "responsible" and "respectable" conservative belief system. As described above, *National Review* eliminated a number of extremists from its rendition of conservatism, including followers of the John Birch Society and of Ayn Rand's atheistic objectivism. Doing so seems a frame constriction rather than a frame extension. However, this constriction paradoxically was probably

the right frame alignment strategy for the magazine and its conservative movement, as the pool of individuals open to conservative ideas would widen *after* the exclusion of more extreme elements.

Frame Transformation. The final sub-process in a strategic frame alignment is frame transformation. Few social movements actively seek to facilitate this process for potential movement participants; however, the first issue of *National Review* does appear to deliberately set forth such an effort. Frame transformation is a far-reaching alteration of movement participants' worldview, following which they begin to see many issues in the same terms – usually moral, spiritual, political and philosophical terms. The application of these new perspectives may extend beyond the issues overtly addressed by the movement (Snow et al., 1986, p. 474). *National Review* readers were explicitly called upon to adopt and act upon the conservative paradigm provided in the magazine, as its benefactors, editors, and writers had done before them:

> More than one hundred and twenty investors made this magazine possible, and over fifty men and women of small means, invested less than one thousand dollars apiece in it….A score of professional writers pledged their devoted attention to its needs….We have nothing to offer but the best that is in us….[But] we offer, besides ourselves, a position that has not grown old under the weight of a giant, parasitic bureaucracy, a position untempered by the doctoral dissertations of a generation of Ph.D.'s in social architecture, unattenuated by a thousand vulgar promises to a thousand different pressure groups, uncorroded by a cynical contempt for human freedom. And that, ladies and gentlemen, leaves us just about the hottest thing in town. (Buckley, 1955, p. 5)

In this succinct statement, Buckley invokes his staff's personal sacrifices, their willingness to serve in this movement, the significance of their effort, and even suggests a certain voguish quality of such involvement. Therefore, for readers, adopting the ideas (and the entire set of them as they are implied here) presented in the magazine is made to seem a noble, worthy, necessary, and stylish thing to do. Such a frame transformation – altering the way movement participants view their entire world – has been called "keying" their beliefs, so that everything they will observe from their acceptance on will be "radically reconstituted" within that new paradigm (Snow et al., 1986, p. 476).

This frame transformation was enhanced by *National Review* in a couple of important ways. First, its use of religious and traditional language, as described above, could also contribute to a process of frame transformation by legitimating the suggested conservative paradigm in moral, spiritual, and historic terms. But references to the past would also eventually be reinforced by future events. External factors, particularly the growth of the "immoral" counterculture during the 1960s and 70s, the deterioration of the liberal movement, the expansion of the federal government under Johnson's Great Society program, and the domestic conflict surrounding the Vietnam War, all apparently supported the view of liberalism propounded by *National Review*: "Suddenly all the terrible things about liberalism that [the magazine] had been saying for years – things which at the time (and in retrospect) seemed extreme and inordinate – took on an air of sober reality" (Nuechterlein, 1988, p. 37).

Such cultural and historical events can provide growing movements, like the conservative movement of the era, with new "cultural stock" that can continue to feed the fire of the movement (Zald, 1996, p. 271). Using that stock, though, requires continuing "ideological work" to integrate these new occurrences and cultural ideas into the existing movement worldview, and *National Review* continued to address issues in ideological terms (Snow et al., 1986, p. 478).

Why *National Review* Succeeded and Others Failed

Why was *National Review* able to strategically frame conservatism for its time and align those frames with its desired audience, whereas other conservative magazines contemporaneously published could not? Why does *National Review* alone receive so much credit for helping shape the modern conservative movement in America? Certainly other conservative magazines did exist at the time. Prior to Buckley's founding of the *National Review*, a list of other conservative magazines included *The Freeman*, *Human Events*, and *The American Mercury*. However, each of these other well-known conservative magazines would diminish in influence due to their shared inability to successfully frame conservatism for the available audience.

The Freeman originally characterized itself as "A Fortnightly for Individualists," and was published independently. A quick review of its June 28, 1954, issue reveals some content that is indeed

similar to that of the first issue of *National Review*. There are also references to the evil of communism; praise for McCarthy; descriptions of the historical foundations for individual liberty in America; an article titled "The Union Member: America's Laziest Man"; a statement generally in favor of "prejudice" for the "Western conception of democracy"; and finally, the all-important description of the cultural and moral relativism of "liberals" (though *National Review*'s innovative capitalization of the word was not yet employed) ("Conservatives for Liberty," 1954, p. 694; Krutch, 1954; Riesel, 1954; "The Real Hysteria," 1954, p. 692). All of these aspects of the magazine seem similar to the political content of the first issue of *National Review*.

However, a crucial moment in the history of *The Freeman* took place just after this issue, when, after suffering financial problems, it began to be published monthly (rather than biweekly) by the Irvington Press, which was in turn owned by the Foundation for Economic Education (FEE). FEE was known for sending strongly libertarian economics textbooks to schools for their use, and even sought out financially disadvantaged schools as special recipients of their free literature. FEE also marketed the magazine as a product that businessmen could buy to send to other businessmen as a gesture of goodwill, and also to spread the libertarian message (evoking images of the "violated businessmen" forming support groups around *The Freeman*) (Perlstein, 2001). In a statement from the new publisher in the first FEE-sponsored issue, the magazine is declared to have as its purpose "to argue for libertarianism and to make a profit" while presenting "a type of journalism which consistently and undeviatingly speaks the case for the rights of the individual, the free market, private property, and limited government" (Read, 1954, p. 5). The magazine's subtitle also changed to reflect this new mission: it was now "A Monthly for Libertarians."

While the magazine's shift in focus to a more exclusively libertarian philosophy might today be seen as a marketing move to reach a more targeted audience, it was at this time in the conservative magazine world not the most successful effort, either in marketing or political terms. The three strands of conservatism that existed could be brought into balance, as *National Review* would soon manage to do,

and in doing so would reach a larger audience. One of its staff later mourned the diminished stature of *The Freeman*:

> It was a shame that we had muffed the chance to maintain *The Freeman*…to fight the Leftist intellectual weeklies….In the longer perspective it did not matter that *The Freeman*, as an intellectual fortnightly, disappeared. For it was reborn in a couple of years in Bill Buckley's *National Review*. (Chamberlain, 1982, p. 145)

In another strategic framing error, *The American Mercury*, once recognized as a prestigious journal of opinion and known as the publisher of H. L. Mencken, devolved into an anti-Semitic publication. As in the case of *The Freeman*, the magazine had financial problems and was sold to a new publisher who dramatically altered its course (Nash, 1999). The magazine entered what *National Review* publisher William A. Rusher would call "the fever swamps of anti-Semitism," never to return (1989, p. 36). This frame extension to include radical anti-Semitism would quickly alienate the magazine's core audience and ruin its credibility as a serious source of political influence. In contrast, five of the 31 staff members credited in the first issue of *National Review* were Jewish (Nash, 1999, p. 123). In 1959, Buckley stated in a published column that *National Review* would no longer hire anyone who had written for *The American Mercury* (once again, overtly constricting *National Review*'s framing of conservatism to exclude particular radical ideologies). Buckley sought out Jewish intellectuals to write for his magazine, and selected Will Herberg, a Jewish theologian and sociologist, to be the magazine's first religion columnist (Nash, 1999, p. 128).

Finally, *Human Events*, the remaining major conservative publication of its time, also included content like that of the original *Freeman* and *National Review*. However, *Human Events* was much more stylistically limited, in both its text and graphic design. Whereas *The Freeman* and *National Review* were published in a magazine format and included cartoons and graphics, *Human Events* appeared (at least in the mid-1950s, when *National Review* was founded) only as an eight-page newsletter in plain typeface. It included four pages of rather dryly presented news and four pages of more developed opinion and argument (including lengthy articles in 1955 issues with rather dull titles like "Five Amendments Are

Needed to Preserve Our Constitutional Liberties" and "A Criminal Law: Why Judges are Lenient with Tax Evaders"). While there is substance and quality writing in the *Human Events* pieces, they just don't engage the mind in the way *National Review*'s content could. No one writing for *Human Events* would claim that their publication was "the hottest thing in town," as Buckley dared to do. Frankly, there is little hot or even lukewarm content to be found in *Human Events*.

In fact, a good portion of the appeal of *National Review* – regardless of its strategic framing – can be found in its sense of style and wit. Even if a reader could never agree with its political paradigm, there is some enjoyment to be had in reading its articles simply for their frequent humor and precise diction. A dull approach would never befit Buckley, a "conservative who could dash off books and duel with liberals on television before disappearing off to some nightclub"; Buckley himself was too dashing and stylish to write without vigor (Micklethwait & Wooldridge, 2004, p. 51). His magazine, then, differed in its vigorous and confident tone, its humorous columns, and its free use of sarcasm, distinguishing the magazine from its dreary predecessors and easing readers' acceptance of its political stance: "Its humor leavened the political statement and made it harder to characterize *National Review* as fanatic and its editors simply as zealots" (Judis, 1988, p. 134). In other words, one might argue that *National Review*'s stylistic approach eased the process of frame alignment for those who felt sympathetic to the conservative viewpoint professed in its pages, in addition to creating a simply more appealing journalistic package.

Finally, as these stories of the other conservative magazines demonstrate, financial insecurity endangers a magazine's framing consistency. *The Freeman* and *The American Mercury* both altered their content in audience-reducing ways as a result of financial issues. *National Review* likely benefited from Buckley's presence, then, in more ways than just his political knowledge and his personal and authorial style: he was able to found the magazine with $100,000 of family money, and could draw on elite social circles for additional donations to the magazine (Judis, 1988, p. 118). Although the magazine has never turned a profit (and at times has had a $500,000 deficit), Buckley's presence has likely contributed to its ability to sustain itself through fundraising (Smith, 1987, p. 37; Kirkpatrick, 2004a, p. A18). Therefore, as other social movements have found, the availability of adequate resources is key to maintaining a

movement's strength and framing consistency. It is also needed to avoid the intervention of powerful donors or other individuals who would redirect the movement's initiative toward frames that are less conducive to widespread alignment with potential movement participants.

The Results of Successful Strategic Framing and Frame Alignment for *National Review* and the Conservative Movement

In 1980, Ronald Reagan was elected president, cementing a conservative movement that had developed over the previous three decades. Reagan is credited with adopting a particularly opportunistic and persuasive conservative strategy:

> Reagan helped change [conservatives'] prevailing image as kooks. He soft-pedaled the position on communism so that the movement was no longer synonymous with anticommunist crackpots and right-wing zealots...He helped turn riots, welfare, student protests, and other issues into effective cudgels that could be used against liberals. (Dallek, 2000, p. 241)

However, these political strategies did not originate with Reagan. These were instead, as this study has shown, techniques that were first strategically developed and deployed by *National Review*. Buckley himself said that the magazine was intended to be "the paradigm" while Reagan was, during his career, "the practitioner" (qtd. in "God and Man in Washington," 1980, p. 2). Buckley even sometimes credited himself as a "ventriloquist," with Reagan his political puppet (qtd. in Judis, 1988, p. 426).

But it did not take nearly thirty years for the conservative movement to see a payoff from *National Review*'s strategic framing and frame alignment efforts. A more immediate result was visible in the energetic presidential campaign of Barry Goldwater in 1964, whose public statements, targeted constituencies, and activists all were shaped by the content of *National Review* over its first decade of publication, content whose overall direction is visible from its first issue. As Irving Kristol, later co-founder of the magazine *The Public Interest*, would write, the magazine

> was part of a larger movement that created institutions that shaped and trained several thousand young conservatives, not so much to go forth and proclaim the gospel, as to go into the Republican Party and gain control over it. This they did, most effectively, over the next decade.

> The result was that it was Goldwater, not Nelson Rockefeller, who was the Republican Party's nominee in 1964. Nor did Goldwater's defeat change the reality that liberal Republicanism had suffered a mortal wound….the course had been set. (1995, p. 91)

That course would continue throughout the Reagan administration and, arguably, to today's still-present conservative movement. While it's always difficult to pin a particular causal role on any outlet of the mass media, it seems reasonable to suggest that *National Review* can be considered one of the founding documents of modern conservatism.

Liberals never seemed able to mount a successful defense to their characterization in *National Review* (and by the conservative movement more generally). A *Harper's* critic said the magazine was radical, humorless, and exhibited a "persecution complex"; other critics said the *Review* was dull and would appeal to the "intellectually underprivileged" (Nash, 1976, p. 152). The liberal opinion press also denigrated the conservatism so doggedly crafted in the magazine's pages, calling the political philosophy a "relic" (Smant, 2002, p. 116). Over time, the assault on liberalism launched by *National Review* would become a critical component of what Bai calls the Republican "message machine," which efficiently redefined liberalism on conservatives' terms (2007, p. 25). The conservative "machine," Bai notes, was met with little resistance from Democrats, whose message lacked the definition and unity so carefully developed by conservatives, including those at *National Review*.[3] Henry Kissinger, speaking at *National Review*'s fortieth anniversary party, would eventually be able to state that "Bill Buckley and *National Review* …conjur[ed] a process that has led to the current state of affairs in which liberalism has become the ideology that dare not speak its name" ("National Review Hits 40," 1995, p. 103).

But whether the conservative movement will in future be able to maintain its formerly successful framing and alignment through skillful "ideological work" remains to be seen. Some have argued that the influence of *National Review* has declined more recently, following conservatives' rise to power. Perhaps this political shift has diminished the immediacy of the fight against liberalism, and thus reduced the magazine's power to lead conservative opinion. One critic notes that conservative victories may have created a sense of satisfaction and even caused "mental sclerosis" among the magazine's staff (Judis,

1995, p. A14). Its longtime leader has also left: Buckley divested himself of his remaining shares in the magazine in June 2004, leaving them to a board of trustees. He stated that he did so primarily due to his age, not out of any decreased passion for the conservative cause (Kirkpatrick, 2004a, p. A18).

In 2005, the magazine had its fiftieth anniversary, and President George W. Bush acknowledged the occasion at the White House. In his remarks, Bush said that *National Review*

> helped move conservatism from the margins of American society into the Oval Office….The people of *National Review* are determined to leave their mark on this new century, and we appreciate it. You got a lot of readers here in the West Wing….I want to thank you for leaving us a magazine and a group of thinkers that will help make the advance of liberty over the last fifty years look like a dress rehearsal for the next fifty years. (Bush, 2005)

Bush explicitly recognized the impact of *National Review* and its strategic framing on the alignment of the nation with conservatism, and suggested that it continues to affect powerful conservatives through its content. However, Bush and his administration have raised concerns about the direction of American conservatism today, even among other conservatives and from Buckley himself. Buckley told the *New York Times* that he would have opposed the war in Iraq with the information now available. He also expressed doubt to a reporter about some of Bush's policies that have increased the size of the federal government: "It bothers me enormously. Should I growl?" (Kirkpatrick, 2004a, p. A18).

Clearly, the strategic framing of conservatism advanced cautiously and thoroughly by *National Review* is being challenged and stretched by today's conservatives. There seems to be less coherence in that definition today, with the three strands so carefully woven by Buckley's magazine perhaps unraveling at the fringes of *National Review*'s conservative fabric. For example, a Google search for the term "conservatism" elicits varieties of conservatism labeled everything from "Darwinian" to "progressive" to "compassionate" to "traditionalist." The differences among libertarians and traditionalists are especially strong, given differing views of changing cultural norms: "One source of the divisions evident today is the tension in modern conservatism between its commitment to individual liberty, and its lively appreciation of the need to preserve the beliefs, practices, associations and

institutions that form citizens capable of preserving liberty" (Berkowitz, 2007, A15). There is also an increase among conservatives in arguments for isolationism (Kirkpatrick, 2004b, p. A1). Given these various approaches to "conservatism," some commentators have begun to consider the perspective to be more a "process" of thought than a well-defined "philosophy": "The mind must possess the process that leads to conservative decisions. As a guide, the books, and the results of experience, may be the more difficult way – much more difficult in a given moment than pre-cooked dogma, which is always irresistible to the uneducated" (Hart, 2005, A20).

The destruction of a coherent conservative frame is even actively supported by some conservatives. "I say we have to go back to before the conservative movement became a movement, back to when it was just a few tormented intellectuals who didn't necessarily see themselves as a coherent group, and even to the so-called isolationist and noninterventionist right," said an assistant editor at *The American Conservative* magazine (qtd. in Kirkpatrick, 2004b, p. A1). That magazine was founded by Pat Buchanan, who was, at one time, a *National Review* devotee. A return to incoherence, to that inchoate state of conservatism prior to *National Review*'s articulation of conservative belief and its boundaries, may be in the making.

Conclusion: Some Implications for Social Movements and Political Magazines

This analysis of the ways in which *National Review* contributed to the development of the conservative movement contains implications for today's political movements, and also for those who seek to create partisan political messages, particularly political magazines. To summarize, *National Review* provides evidence of a clear process of frame alignment. That process began with the virtual "editing" of conservatism, as the magazine's editorial staff deliberately included and moderated the elements most likely to hold wide appeal. Simultaneously, elements that seemed most radical and less appealing – such as the anticommunism of the John Birch Society – were systematically eliminated from *National Review*'s frame of conservatism. Liberalism became the enemy to be combated by the conservative audience. Finally, the magazine advanced the completed conservative frame through frame bridging, amplification, and transformation, in order to connect the audience to the frame and intensify

their identification with it. This frame alignment led to the readers' micromobilization within the conservative political movement and aided in the maintenance of conservative momentum over time.

For those involved in social movements, conscious awareness of such an editing and alignment process seems particularly useful to advance a specific cause. Organizers can deliberately work to formulate a combination of existing political philosophies that would be most likely to work in the frame alignment process. Ideas can be presented in ways that activate potential participants' existing beliefs and values and that impel them to act. Once individuals identify with a movement, the media of the movement can be effectively used to maintain participants' motivation and to continue reinforcing the movement's ideology. While this conscious formulation of frames for micromobilization may sound manipulative, it is not unlike techniques used in advertising and marketing to link consumers to specific products and encourage consumers' micromobilization – albeit in the aisles of retail stores.

Additionally, there are professional considerations for journalists at political magazines. Political magazines, as media products, must find audiences hospitable to their views. This genre of magazines is also notoriously financially unstable, often relying on the donations of related foundations. Furthermore, their audience sizes fluctuate inversely with the political position of the party in power; when politically opposed to the party in power, opinion magazines seem to gain readership (Project for Excellence in Journalism, 2005). In other words, these magazines may gain momentum from readers who likely seek confirmation of their minority views – an alignment of their personal frames with an external source. These magazines and their associated political movements would probably like to maintain that increased audience even after a shift in the possession of elected offices. The example of *National Review*, as illustrated above, demonstrates how a magazine can continue "ideological work," and actively attempt to manage readers' relationship to a particular political ideology. Maintaining such momentum could contribute to the audience's retention of interest in the magazine (i.e., their subscriptions) and perhaps also to their mobilization in support of a particular political movement. Researchers might wish to further examine how magazine readers' beliefs and activities are shaped by their literal "subscription to" journalistic content and its underlying paradigms. Study of the construction of a magazine's community

of readers, and the ensuing potential for that community's activation, might be yet another fruitful way to see how media alter political perspectives and actions.

The repeated mentions of *National Review*'s contribution to the conservative movement in accounts of that movement's development seemed mysterious: how could a magazine encourage such dramatic commitment to a political viewpoint and contribute to its rise to dominance in the U.S.? After all, the magazines we see the most – the lighter reading widely available at supermarket checkout stands, for example – seem little capable of such inspiration. However, a deeper reading of the magazine's content, placed in context with its times and its rival publications, reveals a deeper and largely deliberate process of frame construction and alignment with regard to modern conservatism. Although the future of this magazine and of conservatism in general may appear somewhat uncertain, an analysis of *National Review*'s techniques provides insight into how political movements can form and be aided in that formation by carefully crafted partisan media products. *National Review*'s example illuminates a powerful way that media can, if thoughtfully constructed to do so, encourage political engagement and mobilization by the public.

---

[1] The first issue of *National Review* is of particular interest here because it provided a clear purpose and "manifesto" of principles for the magazine's content in the years to come. Though the magazine has now been published for over 50 years, the degree to which its early content served as a mobilizing force for the conservative movement in the late 1950s and 1960s is of greatest interest in this study. Therefore, a close examination of the statements made in this first issue can demonstrate the key elements of its mobilizing power. As Johnson and Prijatel note, "a magazine has a driving philosophy which, if strongly defined, gives the publication its identity and personality. An editorial philosophy explains what the magazine is intended to do, what areas of interest it covers, how it will approach those interests, and the voice it will use to express itself" (2007, p. 135). The "Publisher's Statement" and other forward-looking self-descriptions in this first issue of *National Review* serve much the same purpose as a contemporary "editorial philosophy," thus permitting this first issue to represent much of the magazine's direction and content during the formation of the conservative movement of its era.

[2] The reference is to the 1955 Geneva Conference, which was intended to resolve some of the Cold War issues between Russia and the U.S. but was seen by many Americans as making little progress toward eliminating communism. The Geneva Accords also resulted in the partitioning of Vietnam.

[3] Bai (2007) further describes in his book how the Democrats today are making an effort not only to "re-brand" their party in marketing terms, but to revise and redefine the ideology of the party from the bottom up, using a network of wealthy donors, bloggers, and activists to support and disseminate the party's re-imagined "progressive" perspective.

References

Abrahamson, D. (2002). Beyond the mirror metaphor: Magazine exceptionalism and sociocultural change. *Journal of Magazine and New Media Research, 4*(1), Article 3. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from http://aejmcmagazine.bsu.edu/journal/archive/ Spring_2002/Abrahamson%204-1.htm

Allitt, P. (1993). *Catholic intellectuals and conservative politics in America, 1950-1985*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Anderson, G. (1990). *National Review*. In A. Nourie & B. Nourie (Eds.), *American mass-market magazines* (pp. 291-298). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Bai, M. (2007). *The argument: Billionaires, bloggers, and the battle to remake Democratic politics*. New York: Penguin.

Benford, R. D., & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology, 26*, 611-639.

Berkowitz, P. (2007, May 29). The conservative mind. *Wall Street Journal,* p. A15.

Brinkley, A. (1994). The problem of American conservatism. *The American Historical Review, 99*(2), 409-429.

Buckley, W. F., Jr. (1955, November 19). Publisher's statement. *National Review, 1,* 5.

Burner, D. (1996). *Making peace with the 60s*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Burnham, J. (1955, November 19). The third world war. *National Review, 1,* 20.

Burnham, P. (1955, November 19). Portrait of a saint. *National Review, 1,* 30.

Bush, G. W. (2005). *President honors Buckley at 50th anniversary of* National Review. Retrieved October 20, 2005, from http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2005/10/20051006-4.html

Chamberlain, J. (1955, November 19). Sorry triumph. *National Review, 1,* 27-28.

Chamberlain, J. (1982). *A life with the printed word*. Chicago: Regnery Gateway.

Conservatives for liberty. (1954, June 28). *The Freeman, 4,* 694.

Dallek, M. (2000). *The right moment: Ronald Reagan's first victory and the decisive turning point in American politics*. New York: Free Press.

Gamson, W. A., & Meyer, D. S. (1996). Framing political opportunity. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 275-290). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

God and man in Washington. (1980, December 13). *The Nation, 231,* p. 2.

Hart, J. (2005, December 27). The Burke habit. *Wall Street Journal*.

Johnson, S., & Prijatel, P. (2007). *The magazine from cover to cover* (2nd ed.). New York: Oxford University Press.

Judis, J. B. (1988). *William F. Buckley, Jr.: Patron saint of the conservatives*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Judis, J. B. (1995, November 10). A magazine and a movement. *Wall Street Journal,* p. A14.

Kendall, W. (1955, November 19). The liberal line. *National Review, 1,* 8.

Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2004a, June 29). *National Review* founder says it's time to leave the stage. *New York Times,* p. A18.

Kirkpatrick, D. D. (2004b, July 17). Young right tries to define post-Buckley future. *New York Times,* p. A1.

Klatch, R. E. (1999). *A generation divided: The new left, the new right, and the 1960s*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Klatch, R. E. (2002). The development of individual identity and consciousness among movements of the left and right. In D. S. Meyer, N. Whittier & B. Robnett (Eds.), *Opportunities and identities: Bridge-building in the study of social movements* (pp. 185-204). New York: Oxford University Press.

Knowland, W. F. (1955, November 19). Peace – with honor. *National Review, 1,* 9-11.

Kristol, I. (1995). American conservatism 1945-1995. *The Public Interest, 121*, 80-91.
Krutch, J. W. (1954, June 28). Let's be prejudiced. *The Freeman, 4,* 703-704.
Lora, R. (1999). *National Review*. In R. Lora & W. H. Longton (Eds.), *The conservative press in twentieth-century America* (pp. 515-530). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.
The magazine's credenda. (1955, November 19). *National Review, 1,* 6.
McAdam, D., McCarthy, J. D., & Zald, M. N. (1996). Opportunities, mobilizing structures, and framing processes: Toward a synthetic, comparative perspective on social movements. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 1-22). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
McCarthy, J. R. (1953). March 14, 1951: American Foreign Policy. In *Major speeches and debates of Senator Joe McCarthy delivered in the United States Senate, 1950-1951* (pp. 187). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
Meyer, F. S. (1955, November 19). Croce on liberty. *National Review, 1,* 29-30.
Micklethwait, J., & Wooldridge, A. (2004). *The right nation: Conservative power in America*. New York: Penguin.
Mitchell, J. (1955, November 19). Labor. *National Review, 1,* 19.
Nash, G. H. (1976). *The conservative intellectual movement in America since 1945*. New York: Basic Books.
Nash, G. H. (1999). Forgotten godfathers: Premature Jewish conservatives and the rise of *National Review*. *American Jewish History, 87*(2 & 3), 123-157.
National Review hits 40. (1995, December 11). *National Review, 47,* 102-109.
Navasky, V. (2005, May 16). Protest and survive: Thoughts on the critical role of the journal of dissent in America. *The Nation, 280,* 18-22.
Noble, D. W. (1978). Conservatism in the USA. *Journal of Contemporary History, 13*(4), 635-652.
Nuechterlein, J. (1988). William F. Buckley, Jr. and American conservatism. *Commentary, 85*(6), 31-41.
Perlstein, R. (2001). *Before the storm: Barry Goldwater and the unmaking of the American consensus*. New York: Hill and Wang.
Project for Excellence in Journalism. (2005). State of the news media report: 2005: Magazines: Audience. Retrieved November 10, 2005, from http://www.stateofthenewsmedia.org/2005/narrative_magazines_audience.asp?cat=3&media=7.
Read, L. A. (1954, July). From the new publisher. *The Freeman, 5,* 5.
The real hysteria. (1954, June 28). *The Freeman, 4,* 692.
Reger, J. (2002). More than one feminism: Organization structure and the construction of collective identity. In D. S. Meyer, N. Whittier & B. Robnett (Eds.), *Opportunities and identities: Bridge-building in the study of social movements* (pp. 171-184). New York: Oxford University Press.
Riesel, V. (1954, June 28). The union member: America's laziest man. *The Freeman, 4,* 699-700.
Rusher, W. A. (1989, January 27). Now it can be told. *National Review, 41,* 36-42.
Sender, K. (2001). Gay readers, consumers, and a dominant gay habitus: 25 years of *The Advocate* magazine. *Journal of Communication, 51*(1), 73-99.
Smant, K. J. (2002). *Principles and heresies: Frank S. Meyer and the shaping of the American conservative movement*. Wilmington, DE: ISI Books.
Smith, D. (1987, July 27). 'Hey, bro'er!' It's William F. Buckley, Jr. *New York, 20,* 37-42.
Snow, D. A., Rochford, E. B., Jr., Worden, S. K., & Benford, R. D. (1986). Frame alignment processes, micromobilization, and movement participation. *American Sociological Review, 51*(4), 464-481.
Théberge, P. (1991). Musicians' magazines in the 1980s: The creation of a community and a consumer market. *Cultural Studies, 5*(3), 270-293.
Utley, F. (1955, November 19). The paradox of France. *National Review, 1,* 28-29.
We have come through. (1995, December 11). *National Review, 47,* 24.
Williams, R. A. (2002). From the "beloved community" to "family values": Religious language, symbolic repertoires, and democratic culture. In D. S. Meyer, N. Whittier & B. Robnett (Eds.),

Opportunities and identities: Bridge-building in the study of social movements (pp. 247-265). New York: Oxford University Press.

Zald, M. N. (1996). Culture, ideology, and strategic framing. In D. McAdam, J. D. McCarthy & M. N. Zald (Eds.), *Comparative perspectives on social movements: Political opportunities, mobilizing structures, and cultural framings* (pp. 261-274). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.