Negative microfilm
received from
university

Mic 59-4941

KISSEL, Bernard Charles. A RHETORICAL STUDY OF SELECTED SPEECHES DELIVERED BY VICE-PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON DURING THE CONVENTION AND PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1956.

University of Michigan, Ph. D., 1959
Speech - Theater

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

A RHETORICAL STUDY OF SELECTED SPEECHES DELIVERED BY VICE-PRESIDENT RICHARD M. NIXON DURING THE CONVENTION AND PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN OF 1956

by
Bernard Charles Kissel

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirement for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1959

Committee in charge:

Professor William M. Sattler, Chairman
Associate Professor Hayden K. Carruth
Associate Professor N. Edd Miller
Assistant Professor John P. White

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	Purpose of the Study Sources of Material Plan and Methods of Procedure	
II.	BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF RICHARD M. NIXON . .	14
	Family Educational Training The Years 1937-1945 Political Career	
III.	THE AMERICAN SCENE -- 1956	44
	Economic Situation Political Situation The Republican National Convention Party Platform Nixon's Itinerary	
IV.	THE 1956 ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS	76
	The Immediate Setting Arrangement Invention Emotional Appeals Ethical Appeals Style Summary	
V.	THE AMERICAN LEGION ADDRESS	123
	The Immediate Setting Arrangement Invention Emotional Appeals Ethical Appeals Style Summary	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter		Page
VI.	THE CAMPAIGN SPEECH AT GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA	168
	The Immediate Setting Arrangement Invention Emotional Appeals Ethical Appeals Style Summary	
VII.	THE COLORADO SPRINGS ADDRESS	205
	The Immediate Setting Arrangement Invention Emotional Appeals Ethical Appeals Style Summary	
VIII.	THE ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL DINNER ADDRESS	248
	The Immediate Setting Arrangement Invention Emotional Appeals Ethical Appeals Style Summary	
IX.	SPEECH PREPARATION AND REACTIONS TO NIXON AS A SPEAKER	289
	Speech Preparation Reactions To Nixon As A Speaker	

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

Chapter	Page
X. CONCLUSION	311
APPENDICES	325
A. Itinerary of Vice-President Nixon	
B. Acceptance Address Text	
C. American Legion Address Text	
D. Campaign Speech at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania Text	
E. Colorado Springs Address Text	
F. Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address Text	
BIBLIOGRAPHY	363

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In 1953 Richard Milhous Nixon became the Vice-President of the United States. In the four years that followed he became one of the most active Vice-Presidents in the history of the United States.[1] He was the first Vice-President to chair the Cabinent and the National Security Council in the President's absence. His duties took him on diplomatic missions to the Far East, Caribbean, and Central America. And in the 1954 off-year election, he became one of the chief campaigners for the Republican Party when he covered thirty states and spanned some 26,000 miles delivering campaign addresses.[2] Nixon continued as a campaigner in the 1956 presidential campaign after his renomination as the Republican vice-presidential candidate.

Nixon's part in the campaign of 1956 was divided into three phases. During the first phase, he visited thirty-two states and covered approximately 15,000 miles. On the second tour, which lasted twelve days and took him

---

[1] Irving Williams, The Rise of the Vice-Presidency (Washington, D. C.: Public Affairs Press, 1956), p. 235.

[2] "The Nixon Story," U. S. News and World Report, May 11, 1956, p. 75.

into fifteen states, he traveled nearly 10,000 miles. The phase which ended Nixon's campaign tour covered twelve states and 13,000 miles. During this final swing, Nixon spoke in as many as six cities in a single day at rally type meetings. In all, Richard Nixon delivered 119 formal addresses and over 200 informal talks while traveling approximately 38,000 miles.[1]

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to present a rhetorical analysis of selected speeches delivered by Richard Nixon during the 1956 Republican National Convention and presidential campaign. In order to accomplish this purpose, it will be necessary to consider historical factors preceding the convention and campaign as well as biographical information bearing on Nixon's speaking ability. Therefore, this dissertation will attempt:

1. To indicate the influence and experiences in Nixon's early life which may have had a bearing on his speaking ability.
2. To describe the economic and political situation at the time of the Republican National Convention and the presidential campaign of 1956.
3. To identify the basic themes and issues forwarded by the Republican National Convention and adopted by Nixon in his public speeches.
4. To analyze selected speeches from the 1956 campaign in terms of classical rhetorical theory.
5. To describe Nixon's speech preparation and delivery.

---

[1] New York Times, November 4, 1956, p. 84.

Sources of Material

The major consideration in selecting the speeches to be used for analysis was the availability of authentic and complete texts. This was a special problem in this study since Nixon's presentations were predominantly of an extemporaneous nature. The speeches selected were chosen because they were among the major addresses for which authentic texts were available, and because they were significantly different from one another to warrant analysis. In this connection, matters concerning availability of texts and repetition of speech materials will be discussed more fully in Chapter IX. In order to obtain authentic texts, the following primary sources were investigated:

1. Tape recordings of Nixon's speeches during the 1956 campaign.
2. Manuscripts of Nixon's speeches during the 1956 campaign from the office of the Vice-President.
3. Manuscripts of Press Release Excerpts of the 1956 campaign from the Republican National Committee.
4. News releases of the 1956 campaign received from the clipping service of the office of the Vice-President.
5. Interviews with Vice-President Nixon and members of his staff.
6. Transcripts of speeches from the New York Times.

To gain an insight into Richard Nixon the man, it was necessary to secure biographical information concerning his interests, education, and early speech experiences. The following secondary sources were especially useful in this regard:

1. Andrews, Phillips, _This Man Nixon_.
2. de Toledano, Ralph, _Nixon_.
3. Koegh, James, _This Is Nixon_.
4. _New York Times_.
5. Magazine and periodical articles concerning Richard M. Nixon.

It is important in analyzing the speeches of a political speaker to understand the basic political concepts in operation in a convention and campaign. To gain this insight, it was necessary to refer to such political science texts as H. A. Bone's _American Politics and the Party System_, Hinderaker's _Political Parties_, V. O. Key's _Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups_, and Moos' _The Republicans_.

The rhetorical analysis will be governed by a number of texts in the field of public address. Those of particular importance to this dissertation are Thonssen and Baird's _Speech Criticism_, Aristotle's _Rhetoric_, Bryant and Wallace's _Fundamentals of Public Speaking_, and Baird and Knower's _General Speech_.

Plan and Methods of Procedure

Background: The dissertation will begin with a brief biography of Richard Milhous Nixon. This information is included because it contributes to a fuller understanding of the educational and environmental influences which may have affected his speaking. Thonssen and Baird state, "The preparation and background that the speaker brings to the process of logical invention figures strongly in the deter-

mination of argumentative soundness and integrity."[1] It is also important to include such material because of its bearing on the speaker's style. Thonssen and Baird maintain that, "A man may be said to speak as he does because of what he is."[2] Since the elements of invention and style are two rhetorical categories under consideration in this dissertation, it is necessary to ascertain the earlier influences in the life of Nixon. The material will be presented chronologically beginning with Nixon's antecedents and continuing through his early life, education and political career. The biography will include his political career up to the time of the presidential campaign of 1956.

In order to place the campaign of 1956 in its proper setting, historical material will be included following Nixon's biography. J. B. Bury justified the inclusion of this type of historical material when he related his concept of history:

> We have come to see that all events in the past, however differing in importance, were relative to their historical conditions: that they cannot be wrenched out of their chronological context and endowed with an absolute significance. They are parts of a whole, just as man's arm has no meaning apart from its body.[3]

This background material will also be developed chronologically beginning with a forecast of economic condi-

---

[1]Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, Speech Criticism (New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1948), p. 335.

[2]Ibid., p. 402.

[3]John Bagnell Bury, The Ancient Greek Historian (London: Macmillan and Co., 1909), p. 250.

tions as indicated by selected reports in January of 1956. The over-all economic situation of that year as shown by the President's economic report to the nation dated January, 1957, will follow the original forecast. An attempt will be made to uncover the economic conditions which were to become campaign issues.

Included in the historical background will be a survey of the political situation in the year 1956 as it developed prior to the campaign. Particular emphasis will be placed on those political events which had a bearing on Richard Nixon. One of these concerns the Harold Stassen objection to the renomination of Richard Nixon as a Republican vice-presidential candidate. Because Stassen's objection was a culmination of public opinion concerning Nixon's personal appeal to the American people, this section of the dissertation will include an account of the personal reputation of Richard Nixon. The background will continue with information concerning the convention and the formation of the party platform. It will conclude with Richard Nixon's itinerary for the campaign and an indication of the general issues which were to be used as the basis for his campaign speeches.

Analysis: The remainder of the dissertation will concern itself with a rhetorical analysis of selected speeches of Richard Milhous Nixon from the 1956 convention and campaign. The first speech to be analyzed will be the Acceptance Address delivered at San Francisco's Cow Palace

on August 23, 1956. This will be followed by an analysis of the American Legion National Convention Address delivered on September 6, 1956; the Republican "kick-off" speech delivered September 12, 1956 on President Eisenhower's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania farm; the Colorado Springs Address delivered on September 22, 1956 in Colorado Springs, Colorado; and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address delivered on October 18, 1956 in New York City.

According to classical writers, rhetoric is divided into five canons: invention, disposition, elocution, memory, and delivery. For the purpose of this dissertation, four of these canons will be used in the analysis. These are the canons of invention, disposition (arrangement), elocution (style), and delivery. Each speech will be covered as an entity and will include in its analysis the canons of invention, arrangement, and style. These three canons pertain to the speech itself. The canon of delivery will be considered in general terms under a separate chapter heading.

The analysis of each of the five selected speeches will follow the same pattern. The analysis will begin with an account of the situation or occasion for the presentation. The setting will be followed by a discussion of the canon of arrangement.

Arrangement will be concerned with the movement and planning of materials within the speech. Thonssen and Baird state that the general meaning of arrangement is

two-fold:

> The appreciation of a plan for the speech as a whole, and the development of the specific parts of the speech, such as the exordium, narration, proof, peroration, and whatever other divisions the authors (of public speeches) specify.[1]

These two conceptions of arrangement contribute to the orderly planning and movement of the key or central idea of the speech. Therefore, in the analysis, the plan and parts of the speech will be considered.

First, an attempt will be made to ascertain the principal plan employed by the speaker in the speech. These, according to Thonssen and Baird, are the historical method, the distributive method, and the logical method.[2] When the speech materials are arranged by the historical method "the material is arranged in chronological order."[3] When the distributive method is used "the matters having a common thought center and an obvious connection among themselves are grouped in certain sections."[4] When the logical method is employed "the arrangement of materials is determined by the continuity of the reasoning process; materials are placed at those points where they serve as links in the uninterrupted sequences or chains of thought."[5]

The Aristotelian conception of the parts of speech will be followed as the criterion for the evaluation and

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394. [2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., p. 395. [5] Ibid.

analysis. This conception was in terms of the function of the parts, each part having a specific task in furthering the purpose of the speech. These functions have been summarized in this manner:

> The introduction, which Aristotle said conformed to the prologue in poetry, is intended to enlist the attention and interest of the listeners, to render the audience well disposed toward the speaker, and to prepare the way for the ideas to come. The statement of the case sets forth clearly and concisely the nature of the subject presently to be developed. The proof contains the elaboration of subject matter through which the idea or ideas are enforced. And the peroration or conclusion, to quote Aristotle, proposes 'to inspire the audience with a favorable opinion of yourself and an unfavorable one of your adversary, to amplify or depreciate the subject, to excite the emotions of the audience and to recall the facts to their memory.'[1]

The second canon to be studied, invention, will be developed through the study of logical, emotional, and ethical modes of proof or appeal. Modern critics generally divide invention into these three elements. In his Rhetoric, Aristotle described these modes of proof or persuasion:

> The character (ethos) of the speaker is a cause of persuasion when the speech is so uttered as to make him worthy of belief. . . . Secondly, persuasion is effected through the audience, when they are brought by the speech into a state of emotion. . . . Thirdly, persuasion is effected by the arguments, when we demonstrate the truth, real or apparent, by such means as inhere in particular cases.[2]

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 398.

[2] Lane Cooper, The Rhetoric of Aristotle (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932), I. ii. 1356.[a]

The analysis of Nixon's addresses will consider the instances of each form of persuasion in the development of the basic arguments in the five addresses.

Logical proof, considered by Aristotle as the most important mode of persuasion, will be considered first. Thonssen and Baird consider that it can be discovered by at least two principal means; "determination (1) of the intellectual resources of the speaker, and (2) of the severity and strictness of the argumentative development."[1] The intellectual resources of the speaker deals with the entire speech and not the individual contentions. Thonssen and Baird feel that "the speaker's knowledge and experiences figure importantly in any critical estimation of his merit."[2] An assessment of Nixon's background and training will be developed in a chapter prior to the analysis of his speeches. Therefore, the study of logical proof as reflected in the speeches will be primarily concerned with argumentative development.

Thonssen and Baird indicate that "fundamentally, the constitutents of logical proof are evidence and argument or reasoning."[3] Special study will be given to the use of evidence and argument in relation to each major issue advanced by Nixon.

The reasoning process found in given cases will be identified in terms of the deductive and inductive patterns.

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 334-335.

[2] Ibid., p. 336. [3] Ibid., p. 341.

By definition these reasoning processes are opposites. The inductive method begins with an enumeration of concrete objects or details and terminates with a general principle or proposition.[1] The reverse is true in the deductive process. It starts with a general concept or conclusion and then proceeds to specific events or objects.[2]

This will be followed by an identification and explanation of the various forms of support used as evidence. Thonssen and Baird consider evidence to be the raw materials used to establish proof.[3] Bryant and Wallace classify supporting materials into four categories; information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony.[4]

Emotional appeals will be discussed under two categories. These are: (1) the appeals to the basic motives and (2) the emotions. Bryant and Wallace's Fundamentals of Public Speaking lists as motive appeals the following:

1. Health
2. Wealth
3. Home, family and children
4. Freedom of action
5. Desire to belong
6. Opportunity and fair play
7. Reputation
8. Conformity
9. Duty
10. Competition
11. Honor
12. Loyalty[5]

This is quite an extensive list, and although Nixon alludes

---

[1]Baird, Argumentation, Discussion and Debate (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1950), p. 115.

[2]Ibid. [3]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 341.

[4]Donald C. Bryant and Karl R. Wallace, Fundamentals of Public Speaking (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953), p. 117.

[5]Ibid., p. 277.

to many of these within his various speeches, it will be the purpose of this dissertation to concern itself with the four or five motives which are most often used. In addition, an attempt will be made to identify the emotions in the audience which were likely to be affected by the motive appeals.

The final aspect of invention, personal proofs or ethical appeal, will be developed next. Aristotle depicted ethos as being revealed through the qualities of intelligence, character and good will.[1] These elements aid in establishing the speaker's moral integrity and personal credibility. Any attempt to measure all of the ways by which a speaker might gain credibility in his address would be too extensive for comprehensive analysis; therefore, Thonssen and Baird's exploratory lists for cataloging ethical attributes will be used as a basis for the analysis of personal appeals in Nixon's presentations.

The analysis of the individual speeches will end with a discussion of language choices or style. Baird and Knower enumerate as some considerations of the methods of language usage such elements as directness, concreteness, parallelism and figurative language.[2] These are a few of the elements of style listed in the work which apply to the speeches of Richard Nixon to be analyzed in this disserta-

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

[2] Baird and Knower, General Speech (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co. Inc., 1949), pp. 132-156.

tion.

In summary, the analysis of the individual addresses will begin with a discussion of the situation or occasion for the speech. An outline of the speech will be included as well as a discussion of the arrangement of the presentation. This will be followed by a discussion of invention through its components of logical appeal, emotional appeal, and ethical appeal. The analysis of the individual speeches will conclude with a consideration of style.

The final chapter of the analysis will be devoted to a discussion of speech preparation and reactions to Nixon as a speaker. This chapter will include the steps followed by Nixon in preparing for the presentation of his convention and campaign speeches. In addition, the chapter will include an account of the reactions to Nixon as a speaker noted by the newsmen during the convention and campaign of 1956.

The final chapter of the dissertation will include a summary of the work as well as the conclusions which may arise from the research.

CHAPTER II

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF RICHARD M. NIXON

It is the purpose of this chapter to trace the life and accomplishments of Richard Milhous Nixon in order to gain an insight into the factors or conditions which may have had a bearing on the formation of Nixon as a speaker. Biographical information concerning Nixon's family, education, law career, public service, and political career will be presented.

Family

Ancestry and heritage: Richard Milhous Nixon was born on January 9, 1913 in Yorba Linda, California of Quaker parents.[1] He was the second son in a family of five boys. Richard Nixon's antecedents, on both his father's and mother's side, date back to pre-revolutionary America.

The first of Nixon's American forefathers, James Nixon, migrated to America in 1752 and settled in Delaware. His two sons, John and George, fought in the Revolutionary War. Years later in the early 1860's, George Nixon III fought in the Civil War as a member of Company B, 73rd Ohio Voluntary Infantry Regiment, and was killed in action

---

[1] Current Biography 1948 (New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1949), p. 473.

and buried at Gettysburg.[1]

As for Richard Nixon's immediate family, his father, Frank Nixon, was born near McArthur, Ohio, one of a Scotch-Irish Methodist farm family.[2] Koegh, in his biography of Richard Nixon, relates an interesting story with political implications concerning the young Frank:

> When Frank Nixon was only thirteen there occurred one of those incidents that have a deep effect on the life of a boy and man, and sometimes can affect the course of history. It happened when William McKinley was running for Governor of Ohio. The Nixon's were Democrats, but Frank got involved in McArthur's ambitious plans to welcome McKinley on his campaign tour. "They had a big parade for him with flags and streamers and all," Frank Nixon recalled, "Well, I had a fine filly, the prettiest horse in town, and because of her the committee asked me to ride in the parade directly behind William McKinley's carriage. When we got up to the stand he hopped out and came around and spoke to me and ran his hand on her neck and said, 'I never did see such a fine, pretty horse.' He wanted to know if I was a Republican, and if I'd always vote Republican, and I said I would."[3]

This experience may in part account for Frank Nixon's interest in politics. An indication of this continuing interest was the friendly political discussions he carried on in his country store in later years.[4]

In 1907, Frank Nixon migrated to Southern California where he met Hannah Milhous. The ancestry of Hannah Milhous, like that of Frank Nixon, had its American beginnings in

---

[1] Ralph de Toledano, Nixon (New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956), p. 151.

[2] James Koegh, This Is Nixon (New York: J. P. Putnam's Son's, 1956), p. 43.

[3] Ibid. [4] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 21.

pre-revolutionary times. The first of Hannah's Irish-Quaker ancestors, Thomas Milhous, migrated to Pennsylvania from Dublin, Ireland in the seventeenth century.[1] Hannah's father, Franklin Milhous, moved to Whittier, California from the family home in Butlerville, Indiana in 1897.[2] Whittier had been established by the Quaker faith only ten years earlier. It had been named for the Quaker poet, John Greenlead Whittier.[3] And although Frank Nixon was a Methodist, he met Hannah Milhous at a Quaker meeting of the Society of Friends. They were married a few months after their first meeting.[4] After their marriage, Frank Nixon joined the Quaker faith and in the years that followed, their five boys were reared as Quakers.

Early years: Richard Nixon's early family life has been characterized as being good, but not easy.[5] His father did not seem to be able to settle upon a satisfactory means of supporting the family until he opened a moderately successful grocery store in Whittier. Before this, Frank Nixon had labored as an oil field worker, a foreman on a citrus ranch, and had even planted a lemon grove. Then in 1922, the family returned to Whittier where he opened the country store.[6] Other difficulties plagued the family during this time. Harold, the oldest of the Nixon boys,

---

[1] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 19.

[2] Time, August 25, 1952, p. 13. [3] Ibid.

[4] Koegh, op. cit., p. 16.

[5] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 23. [6] Ibid.

contracted tuberculosis and the family sent him, with his mother, to Prescott, Arizona in the hope that the drier climate would aid in his recovery. Since Richard was the second eldest son, he shared a great part of the responsibility of maintaining the family and running the store. "He not only helped to keep the books, but had full charge of the fruit and vegtable department--driving to the Los Angeles public market before sunrise to do the purchasing and then attending to the store after school."[1] In all, Harold's illness lasted five years until his death. At the time of Harold's death, Richard Nixon was eighteen years old. Another tragedy which occurred in the family during Richard's early years was the death of the youngest child Arthur. The depression of 1930 heightened the difficulties which the family endured. Richard's brother, Donald Nixon, summed up these early years tersely when he stated, "It wasn't easy."[2]

Through all of these difficulties, there existed in the Nixon family a strong Quaker faith. The boys attended church three times on Sunday as well as a mid-week service.[3] Most of the religious training which the boys received was imparted to them by their mother, Hannah Milhous.[4]

It is difficult to ascertain the effect specific incidents have had upon an individual. But it can be said

---

[1] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 21.

[2] Koegh, op. cit., p. 22. [3] Time, op. cit., p. 13.

[4] Koegh, op. cit., p. 16.

that the difficulties which the Nixon family encountered during Richard Nixon's formative years did forge a closely knit family group. From his mother he received his religious principles; from his father an interest in politics and debate.

Educational Training

Elementary and high school training: Richard Nixon attended Yorba Linda Elementary School in Yorba Linda, California. He was considered an above average student. It was in elementary school that Richard Nixon started his public speaking training. He became a debater in the seventh grade and was on a boys debating team against a girls team on the subject, "Resolved: that insects are more beneficial than harmful."[1] He was on the affirmative side of the issue and his team was victorious. He continued his debating and speech training at both Fullerton High School and Whittier Union High. In his sophomore year at Fullerton High, he won the Constitutional Oratorical Contest, and was commended for his work in the school's 1928 year book for his efforts as the sophomore representative of West Coast High Schools in the National Oratorical Contest.[2] It is worthy of note that the subject of his early oration was the U. S. Constitution, an area of interest which he pursued throughout his educational career.

He continued his speech interests and participated in

---

[1] Time, op. cit., p. 13.

[2] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 22.

the Constitutional Oratorical Contests in both his junior and senior years at Whittier Union High School. In his junior year, in 1929, he won both the local and district contests with a speech entitled, "Our Privileges Under The Constitution."[1] His success in oratorical contests ran concurrently with his successes on the debate squad.

All of these extra-curricular activities did not seem to hamper his academic work, for he was one of the leaders of his class scholastically. Upon graduation, his diploma was embossed with the California Interscholastic Federation Gold Seal Award for scholarship. He also was awarded the Harvard Award as the "Best All-Around Student."[2] This award included a tuition scholarship to Harvard University. Nixon, however, chose to attend the Quaker College in his home town.

College training: At Whittier College, Nixon continued to gain experience in public speaking. During his freshman year, he was a member of the debating team, debating the college topic, "Resolved: All Nations Should Adopt A Policy Of Free Trade."[3] He continued debating during his entire college career and was a member of a championship team in his college conference. In addition to debating, he also participated in speaking contests. While in college, he won the Reader's Digest Southern Conference Extemporane-

---

[1] Koegh, op. cit., p. 19.

[2] Williams, op. cit., p. 236.

[3] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 24.

ous Speaking Contest, and in his final year at Whittier, he became the Southern California Intercollegiate Extemporaneous Champion.[1]

While in college, Nixon also developed an interest in college politics. He was the president of his freshman class, vice-president of the student body in his sophomore year, and in his senior year, he became president of the student body. He was also an associate editor of the campus newspaper and became the president of a social group on campus called the Orthogonians.[2]

Richard Nixon graduated from Whittier College second in his class.[3] His scholastic interest in college centered around his major field in history. He took such courses as "The American Constitution" and "International Law and Relations," as well as the normal English and American History courses.[4] These courses indicate his continuing interest in the Constitution and law. His scholastic interests led him also to the study of French History, particularly the political philosophers such as Voltaire and Rousseau which he read in the original French.

Nixon's collegiate interests extended even to the area of athletics. He was a member of the football team and although a second stringer, he was on the varsity squad for four years.

---

[1]de Toledano, op. cit., p. 24. [2]Ibid.

[3]Koegh, op. cit., p. 24. [4]Ibid., p. 25.

Upon graduating from Whittier College in 1934, Nixon applied to Duke University's School of Law, and in September of that year was enrolled as a student. He received a scholarship from Duke which covered his tuition for his three years there.[1]

At Duke, Richard Nixon again took part in college politics. In his second year, he ran for the presidency of the Duke Bar Association, a student organization, and was elected. He was on the staff of the Law Review.[2] His scholastic efforts at Duke were rewarded when he was elected to the Order of the Coif, a national honorary society for the upper ten per cent of the law students in the United States.[3] In 1937, Richard Nixon received his law degree from Duke University, graduating third in his class.[4]

An incident occurred in 1954 concerning Duke University and Richard Nixon which should probably be considered at this time. In that year, the trustees of the University informed Richard Nixon that he was to be awarded an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws pending faculty approval. They also extended an invitation to Nixon to deliver the commencement address which he accepted. However, for the first time in the fifty year history of the school, the faculty over-

---

[1] Koegh, op. cit., p. 25.

[2] The Law Review is a national college periodical. An appointment to the Law Review is an honorary appointment to students of high academic standing.

[3] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 27.

[4] Williams, op. cit., p. 237.

ruled and voted to refuse the honorary degree. A great deal of speculation was forwarded as to the reason for this refusal. Most of it concerned the political implications surrounding Richard Nixon's position in the Alger Hiss affair.[1] The action caused Dr. Horack, Dean Emeritus of the Duke University Law School to state, "I thought educators would be above that."[2] Richard Nixon did not make any public comment on this action.

The Years 1937-1945

His law practice: After his graduation from Duke, Nixon took a Federal Bureau of Investigation examination with the intention of joining that service. Although he passed the examination, he decided not to join that organization, but rather to go into private law practice. He went to Los Angeles, California to prepare for the law examination in that state and on November 9, 1937, he became a member of the Bar of the state of California.[3] He returned to Whittier and joined the law firm of Wingert and Bewley.[4] Within a year, the name of the firm was changed to Wingert, Bewley and Nixon. The firm maintained this partnership until 1946 when Nixon resigned before entering Congress.

During his law career, which was interrupted by the Second World War, Nixon found time for community activities.

---

[1] New York Times, April 6, 1954, p. 1.

[2] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 28. [3] Ibid., p. 31.

[4] Williams, op. cit., p. 237.

He served as a trustee of Whittier College, as a part-time assistant city attorney, became president of the college alumni association, and even had time to participate in a theater group. It was while a member of the theater group in a play called 'Night of January 16" that he met Thelma Patricia Ryan who eventually became his wife.[1]

His marriage: At the time Richard Nixon met Miss Ryan, she was a teacher of business courses at Whittier High School. After their first meeting, Richard Nixon and Patricia Ryan dated for over two years before their marriage on June 21, 1940.[2] Richard and Pat Nixon have two daughters, Patricia and Julie.

After his marriage, Nixon continued to practice law and furthered his interests in politics. He campaigned for Wendell Willkie, the Republican candidate for the presidency in 1940.[3] Then in 1941, Pearl Harbor altered Richard Nixon's private law career. A month after World War II began, he accepted a position with the Office of Emergency Management, the fore-runner to the Office of Price Administration.

His public service: He had not served many months in this new position when he decided to apply for a commission in the United States Navy, although as a Quaker, he might have claimed a military exemption. He was accepted as a Lieutenant Junior Grade in September of 1942, and his

---

[1] Time, August 25, 1952, p. 13.

[2] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 3.

[3] Time, August 25, 1952, p. 14.

first tour of duty was in Ottumwa, Iowa as an executive officer organizing a new naval air base.[1] After six months at this post, Nixon applied for sea duty and in May of 1943, he was assigned to the South Pacific Air Transport Command.[2] During his tour of the South Pacific, he served on Guadalcanal, Bougainville, and Green Island. The majority of his work on these islands concerned setting up operation bases for DC-3 airplanes. He served for fifteen months on this tour of duty and was then transferred to a fleet wing at Alameda, California. In November of 1945, in Baltimore, Maryland, Lieutenant Commander Richard Nixon was separated from the armed services.[3]

Upon leaving the service in 1945, Nixon had several civilian career choices he could have made. He could have returned to his law firm in Whittier, California or he could have returned to his job with the Office of Price Administration, but he selected neither of these. He decided to go into politics.

Political Career

Richard Nixon entered politics in an unusual way. In August of 1945, some twenty-six newspapers in California's Twelfth District carried the following news item:

> Wanted: Congressional candidate with no previous political experience to defeat a man who has represented the district in House for ten years. Any young man, resident of district,

---

[1] *Time*, August 25, 1952, p. 13.

[2] Williams, *op. cit.*, p. 237. [3] *Ibid.*

> preferably a veteran, fair education, no political strings or obligations, and possessed of a few ideas for betterment of country at large, may apply for the job. Applicants will be reviewed by 100 interested citizens who will guarantee support but will not obligate the candidate in any way.[1]

Good candidates were few and far between. A Mr. Herman L. Perry knew of Richard Nixon and contacted him concerning this political need of the Republican Party.[2] Nixon flew to California, met with the committee, and was accepted as their candidate by a vote of fifty-five to twenty-two.[3]

First campaign: On March 19, 1946, Richard Nixon placed his name in both the Democratic and Republican primaries.[4] This practice of "cross-filing" or "double-filing" is unique to the state of California. Other states such as Maryland, Maine, New York, and Vermont permit "double-filing" to only a limited extent.[5] Nixon's opponent in the campaign for the House seat was Horace Jeremiah (Jerry) Voorhis. He was the Democratic incumbent and had served ten years in the House. For the better part of the campaign, prior to the primaries, Richard Nixon campaigned

---

[1] L. Bowers and D. Blair, "How To Pick A Congressman," Saturday Evening Post, March 19, 1949, p. 31.

[2] V. O. Key, Jr., Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1952), p. 418.

[3] Saturday Evening Post, March 19, 1949, p. 42.

[4] Ibid., p. 132.

[5] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 42.

in his Navy uniform. The primaries went according to party lines with Voorhis winning the Democratic primary and Nixon winning the Republican primary. However, in the over-all vote of the two primaries, Voornis had an aggregate lead of 7,000 votes.[1] This seemed to indicate that Voorhis would enter the House for his sixth term.

Although Richard Nixon was not experienced in politics, he had had considerable experience in debate, so he challenged Voorhis to a series of debates on the issues of the day. In one respect this would seem to have been a foolish move since Voorhis was a seasoned politician. On the other hand, Voorhis, who had already served five terms in the House, would undoubtedly command a larger audience than the politically unknown Nixon. Through the debates, therefore, Nixon would have the opportunity to speak before a variety of audiences.

A key issue in this campaign centered around the Federal controls which were established during the war. Voorhis, who had been identified by some persons as a "one-time Socialist," debated for the continuance of these New Deal controls. Nixon debated against them, arguing that they were leading the country toward Socialism.[2]

Nixon capitalized on the fact that the Congress of Industrial Organizations' (C. I. O.) Political Action

---

[1] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 42.

[2] Koegh, op. cit., p. 34.

Committee had recommended endorsement of Voorhis. The California Political Action Committee was reputed by some to be dominated by Communists.[1] Voorhis himself felt the disadvantages of such endorsement and publicly asked the Committee to withdraw its intended endorsement. The damage, however, was already done. Nixon distributed some 25,000 thimbles labled, 'Elect Nixon and Needle the P. A. C."[2] The implication was that Voorhis was the Political Action Committee's candidate, and the assumption Nixon forwarded was that Voorhis himself had communistic leanings. This argument on the part of Nixon that Voorhis was backing socialistic trends by keeping Federal controls and that he had communistic leanings seemed to be damaging evidence against Voorhis. Concerning the first of their debates, The Saturday Evening Post stated that Nixon actually asked whether Voorhis was endorsed by the Political Action Committee. Voorhis denied the charge. Nixon then proceeded to produce a list of the candidates that were endorsed by the Political Action Committee, and the name of Voorhis was listed.[3] Nixon also attempted to point out actions of Voorhis during his term of office when he voted for programs which could be termed socialistic in nature.[4] How much damage this reported association with Communism and Social-

---

[1]U. S. Congress, Congressional Record (Washington: Government Printing Press Office), 92, Part 5, 6699.

[2]Koegh, op. cit., p. 33.

[3]Saturday Evening Post, op. cit., p. 31.

[4]de Toledano, op. cit., p. 44.

ism had on Voorhis in this campaign is not easily discernible. It is difficult to ascertain even the effectiveness of campaigns in general. Key, for example, refers to this problem by saying:

> Trustworthy data on the effects of campaigns is extremely limited, and the information that exists relates primarily to national campaigns. One way to narrow the problem of estimating the effects of campaigns is to examine, first, other factors that perhaps have greater weight in determining the outcome of elections than campaigns themselves.[1]

The New York Times listed in its election results that the Twelfth District of California went to Richard Nixon. The vote was 64,784 to 49,431.[2] Thus Richard Nixon became a member of the House of Representatives in November of 1946.

First term in the House: One of the first appointments Nixon received in the House of Representatives was as a member of the Labor Committee.[3] He was on this committee when it drafted the bill which later became known as the Taft-Hartley Act. Also in his first year as a Congressman, he was sent to Europe as a member of a committee to investigate economic conditions. But probably the most significant position held by Nixon while a member of the House was his membership on the House Committee on Un-American Activities.[4]

---

[1] V. O. Key, Jr., op. cit., p. 506.

[2] New York Times, November 7, 1946, p. 16.

[3] Congressional Record, op. cit., 93, Part 1, 308.

[4] Ibid.

This committee was attempting to uncover Communists in high political positions who might endanger America's security. The Russian cold war in Germany was under way in 1947, and the American public no longer felt the same toward Russia and Communism as it had when Russia was an ally during World War II. During this period, former Communists were being subpoenaed by the committee. Two of the Communists brought before them, as Nixon appeared on the scene, were Gerhard Eisler and Eugene Dennis. Nixon had an opportunity to present the Committee's case against these men. His maiden speech in the House was as a representative of this committee asking for a contempt of Congress citation against Eisler.[1] After this initial speech, Nixon worked with the committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation in tracing the movements of Communists in the United States. He participated in the "Hollywood Hearings" during the fall of 1947.[2] Current Biography reported that during these hearings a great deal of financial support for the Communist Party was uncovered.[3] After these hearings, the committee investigated Communist infiltration into labor unions. Then in 1948, the committee issued a report of proposed legislation called the Subversive Activities Control Bill.[4] This bill, H. R. 5852, passed the House but was not voted upon in the

---

[1] Congressional Record, op. cit., 93, Part 1, 1129.

[2] Ibid., 93, Part 9, 10792.

[3] Current Biography 1948, op. cit., p. 473.

[4] Congressional Record, op. cit., 94, Part 5, 6047.

Senate. It did not come up again until after the National Election of 1948.

Second House campaign: In 1948, Nixon ran for a second term in the House. He entered both the Republican and Democratic primaries in his district. He was victorious in both primaries. In November, he was re-elected unopposed, amassing 141,509 votes.[1]

Second term in the House: After the election, Nixon reintroduced the bill which he and Mundt had authored. The bill was amended by the House and by the Senate, and then passed as the Internal Security Act of 1950.[2] The stated purpose of the act was "to protect the United States against certain un-American and subversive activities by requiring registration of Communist organizations, and for other purposes."[3] The search for Communists in government was increased. Nixon pursued the investigation of Alger Hiss which had been started just prior to the 1948 election. On July 31, 1948, Whittaker Chambers, a senior editor of Time magazine, appeared before the House Committee on Un-American Activities and named the members of a Communist cell of which Alger Hiss was reputed to be a member.[4] A great deal

---

[1] State of California Statement of Vote, General Election, November 2, 1948 (Sacramento: California State Printing Office, 1949), p. 8.

[2] United States Statutes at Large 1950-51 (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1952), 94, Part 1, 987.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Congressional Record, op. cit., 96, Part 1, 1000.

of controversy followed. Hiss denied all allegations and even started a civil law suit for libel against Whittaker Chambers. Through the charges and countercharges, other names appeared. One of the most notable of these was Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury. He was brought before the committee, but a few days after his appearance he died of a heart attack.

The investigation of Hiss continued. Nixon felt that a perjury count against Hiss was in order because of his gift of an automobile to the Communist Party, and the existence of numerous government documents which Whittaker Chambers gave to the committee. These documents were reported to have been typed on a typewriter owned by Alger Hiss. Hiss had denied knowing or having any contact with Whittaker Chambers. Finally, on December 15, 1949, Hiss was indicted for perjury and on January 21, 1950, he was convicted on two counts of perjury involving espionage.[1] After his conviction, Nixon rose on January 26, 1950, to speak to the Congress. He outlined the danger to the nation of the repetition of such an episode in the government when he stated:

> This nation cannot afford another Hiss case. It is essential therefore that we recognize the seriousness of the crime involved, the extent and scope of the conspiracy of which Mr. Hiss was a member, the reasons for the failure to bring that conspiracy to light--and the positive steps which we can and must take now to guard against such a situation in the future.[2]

---

[1] New York Times, January 22, 1950, p. 1.

[2] Congressional Record, op. cit., 96, Part 1, 1001.

Nixon then continued with an account of the Hiss case as well as the Harry Dexter White episode. He included many recommendations for legislation to guard against the recurrence of such a problem. Because of his efforts on the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Richard Nixon received national recognition. This recognition may have aided him in his campaign for the Senate.

Senate campaign: Prior to the 1950 election in California, Democratic Senator Sheridan Downey announced he would not run for re-election because of ill health.[1] This left the Senate seat open to both parties. In the Republican primary, Richard Nixon appeared to be the strongest candidate. While the Democrats had several candidates, the strongest of these appeared to be Los Angeles Daily News publisher Manchester Boddy and Representative Helen Gahagan Douglas. On June 5, 1950, the day before the primary election in California, Newsweek magazine predicted a Nixon-Douglas race for the Senate seat.[2] The election on the following day proved Newsweek's prediction to be an accurate one.

The race then pitted Richard Nixon, a young politician noted as a Communist investigator, and Helen Gahagan Douglas, a former stage and screen star and a Fair Deal Democrat. Both were members of the House of Representatives. The issues around which this campaign centered were foreign policy, the Taft-Hartley Act, housing controls, welfare

---

[1] New York Times, March 26, 1950, p. 96.

[2] "California Foot Race," Newsweek, June 5, 1950, p. 250.

state legislation, and Communism.[1] Before the campaign, Newsweek had stated that Helen Ganagan Douglas, an extreme Fair Dealer "is also firmly anti-communist."[2] In the campaign, Nixon attempted to show a lack of an anti-communist attitude on the part of Mrs. Douglas, particularly through her voting in the House. The campaign turned into a difficult battle between the two senatorial aspirants.

Nixon began by pointing out that Mrs. Douglas had voted 354 times in the same way as Vito Marcantonio, the American Labor Party representative from New York.[3] And since Marcantonio was reported to have communistic leanings, this prompted Nixon to state that Mrs. Douglas was "a Stalinist at heart."[4] Mrs. Douglas retaliated by pointing out that Nixon had voted on January 19, 1950 with the same Marcantonio against aid for Korea.[5] Nixon continued his attack on Mrs. Douglas by pointing out the numerous times she had voted against the Truman Administration on such issues as aid to Greece and Turkey, the Selective Service Act of 1948, and the loyalty program.[6] He hammered away at what he con-

---

[1] New York Times, November 1, 1950, p. 32.

[2] Newsweek, June 5, 1950, p. 250.

[3] New York Times, November 1, 1950, p. 32.

[4] Earnest Brashear, "1950 Campaign," New Republic, September 1, 1952, p. 11.

[5] "An Issue of Principle," Nation, October 4, 1952, p. 288.

[6] de Toledano, "Roaring Races," Newsweek, October 30, 1950, p. 21.

sidered her lethargic feeling toward Communism quoting her as saying, 'Communism is no real threat to the Democratic institutions of our country."[1] Nixon repeated his charges in his many speaking situations. He made as many as fourteen speeches a day.[2] Mrs. Douglas labled Nixon's attacks as a smear and attempted to point out Nixon's oil interests in voting for state controls of the tide-lands oil.[3] Raymond Moley, writing in Newsweek magazine, characterized the key issue of the race as, 'The essential domestic issue before the country--the issue of individual freedom as against increasing governmental intervention in economic life."[4] The crucial issue, however, proved to be Communism. The campaign was a bitter one. California's Republican Governor, Earl Warren, refused to endorse Nixon's candidacy, but it made little difference.[5] The election went to Richard Nixon by a majority of 681,000 votes.[6] While Nixon was victorious, his reputation was questioned because of this campaign. Earnest Brashear wrote in a 1952 issue of the New Republic magazine that "in the off-year election of 1950, the clean-cut young man from Whittier ran for the United States Senate

---

[1] New York Times, October 25, 1950, Section IV, p. 9.

[2] Ibid.

[3] New York Times, October 29, 1950, Section VI, p. 11.

[4] Newsweek, October 30, 1950, p. 21.

[5] Williams. op. cit., p. 240.

[6] Statistical Abstract of the United States 1951 United States Department of Commerce (Washington 25, D. C.: United States Printing Office, 1951), p. 298.

and defeated Fair Deal favorite Helen Gahagan Douglas in one of the best financed, well publicized and most underhanded campaigns in California's history."[1] This stigma was one that Nixon had to overcome in his succeeding political years.

The Senate: In the Senate, Richard Nixon continued his interest in anti-subversive legislation. He was placed on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the Foreign Relations Committee initially, and the Judiciary Committee soon after.[2] These posts were similiar to those he had held in the House. Thus he was able to continue in the fight against Communism.

Subversion, however, was not Nixon's only interest while in the Senate. He was critical of the Administration's foreign policy, it's attitude toward Communism, and it's handling of the Korean situation. In one of the many speeches he made condemning the Administration, he stated:

> Secretary Acheson and the President should follow the lead of General Marshall and make a forthright unequivocal statement that Formosa is essential to our defenses--and that the United States will use the veto to keep Red China out of the United Nations.
>
> We should warn the Chinese Communists that, unless they cease their aggression against Korea, by a certain date, our commanders in the field will be given the authority to bomb Manchurian bases.
>
> We should take the required steps, including naval blockade if necessary, to stop all trade with Communist China.

---

[1] Earnest Brashear, "Who Is Richard Nixon," New Republic, September 1, 1952, p. 10.

[2] Congressional Record, op. cit., 97, Part 1, 20.

> We must develop as many allies as possible in Europe and Asia.
>
> We must, as we defend ourselves militarily against our enemies abroad, declare war on waste and inefficiency at home. Otherwise, we may spend ourselves into bankruptcy--as Marx and Lenin and Stalin predicted. We should recognize that one of the greatest assets on our side in the present struggle are the millions of people behind the Iron Curtain who are not Communists. We should quit talking about containment and defense and go on the offensive in the ideological struggle. The Voice of America is not competent to handle this assignment. The whole program should be taken out of the State Department and set up as a separate agency similiar to ECA. The amount of funds appropriated for this purpose should be at least equal to what the Communists spend.[1]

It can be noted that Nixon had specific recommendations for solving the problems which he felt were not being adequately handled by the Administration. Nixon's efforts in the Senate, however, were interrupted in 1952, after only two years of service, when he was nominated as the Republican vice-presidential candidate.

The 1952 campaign: The Republican National Convention of 1952 was held in Chicago, Illinois in July of that year. On June 11, the Convention nominated Dwight David Eisenhower as its presidential candidate. After his nomination, Eisenhower was approached by Governor Dewey, Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, and Arthur Summerfield, among others, to consider vice-presidential possibilities.[2] Williams, in his book The Rise of the Vice-Presidency, reported that Eisenhower avoided making a single selection, but rather sub-

---

[1] as quoted in de Toledano, op. cit., p. 111.

[2] Williams, op. cit., p. 242.

mitted a list of seven men who were acceptable to him. The men under consideration were Senator Richard Nixon of California, Senator Lodge, Governor Dan Thornton of Colorado, Governor Arthur Langley of Washington, Governor Alfred Driscoll of New Jersey, Senator Knowland of California, and Harold Stassen.[1] Nixon's name headed the list and the word around the Convention Hall seemed to indicate that he was to be the vice-presidential candidate.[2] Then on Friday afternoon, July 11, Senator Knowland made the nominating speech for Richard Nixon as the Republican vice-presidential candidate. Governor Alfred E. Driscoll seconded the nomination. The momentum grew for Richard Nixon and Governor John S. Fine of Pennsylvania made a motion to discard the roll call to nominate Nixon by acclamation. This was done and Nixon became the vice-presidential candidate.

Nixon began campaigning by train. However, an article appeared in several newspapers across the country on September 18, 1952, which necessitated a change in tactics by Nixon. It was on this day that a special fund was disclosed to the nation. This fund was contributed by a number of California businessmen to Nixon for use in carrying out his Senatorial duties and responsibilities. Inferences were made questioning the ethics of Nixon in using these funds. Nixon spoke out against these inferences from his campaign train on September 19, stating, "The Communists, the left-wingers, have been fighting me with every smear that they

---

[1] Williams, op. cit., p. 242. [2] Ibid.

have been able to do."[1] Because of these inferences and because of the alleged smear to his reputation, there was talk that Nixon should be dropped as the Republican vice-presidential candidate.[2] The fund became such an issue that Nixon flew back to California from Portland, Oregon and began to prepare an account of the fund for a national radio and television broadcast. On Tuesday evening, September 23, 1952, Nixon began his radio and television speech before an estimated audience of fifty-five million people stating, "My fellow Americans: I come before you tonight as a candidate for the vice-presidency and as a man whose honesty and integrity has been questioned."[3] In this speech, Nixon pointed out that the fund, which totaled approximately $18,000, was set up by Dana Smith and was to be used by Nixon for political business which he felt was necessary for the efficient running of his Senate office. Some of the items which were listed by the firm of Price, Waterhouse and Company, which examined the fund upon the request of Dana Smith, were $2,306.94 for travel and hotels for Mr. and Mrs. Nixon, $4,237.54 for Christmas cards, $1,281.07 for addressograph plates, etc.[4] The speech further presented the legal opinion of the law firm of Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher of Los Angeles.[5] The New York Times commented on the emotional

---

[1] New York Times, September 22, 1952, p. 10.

[2] New York Times, September 19, 1952, p. 11.

[3] New York Times, September 24, 1952, p. 22.

[4] Ibid., p. 23. [5] Ibid.

impact of the presentation in which Nixon attempted to repudiate what he considered to be false allegations against him.[1]

All during the presentation, presidential candidate Dwight Eisenhower was viewing it by television at Cleveland's Public Hall prior to his own speech. After the telecast, Eisenhower faced the Cleveland audience and apologized for departing from his original speech and giving an off-the-cuff reaffirmation of faith to Richard Nixon.[2] He applauded Nixon's presentation as he said, " Not only has he vindicated himself but I feel that he has acted as a man of courage and honor, and so far as I am concerned he stands higher than ever."[3] After the broadcast, the Western Union offices across the nation were flooded with calls and were jammed for some eighteen hours with responses applauding Nixon's action.[4] The Republican National Committee was polled by chairman A. E. Summerfield and, of the 107 members that he was able to contact, the vote was 107 to 0 in favor of Nixon.[5] The remainder of the campaign was fairly uneventful even though the fund did not become a dead issue. In the election, the ticket of Eisenhower and Nixon was successful. Richard Nixon had become the Vice-President of the United States.

---

[1] New York Times, September 24, 1952, p. 23.

[2] Ibid., p. 24. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., p. 21.

(The information cited in the above footnotes was also noted in Business Week, October 4, 1952, Newsweek, September 29, 1952, and Life Magazine, September 29, 1952.)

[5] "In Financial Undress," Business Week, October 4, 1952, p. 31.

First term as Vice-President: The vice-presidency kept Richard Nixon extremely busy and proved quite eventful for him. He was the first Vice-President to chair the National Security Council in the President's absence and he took part in regular cabinent sessions. It should be remembered that the National Security Council is an advisory body and does not have given powers. He also attended a great many social functions, since it was the preference of President Eisenhower to attend as few as possible of these and to send the Vice-President in his stead.[1]

Nixon's role as Vice-President gradually impressed itself on the Washington political scene. In the summer of 1953, Arthur Krock reported in the New York Times, "Persons familiar with the Vice-President's helpful activities have told this reporter that they consider them unique in the records of his high office."[2] In December of the same year, Robert Coughlan stated in Life, "He has made the Vice-Presidency, hitherto the butt of ridicule, an important office and has established himself as an assistant President, a mover and shaper of national and world affairs."[3] Then while his reputation was growing on the domestic scene, Nixon embarked upon a world good-will tour.

In a period of ten weeks, the Vice-President with

---

[1] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 153.

[2] New York Times, July 16, 1953, p. 23.

[3] Life Magazine, December 14, 1953, p. 146.

Mrs. Nixon traveled some 45,000 miles in the Far East.[1] He visited Malaya, Burma, and other Far Eastern countries spreading American good-will. After his excursion in the Far East, he and Mrs. Nixon embarked on another good-will campaign. This time it was through Mexico and the Caribbean. On this tour, the Nixons traveled approximately 8,500 miles.[2]

In addition to these foreign good-will tours, Nixon also traveled a great deal within the United States. In the 1954 off-year election, he campaigned vigorously for the Republican Party. During this campaign, he visited about ninety-five cities, covered thirty states across the United States and spanned 26,000 miles in delivering 204 speeches and holding more than 100 news conferences. The campaign efforts of Richard Nixon did not stop the Democrats from regaining the control of the House and Senate they had lost in 1952, however. After the election the Democrats controlled the House by 232-203 and the Senate 48-47.[3] As Vice-President, Nixon was busy, but it took Eisenhower's heart attack on September 18, 1955 to focus the national limelight sharply on Richard Nixon. Although the heart attack was a mild one and Eisenhower recovered, the idea of Richard Nixon's succeeding to the presidency upon the death of President Eisenhower seemed within the realm of possibility. This

---

[1] New York Times, July 8, 1953, p. 1.

[2] New York Times, February 6, 1955, p. 6.

[3] Statistical Abstract of the United States, op. cit., p. 341.

feeling grew as Eisenhower faced a second illness when he was operated upon for an intestinal complication. During these periods of Eisenhower's illness, Nixon's role as Vice-President was again heightened by the possibility of an invalided President. Eisenhower recovered, however, and decided to run for a second term as President. Richard Nixon was again selected as the vice-presidential candidate.

Summary

1. Richard Milhous Nixon was born in Yorba Linda, California of Scotch-Irish Quaker parents. His American antecedents date back to pre-revolutionary America. His boyhood in California contained elements of hard work, tragedy, and strong religious and moral training.

2. Throughout all of his educational training, Nixon maintained a high scholastic average and was active in extra-curricular activities. He gained particular prominence in debate and speech related activities, as well as class politics. Scholastically, Nixon received several honors, culminated by the Order of the Coif while at Duke University Law School.

3. The years prior to Nixon's political career were occupied by his law practice in Whittier, California, his marriage to Patricia Ryan, and his public service to the United States during World War II. After his graduation from Duke, he joined the law firm of Wingert and Bewley, and within a year, became a partner in that firm. With the advent of World War II, he went to Washington, D. C. to work

with the Office of Emergency Management. Some months later he was accepted as an officer in the United States Navy, serving until the end of the war.

4. In 1945, after being discharged from the Navy, Nixon was elected to the House of Representatives from the state of California. His two terms in the House were primarily concerned with a search for corruption in government and the investigation of Communist infiltration in high governmental offices. His diligence in the Alger Hiss case gained him national recognition. He also gained recognition for his work on labor legislation.

5. He was elected to the Senate in 1950. As a result of the campaign for the Senate seat, Nixon received some unfavorable publicity because of his so-called smear tactics against Helen Gahagan Douglas. In the Senate, as in the House, Nixon continued his attack against Communism and corruption in government.

6. In 1952, six years after his entrance into politics, Nixon was elected as the Vice-President of the United States. During that campaign, Nixon defended his use of a fund established for him by Californians during his tenure in the Senate. As Vice-President, Nixon became a good-will ambassador for the United States to such areas as the Far East and Central America. The Republican Party capitalized on Nixon's speaking ability when it made him the chief campaigner in the 1954 off-year election. Attention was focused on Richard Nixon as Vice-President when President Eisenhower suffered his illnesses.

CHAPTER III

THE AMERCAN SCENE--1956

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the economic and political conditions existing prior to the 1956 presidential campaign. The chapter will include references to the 1956 Republican National Convention in San Francico's Cow Palace, the campaign platform, the issues in general, and the speaking itinerary of Richard Nixon. These historical elements are included in order to place the campaign speeches in their proper chronological context.

Economic Situation

The importance of the economy of the nation in the campaign of 1956 can be determined quickly by looking at the structure of the 1956 Republican Platform. The platform took cognizance of such areas as business and economic policies, small business problems, labor needs, and aids to agriculture.[1] The inclusion of these items in the platform indicated the Republican Party's awareness of their importance in the coming campaign.

General economic growth and development: The economy of the nation in 1956 was particularly important to the

---

[1] 1956 Republican Platform (Washington: Issued by the Republican National Committee, 1956).

Republican Party since they were the party in power and had to stand upon the merits of their record during the preceding four years. The Eisenhower Administration felt confident that their record could withstand the scrutiny of opposing speakers.[1] The year of 1955 had ended on a note of prosperity and the main question being posed in the leading periodicals was, "Will The Boom End?" In January, Newsweek was predicting an increase in the prosperity although it was warning that there would be some signs of strain and stress.[2] U. S. News and World Report was forecasting the "best year yet."[3] But it felt that there would be a slow decline in some fields. With this general feeling of well-being, a look into some of the various facets of the economy of the United States should give a clearer picture of what the nation faced in 1956.

The economy and the individual: In order to assess the manner in which the economy affected the individual, the following economic conditions will be investigated: (1) personal incomes, (2) the state of employment, (3) the dividends realized on stocks and bonds, (4) the farmer's status, and (5) the cost of living index.

There were many optimistic predictions for the consumer as the year began. One prediction was for personal

---

[1] 1956 Republican Speaker's Handbook (Washington: prepared by the Republican National Committee, 1956), p. 1.

[2] U. S. News and World Report, January 6, 1956, p. 23.

[3] Newsweek, January 9, 1956, p. 51.

incomes to again rise as was true in 1955 and for the ever increasing cost of living index to level off.[1] The feeling was that prosperity would be even greater in 1956 and that this would enable the individual to reduce many of the debts built up by credit. Another bright forecast was that those individuals holding stocks and bonds would again be realizing large dividends.[2] The forecasters thus predicted a good year for the country.

Not all of the predictions for the election year of 1956, however, pointed to prosperity. The farmer's income was expected to decline while his economic situation was to remain fairly constant.[3] There was an anticipated increase in unemployment. It was felt that more people were going to be looking for jobs and that there not going to be enough new positions to satisfy the demand.[4] The major areas of unemployment were expected to come from the farming and construction fields.[5] Since more people were to be looking for jobs, the forecasters felt that more people would be employed.

The future, then, was for a continuance of the boom of 1955 although it was felt that there would be a leveling off process. The following chart will show the 1955 averages as compared to the estimated 1956 averages and the actual 1956 averages as indicated by the Economic Report of the

---

[1] New York Times, January 4, 1956, pp. 49-87.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

President dated January, 1957.[1]

	1955 Average[2]	1956 Forecast[3]	1956 Actual Average[4]
Personal Income	302.6 billions	311.4 billions	325.2 billions
Employment	63.2 millions	63.5 millions	65.0 millions
Unemployment	2.7 millions	3.2 millions	2.5 millions
Stockholders	10.9 billions	11.4 billions	12.0 billions
Farmers	32.9 billions	28.4 billions	33.8 billions
Cost of Living Index	114.5 %	115.1 %	116.1 %

As can be seen from the above chart, the economic situation in 1956 surpassed even the most optimistic forecasts. The wage earner realized a greater personal income, employment was up and unemployment was down, and even the farmer's income had improved during the year. The boom con-

[1] Economic Report of the President (Washington: transmitted to Congress, U. S. Government Printing Press, January 23, 1957).

[2] Ibid., pp. 123-191.

[3] U. S. News and World Report, January 6, 1956, p. 23.

[4] Economic Report of the President, op. cit., pp. 123-191.

tinued and the ticket of Eisenhower and Nixon had support for their contention that the United Stated was witnessing prosperous times. The only negative aspect for the consumer to consider was the continuing upward spiral of the cost of living index.

Business situation: To assess the economic situation for the businessman in 1956, it will be necessary to investigate labor costs, corporation profits, industrial output, retail trade, and new construction. These general categories will give an indication of the business situation prior to the 1956 campaign.

The forecasters were quite optimistic for the individual consumer, but their optimism did not extend to the businessman. The prediction was for a decline in corporate profits, construction was to be on the decrease, industrial output was to remain constant, and only retail trade was expected to increase slightly during the year.[1] Another problem facing the business world was the forecast for an increase in labor costs.[2] The forecasters seemed to indicate that despite these problems, business was to have a good year.

While the forecasters were predicting a slight decline for business in general, the decline was not expected to affect, to any great extent, the prosperity that the nation had witnessed in 1955. The following chart will

---

[1] New York Times, January 4, 1956, pp. 49-87.

[2] Ibid.

show the 1955 averages, the 1956 forecasts, and the 1956 actual averages for the business world.

	1955 Average[1]	1956 Forecast[2]	1956 Actual Average[3]
Labor Costs	1.88 per hour	1.96 per hour	1.98 per hour
Industrial Output	139% of 1947-49 average	139% of 1947-49 average	143% of 1947-49 average
New Construction	42.1 billions	40.6 billions	44.3 billions
Retail Trade	185.0 billions	186.7 billions	189.8 billions
Corporation Profits	21.5 billions	20.4 billions	21.5 billions

The preceding chart shows that the businessman, as well as the consumer, reaped the benefit of prosperous times. None of the expected declines materialized in 1956. The year of anticipated prosperity extended into the business world. The only decline recorded occurred in the auto industry. The drop was from 203 per cent of the 1947-49 industrial production index in 1955 to 199 per cent of the

---

[1] Economic Report of the President, op. cit., pp. 123-191.

[2] U. S. News and World Report, January 6, 1956, p. 29.

[3] Economic Report of the President, op. cit., pp. 123-191.

industrial index for 1956.[1] In general, however, business did not suffer any major set backs and the year of 1956 was a prosperous one.

General economic situation at convention time: From the economic standpoint, three issues became apparent by the end of August of 1956. They were: prosperity, the cost of living, and farm prices.[2] U. S. News and World Report predicted that both parties would capitalize on these issues, particularly the agricultural issue.[3]

The Republicans could point to the prosperity as an indication of their success. They could also point out that the farmer's situation had improved during the year even though their difficulties had not been entirely eliminated. They could point out, too, that the cost of living not only indicated how high prices were, but that it also indicated a high standard of living.

The Democrats, on the other hand, would have to argue that prosperity was not the entire picture. They could point to the discontent in the middle west farm states.[4] They could point to the farm problems of overproduction and surpluses.[5] They could point to the unsteady situation in

---

[1] Economic Report of the President, op. cit., p. 152.

[2] U. S. News and World Report, August 31, 1956, p. 24.

[3] Ibid.

[4] New York Times, September 18, 1956, p. 12.

[5] New York Times, January 22, 1956, p. 66.

the automobile industry.[1] And they could point to the cost of living and its steady climb toward inflation.[2]

Regardless of the farmer's situation and the unsteady situation in the automobile industry, it must be noted that business in general was good. The gross national product had reached an all time high of 412 billion dollars.[3] This was an increase of 21.5 billion dollars over the previous year. Employment had made sizeable gains and there were fewer unemployed, and incomes rose for all major income groups.[4]

It became apparent as the campaign approached that the economy was of political interest. The periodicals at convention time featured articles on the economic situation. Newsweek, for example, was running such articles as, "Your Dollar-Target In A Hot War," "New Look At Our Amazing Boom," and "Ike And The Farmers."[5] U. S. News and World Report was featuring such articles as, "What's Coming Up In Business?" "What 'Tight Money' Really Means," "Business Boom To Slow Up?" and "Why Prices Are Rising."[6]

The economic situation continued as the focal point throughout the campaign. Newsweek featured such articles

---

[1] New York Times, June 3, 1956, IV, p. 66.

[2] New York Times, September 10, 1956, p. 38.

[3] Economic Report of the President, op. cit., p. 1.

[4] Ibid., p. 5.

[5] Newsweek, april-July, 1956,

[6] U. S. News and World Report, June-September, 1956.

during the campaign as "The Farmer: His Problem, His Outlook," "Labor: Has Ike Gained Or Loss?" and "The Farm States--How They Lean Now."[1] During this time, U. S. News and World Report was highlighting "Industry Dilemma: Sales Climb, Profits Fall," "Why Stock Market Is Shaky," and "Money Will Stay Tight."[2] It remained, then, for the candidates to answer these foremost economic problems.

Political Situation

As the presidential election year of 1956 developed, the Republicans, with Dwight David Eisenhower as President and Richard Milhous Nixon as Vice-President, were the party in power. The off-year election of 1954, however, had made some changes in the Congress. In the Senate, the Democrats held a forty-nine to forty-seven member edge.[3] The Democrats also held a membership plurality in the House by a majority of 230 to 201.[4] The Democratic Party also led the nation at the state level. They had twenty-seven governors to twenty-one for the Republicans.

Thus, it became the task of the Republican Party in the election year of 1956 to gain the majority in the House, in the Senate, and in the Governor's mansions across the nation that they had held after the 1952 election.[5] In

---

[1] Newsweek, September-November , 1956.

[2] U. S. News and world Report, September-November, 1956.

[3] Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1957 op. cit., p. 352.

[4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

that election, the ticket of Eisenhower and Nixon amassed 442 electoral votes while the Democrats received only 89.[1] There was hope that Eisenhower's popularity would continue as high as it had been in 1952 and would again put the Republican Party into complete power. As convention and election time neared, it seemed that there was cause for hope on the part of both political parties for the attainment of the necessary 266 electoral votes for victory. As far as the Republicans were concerned, there were problems to overcome before the convention began.

The health of the President: The major concern as the year started centered around whether Eisenhower would run again. This concern was caused by the heart attack Eisenhower suffered in September of 1955. U. S. News and World Report published the results of a questionnaire circulated to heart specialists concerning Eisenhower and his heart attack. The questionnaire specifically asked two questions: (1) would a man who has had a heart attack be able to serve a term as President? and (2) could the President be regarded as physically able to serve a second term if he had the proper convalescence? The consensus on these two questions indicated that over sixty per cent of the heart specialists, in both instances, felt that an individual suffering a heart attack would be physically able to

---

[1] Statistical Abstract of the United States, op. cit., p. 341.

[2] U. S. News and World Report, January 13, 1956, p. 21.

serve a second term and that President Eisenhower could be regarded as being physically able after the proper convalescence.[1] A great deal of speculation and concern surrounded Eisenhower's health during the first half of 1956. By June 1, however, it seemed that Eisenhower had overcome public apprehension concerning his heart attack. He appeared to be assuming his normal schedule as President and there was hope that he was recovered completely.

On June 7th, however, President Eisenhower suffered a mild upset stomach which later turned out to be an illness called ileitis.[2] A successful operation was performed on the President at this time. This new illness meant two things to the Republican Party. First, if Eisenhower ran for office, would he do the barnstorming he had during the 1952 election, and second, would the possibility of an invalided President focus more attention on the running mate to be chosen at the convention in August?

Eisenhower answered the first query when he stated that he would do no barnstorming.[3] He stipulated that there would be a few plane trips and that he would appear on television.[4] The assumption seemed to indicate that his popularity could carry him into another term.[5] This apparent

---

[1] U. S. News and world Report, January 13, 1956, p. 21.

[2] New York Times, June 7, 1956, p. 1.

[3] New York Times, February 9, 1956, p. 1.

[4] Ibid.

[5] New York Times, February 17, 1956, p. 1.

campaign strategy, forwarded before the convention convened, would indicate that if there was to be any stumping, President Eisenhower was not going to do it.

The question of Nixon's candidacy: The second question came to the forefront during the first week of March, 1956 when an anti-Nixon drive became apparent.[1] Most of the controversy started when President Eisenhower refused to comment on a vice-presidential nominee after announcing his own candidacy. In a press conference on March 7, 1956, Eisenhower was asked, "Mr. President, when you say, sir, you have suggested to Mr. Nixon that he chart out his course, is the implication of that that if he elects to remain on the ticket, that you are content to have him as your running mate?"[2] To this question, Eisenhower answered:

> Well, I am not going to be pushed into corners here and say--and right now, at this moment--say what I would do in a hypothetical question involving about five if's. And I don't think you should expect me to.
>
> I do say this: I have no criticism of Vice-President Nixon to make, either as a man, an associate or as my running mate on the ticket.[3]

This evasive answer paved the way for a great deal of speculation concerning the vice-presidential candidate. One newspaper commentator was quoted in Newsweek as accusing

---

[1]New York Times, March 1, 1956, p. 1. James Reston reported as early as February 17, 1956 in the New York Times that a movement was underway to replace Nixon on the ticket. The movement did not have White House backing, however.

[2]New York Times, March 7, 1956, p. 14. [3]Ibid.

the President of planning to "dump Nixon."[1] To this comment, Eisenhower replied, "I would be happy to be on any political ticket in which I was a candidate with him (Nixon)."[2] This declaration by President Eisenhower did not end speculation concerning Nixon's status. In the next few months, no fewer than a dozen articles concerning Nixon's situation appeared in Newsweek, Time, and U. S. News and World Report.

In May of 1956, Nixon announced that he would be "honored to accept the nomination again."[3] He gave as one of his reasons for making this decision, the Newsweek poll which appeared in Newsweek magazine on April 23, 1956. This poll gathered the opinions of 100 editors across the United States on the question, "Would having Nixon as his running mate help or hurt President Eisenhower?"[4] The result of this questionnaire indicated that fifty-eight editors thought that Nixon would help Ike's ticket, twenty-five thought that he would harm it, and seventeen felt that he would neither help nor harm the ticket.[5] Nixon felt that this poll was substantiated by the opinions forwarded in his personal mail.[6] On July 12, Republican National Chairman Hall was asked if the President would still be pleased with

---

[1] Newsweek, March 26, 1956, p. 26.

[2] New York Times, March 15, 1956, p. 1.

[3] New York Times, April 27, 1956, p. 1.

[4] Newsweek, April 23, 1956, p. 27. [5] Ibid.

[6] Newsweek, May 7, 1956, p. 29.

Nixon on the ticket.[1] He replied, "absolutely."[2] This seemed to suggest that Nixon was almost assured of being on the ticket again.

On July 23, however, Harold Stassen, the President's special assistant on disarmament, called a press conference to support Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts for Vice-President in place of Richard Nixon.[3] The issue of a vice-presidential candidate had not ended. Stassen stated that he conducted a personal survey and the results had suggested that Nixon should be replaced. He further said that a ticket of Eisenhower-Herter would run at least six per cent stronger than a ticket of Eisenhower-Nixon.[4] The reaction to this press conference came quickly. Within the next day or two, important members of the Republican Party voiced their opinions on Nixon as the vice-presidential choice. Chairman Hall stated, "The ticket will again be Eisenhower and Nixon."[5] Twenty Republican House members telegraphed their amazement and shock at Stassen's action.[6] Christian Herter, himself, held a press conference stating that he would place Mr. Nixon's name in nomination for re-election.[7] Even the leading opinion assessors, such as Gallup, Roper, and Trendex, stated that Nixon was favored for the candidacy

---

[1] New York Times, July 24, 1956, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 16. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

[5] New York Times, July 25, 1956, p. 1.

[6] New York Times, July 24, 1956, p. 1.

[7] Christian Science Monitor, July 21, 1956, p. 1.

by a great majority.[1] Stassen was not content to allow the issue to settle down even though his candidate did not seek the office. He said that he would still back Herter at the convention.[2]

During this period of controversy, the White House remained silent. President Eisenhower intimated that the decision of selecting the vice-presidential candidate would be placed in the hands of the convention.[3] Thus, the selection of the vice-presidential candidate was not to be decided until the Republican National Convention in San Francisco's Cow Palace in late August of 1956.

Nixon's personal appeal: Stassen's opposition to Nixon highlighted an important question in rhetoric, namely, Nixon's personal appeal. Thonssen and Baird state in this regard, "The attitude of the audience toward the speaker--based upon previous knowledge of the latter's activities and reputation--cannot accurately be separated from the reaction the speaker induces through the medium of speech."[4] Stassen intimated that Nixon's reputation would harm the Republican Party when he stated as one of his reasons for opposing Nixon that "the independent voters in this country, and important portions of the Allied and Neutral world 'would have greater confidence in an Eisenhower-Herter tick-

---

[1] New York Times, July 27, 1956, p. 5.

[2] New York Times, August 18, 1956, p. 9.

[3] New York Times, August 8, 1956, p. 15.

[4] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 385.

et'."[1] This questioning of Nixon's "personal appeal" to the American people is an important point in any study of a speaker, because the reputation a speaker brings into a speaking situation greatly affects his persuasiveness. Information concerning Nixon's reputation, therefore, will now be included in this dissertation.

Before entering into a description of the controversial aspects of Nixon's reputation, a brief review of the highlights of Nixon's biography is in order. Prior to entering politics, his actions and accomplishments had not elicited cause for concern over his reputation. His educational training at all levels included recognition for scholastic achievements and extra-curricular accomplishments. His home life was religious and he was successful in his career as a lawyer. Nixon also had to his credit honorable service in World War II as an officer in the Navy. An awareness of these aspects of Nixon's life tend to support the belief that there were no negative factors detracting from his reputation and ethical appeal.

The controversy concerning the reputation of Richard Nixon began with his entrance into politics. He was condemned for his conduct during his first two campaigns for political office.

In his campaign against Jerry Voorhis in the 1946 election for the House, he was condemned for labeling Voorhis a Communist, and for using the tactics of "guilt by

---

[1] Detroit Free Press, July 24, 1956, p. 6.

association."[1] Again in his campaign against Helen Gahagan Douglas, his tactics were considered by his opponents to be largely "name-calling" and "guilt by association."[2] This type of so-called "guilt by association" and "name-calling" campaign strategy used by Nixon prompted some persons to be skeptical of his ethical choices.

Richard Nixon's campaign tactics, however, were not the only areas attacked by his opponents. His conduct in the House, particularly his diligence in the Alger Hiss affair, had been criticized and had even been labeled McCarthyesque.[3] Time magazine came to his defense in 1952 when he was nominated for the vice-presidency when it stated, "There is nothing McCarthyesque about Nixon's methods. He has laid down and followed two rules: (1) there must be no charge without evidence to support it; (2) a charge that is false can harm our case more than it can help it."[4] This defense did not alter the fact that Nixon's conduct offered his opponents opportunity for continued criticism.

A reaction to Nixon's over-zealous investigations occurred in 1954 when the faculty of the Duke University Law School failed to give their approval for an honorary Doctor of Laws degree. Dr. Horack, Dean Emeritus, felt educators should not have condemned Nixon for his actions in

---

[1] Supra., Chapter II, pp. 25-27.

[2] Supra., Chapter II, pp. 32-25.

[3] Time, August 25, 1952, p. 15. [4] Ibid.

Congressional hearings.[1]

The 1952 presidential campaign did not pass without incident with regard to Nixon's reputation. It was pointed out in Chapter III that Nixon was criticized for using a special fund, established by California businessmen, during his tenure as a Senator. This attack on his reputation forced Nixon to explain his actions before a nation-wide television audience in 1952. Nixon's personal comment, as reported by Columbia Broadcasting System's Eric Sevareid, concerning his conduct on this television presentation is interesting to note. Mr. Sevareid described his recollection of the incident as follows:

> 'Now what you do is to ad lib, you speak impromptu, as though straight from the heart, Except that you don't really.' Nixon made it clear that all good impromptu TV speeches are really very promptu. The road to a real triumph of manner over matter is the road to intense work in advance: naturalness does not come naturally, and great care is required in order to appear careless.
>
> With charming frankness, Nixon took his audience behind the scenes of his celebrated TV speech of '52, defending his acceptance of that private fund. The reason it was given on Tuesday instead of Sunday was not, as many thought, to clear things with General Eisenhower, but to build up more suspense in the audience and give more time for careful preparation.[2]

Mr. Sevareid continued his recollection by explaining that Mr. Nixon's wife was instructed to look at her husband during the presentation in case a camera was beamed on her.[3]

---

[1] de Toledano, op. cit., p. 28.

[2] as quoted in Williams, op. cit., p. 245. [3] Ibid.

A favorable response by the public to this television presentation was spontaneous and over-whelming. This response does not preclude the fact that his reputation had been questioned because of his use of the private fund.

Although Stassen's attempt to replace Nixon as the Republican vice-presidential nominee was unsuccessful, it did force the American people again to make a decision concerning Nixon. A study conducted by the University of Michigan's Survey Research Center during the campaign of 1956 uncovered some interesting facts concerning Nixon's reputation. The survey was conducted during the entire campaign and followed an interview format. The question asked was, "How about the candidates for Vice-President? Aside from their parties, do you have any strong opinion about either of them?"[1] It is significant to note from the results that of all of the people interviewed, twenty per cent chose to talk about Nixon's personal qualifications as Vice-President.[2] The most significant item mentioned under personal qualifications concerned Nixon's integrity. Eight per cent of the Democratic Party members contacted chose to speak on his integrity, and all eight per cent were anti-Nixon. The Republican Party members who chose to speak on Nixon's integrity numbered only four per cent and that four per cent

---

[1] "A Study of the Presidential and Vice-Presidential Candidates: September-November, 1956, University of Michigan Research Center Study, (Ann Arbor, Michigan: unpublished document, 1956).

[2] Ibid.

was split; one per cent pro and three per cent anti-Nixon. Although the per cent choosing to discuss Nixon's integrity was not significant, it was significant that twenty per cent of all the people contacted did choose to speak on his personal qualifications and reputation.

In addition to the general category of personal qualifications, thirteen per cent of the Democratic members and twenty-two per cent of the Republicans chose to discuss Nixon in terms of his goodness as a man. As might be expected, of the Democrats, nine per cent were anti-Nixon, while four per cent felt that he was basically a good man. Of the Republicans contacted, eighteen per cent felt that he was a good man and four per cent felt that he was not. The significant factor, then, was the number of people choosing to talk about Nixon in terms of his personal appeal.

Because of the publicity surrounding the incidents in which Nixon's ethics had been questioned, he became the target of the opposition.[1] The Democrats intended to make him a prime target from the outset of the campaign.[2] They were to attack him constantly, just as if he were the candidate for President.[3] In fact, Nixon was quoted as saying that it was logical for him to be considered the "whipping boy for the Administration" since opposing speakers were

---

[1] New York Times, March 20, 1956, p. 10.

[2] New York Times, February 20, 1956, p. 16.

[3] New York Times, August 19, 1956, IV, p. 3.

was split; one per cent pro and three per cent anti-Nixon. Although the per cent choosing to discuss Nixon's integrity was not significant, it was significant that twenty per cent of all the people contacted did choose to speak on his personal qualifications and reputation.

In addition to the general category of personal qualifications, thirteen per cent of the Democratic members and twenty-two per cent of the Republicans chose to discuss Nixon in terms of his goodness as a man. As might be expected, of the Democrats, nine per cent were anti-Nixon, while four per cent felt that he was basically a good man. Of the Republicans contacted, eighteen per cent felt that he was a good man and four per cent felt that he was not. The significant factor, then, was the number of people choosing to talk about Nixon in terms of his personal appeal.

Because of the publicity surrounding the incidents in which Nixon's ethics had been questioned, he became the target of the opposition.[1] The Democrats intended to make him a prime target from the outset of the campaign.[2] They were to attack him constantly, just as if he were the candidate for President.[3] In fact, Nixon was quoted as saying that it was logical for him to be considered the "whipping boy for the Administration" since opposing speakers were

---

[1]New York Times, March 20, 1956, p. 10.

[2]New York Times, February 20, 1956, p. 16.

[3]New York Times, August 19, 1956, IV, p. 3.

"afraid to touch the President."[1]

There seemed to be no middle ground in the people's feelings toward Richard Nixon. They either liked him or disliked him intensely.[2] Those who were for Nixon liked him because of "his youth, his aggressiveness as a campaigner, and his record of exposing Communists."[3] They further felt that Nixon had made more of the vice-presidency than any of his predecessors and would enter the White House with more experience if the President should die.[4] There were even some individuals who felt that Nixon would make a better President than Mr. Eisenhower.[5] On the other hand, those who disliked him looked to his youth as a sign of immaturity; his aggressiveness in campaigning as a sign of "a lack of scruples."[6] The feelings of his detractors can be summed up in the label they gave him, that of "Tricky Dicky."[7] The peculiar point about these strong feelings was that many of the people who liked Nixon, and more particularly those who disliked him, did not know why they had these feelings.[8]

This summary of the incidents and feelings surrounding Nixon's conduct and reputation is not an attempt to ascertain the quality of his reputation or ethical appeal. It is an attempt to summarize the events which have condition-

---

[1] Newsweek, October 1, 1956, p. 28. [2] Ibid., p. 27.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid. [5] Ibid.

[6] New York Times, February 14, 1956, p. 1.

[7] Barnet Baskerville, "The New Nixon," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIII (February, 1957), 39.

[8] Newsweek, October 1, 1956, p. 27.

ed the opinions of the American people toward Nixon by the time of the 1956 convention.

The Republican National Convention

The delegates: Across the United States, the Republicans had prepared for their convention in San Francisco's Cow Palace. The convention was attended by 1,323 delegates. Of these, approximately 703 were party workers and 287 were government office holders.[1] The Republicans, since they were the party in power, had more delegates who were office holders than they had had in 1952. The delegates were selected by the Republican Party in the following manner. Thirty-four of the states, as well as Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, allowed approximately 47,000 Republican Party workers to meet in state conventions and they in turn elected 727 of the delegates for the National Convention.[2] Three of the states and Alaska allowed state committeemen to meet and appoint 38 delegates.[3] The remaining sixteen states and the District of Columbia held primary elections to elect 558 delegates. In this manner, the Republican Party selected the 1,323 delegates for the convention in August of 1956.

Convention schedule: The convention was set up to cover five sessions. The first session started on August 20, 1956 and was devoted to ceremonies and organization.[4] The

---

[1] U. S. News and World Report, February 3, 1956, p. 31.

[2] Ibid., p. 32. [3] Ibid.

[4] New York Times, August 21, 1956, p. 1.

second session included addresses by Leonard Hall, the Republican National Chairman, and the keynote address by Governor Arthur B. Langlie of Washington.[1] The third session on August 21st was devoted to speech making, and, during the fourth session on the following day, the major work of the convention took place.[2] This fourth session included the nomination of the presidential and vice-presidential candidates.[3] The final session on August 23rd was devoted to the acceptance addresses by the vice-presidential and presidential nominees.[4]

Radio and television coverage: All four of the major radio and television networks gave full coverage to the convention. A corps of newsman set up a central headquarters and remained with the convention even during the time consuming parades and demonstrations.[5] Periodically during the convention, newscasters and commentators attempted to give behind the scenes reports and keep the public informed. The public was able to view and hear all of the presentations delivered at the convention from its inception to its conclusion.

The proceedings: The Republican Convention began as some 15,000 convention-goers met in San Francisco's Cow

---

[1] New York Times, August 21, 1956, p. 16.

[2] New York Times, August 22, 1956, p. 1.

[3] New York Times, August 23, 1956, p. 1.

[4] New York Times, August 24, 1956, p. 10.

[5] New York Times, August 22, 1956, p. 11.

Palace. There did not seem to be any serious problems facing the delegates, with the possible exception of the Nixon-Stassen controversy, as the convention got under way.[1] The keynoter, Governor Langlie, confided to his friends before his presentation that he did not want his speech to contain "any unjustified name-calling."[2] He also voiced the opinion that he hoped his presentation would be on higher plane than the address given by the Democratic keynoter Frank Clements in Chicago.[3] In his speech, Langlie lauded the Administration for its achievements in the past four years, emphasizing how it had ended the Korean War, improved farm economy, and raised the nation to a high level of prosperity.[4] Although he had said he was going to avoid name-calling, he did condemn the Democratic Party for their twenty years of leadership.[5] He further condemned the Democratic keynoter for the "scorn, abuse, and ridicule leveled at President Eisenhower and his staff."[6] Governor Langlie's appraisal of the Republican position in the past four years was simple and brief. He indicated that Eisenhower's leadership had made the United States "the richest, freest, finest country in the world."[7]

After the keynote address, the Republican Party delegates met their responsibilities as expected. President

---

[1] Time, August 27, 1956, p. 9.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] New York Times, August 21, 1956, p. 16.

[5] Ibid. [6] Ibid. [7] Ibid.

Eisenhower was the unanimous selection as the presidential nominee. After his nomination, Eisenhower allowed the delegates the opportunity of selecting the vice-presidential candidate. The anticipated objection by Harold Stassen to block Richard Nixon's candidacy did not materialize. In fact, Stassen seconded the nomination of Nixon.[1] Richard Nixon's nomination was then made unanimous by the convention and the ticket of Eisenhower and Nixon was, for a second time, a reality.

Party Platform

The main theme of the Republican Party Platform as formulated at the convention was "peace and prosperity."[2] The platform was adopted at the Republican National Convention on August 21, 1956.[3] The following are some of the policies forwarded in the platform:

1. The platform called for an endorsement of the Administration's flexible price supports and the soil bank as well as promised research into the possibility of new uses for existing farm products to overcome the surplusses.[4] The farm plank also included an appraisal of the farmer's situation with the realization that more help was still needed by the farmer.

2. The labor plank of the platform pointed out the peak

---

[1] New York Times, August 23, 1956, p. 14.

[2] New York Times, August 21, 1956, p. 16.

[3] 1956 Republican National Platform, op. cit.

[4] Ibid., pp. 13-15.

employment existing in the United States and called for a revision of the Taft-Hartley Act.[1]

3. With regard to taxation, the platform indicated that the Party was in favor of tax reduction. The stipulation, however, suggested a reduction which was consistent with a balanced budget and the reduction of the national debt.[2]

4. The controversial civil rights issue contained an endorsement of the desegregation decision of the Supreme Court.[3] This plank also indicated the need for a White House conference on procedures for integration, and the possible establishment of a commission to aid in solving racial problems.[4]

5. The issue of foreign policy was entitled "Human Freedom and Peace." This issue noted the peace in Korea as well as the Administration's efforts in fighting Communism through such organizations as "SEATO" and "NATO."[5]

6. With regard to business, the platform cited aid to small business with a possible tax reduction on business profits.[6] The plank indicated the necessity for strengthening anti-trust and merger controls.[7]

The Republicans also promised in the Platform that they would continue the operation of the Federal Government as a clean, honorable, and efficient organization. The

---

[1] 1956 Republican National Platform, op. cit., pp. 10-11.

[2] Ibid., p. 7. [3] Ibid., p. 20. [4] Ibid.

[5] Ibid., pp. 21-22. [6] Ibid., p. 9.

[7] Ibid., p. 8.

planks included consideration of immediate statehood for Hawaii and Alaska, a balanced budget, reduction of the national debt, and aid to private industry for atomic projects.

In general, the Republicans felt that they had established a good record. President Eisenhower stated, "Tell the truth: tell it forcefully . . . The record is there; and it is good."[1]

The Speaker's Handbook for the Party indicated that the campaigners were going to point up the following general issues in their speeches:

1. The Party intended to point out to the voters the accomplishments that the Administration had been responsible for in the preceding four years.

2. Agriculture was a major issue according to the Handbook. Such areas as Eisenhower's nine point program, price support boosts, parity ratio index, credit and disaster aids, grain storage, regaining export markets, the surplus problem, and the 1952 pledges that were fulfilled by the Party were the areas to be stressed by the campaigners.

3. Business and government were included in the Speaker's Handbook as issues for the coming campaign.

4. Civil Rights was included. The issue stressed particularly the alleged anti-discrimination action and the climate of equality established by the Republican Party during their

---

[1] 1956 Republican Speaker's Handbook (Washington: prepared by the Republican National Committee, 1956), p. 1.

four years in power.

5. Communism and corruption clean-up promises were included.

6. Defense was taken into consideration by the Handbook. The issue of defense included preparedness, air power and guided missiles, continental and civil defense, and military personal benefits.

7. Education was placed as a possible issue in the Handbook, particularly progress over the past four years and the school construction bill.

8. Next, the foreign policy included collective defense, Atoms-for-peace, disarmament, mutual security, and foreign trade.

9. Health, housing, and immigration were included as areas for discussion, and finally

10. The issue of labor was included as a major issue in the Handbook. Labor considerations were to include wages, prices, strikes, employment and unemployment, Taft-Hartley revisions, and the GOP record in the four years of Eisenhower's Administration.[1]

It must be pointed out that these were not all of the possible issues forwarded by the Handbook. Further, the Handbook included numerous facts under each of the issues listed. These were not the only issues which could be used by the campaign speakers. U. S. News and World Report indicated that the issues that would actually influence

---

[1] 1956 Republican Speaker's Handbook, op. cit., pp. 1-116.

the voters were: peace, prosperity, farm prices, segregation, taxes, the cost of living, school aid, and health.[1] These were also the issues to be used by Richard Milhous Nixon in his campaign speeches during the campaign in 1956.

Nixon's Itinerary

Nixon delivered his Acceptance Address on August 23, 1956 at the convention and then began to prepare for the coming campaign. His first speech as a candidate for re-election was delivered on September 6, 1956 in Los Angeles, California at the American Legion National Convention. The official kick-off rally, however, was held September 12, 1956 on President Eisenhower's Gettysburg farm in Pennsylvania. On this occasion, Nixon was the principal speaker. For the remainder of the campaign, Richard Nixon's itinerary was scheduled to include three major tours.

First campaign tour: The first tour began on Tuesday morning, September 18, 1956.[2] Eisenhower was on hand to bid Nixon farewell at the Washington National Airport. Nixon boarded a transcontinental flight bound for Long Beach, California, with a stop-over at Indianapolis for a noon meeting and a speech.[3] On this first tour, Nixon visited thirty-two states and traveled 18,000 miles.[4] His presentations con-

---

[1] U. S. News and World Report, August 31, 1956, p. 24.

[2] The schedule of speeches for the three campaign tours can be found in Appendix A.

[3] Republican National Committee News Release, (Washington: September 15, 1956).

[4] Ibid., October 17, 1956.

sisted of morning meetings, noon rallys, evening addresses and occasionally some stumping through key states. This first tour ended on Tuesday, October 3, 1956 in Philadelphia.[1]

Second campaign tour: The second campaign tour started a week later on Tuesday, October 9, 1956. On this tour, Nixon traveled nearly 10,000 miles and visited fifteen states.[2] During this second swing, he crossed the United States by plane visiting key states and again doing a certain amount of stumping. The second tour ended on October 20, 1956 in Fort Lauderdale, Florida. Between the end of the second swing and the beginning of the third, Nixon appeared before a national television audience to answer the questions posed by a group of collegiate newspaper editors.[3]

The third tour: The final tour of Nixon's itinerary started on October 22, 1956 when Richard Nixon again left Washington and flew to the state of Michigan.[4] The first week of this tour was devoted to stumping the various states to which he flew. The second and last week of the campaign started on October 29, 1956. In this final week, Nixon again chose to stump specific states. Nixon returned to Washington, D. C. November 3rd. The following evening, Richard Nixon and President Eisenhower faced a nation-wide tele-

---

[1] Republican National Committee News Release, op. cit., September 15, 1956.

[2] Ibid., October 1, 1956. [3] Ibid., October 17, 1956.

[4] Ibid.

vision audience in an election eve wind-up.[1]

Summary

1. The gross national product during 1956 had increased to its highest level in history. The individual consumer, as reflected by average income, was making more money and the business world as a whole was realizing greater profits. The economic issues in the campaign centered around prosperity, the cost of living, and farm prices.

2. The apprehension concerning President Eisenhower's health, caused by a heart attack and an ileitis operation, had been, for the most part, overcome, and Eisenhower was renominated for the presidency. The consensus among the doctors consulted was that Eisenhower was well enough to serve a second term.

3. Nixon's candidacy for the vice-presidency was questioned by Harold Stassen. Attention was focused on the vice-presidential candidate when Eisenhower refused to comment on his personal choice for a running mate in early March of 1956. On July 23, 1956 Harold Stassen called a press conference and supported Christian Herter for the nomination. This announcement caused the most significant political problem the Republicans had to face at San Francisco's Cow Palace. The crisis, however, did not materialize, and Nixon was nominated as the vice-presidential candidate.

4. Stassen's objection to Richard Nixon was based

---

[1] Republican National Committee News Release, op. cit., October 17, 1956.

upon a belief that an alternative choice by the Republican Party would find greater acceptance on the part of the electorate. Stassen based his objection upon a personal survey he conducted which indicated that Nixon's ethical appeal would harm the Party in the coming election. Public opinion formed in favor of Nixon and Stassen finally withdrew his objection.

5. The Republican National Convention convened on a note of "peace and prosperity." After the nomination of President Eisenhower, the delegates were allowed the opportunity of nominating the vice-presidential candidate. Richard Nixon was renominated unanimously on the first ballot.

6. The theme of the Party Platform was a repetition of the convention theme: peace and prosperity. The planks promised a continuance of the accomplishments forwarded by the Party in the preceding four years.

7. The Republican Party felt that the Eisenhower Administration had established a good record. It was confident that the record would show that peace and prosperity had become a reality during the Administration of Eisenhower.

8. Richard Nixon's itinerary for the 1956 campaign was extensive. His campaign was divided into three tours. At the completion of the campaign, he had traveled some 38,000 miles and had visited almost every state in the Union.

CHAPTER IV

THE 1956 ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS

The purpose of this chapter is to present a rhetorical analysis of Richard Nixon's Acceptance Address delivered at the Republican National Convention in San Francisco. The analysis will include a description of the setting and a discussion of arrangement, invention, and style.

The Immediate Setting

Richard Nixon arrived at San Francisco prior to the opening of the convention confident that he was going to be the vice-presidential nominee.[1] He related in a press conference that he had already begun to prepare his Acceptance Address.[2] Nixon felt that it was important for his Acceptance Address to be short to suit television because, as he said, 'TV is death on long speeches.'[3] He did not, however, allow himself to become over-confident and thus over-look the factions within the convention which opposed his candidacy.

On the morning of August 20th before the convention

---

[1] New York Times, August 21, 1956.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

formally convened, Nixon visited state caucuses to procure support for renomination. By the time the convention had officially opened, he had been promised 1,133 votes.[1] This far exceeded the 662 votes needed to secure the nomination. Nixon's cause was further aided when the President arrived on August 21st. The morning after his arrival, President Eisenhower called a press conference at which time he stated that it was now Mr. Stassen's opinion that the majority of the delegates wanted Richard Nixon.[2] The President also related that it was Mr. Stassen's wish to second the nomination of Vice-President Nixon in order to enable him to "get his own position clear."[3] Thus the actions of both the President and Mr. Stassen seemed to support Nixon's pre-convention confidence.

On August 22nd, Richard Nixon departed San Francisco for La Habra, California before the nominations for President and Vice-President took place. His trip was necessitated by the serious illness of his father, Frank Nixon, and it was not known whether the Vice-President would be able to return to the convention.[4] During Nixon's absence, President Eisenhower, after his own renomination, opened the nomination of the vice-presidential candidate to the convention. Governor Herter then placed Nixon's name in nomination and Harold

---

[1] U. S. News and World Report, August 31, 1956, p. 38.

[2] San Francisco Chronicle, August 23, 1956, p. 1.

[3] Ibid.

[4] New York Times, August 23, 1956, p. 1.

Stassen seconded it.[1] The nomination of Richard Nixon was quickly made unanimous. The single objection was offered by Terry Carpenter, a delegate from Nebraska, who attempted to place the name of Fred A. Seaton, Secretary of the Interior in nomination. This attempt was thwarted by Chairman Joe Martin who refused on the grounds that this was against Mr. Seaton's wishes.[2] Mr. Carpenter then manufactured a "Joe Smith" and attempted to place that name in nomination in lieu of Seaton.[3] Chairman Martin over-looked the "Joe Smith" incident and went on with the unanimous role-call. Richard Nixon received the news of his renomination at his father's home.[4] Since his father's condition had improved slightly, he returned to San Francisco at noon the following day.[5]

The convention hall on August 23rd was filled to capacity as the program started at approximately 4 P. M. Pacific Daylight time.[6] The program, which began with music and a parade of Young Republicans through the convention hall, was called to order by Chairman Martin.[7] This call to order was followed by the presentation of the colors, the pledge of allegiance, the national anthem, and the invocation. The Republican members of Congress were then in-

---

[1] New York Times, August 23, 1956, p. 1. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid. [4] New York Times, August 23, 1956, p. 13.

[5] New York Times, August 24, 1956, p. 1.

[6] San Francisco Examiner, August 24, 1956, p. 1.

[7] Ibid.

troduced to the convention followed by several musical selections and resolutions of appreciation to those individuals who had worked to make the convention a success.[1] During these ceremonies the convention-goers intermingled, carrying on conversations, meeting other delegates, and entering and leaving the convention floor. They appeared to pay little attention to the formal festivities of the convention. The program continued with more music before Richard Nixon was escorted to the speaker's platform.

With Nixon's arrival on the platform, the convention-goers began a demonstration. Cheerleaders situated themselves on both sides of the speaker's platform and began leading cheers of "We want Dick!"[2] As the cheering continued, the delegates did a slow snake dance around the auditorium.[3] After five minutes of demonstrations, Chairman Martin stopped the demonstrators and introduced Richard Nixon. His introduction aroused another outburst.[4] This second demonstration lasted approximately two minutes before Chairman Martin again stopped it. Richard Nixon then approached the rostrum literally surrounded by 15,000 convention-goers and delivered his presentation before a nation-wide television and radio audience.[5]

---

[1] San Francisco Examiner, August 24, 1956, p. 1.

[2] New York Times, August 24, 1956, p. 9.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

[5] San Francisco News, August 24, 1956, p. 1.

Arrangement

The following is an outline of the address delivered by Richard Nixon before the Republican National Convention. An attempt has been made to use, whenever possible, Nixon's sentences to indicate the major divisions of the speech. His words will be noted in the outline by quotation marks. The introduction and peroration will be a précis.

Outline

I. Introduction: I know you realize how honored and privileged I am to share with you one of the great moments in history. And I speak of the privilege which has been ours to renominate a President whose name is revered throughout the world. Our nation and the world is most fortunate that we shall have his wise and enlightened leadership for four more years.

II. Statement of case: "I pledge to you today that I shall carry the great message of the magnificent record of this Administration to every corner of this land as I work with you for an even greater victory in 1956 than we had in 1952--a victory which will assure not only the re-election of our President, but which will assure what any great President needs and deserves--a House and Senate with a majority of his own party in control of the machinery of those organizations."

III. Proof:

A. (Argument 1) The American people will approve of President Eisenhower's record because they value freedom, have courage, faith and a sense of vision.

1. "It is the love of freedom and independence that inspired the men at Valley Forge as they broke from a foreign tyranny."

2. "Our people are great, too, because we have courage."

3. "America is great because we have faith."

4. "There is another American quality that is particularly important to which I would like to refer. I refer to the American sense of vision."

B. (Argument 2) "Individual Americans should be free, subject only to the laws necessary for the welfare of all."

1. "We must build ever stronger the foundations for the prosperity we have all enjoyed."

2. "Government should be a partner with business and labor and not a partisan to encourage one to fight with the other."

3. "Government should stimulate the productive energies of the nation."

4. "We believe in human welfare, but not the welfare state."

5. "We seek social gains, but we reject completely the well-intentioned but mistaken theories of those who would socialize, federalize or nationalize basic American institutions."

C. (Argument 3) "I say to you that Americans will never be satisfied as long as avoidable misery, disease, or ignorance exists anywhere in this great land of ours."

1. "We must assist the states and communities in bringing in new industries in depressed areas."

2. "We recognize they (the farmers) do not yet have a fair share of America's increasing prosperity."

3. "A problem with which I have had personal responsibility in this Administration--our prosperity in this land must be more fully shared by the 17 million Negro Americans."

4. "We should go forward until every American is guaranteed the chance of the finest education which a nation can provide."

5. "A healthy climate for small business is essential to American freedom."

D. (Argument 4) The true ideals of democracy can win out over the deceptive and false ideals of Communism if the people have a chance to compare them.

1. "We must have the military strength to clearly deter any aggressor."

2. 'We must seek to keep the free world independent in the face of Communist aggression."

3. 'We must maintain a long-range foreign economic policy, designed to bolster, when needed, the economic strength of our allies."

4. 'We must continue to develop a bold and imaginative program to win the minds and hearts of men to the ideals of freedom and democracy."

IV. Peroration: These are our ideals as we face the American people to ask their support this November. And I can say to you that I am immensely proud of those ideals as a Republican and as an American. We believe that they show the youth and the vigor of our party and its dedicated work for our nation. Make no mistake about it, the quality of America's leadership will determine the difference between life and death, slavery and freedom, plenty and poverty, happiness and sorrow for millions of people on this earth.

Method of Arrangement

The primary plan of arrangement used in Nixon's Acceptance Address was the distributive method.[1] In this speech, Nixon linked together ideas which had a common thought center or obvious connection under a single heading. The four major sections or arguments of his proof were:

1. Eisenhower stands for the ideals which have made America great.

2. The domestic policy of the Eisenhower Administration has been successful.

3. The Administration feels that there are areas which still need further progress.

4. The Administration offers a foreign policy which will secure world peace.

There was a great deal of consistency in the distributive method of Nixon's speech. He kept his ideas strictly with-

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

in the topical confines of each argument.

The skillful use of the repetition of a theme as a transitional device suggested that perhaps the logical method of arrangement had been employed. These transitions made it appear that one argument was contingent upon another. This can be noted at the end of Argument 1 when Nixon developed the idea that the nation was great because Americans possessed a sense of vision. He then proceeded to show that this sense of vision in the American people would support Eisenhower's record. He further concluded that the Republican Party was not going to "stand pat" on its record. These conclusions then led him from one argument to another and made it appear that one was contingent on the other. A look at the manner in which this was accomplished between Arguments 1 and 2 should clarify this type of transition:

> I refer to the American sense of vision. We Americans are never content even with remarkable achievements of the past. We continually seek to improve and to perfect. 'Good enough' is not good enough for us.
>
> And that is why the American people approve of President Eisenhower's record, and in my opinion, they will overwhelmingly re-elect him on that record. But standing pat on that record is not enough for the Republican Party or for the nation, and we can be proud of the fact that we have a President who does not feel that his job is completed.

It can be noted, then, that Nixon adroitly took his audience from the idea of a sense of vision through the conclusion of Argument 1 directly into Argument 2. He did this by pointing out that "not standing pat" seemed to be derived logically from "good enough is not good enough for us." A similiar

type of transition was used in each of the arguments and made it appear that there was a logical sequence of ideas. The transitions were used principally to unify the presentation under a single theme dealing with approval for the Eisenhower Administration's record and continuing assurances of future progress.

Parts

The previous section dealt with the method of arrangement used by Nixon in his Acceptance Address. This section will be concerned with the order of the specific parts of the address. That is, the introduction, statement of case, proof, and peroration. As was stated in the introduction of this study, the analysis of the parts will be governed by Aristotle's conception of the parts in terms of their function.[1]

In the Acceptance Address, Nixon used a very long and involved introduction. First, he seemed to feel that it was necessary to pay tribute to those individuals responsible for the convention work, which he did in part when he said, "We have been served by a superb convention organization, under the leadership of two of the greatest Republicans--Len Hall and Joe Martin." Secondly, he complimented the host city when he referred to "the unsurpassed hospitality of a beautiful and gracious city." Thirdly, Nixon included the audience in his introduction. He stated, "I know that

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

we shall go back to our homes inspired to greater efforts by those who have so eloquently addressed this convention." And a final factor contributing to the length of the introduction was the tribute to Eisenhower. He depicted the President as being respected throughout the world because he was "a living symbol of peace and freedom." This tribute to Eisenhower was the basis of the presentation which followed. The proof of the presentation highlighted, in general terms, the elevated nature of the accomplishments of Eisenhower and his Administration. The proof further intimated that the future contained even greater promise because of President Eisenhower. According to Walter Lippmann, the leadership of Eisenhower was the crucial issue in the campaign, although he felt it usually appeared "just under the surface." Writing in the New York Herald Tribune on October 19, 1956, Lippmann stated: "The crucial issues arise from the fundamental fact that Eisenhower's leadership and control of the Republican Party depend uniquely on his own personality."[1]

In this lengthy introduction, Nixon appeared to have gained the attention and interest of the audience and rendered them well disposed toward himself. This was accomplished, as has been indicated, when he paid tribute to the convention organization, the city, the audience, and President Eisehower. Although the length of the introduction was approximately one-fifth of the entire presentation, it

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune, October 19, 1956, p. 7.

did not appear to interfere with the accomplishment of the functions of gaining the attention and interest of the audience.

The statement of the case fulfilled the function of setting forth clearly and concisely the nature of the thought to be developed in the presentation. It stated in general terms that Nixon was going to concern himself with the Administration's record of accomplishments. It did not, however, reveal the fact that he was going to speak on promises for the future as well as past accomplishments, nor did it clearly indicate the four arguments to be discussed.

Within the proof of the presentation, the transitions were noteworthy. Those from one argument to another were usually a paragraph long, although the paragraphs themselves were comparatively short. An example of this use of a transitional paragraph from one argument to another was:

> But, here again, I say we are not going to rest on our laurels. We are not going to be satisfied with the achievements of the past three and a half years, because the task is not yet finished. If I may apply the words of Abraham Lincoln to the present situation, 'Our task will not be finished so long as the world is half slave and half free.' The enslavement of any people in the world is a threat to peace. The triumph of aggression in any part of the globe is a cloud of war over the entire world, and, when freedom loses anywhere, it is threatened everywhere.

Nixon continued from this connective by refering to a phase of the foreign policy of the Eisenhower Administration.

The transitions were also noteworthy because of the use of a theme as a device in the address. This theme, as can be noted in the above quotation, centered around the

idea that the Administration was not going to stand on its record, but was going to go forward and make still further gains. The repetition of this theme, then served as a connective between each of the arguments. The theme was stated between the arguments as follows:

(1) But standing pat on the record is not enough for the Republican Party . . . ,
(2) And I submit that we could rest here on our laurels but there is more to be done . . . , and
(3) But, here again, I say we are not going to rest on our laurels.

This technique served two functions: (1) it served as a smooth transition between the arguments in the speech as a whole and (2) it unified the address.

Within a given major argument, however, Nixon's transitions from one point to another were not as elaborate. In each argument, he repeated the same connective word. For instance, in the first and third arguments, he used the word "and" repeatedly. In Argument 2, the word "we" was repeated in almost every paragraph. And in Argument 4, he used "in addition" as well as "first" and "second." Although these connectives were not as smooth as the transitions between the arguments, they were by no means awkward and in some instances served to emphasize the individual points.

The peroration of Nixon's presentation served two functions.[1] First, Nixon attempted to excite the emotions of the audience by recalling the past achievements of the Republican Party and further accomplishments promised from

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

another four years under the leadership of President Eisenhower. Secondly, he summarized, in general terms, the ideas he had forwarded in his address. After the peroration, Nixon became personal and thanked the audience for their concern and kindness with regard to his father's illness. This was not, in the strictest terms, a part of the conclusion.

In summary, this analysis of Nixon's Acceptance Address has shown that the speech followed a distributive method of arrangement. The parts of the speech contained a lengthy introduction which attempted to gain the good will of the audience and to render them well disposed toward himself; a proof which elaborated the arguments and ideas in a clear and coherent manner; and a conclusion which aroused a feeling of party pride and reviewed the ideas forwarded in the proof of the presentation.

Invention

The following analysis of invention will be developed through the study of logical, emotional, and ethical proofs. Logical proofs will be concerned with the reasoning process found in each of the arguments. This will be followed by an investigation of the various forms of support used as evidence to substantiate the arguments. The analysis of emotional proofs will be concerned with the motive appeals and emotions contained in the address as a whole. The section on ethical appeal will be developed through an examination of the qualities of intelligence, character, and good

will as revealed by the content of the speech.

It was noted from the analysis of arrangement of materials that the Acceptance Address contained four arguments. Each of these arguments will be discussed individually.

> Argument 1: The American people will approve of President Eisenhower's record because they value freedom, have courage, faith and a sense of vision.

In Argument 1, the type of reasoning process employed was the inductive pattern. The inductive pattern begins with an enumeration of concrete objects or details and terminates with a general principle or proposition.[1] Within this argument, Nixon listed four specific qualities of American greatness and nobility. The argument from specific instances attempted to arrive at a generalization by examining these specifics. In examining the qualities of greatness enumerated by Nixon in Argument 1, it can be noted that the generalization arrived at does not appear to evolve directly from the qualities of greatness. The four qualities noted were:

(1) The love of freedom and independence that inspired the men at Valley Forge . . . ,
(2) Our people are great, too, because we have courage . . . ,
(3) America is great because we have faith . . . , and
(4) Another American quality that is particularly important . . . I refer to the American sense of vision.

Nixon, however, concluded that the above mentioned Argument 1 did evolve from the instances preceding it.

The specific instances appeared to be an appeal to prestige. According to Baird, this element could be an "obstacle to straight thinking."[2] This obstacle occurs

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115. [2]Ibid., p. 185.

principally when the line of reasoning does not point to the truth or falsity of the generalization.[1] The four qualities of greatness forwarded by Nixon did not point to the truth or falsity of the generalization stated as Argument 1. All of the instances indicated the greatness and nobility of America. The connection, however, between this greatness and nobility and Eisenhower as the symbol of this greatness and nobility was assumed by Nixon and could not be logically derived from the instances.

This apparent conflict, however, was not unanswerable. In the introduction of Nixon's address, he attempted to make Eisenhower synonymous with the greatness and nobility of America. In this introduction, he stated, "I can tell you that to millions of persons in other countries as well as in the United States, President Eisenhower is a living symbol of peace and freedom." Nixon further stated, "Our nation and the world is most fortunate that we shall have his (Eisenhower's) wise and enlightened leadership for four more years." He continued by stating, "I shall carry the great message of this Administration to every corner of this land." Nixon completed this union of Eisenhower and American principles in his transition from the introduction to the first argument when he said, "We should dedicate ourselves to the ideals that have made this nation great." At this point, then, and in this manner, Nixon had united Eisenhower and his Administration with basic American ideals. The inductive

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 185.

pattern in this argument, although not based on sound logic, was not inconsistent in light of the basic assumption arrived at by Nixon that Eisenhower's theory of Americanism was the same as the ideals that have made this country great.

> Argument 2: Individual Americans should be free, subject only to the laws necessary for the welfare of all.

The reasoning process employed in Argument 2, as in Argument 1, was presented through an inductive pattern. In this argument, Nixon listed five general statements which resulted in the more inclusive generalization stated as Argument 2. The statements named concerned policies of the Administration. They were forwarded as truths of the party's policies and were merely a clarification of the Administration's point of view. Their enumeration involved little or no amplification or evidence to substantiate Argument 2. It would seem that Nixon did not consider it necessary to elaborate at this point since he was dealing in the realm of what should be rather than what was. The opinions of the party stated as policy in this argument were:

1. We must build ever stronger the foundations for the prosperity we have enjoyed.
2. We believe that government should be a partner with business and labor and not a partisan to encourage one to fight with the other.
3. We hold that government should stimulate the productive energies of the nation.
4. We believe in human welfare, but not the welfare state.
5. We seek social gains, but we reject completely the well-intentioned but mistaken theories of those who would socialize, federalize or nationalize basic Amer-

ican institutions.

These general statements led to the argument that Americans should be free although subject to laws necessary to the welfare of all. No elaborate evidence or proof was used to substantiate this argument.

> Argument 3: I say to you that Americans will never be satisfied as long as avoidable misery, disease or ignorance exists anywhere in this great land.

In this argument, Nixon used five sub-arguments which culminated in Argument 3. Within each of the instances, Nixon accomplished a dual purpose; he pointed to the areas which needed further progress as well as to the progress which had been initiated by the Administration to rectify the existing difficulties. Here again, Nixon's plan was to exemplify the aims of the Republican Administration and to show that the Administration was promising solutions for the difficulties. The dualism in this argument enabled Nixon to point out that these were more than promises forwarded by the Administration since the Administration had, at least, initiated some measures for the resolution of the existing problems. An example of the manner in which Nixon accomplished this dual purpose can be seen by examining one of the sub-arguments as follows:

> And, second, we are happy to note that our farmers, whose income has been depressed because of the mountainous surpluses of farm products, are now beginning to move forward with other segments of our economy. But we recognize that they do not yet have a fair share of America's increasing prosperity. We are confident that the program we have adopted, which is aimed at reducing surpluses, increasing productivity, and conserving our land, will provide

> the farmer with his share of the national income. We did not create this problem, but we are determined to solve it, and we believe we have the answer.

It should be noted that this sub-argument was worded in a positive manner before leading into the problem which existed. Nixon did this in each of the instances in the argument.

The sub-arguments stated by Nixon in this argument were:

1. We must assist the states and communities in bringing in new industries in depressed areas.
2. We must recognize that the farmers do not yet have a fair share of America's increasing prosperity.
3. We must insure that our prosperity in this land is more fully shared by the 17 million Negro Americans.
4. We should go forward until every American is guaranteed the chance of the finest education which a nation can provide.
5. A healthy climate for small business is essential to American freedom.

The argument did not evolve necessarily from the instances but was more of an assumed emotional response rather than a direct generalization from the statements made. In other words, Nixon anticipated the response of the American people to the problems he had enumerated. The fact that these problems existed, however, does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that the American people "would never be satisfied as long as avoidable misery, disease or ignorance exists anywhere in this great land."

> Argument 4: The true ideals of democracy can win out over the deceptive and false ideals of Communism if the people have a chance to compare them.

In this argument, Nixon presented his material in a deductive pattern for the first time in this address. As was stated in Chapter I, the deductive process is usually reduced to the syllogism by the rhetorical critics. There are three types of syllogisms: the categorical, disjunctive, and hypothetical.[1] Regardless of its type, the syllogism, when used in rhetorical discourse, is expressed as an "enthymeme." That is to say, one or more of the premises or the conclusion may be missing and the eventual conclusion will be a probability rather than a certainty. This adaptation of the syllogism is useful in speech because the propositions with which the speaker deals do not always admit to certainty.[2] The syllogisms in this argument were hypothetical and the symbol "if" could be placed in front of the "enthymemes" which evolve from the argument. In other words:

> If we have the military strength to deter any aggressor . . . ,
> If we seek to keep the free world independent in the face of Communist aggression . . . ,
> If we maintain a long-range foreign economic policy . . . , and
> If we continue to develop a bold and imaginative program to win the minds and hearts of men to the ideals of freedom . . .

then Argument 4 would be fulfilled. Each of these "enthymemes" form a hypothetical type of syllogistic reasoning with the argument.

Nixon approached the syllogistic reasoning in the

---

[1] Baird, op. cit., p. 156.

[2] Ibid., pp. 110-124.

argument in the same manner that he had the sub-arguments which culminated in Argument 3. He framed each premise with the positive assertion that the United States should accomplish the "enthymemes" of the argument. This positive assertion made it appear that the Administration had already initiated programs toward the ultimate accomplishment demanded by the "enthymemes" in the argument.

From the analysis of the four arguments, it was found that Nixon developed the first three arguments through the inductive pattern of reasoning. His fourth argument was developed through the use of a hypothetical syllogism.

Forms of Support

The analysis of forms of support will be concerned with those classified in Bryant and Wallace as; information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony.[1] Within the arguments of the Acceptance Address, forms of support were not used extensively as evidence. Nixon spoke primarily in unsupported generalities. He did not appear to be especially concerned with the use of evidence to substantiate his ideas in this address.

Information: Information, according to Bryant and Wallace, is concerned with factual and statistical data which can be verified independently of the speaker using it.[2] Within the address, Nixon did not concern himself with factual

---

[1] Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 117.

[2] Ibid., p. 37.

or statistical information. He frequently spoke of the record established by the Republican Administration, but he did not elaborate upon this record nor did he indicate what it was. It can be assumed that the audience was cognizant of the meaning of his statement "the record" and was also aware of the facts comprising the record. If this assumption were true, then it would have been redundant to have enumerated the facts in the speech. To this end, references concerning the Administration's record could be termed as assumed fact and the numerous allusions to such accomplishments of the Administration as "more jobs," "higher real wages," and "a greater security against the hazards of unemployment" could also be termed information in this sense. Nixon used these allusions to the record as a means of substantiating his arguments.

Example: Bryant and Wallace describe an example as "the detailing, sketching or otherwise setting before the audience a typical circumstance, a particular case or an incident which helps make clear and to support the general idea which the speaker wants his audience to understand."[1] In this address, Nixon relied on this form of support as evidence almost exclusively. His use of the example was centered primarily in the first and third arguments of the presentation.

In his first argument, Nixon listed such examples as:

---

[1]Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 38.

(1) Love of freedom and independence that inspired the men at Valley Forge . . . .
(2) Faith in that magnificent charter that we call the Bill of Rights . . . . ,
(3) Love of freedom that three times in this century sent American soldiers abroad . . . , and
(4) Our Declaration of Independence claims that man's rights spring from the Creator.

These examples attempted to substantiate the assertions forwarded in Argument 1 which led to the argument itself.

In Argument 3, Nixon used the specific cases of the farmer, the Negro, and small business to support the general ideas which he wanted the audience to understand and accept. These instances show that Nixon relied on the form of support of evidence even though the examples were primarily in Arguments 1 and 3 and not in Arguments 2 and 4.

Comparison and contrast: In this presentation, Nixon did not directly compare or contrast the party's accomplishments with those of the opposition, nor was he interested in comparing what had happened before the Republican Party had come into power. This form of support, however, was used in the other addresses to be discussed in this study.

Testimony: Testimony, according to Bryant and Wallace, is the use of the opinion of someone other than the speaker. It may include applicable quotations to such sources as the Bible, Shakespeare, or history.[1] In the Acceptance Address, Nixon used testimony as defined here on only one occasion. He quoted Abraham Lincoln when he said:

---

[1] Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 41.

> If I may apply the words of Abraham Lincoln to the present situation, 'Our task will not be finished so long as the world is half slave and half free.'

Beyond this single instance of actual testimony, Nixon used a great deal of personal testimony to substantiate his ideas. On several occasions he used himself as an authority. The following statements are examples of this:

(1) A problem with which I have had personal responsibility in this Administration . . . ,
(2) In the past three years, Mrs. Nixon and I have traveled in mileage four times around this earth. We have visited thirty-two countries, and I can tell you . . . , and
(3) We are dealing, as I know from experience . . .

As can be noted, then, Nixon relied on his personal experience to substantiate and support his ideas to a greater extent than he did the testimony of others.

By way of summary, it must be noted that Nixon did not rely on forms of support extensively. His arguments were reasoned logically but did not contain a great deal of what would normally be termed evidence. He did not appear to be greatly concerned with substantiating his arguments with specific supporting materials. In this presentation, he seemed to rely on emotional and ethical appeals rather than on logical proofs.

Emotional Appeals

Emotional appeals will be discussed in this Acceptance Address in terms of the motive appeals. The appeals will be identified in units of at least one paragraph. It was found that the motive appeals were most accurately analyzed within the paragraph unit rather than

the sentence unit. The analysis will also include an identification and discussion of the emotions which were probably evoked by the motive appeals. In this address, Nixon appealed primarily to three motive appeals. These, as defined in Bryant and Wallace, were motive appeals to reputation, opportunity and fair play, and duty.[1] The discussion of these motive appeals will begin with the appeal to reputation as it was the appeal most extensively used in this address.

Reputation: Nixon appealed to the motive of reputation throughout the entire speech. Each of the arguments as well as the introduction and conclusion contained elements of this motive. In fact, the first argument per se was an appeal to reputation. The extensive use of this motive suggests the importance Nixon placed on highlighting the alleged good reputation of his audience. The following enumeration of the analysis of emotional appeals will highlight the extensive use of the appeal in the speech.

The analysis revealed that the speech began with two distinct appeals to reputation. At the outset, Nixon stressed the magnitude of the party's "privileged" responsibility in this convention. This "privileged" responsibility was the renomination of President Eisenhower. Nixon further established the party's reputation by depicting President Eisenhower as a "living symbol of peace and prosperity." Thus in the introduction, Nixon appealed to the motive appeal of repu-

---

[1] Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 277.

tation by (1) applying Lincoln's Gettysburg prophesy to the immediate situation and (2) depicting the party's presidential nominee as being possessed of high ethical qualities. His words in doing this were:

> (1) Most of what has been said here will not long be remembered, but what we have done here will leave an indelible mark on the history of the nation and on the history of mankind. And I speak of the privilege which has been ours to renominate a President whose name is revered throughout the world. . . . and
> (2) In the past three years, Mrs. Nixon and I have traveled in mileage four times around this earth. We have visited 32 countries, and I can tell you that to millions of persons in other countries as well as in the United States, President Eisenhower is a living symbol of peace and freedom.
>
> Our nation and the world is most fortunate that we shall have his wise and enlightened leadership for four more years, and that we shall have.
>
> No man could be more highly honored than to be selected as the running mate of such a great President.

While found in three of the four arguments, the appeal to the motive of reputation was particularly strong in Argument 1. The entire argument embodied elements of this motive. In it, Nixon appealed to the audience not as Republicans but rather as Americans. He recalled their American heritage in an effort to show the audience the foundations from which America had attained its greatness. He enumerated the qualities of American greatness and indicated that listeners should dedicate themselves to these qualities. He also alleged that the Eisenhower record embodied the ideals which had contributed to the "nobility and greatness of America." It was because of this assumed fact that Nixon confidently concluded Argument 1 with the assurance that:

> And that is why the American people approve of President Eisenhower's record, and in my opinion they will overwhelmingly re-elect him on that record.

The paragraphs in Argument 1 which embodied this appeal read as follows:

> First of all, it is the love of freedom and independence that inspired the men of Valley Forge as they broke from a foreign tyranny. It is that freedom which is grounded in an abiding faith in the magnificent charter that we call the Bill of Rights. It is that love of freedom that, three times in this century, sent soldiers abroad to help other men keep their freedom and their liberty. And it is that same love of freedom that today impels us to sacrifice, sacrifice willingly, so that the flood tide of Communism will not blot out decency from the face of the earth. Our greatness, then, is in our love of freedom.
>
> And our people are great, too, because we have courage. From the pioneers who braved the wilderness to the scientists who today harness the atom, we are a people who challenge the unknown and often achieve what seems impossible.
>
> And America is great because we have faith. We are one nation under God. Our Declaration of Independence proclaims that man's rights spring from the Creator, and that our cause has been committed to the providence of the Almighty. We do not idly say, 'In God we trust.'
>
> And there is another American quality that is particularly important to which I would like to refer. I refer to the American sense of vision. We Americans are never content even with remarkable achievements of the past. We continually seek to improve and to perfect. 'Good enough' is not good enough for us.

To a lesser degree, Nixon appealed to reputation in Argument 2. In this argument, he depicted the prestige to be found in the Republican Party per se. He did this by associating the alleged achievements of the Eisenhower Administration with the party as a whole. Nixon further urged that the party not stand on this record alone, but that it continue on to further progress. Statements con-

taining these elements to the appeal to reputation in Argument 2 were found in the two following paragraphs:

(1) In a nutshell, individual Americans should be free, subject only to the laws necessary for the welfare of all. Operating under this philosophy during the past three and a half years, we Americans, as you have been told over and over again this week, have enjoyed the greatest prosperity in the history of the world. We have never had more jobs, higher real wages, greater security against the hazards of unemployment, sickness or old age. . . . and

(2) And I submit that we could rest here on our laurels but there is more to be done, and we eagerly accept the responsibility and the opportunity of doing it.

Within the arguments, the final appeal to the motive of reputation was contained in Argument 3. The fourth argument did not contain an appeal to this motive. In Argument 3 Nixon stressed, in general terms, the areas which the Eisenhower Administration felt needed further progress. He was careful to point out that the Administration's record indicated that programs had already been initiated to satisfy existing problems. He intimated that the party could be justifiably proud of the record established by the Administration. The motive of reputation, then, in Argument 3 centered around the record of the Eisenhower Administration and the promise of further progress under another four years of Eisenhower's leadership. The major statements in Argument 3 which highlighted this appeal to reputation were:

(1) . . . we are happy to note that our farmers, whose income has been depressed because of the mountainous surpluses of farm products, are now beginning to move forward with other segments of our economy. But we recognize that they do

not yet have a fair share of America's increasing prosperity. We are confident that the program we have adopted, which is aimed at reducing surpluses, increasing productivity, and conserving our land, will provide the farmer with his share of the national income. We did not create this problem, but we are determined to solve it, and we believe we have the answer . . . ,

(2) Here we offer more than promises because we can show performance. But, proud as we are of this performance, we shall continue to drive forward until we achieve the goal for which the first Republican President made the supreme sacrifice.

We believe that our prosperity should be such that the young people of America will always find this a land of opportunity. . . . ,

(3) We can be proud--immensely proud--of the progress we have made in the economic field in the last three years, but I say to you that Americans will never be satisfied as long as avoidable misery, disease or ignorance exists anywhere in this great land of ours. . . . , and

(4) The economic prospects I have spoken of are bright, but, as you are aware, all these domestic achievements can be nullified by the terrifying destruction of atomic war, and that is why we must be equally skilled and resourceful in our drive for permanent peace in a troubled world. We are justifiably proud in this field of the magnificent leadership which first secured the peace and has retained it.

The conclusion of this address not only served to summarize the speech as a whole, but it also summarized Nixon's appeal to the motive of reputation. He culminated the appeal by pointing to the history of the Republican Party, particularly the manner in which the party had obtained "the idealism and faith that is the greatness of America." He forecast a bright future for the American people under the continued leadership of the Eisenhower Administration. Nixon actually suggested that the Republican Party was "a mighty instrument for good which will lead America into a new age." This depiction of the high

level of prestige of the Republican Party ended, then, not only the appeal to reputation but the speech as well. Nixon accomplished this summary of the appeal to reputation in the conclusion by the following statements:

(1) The Republican Party is a hundred years old. But under his leadership it is again young and imaginative; it has captured the idealism and faith that is the greatness of America. But I believe that it would be a great mistake if we were to become smug and complacent because we have done so well under a great leader.

Our party, I say to you, is not a party of drift and self-satisfaction. The greatest moments of the Republican Party have been those many years in which it was progressive and forward-looking. We are conservative only in the sense that we keep what is sound and proven from the past. And of that we are certainly proud. . . . ,

(2) These are our ideals as we face the American people to ask their support this November. And I can say to you that I am immensely proud of those ideals as a Republican and as an American. . . . , and

(3) And let us recognize, then, that our party is more than a machine designed to perpetuate its adherence in power. Under President Eisenhower it has been welded into a mighty instrument--a mighty instrument for good which will lead America into that new age in which the dreams and hopes of our fathers will be realized, not only for ourselves but for peoples throughout the world.

Throughout the many appeals to the motives of reputation in this address, two emotions were particularly affected. First, there was an attempt to instill in the audience pride for their American heritage. This was particularly true in the appeal in Argument 1. Secondly, there was an attempt to show the audience why they should be proud of their party, especially because of President Eisenhower and the "magnificent record" established during his Administration. The emotion of confidence was affected to a lesser

degree. Confidence was aroused principally by the numerous references to the alleged fact that the caliber of the Eisenhower Administration's record would cause the American people to "unanimously re-elect Eisenhower." Thus through the appeals to reputation, the audience could be proud of the fact that they were Americans as well as Republicans and they could be confident that the Eisenhower "record" would withstand the campaign and the Republican Party would again be victorious.

In general, then, the appeal to the motive of reputation was the most significant appeal in this address. Appeals to this motive were found in three of the four arguments as well as in the introduction and conclusion of the speech. Only the fourth argument did not contain an appeal to the motive of reputation.

Duty: In this address, Nixon attempted to show that the Republican Party had an obligation and duty to themselves and to the American people. This motive appeal of duty was embodied to a minor degree in the speech as a whole. The majority of the appeal, however, was focused in Argument 4. The following discussion will be concerned with this motive appeal as it applied to the immediate audience gathered at the Cow Palace.

In the early portions of the speech, Nixon depicted the party's duty in the coming campaign. He specified that the party's responsibility was embodied in three specific areas: (1) the party had to disseminate the "great message

of the magnificent record" of the Administration to the American people, (2) the party had to forward to the world the ideals which had made America great, and (3) the party had to make known the facts that the party was not satisfied to stand on its "fine record" and that another four years of Republican leadership promised further progress. These three areas of responsibility outlined by Nixon in the first part of the address were also highlighted in the conclusion as he summarized the party's duty in the coming campaign. Nixon implied, in the conclusion, that the Republican's duty in the campaign had significant importance throughout the world. He suggested that their efforts could mean the difference between "life and death, slavery and freedom, plenty and poverty." From the analysis of the motive appeal of duty, from the entire speech with the exception of Argument 4, paragraphs which contain this appeal read:

(1) I shall carry the great message of the magnificent record of this Administration to every corner of this land as I work with you for an even greater victory in 1956 than we had in 1952. . . . ,
(2) In this campaign, we could express to the people of the world the qualities that have made America honored and respected in every part of the globe. . . . ,
(3) And I submit that we could rest here on our laurels but there is more to be done, and we eagerly accept the responsibility and the opportunity of doing it. . . . , and
(4) I need not tell you how great the stakes are as we go forward into this campaign. But I say to you tonight, with all the conviction at my command, that America cannot settle for less than the best leadership it can get in the next four years. Because, make no mistake about it, the quality of Americ's leadership will determine the difference between life and death, slavery and freedom, plenty and poverty, happiness and sorrow for millions of people on this earth.

Argument 4 highlighted the audience's duty and re-

sponsibility on the foreign scene and contained the major appeal to duty in this address. Nixon presented the ominous forecast that the party should consider the triumph of aggression anywhere in the world as a threat to America. He promised that the Republican Party would accept its responsibility and meet the unfinished task of facing aggression in all parts of the world. With this promise, Nixon incorporated his seemingly favorite subject into his speech--the threat of Communism. The statements in Argument 4 which embodied the appeals to the motive of duty read:

(1) But, here again, I say we are not going to rest on our laurels. We are not going to be satisfied with the achievements of the past three and a half years, because the task is not yet finished. If I may apply the words of Abraham Lincoln to the present situation, 'Our task will not be finished so long as the world is half slave and half free.' The enslavement of any people in the world is a threat to peace. The triumph of aggression in any part of the globe is a cloud of war over the entire world, and, when freedom loses anywhere, it is threatened everywhere. . . . ,

(2) First, we must have military strength to clearly deter any aggressor. And, to keep this strength, it is true that we must all sacrifice. The young men who enter military service sacrifice, as well as the rest of us who pay the high cost of essential defense. But I say this to you: no sacrifice is too great if it is the price of freedom. . . . ,

(3) . . . we must continually seek to keep the free world independent in the face of Communist aggression. American partnership in the alliance of free nations is essential to our own safety, because the security of one nation in the world is the security of all. . . . ,

(4) . . . we must maintain a long-range foreign economic policy, designed to bolster, when needed, the economic strength of our allies. Economic assistance may add to our sacrifice, but we should never force a nation--and I repeat--we should never force a nation to choose between bankruptcy and submission to the Kremlin. That we will never do. . . . ,

(5) . . . we must continue to develop a bold and imaginative program to win the minds and hearts of men to the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Communism has long sought to capture the leaders and

thinkers of the world. The true ideals of freedom and democracy can win out over the deceptive and false ideals of Communism if people have a chance to compare them. Let's give them this chance. We should not lose this war by default, and I assure you that we shall not. . . . , and

(6) In this great contest we can never relax. We are dealing as I know from experience, with a dedicated enemy, quick to pounce on any weakness or resolve on our part. And for the sake of millions in the world who depend upon our leadership, we must never falter in this vital struggle for freedom. Great as the temptation may be at times to think only of our security at the moment, we shall never resort to that cynical type of compromise which may seem to promise peace for ourselves but which would inevitably bring war or surrender for our children.

The motive appeals to duty in this speech affected the emotions of confidence and fear. The appeal to duty instilled confidence in the audience through the knowledge that the party's efforts in the campaign would succeed. This success, in turn, would insure that the "ideals of freedom and democracy" would always be safeguarded. The emotion of fear seemed to be evoked through the realization forwarded in the appeals that the consequences would be disastrous if the party did not fulfill its obligations and responsibilities in the campaign and on the foreign scene. In fact, Nixon depicted the difficulties in foreign affairs as part of a war effort when he stated, 'We should not lose this war by default."

In summary, the appeal to the motive of duty was stressed in this speech to a lesser degree than the motive of reputation. While the appeal to duty was contained throughout the speech, it was especially important in Argument 4 when Nixon devoted the argument to an analysis

of the party's responsibility in the area of foreign affairs.

Opportunity and Fair Play: The motive of opportunity and fair play was stressed in Argument 3. In this argument it was Nixon's purpose to indicate areas in which the Administration felt that further progress was necessary. Within the scope of promised improvements, Nixon appealed to the motive of opportunity and fair play. No other appeals directed toward this motive were found in the speech. The following paragraphs from Argument 3 point out the manner in which Nixon appealed to this motive:

(1) We should go forward until every American is guaranteed the chance for the finest education which a nation can provide. . . . ,
(2) We must move ahead with vigor and imagination to root out any pocket of poverty in our midst. . . . Our aim should be: No able and willing worker should be without a job in our nation. . . . , and
(3) But I say to you that we should not and we will not rest until every Negro has an equal opportunity to obtain proper housing, decent medical care, good education, and the unlimited chance for employment according to his ability, which is every American's right.

The analysis of the above statements showed that Nixon used the technique of the campaign promise as a means of appealing to the motive of opportunity and fair play. It was further noted that his proposed recommendations appealing to this motive were worded in general terms and contained no specific recommendations or solutions for the existing problems. They did, however, appeal to the emotion of confidence by assuring the Republicans that they could tell the voters that their party would guarantee opportunity and fair play to all segments of the population.

In general, the Acceptance Address contained a great number of emotional appeals. Since Nixon was attempting to set the pace for the coming campaign, such a preponderance of emotional appeals might be expected. He seemed to feel that it was necessary to arouse his audience to action. The majority of Nixon's emotional appeals were directed to the motives of reputation and duty. Nixon appealed to the motive of reputation throughout the speech as a whole. The appeal to duty was concentrated primarily in the fourth argument of the address. The analysis revealed that the only other motive appeal was the minor appeal to the motive of opportunity and fair play in Argument 3. Nixon indicated a fear that the Republicans might become complacent and, in his own words, "rest on their laurels." He stated time and time again, primarily through motive appeals, that the convention-goers had to work to insure victory. He maintained, however, that they could be confident of the record that the Administration had established, but that it was their duty to tell and re-tell with pride the record of accomplishments the Administration had achieved.

Ethical Appeals

As stated in Chapter I, the various elements which aid in the establishment of the speaker's moral integrity and personal credibility are quite extensive. Therefore, Thonssen and Baird's exploratory list for cataloging ethical attributes will be used as a basis for this analysis.[1]

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

Thonssen and Baird divide their list of ethical attributes into the three categories of intelligence, character, and good will as depicted by Aristotle in his Rhetoric.[1] Because good will was initially established in the introduction of Nixon's Acceptance Address, it will be considered first, followed by the analysis of character and intelligence.

Good Will: Thonssen and Baird consider that good will within the content of an address can be gauged by at least six means.[2] Two of these are pertinent to the analysis of Nixon's Acceptance Address. They are:

1. The ability to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience.

2. The ability to identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems.

From the analysis it was found that the above mentioned means of gauging good will were used primarily in the introduction and first argument of the address. In the introduction, Nixon established good will with the audience by words of praise, with special praise to those in charge of the convention. He told them:

> This convention has truly been a mountain-top experience for those of us who have been fortunate enough to attend it. We've enjoyed the unsurpassed hospitality of a beautiful and gracious city. We have been served by a superb convention organization, under the leadership of two of the greatest Republicans--Len Hall and Joe Martin.

In Argument 1, Nixon continued to enhance his good will by

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387. [2] Ibid.

a form of indirect praise. In each of the paragraphs of this argument, he associated his audience with the greatness and nobility of basic American ideals and in so doing, he praised them for their American heritage. The establishment of good will in the argument was closely associated with the motive of reputation discussed in the section on emotional appeals. The following excerpts from paragraphs indicate the manner in which Nixon established good will in Argument 1:

(1) Our greatness, then, is in our love of freedom . . . ,
(2) Our people are great, too, because we have courage . . . ,
(3) America is great because we have faith. We are one nation under God . . . , and
(4) We Americans are never content even with remarkable achievements of the past.

Throughout the remainder of the presentation, Nixon's close alliance to the audience can be noted by the numerous times he linked the audience with the ideas he presented. He accomplished this by the use of personal pronouns such as "we," "our," and "us." His identifications with the audience on these occasions were brief and were not developed within the confines of the paragraph length limitations set up for analysis in this study.

Character: Thonssen and Baird indicate that one way of focusing attention on the probity of character can be accomplished by the speaker if he associates "either himself or his message with what is virtuous and elevated."[1] Nixon continually associated his personal position with that

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

of President Eisenhower. This association with Eisenhower could, in this context, be termed an association with that which is elevated. For as Nixon himself pointed out, Eisenhower's name was "revered throughout the world." Nixon continually pointed to Eisenhower's high ethical appeal throughout the presentation with such statements as "President Eisenhower is a living symbol of peace and freedom" and ". . . inspired by the vigor and the vision of the man of the century." Consequently, Nixon, as the spokesman of the Eisenhower Administration, was associated with "this" high ethical appeal, and his message could not be separated from the ideals of the Eisenhower Administration. The most complete example of this association was found in the introduction and is cited below:

> No man could be more highly honored than I am to be selected as the running mate of such a great President. I accept this nomination in that spirit, and, to the extent that physical limitations of time and space permit, I pledge to you today that I shall carry the great message of the magnificent record of this Administration to every corner of this land.

In addition to this association with the "elevated," Nixon also strengthened the probity of his character within the proof of the speech by relying on his personal experiences to substantiate his ideas.[1] This reliance upon authority, according to Thonssen and Baird, tends to contribute to the establishment of the probity of character. This means of focusing attention on the probity of his character was noted

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

on three occasions:

(1) . . . Mrs. Nixon and I have traveled in mileage four times around this earth. We have visited thirty-two countries, and I can tell you that to millions of persons in other countries as well as in the United States, President Eisenhower is a living symbol of peace and freedom. . . . ,
(2) And, third, a problem with which I have had personal responsibility in this Administration--our prosperity in this land must be more fully shared by the seventeen million Negro Americans. . . . , and
(3) We are dealing, as I know from experience, with a dedicated enemy quick to pounce on any weakness or resolve on our part.

The analysis of the content of the Acceptance Address revealed that Nixon strengthened the probity of his character by associating himself and his message with the elevated and by relying on his personal experiences to substantiate his ideas. The association with the elevated occurred specifically in the introduction of the speech while reliance upon personal experience was used on three occasions in the proof.

Intelligence: The means of gauging intelligence or sagacity in Nixon's address were not clearly defined within the content of the presentation. The problem may have been that the immediate audience was highly partisan, and whatever Nixon uttered, it could, in some manner, have been termed common sense, employing tact or moderation, displaying a sense of good taste, or revealing a broad familiarity with the interests of the day. Even though these factors cannot be clearly delineated, it must be said that they did appear in the address in a general way. The most significant means of gauging the sagacity of Richard Nixon

found in this address centered around "a broad familiarity with the interests of the day in the following manner:

(1) His discussion in Argument 2 of the economic policies of the Administration underlined economic issues of importance to the individual,
(2) His recognition in Argument 3 of the areas which needed further progress displayed a knowledge of the pertinent domestic issues of interest in August of 1956, and
(3) The discussion of the Communist threat in Argument 4 revealed knowledge of international issues of the day.

Although it was not possible to ascertain with certainty all of the means of gauging sagacity from the content of the text, it was noted that Nixon did demonstrate a broad familiarity with the interests of the day.

It can be concluded, then, that Nixon did attempt to gain credibility in his address and that within the content of the presentation, there can be found the means of gauging Nixon's establishment of good will, character, and intelligence.

Style

It was noted in the analysis that four elements of style predominated in this address. These were directness, concreteness, restatement, and parallel structure.

Directness: A means of assessing directness in an address is by the analysis of the use of personal pronouns and elements of conversation within the speech.[1] In this Acceptance Address, Nixon's directness was enhanced by the use of such familiar and specific references as "Len Hall," and "Joe Martin." This familiarity and directness was also

---

[1] James H. McBurney and Ernest J. Wrage, Guide to Good Speech (New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1955), p. 165.

furthered by the extensive use of the personal pronoun. He used "we," "us," and "you" in all fifty-two paragraphs of the speech. In addition, there were only a few sentences which did not contain personal pronouns. In this speech, Nixon used 274 pronouns. Of this number, 103 were of the "we" and forty-seven of the "our" type. Nixon also seemed to avoid using difficult words and complex phrases. His language could be readily understood by the average listener. From the analysis, then, it can be concluded that the content of this address indicated a high degree of directness as a result of the use of numerous personal pronouns, personal references, and a lack of difficult language.

Concreteness: Baird and Knower include in their definition of concreteness such attributes as the use of individual names, general classes of people, specific dates, general statistics, specific instances, illustrations, quotations, and brief anecdotes.[1] In this presentation, there were included a number of concrete words and phrases. These attributes which contributed to concreteness were:

(1) (Names) Len Hall, Joe Martin, Mr. Smith, Herbert Hoover, President Eisenhower, Mrs. Nixon, Abraham Lincoln, and God. . . . ,
(2) (General classes of people) Republican Party, the American people, the men at Valley Forge, the 17 million Negro Americans, young Americans, fellow delegates, guests of this Convention, the Administration, and Communists. . . . ,
(3) (Places) Valley Forge, America, United States, Russia. Kremlin, and Southern California. . . . ,
(4) (Dates and General Statistics) 1952, 1956, 32 countries, and 17 million. . . . , and

---

[1]Baird and Knower, op. cit., p. 145.

(5) (Specifics) Declaration of Independence, House, Senate, and Bill of Rights.

These specifics tended to give an impression of concreteness to this address. Another means which helped to establish concreteness was the numerous references to the Administration's record. Although Nixon did not enumerate the record, its meaning was probably apparent to the immediate audience.

On one occasion, Nixon did quote from authority. This quotation occurred in Argument 4 when he quoted Abraham Lincoln. He also called upon his own personal testimony to substantiate his statements. Beyond these examples contributing to concreteness, however, Nixon did not attempt to use facts or statistics or to enumerate specific dates.

From the examples noted in this discussion, it would appear that the presentation contained a number of the elements contributing to concreteness. There were, however, a number of general phrases and terms which tended to make the speech abstract. For example, Nixon referred to proposed improvements under consideration by the Eisenhower Administration, but did not discuss specifically what those measures were to embody. Numerous references to the "record" were not elaborated and, although his immediate audience may have been cognizant of the various details of the "record," the vast television audience may have had no such understanding. He further made general statements in Argument 4 as he concerned himself with problems in the

area of foreign policy. He intimated that the Administration's policy was "both imaginative and flexible" but did not detail or explain. In addition to these broad generalities, Nixon used a number of emotionally abstract words and phrases. The following examples of these words and phrases were uncovered in the analysis:

(1) We must build ever stronger the foundations for the prosperity we have enjoyed . . . ,
(2) We must move ahead with vigor and imagination to rout out any pockets of poverty in our midst. . . . ,
(3) . . . we will not allow them to outstrip us in this vital race. . . . ,
(4) . . . vigorous defense . . . ,
(5) . . . avoidable misery . . . ,
(6) . . . magnificent leadership . . . ,
(7) . . . greatest prosperity . . . ,
(8) . . . bold and imaginative program . . . , and
(9) . . . remarkable achievements . . .

These examples indicate the manner in which Nixon used abstract words and phrases in the speech. The abstractions were not clarified by Nixon.

In summary, it was found through the analysis that although the speech contained a number of elements which contributed to concreteness, the general tone of the speech was abstract.

Restatement: Nixon used many instances of restatement for emphasis in this address. These were used throughout the various sections of the speech. In the introduction, the device was used to emphasize the great victory possible in the coming campaign when Nixon urged:

> . . . as I work with you for an even greater victory in 1956 than we had in 1952--a victory which will assure not only the re-election of our President, but which will assure what any great President needs and deserves--a House and Senate with a majority of his own party in control . . .

The technique was also used throughout the proof of the address. The following examples of restatement were found in the four arguments of the presentation:

(1) . . . faith in the dignity of the individual--a faith embodied in that magnificent . . . ,
(2) . . . chance for employment according to his ability, which is every American's right. . . . ,
(3) We can be proud--immensely proud--of the progress . . . ,
(4) Our nation must continue to be strong and prosperous--strong in the moral fiber . . . ,
(5) And there is another American quality that is particularly important to which I would like to refer. I refer to . . . ,
(6) We shall not, we will not allow . . . ,
(7) There is no need on our part, believe me, for . . . , and
(8) . . . we should never force a nation--and I repeat--we should never force a nation . . .

The final uses of the device of restatement occurred in the conclusion when Nixon stated:

(1) But I say to you tonight, with all the conviction at my command, that . . . and
(2) . . . into a mighty instrument--a mighty instrument . . .

The number of times Nixon employed this device of restatement would seem to indicate that he was concerned with insuring that his points were properly emphasized. Because of its extensive use and because of its importance to the speech, restatement was a major stylistic device.

Parallel structure: Baird and Knower identify the parallel structure as the recurring use of a given structure of words, phrases, or sentences.[1] This technique was used extensively by Nixon in this presentation.

On two occasions in Arguments 1 and 2, the technique

---

[1]Baird and Knower, op. cit., p. 151.

of parallel structure took the form of the repetition of similiar sentence structure. The repetition in these instances enabled Nixon to include a great deal of information in a short space of time. These instances were:

(1) It is the love of freedom and independence . . . ,
It is that freedom which . . . ,
It is that love of freedom that . . . ,
It is that same love of freedom that . . . and
(2) We believe, with justification, that . . . ,
We believe that government should be . . . ,
We hold that government should . . . ,
We believe in human welfare . . . ,
We seek social gains . . .

In the following instances, this technique was used in the form of a series. That is, a given structure of words was repeated. These examples from the speech read:

(1) . . . but mistaken theories of those who would socialize, federalize or nationalize basic American institutions. . . . ,
(2) We have never had more jobs, higher real wages, greater security against the hazards of unemployment, sickness or old age. . . . ,
(3) . . . which is aimed at reducing surpluses, increasing productivity, and conserving our land. . . . ,
(4) . . . opportunity to obtain proper housing, decent medical care, good education . . . ,
(5) . . . if our economy is to continue to be strong, productive, and free . . . , and
(6) . . . the difference between life and death, slavery and freedom, plenty and poverty, happiness and sorrow . . .

The above examples underscore the extensive use of this technique in this address. The device appeared to be used to highlight ideas which Nixon forwarded to the audience.

Summary

1. Nixon's Acceptance Address, delivered before the Republican National Convention at San Francisco's Cow Palace on August 23, 1956, was broadcast over a nation-wide

television and radio hook-up. His immediate audience consisted of approximately 15,000 convention-goers.

2. In the analysis of arrangement, it was determined that the primary method of development was the distributive method. It was further noted that the presentation contained the Aristotelian four part order of introduction, statement of case, proof, and peroration. The lengthy introduction achieved the functions of establishing good will and rendering the audience well disposed toward the speaker. The proof consisted of four arguments.

3. In the analysis of logical proofs, it was noted that Nixon employed both the inductive and the deductive processes. The first three arguments were developed inductively by the use of sub-arguments, and the final argument was developed deductively by employing hypothetical syllogistic reasoning.

4. It was noted that Nixon did not rely heavily on the use of forms of support as evidence. In a very limited manner, Nixon used information, example, and testimony as evidence in this presentation. The example was used to the greatest extent and was contained almost exclusively in Argument 1.

5. Nixon used emotional proofs extensively in this presentation. He appealed to the motives of reputation, duty, and opportunity and fair play. The motive of reputation was found throughout the entire address. Duty was also found in the address as a whole, but was principally used in Argument 4. The motive of opportunity and fair play

was restricted to Argument 3. The principle emotions affected by these motive appeals appear to have been confidence, pride, and fear.

6. Nixon's use of etnical appeal was limited primarily to focusing attention on his probity of character and establishing good will with the audience. His appeal to good will can be found primarily in the introduction and the first argument. His appeal to the probity of character was contained throughout the entire presentation.

7. The stylistic devices which were predominant in the Acceptance Address were the elements of directness, concreteness, restatement, and parallel structure. The stylistic devices of restatement and parallel structure were used extensively throughout the speech as a whole. A "we feeling" was inculcated in the speech particularly by the use of numerous personal pronouns. And although the speech contained a number of elements contributing to concreteness, the general tone was actually abstract because of the numerous generalities and vague words.

CHAPTER V

THE AMERICAN LEGION ADDRESS

At the outset of the campaign of 1956, two aspirants for national office addressed the American Legion Convention on successive nights. The Democratic presidential nominee, Adlai E. Stevenson, spoke before approximately 5,000 Legionnaires on September 5, 1956.[1] Mr. Stevenson used this occasion to attack the Republican campaign theme of "peace and prosperity."[2] Stevenson declared that "peace is not an issue in this election."[3] His speech also contained the hope that the military draft would be ended.[4] Finally, Stevenson condemned the Republican Party for their "insulting claim" that the Democrats were responsible for the Korean War. Mr. Stevenson, thus, delivered what the New York Times considered to be a highly partisan speech.[5] On the following day, Vice-President Richard Nixon addressed the same Legion organization.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present a rhetorical analysis of Nixon's American Legion Address delivered at the American Legion National Convention at

---

[1] New York Times, September 6, 1956, p. 1.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., p. 11. [5] Ibid.

Los Angeles, California on September 6, 1956. Included in the analysis will be a description of the setting and a discussion of arrangement, invention, and style.

The Immediate Setting

Nixon presented his first major address as a candidate for re-election on September 6, 1956 at the concluding session of the American Legion's Thirty-eighth National Convention in Los Angeles, California.[1] The speech was delivered two days after his father, Frank Nixon, had died at the family home in Whittier, California.[2] Legion Commander J. Addington Wagner introduced Nixon to the approximately 5,000 Legionnaires assembled in the Los Angeles Shrine Auditorium as "the man whom Communists consider their worst enemy."[3]

Nixon appeared before the nonpartisan American Legion Convention just twenty-four hours after Adlai Stevenson had appeared before it.[4] The New York Times, commenting on the two speeches, stated that Nixon's address was more favorably received than that of Mr. Stevenson.[5] It was noted that Stevenson's presentation was marred by "occasional booing," while Nixon's thirty minute talk was applauded thirty times and received no booing.[6] The most enthusiastic ovation, according to the New York Times, occurred when

---

[1] Los Angeles Mirror-News, September 7, 1956, p. 1.
[2] Los Angeles Times, September 7, 1956, p. 1. [3] Ibid.
[4] New York Times, September 7, 1956, p. 1.
[5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

Nixon criticized the Democrats for saying that "American prestige in the world is at an all-time low."[1] The Los Angeles Times also noted the favorable reception given the Nixon speech by the Legion on the final night of their national convention. The speech was not carried on radio and television. The immediate audience, then, was Nixon's only audience.

Arrangement

The following is an outline of the address delivered by Richard Nixon before the American Legion National Convention. Whenever possible, Nixon's words have been used to indicate the major divisions of the outline. Quotation marks will set off Nixon's words. The introduction and conclusion will be a précis.

Outline

I. Introduction: It is to the eternal credit of the American Legion that, years before the true nature of the Communist conspiracy was generally recognized in this country, you saw the threat and proceeded to educate and alert the American people to the danger. For that leadership in peace, as well as for your service in war, the nation owes a debt which I am proud to acknowledge to you today.

Whatever the results of the election this November, Democrats and Republicans will continue to work together with the leaders of the veteran's organizations toward the objective which every American wants--a full measure of gratitude for those who served our country so ably and so well.

II. Statement of Case: "I should like to devote a major portion of my remarks to analysis of the only serious threat to freedom in the world today--the international Communist movement."

---

[1] Los Angeles Times, September 7, 1956, p. 1.

III. Proof:

A. (Argument 1) "It is apparent that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted because of its record of vacillation."

1. "The leaders of the Kremlin are masters of talking one way and acting another."

2. "A switch in the Communist line is like a change of fashions. It lasts for a while until something more salable comes along."

B. (Argument 2) In order to negotiate for world peace, "we must begin with effective military strength."

1. "History proves that leaders of totalitarian states have a type of mentality which respects strength and strength alone."

2. "In the modern world, military strength means, above all, mastery of nuclear weapons."

3. "An agreement to restrict or reduce armaments would not be worth the paper it was written on unless there was first put into effect a full inspection system."

4. "We must never place a price tag on what freedom is worth to the world."

C. (Argument 3) "The problem of world peace is a complex and difficult one."

1. Economic aid, alone, cannot answer the problem of world peace.

2. "The Communists are running their industrial machines overtime to outdo us in economic aid."

D. (Argument 4) "It is our moral position that will be decisive in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties."

1. "We respect the right of any nation to differ with us on international problems and to choose political neutrality in the present world situation."

2. We must keep faith in the "traditions we cherish as American citizens, by having the courage to speak out clearly on the differences between freedom and Communism."

3. Morally, "we should maintain the policy we have adopted with regard to Communist China."

4. Morally, we should refuse to listen to those "who urge appeasement of potential enemies."

5. Morally, "we cannot be soft on domestic Communism," but "we must be scrupulously fair and accurate in fighting Communism in the United States."

IV. Peroration: In the next two months, we shall and should hear a great deal of criticism and discussion of our foreign policy. We should welcome the opportunity to put our programs to the test of healthy and constructive debate in the American tradition. The entire problem of Communism, however, both foreign and domestic, is too important for partisan criticism or political criticism. When the security of the nation is at stake, we are Americans first and Democrats or Republicans second.

Method of Arrangement

In the American Legion National Convention Address, Nixon used the logical method of arrangement.[1] His development was similar to the "problem-solution order" commonly mentioned in speech texts as a pattern of organization.[2] Nixon recognized the existing problem in his introduction and focused attention on this problem in the statement of his case: "The only serious threat to freedom in the world today--(is) the international Communist movement." In Argument 1, Nixon analyzed the nature of the problem when he portrayed the Russians as untrustworthy because they made "about-faces in Communist policy" and because they were "masters at talking one way and acting another." The recommended solutions to the existing problem of international

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

[2] See Glen E. Mills, Composing the Speech (Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952), p. 221.

Communism were forwarded in Arguments 2, 3, and 4 in the form of military, economic, and moral strength. Nixon further examined the implications of following any one of these solutions and his ultimate solution contained elements of each of the solutions. The method of arrangement, then, of the American Legion Address was logical and followed the problem-solution order.

Parts

The previous section dealt with the method of arrangement used by Nixon in this American Legion Address. This section will be concerned with the order of the specific parts of the address: the introduction, the statement of the case, the proof, and the peroration. This analysis will be concerned with the function of the parts.[1]

In this presentation, Nixon had a comparatively long introduction. It was not, however, as complicated as the introduction of the Acceptance Address. His statements fulfilled the commonly accepted functions of an introduction, namely, enlisting the attention and interest of members of the audience and rendering them well disposed toward himself as a person.

The introduction accomplished its purpose through two principal means. First, Nixon indicated that the American Legion had contributed "magnificently to the defense of freedom at home and abroad." He pointed out that the threat

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

of Communism in America was initially uncovered and faced by the American Legion:

> It is to the eternal credit of the American Legion that, years before the true nature of the Communist conspiracy was generally recognized in this country, you saw the threat and proceeded to educate and alert the American people to the danger.

In this manner, Nixon recognized the debt that the nation owed the Legion for its leadership in a time of peace.

Secondly, Nixon maintained that a bipartisan attitude toward Veteran's legislation was essential:

> In a political campaign, there is understandably a tendency for one side to outbid the other in proving its devotion to needs of the nation's veterans. I am sure that you will agree with me when I say that there is just as little place for politics in developing our veteran's programs in the time of peace as there is in mobilizing our fighting men in time of war.

He then assured the Legionnaires that regardless of the results of the election, their service to the American people would not go unrewarded:

> Whatever the results of the election this November, Democrats and Republicans will continue to work together with the leaders of the veteran's organizations toward the objective which every American wants--a full measure of gratitude for those who served our country so ably and so well.

Through these statements, Nixon gained the attention and interest of the audience and rendered them well disposed toward himself.

The statement of the case fulfilled the function of setting forth clearly and concisely the nature of the thought to be developed in the presentation.[1] Nixon spec-

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 395.

ified clearly that he was going to devote the major portion of the presentation to an analysis of the "international Communist movement." He did not indicate, however, the type of argument he was going to develop in his analysis.

Within the proof, Nixon established a transitional device which effectively unified the presentation. This transitional device was the repetition of the theme of the problem caused by the threat of international Communism. Nixon developed the problem itself in Argument 1. He then stated that he was going to concern himself with the possible solutions of military, economic, and moral strength when he noted, "They pay attention to what you say only when you have military and economic strength to back it up. They fear and, therefore, respect moral strength." The idea of the problem was then repeated as a transitional device between the remaining arguments in the following manner:

(1) How, then, are we to deal with this question? . . . ,
(2) We recognize, then the importance of military strength, but it is not the sole solution to our problem. . . . ,
(3) Nor is economic aid the complete answer. . . . , and
(4) Let us examine some of the moral aspects of this problem.

Thus, the use of this central theme was an effective means of unifying the speech as a whole. Nixon began by establishing the problem in Argument 1, and therefore, repeated the problem when he discussed the solutions of military, economic, and moral strength.

Within Argument 4, Nixon established another theme which connected his ideas. This theme was concerned with

the moral convictions of the United States. He began the argument by stating, "Let us examine some of the moral aspects of this problem." He repeated the theme of moral conviction as he employed such connectives as:

(1) It is because we believe so deeply that our moral position . . . ,
(2) Another example of our moral position . . . ,
(3) Our moral principles . . . , and
(4) These same moral principles . . .

In this argument, then, the repetition of a theme was used as a device to unify the ideas of Nixon.

Within the other arguments, the connectives Nixon used were not as elaborate as in Argument 4. For instance, in Argument 2, he used "in summary" as the device to effect a transition from one idea to another. He also used personal phrases to introduce new ideas. He used such phrases as, "Let me begin," "Let us get," "I respectfully submit," "I realize," or "I would like to add." Although these personal connectives were not as elaborate as the transitions used between the arguments nor as elaborate as the repetition of a theme as used in Argument 4, they did serve to unite the ideas contained in the arguments.

In the peroration, Nixon attempted to achieve two functions: to inspire his audience favorably toward himself, and to arouse them emotionally through the restatement of the idea of nonpartisanship which he had mentioned in the introduction. He stated in the conclusion:

> The entire problem of Communism, foreign and domestic, is too important for partisan criticism or political. It is literally the question of America's security and national survival. . . .

> When the security of the nation is at stake, we are Americans first, and Democrats or Republicans second.

Through this appeal to nonpartisanship Nixon attempted to show that he recognized that the problem of Communism was too important for party politics. Thus, he was appealing to both the Democrats and Republicans in the audience. Nixon also alluded to the international esteem of President Eisenhower when he stated in his conclusion:

> But I cannot agree with those who seem to relish proclaiming that American prestige is at an all-time low. I have traveled around the world two times in the past three and a half years. I have met and talked personally, not only to government leaders, but to thousands of people in all walks of life. I can tell you that there is a great well of friendship and respect for the people and the government of the United States in every country I have visited.
>
> And make no mistake about this: no man in the world today is more respected or more revered as the symbol of peace and liberty than the President of the United States.[1]

In summary, this analysis of arrangement in the American Legion Address has shown the following factors. The method of arrangement followed in this speech was the problem-solution pattern. The introduction of the address enlisted the attention and interest of the audience and rendered them well disposed toward the speaker. The transitions, for the most part, were smooth and carried the thoughts from one argument to another. And the peroration fulfilled the functions of inspiring the audience favorably toward the speaker and exciting the emotions of the audience toward

---

[1] The New York Times reported that Nixon received a lengthy ovation for this defense of American prestige.

the Republican Party.

Invention

Logical Proofs

In the analysis of arrangement of materials in the American Legion Address, four major arguments were noted. Each of these arguments will be discussed individually.

> Argument 1: It is apparent that the Soviet Union cannot be trusted because of its record of vacillation.

The type of reasoning process used in Argument 1 was the inductive pattern in which two lines of argument were forwarded which led to the generalization. These two lines of argument were:

1. The leaders of the Kremlin are masters of talking one way and acting another.
2. A switch in the Communist line is like a change of fashions. It lasts for a while until something more salable comes along.

Both of these general statements appeared to terminate logically in the generalization that it was apparent that the Soviet Union could not be trusted. The unusual feature of this argument was that only two lines of argument were used from which the generalization was reasoned. These lines of argument, however, were substantiated by an extensive number of forms of support. The first line of argument was substantiated by five examples, while the second line of argument was supported by ten facts. These lines of argument were concerned with forwarding the instability of the Russian or Kremlin policy. From these

arguments, the generalization noted as Argument 1 appeared to be a logical assumption.

> Argument 2: In order to negotiate for world peace, we must begin with effective military strength.

Nixon relied on the inductive pattern to develop this argument.[1] He began with an enumeration of general assumptions which led to the generalization which is stated as Argument 2. The four lines of argument used were:

1. History proves that leaders of totalitarian states have a type of mentality which respects strength and strength alone.
2. In the modern world, military strength means, above all, mastery of nuclear weapons.
3. An agreement to restrict or reduce armaments would not be worth the paper it was written on unless there was first put into effect a full inspection system.
4. We must never place a price tag on what freedom is worth to the world.

The first two general statements in this argument appear to lead logically to the generalization that "in order to negotiate for world peace, we must begin with effective military strength." The third and fourth lines of reasoning, however, do not lead to the generalization stated in this argument. The third reference concerning disarmament, although relevant to some extent to the issue of military strength, should be termed an irrelevant deviation in the logical content of the argument.[2] The insertion of this irrelevant instance could probably be attributed to a con-

---

[1] Baird, op. cit., p. 115. [2] Ibid., p. 181.

troversy concerning disarmament taking place on the international scene at the time of the speech. A significant faction in the disarmament controversy concerned Adlai Stevenson's proposal on April 21, 1956 that the H-Bomb should be banned.[1] Eisenhower reacted to the proposal by formally rejecting Stevenson's plan.[2] During the summer months, the "open-skies" policy of Eisenhower was discussed on the international level. In June, the Soviet Union also announced the reduction of their armed forces by 1,200,000 men.[3] Bulganin challenged Eisenhower to match troop cuts by the Russians.[4] The day before the Legion speech by Nixon, Adlai Stevenson again furthered the disarmament controversy when he proposed the ending of the draft.[5] Nixon may have included this side issue of disarma- in order to refute the critics of the day who were calling for disarmament on the part of the United States when he stated:

> I realize that there are those in the United States who sincerely believe that we should have discontinued testing of the hydrogen bombs if other nations would have offered to follow a similar policy.
>
> I respectfully submit that for us to have followed this advice would have been not only naive but dangerous to our national security.

Nixon continued to elaborate the idea of disarmament as a point apparently related to the main argument. Later, in

---

[1] New York Times, April 22, 1956, p. 1.

[2] New York Times, April 26, 1956, p. 1.

[3] New York Times, June 8, 1956, p. 1. [4] Ibid.

[5] New York Times, September 6, 1956, p. 11.

sub-argument four, he gave an emotional treatment to the concepts of freedom, survival, and the costs of military preparedness. This fourth reference dealing with the "price tag," although pertinent to the effectiveness of military strength, was at the same time combined with arguments on the responsibilities that the United States must carry in behalf of other nations. An example of this line of reasoning and its attendant emotional effect can be seen when Nixon said:

> I realize that it is always tempting to tell the voters there is an easy way to meet the difficult problems . . . unfortunately, the easy way is seldom the right way. . . . This is no time to suggest to our friends or our possible opponents abroad that America is getting soft and tired and is looking for an easy way out of our world responsibilities. In this critical moment of our history, let us have the good sense and courage to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to carry out America's international responsibilities.

The absence of strict relevance in developing this particular sub-argument did not appear to weaken the persuasive force of Nixon's main argument. In effect, the last two instances which concerned disarmament and cost were an indirect approach to the support of the major argument calling for military strength as a weapon for establishing peace.

Argument 3: The problem of peace is a complex and difficult one.

The type of reasoning process used to develop Argument 3 was the deductive pattern.[1] In this argument, Nixon stated the generalization from which he deduced two

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

lines of argument. These lines of argument were:

1. Economic aid, alone, cannot answer the problem of world peace.

2. The Communists are running their industrial machines overtime to outdo us in economic aid.

These lines of argument appeared to follow logically from the generalization and further clarification would not seem relevant. The use of the deductive process in the argument enabled Nixon to investigate and eliminate rather quickly economic aid as a possible solution to the problem posed by the threat of international Communism. Thus, the conditions that "economic aid" was not a complete answer and that the "Communists" were working overtime followed from the major premise listed as Argument 3.

Argument 4: It is our moral position that will be decisive in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties.

Nixon again relied on the inductive pattern of reasoning in this argument. He forwarded five general assumptions which terminated in the generalization which is stated here as Argument 4. These assumptions as noted in the analysis of arrangement were:

1. We respect the right of any nation to differ with us on international problems and to choose political neutrality.

2. We must keep faith in the traditions we cherish as American citizens, by having the courage always to speak out clearly on the differences between freedom and Communism.

3. Morally we should maintain the policy we have adopted with regard to Communist China.

4. Morally we should refuse to listen to those who urge appeasement of potential enemies.

5. Morally we cannot be soft on domestic Communism. At the same time, we must be scrupulously fair and accurate in fighting Communism in the United States.

These five assumptions led logically to Argument 4 in this argument. Nixon did not forward irrelevant ideas as he had in the inductive process of Argument 2. He reasoned carefully to the ultimate generalization stated as Argument 4. Each of the general assumptions, therefore, terminated logically in the argument: "It is our moral position that will be decisive in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties."

Forms of Support

Within the arguments, Nixon used various forms of support. This analysis will be concerned with the forms of support classified by Bryant and Wallace as: information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony.[1]

Information: This form of support will be discussed as it appeared independently of the other forms of support. The factual and statistical data used in comparison and contrast and example will be discussed under their appropriate headings. In this address, Nixon used facts to substantiate his ideas, primarily in the first argument. In Argument 1, he set up the problem of the threat of international Communism and forwarded ten specific facts to support his allegation that Russia was not to be trusted. These included:

---

[1] Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 117.

(1) In 1920 the Soviet Union gave independence to the Baltic States . . . ,
(2) In 1940 it enslaved them again . . . ,
(3) In 1939 the bloody hands of Stalin and Hitler were clasped in a fast pact of friendship . . . , and
(4) In 1929 Stalin reversed the field again, wiped out private enterprise and forced the farmer . . .

In the remainder of the speech, Nixon used the form of support of information on only two occasions. Once in Argument 2 and a final time in the conclusion of the speech, information was used. In Argument 2, Nixon used information in his discussion of the aspect of disarmament when he stated, "Beginning in 1946, at every opportunity since then we have advocated the control of nuclear weapons." This single use of the form of support of information as evidence was the last fact used as support in the speech. The information noted in the conclusion was merely a citation of the fact that the population of the United States was 167 million and was not used as evidence.

Nixon's use of information as a support for his ideas, then, was centered principally in Argument 1. The accumulation of this information as evidence appeared to be concerned with substantiating accurately and fully the problem he alleged was created by the threat of international Communism. He supported his allegations with ten specific facts. Throughout the remainder of the speech, however, Nixon used information on only two occasions.

Example: Nixon used the example as evidence in this presentation to a greater extent than any of the other forms of support. It was especially important as a means of

support in Argument 4. In developing this argument, Nixon used five general assumptions which led to the generalization noted as Argument 4. Each of the assumptions contained the use of examples as evidence. The examples found in Argument 4 read:

(1) We have our faults, but we do not enslave our citizens, try to wipe out religion or seek to subvert and conquer nations. We have fought three great wars on foreign soil in the century and lost over one million of our fighting men, and yet we have not sought to acquire sovereignty over one inch of territory after those wars. . . . ,

(2) It is because we believe so deeply that our moral position is right that we nave strongly supported the program for exchanging visitors with other nations. Tnat is why we are not afraid to carry out this exchange even behind the Iron Curtain. . . . ,

(3) Appeasement is the first step to surrender because the appetite of an aggressor knows no limit. We found that out in Korea. South Korea was invaded because . . . ,

(4) . . . those well-meaning but mistaken individuals who would have us seek the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu to the Communist Chinese . . . , and

(5) . . . many Communists escape punnishment through the use of the Fifth Amendment. It is their right to plead that Amendment under our Constitution.

In all, four additional examples were used by Nixon. Two of these were used in Argument 1 to support Nixon's accusation that the Communists could not be trusted. Argument 2 and 3 eacn contained an example in support of ideas that (1) the United States should not consider disarmament and (2) world peace is a complex and difficult problem. Tne examples forwarded in the first three arguments were stated as:

(1) They have talked peace a great deal in recent months. But they are stirring up trouble in the Near East. They shot down an American plane off

China. They have invaded Burma. They are testing nuclear weapons and devising rockets to carry those weapons. . . . ,

(2) The best example of this is Czechoslovakia. The leaders of that unhappy nation, with the best of motives, took Communists into their government. The Communists in turn took over. . . . ,

(3) To have taken such action would have been like telling police officers that they should discard their weapons provided the lawbreakers would offer to throw away their machine guns. . . . , and

(4) For example, those who parrot the cliche that, if we could give every Asian another bowl of rice, there would be no Communism in that part of the world are making a superficial and false analysis of a complex and difficult problem.

Thus the form of support of the example was used extensively as evidence in this address. It was used in all of the arguments, but particularly in Argument 4 when it was the sole form of support.

Comparison and Contrast: In this address, as in the Acceptance Address, Nixon did not use the form of support of comparison and contrast directly. There was, however, a type of indirect comparison in the presentation which distinguished the motives of the United States from those of Russia. On one occasion, for instance, Nixon stated:

> We have our faults, but we do not enslave our citizens, try to wipe out religion or seek to subvert and conquer nations. We have fought three great wars on foreign soil in this century and lost over one million of our fighting men, and yet, we have not sought to acquire sovereignty over one inch of that territory after those wars. We fight to preserve freedom, not to destroy it.[1]

The implication was that Russia did enslave her citizens, try to wipe out religion and was attempting to subvert and

---

[1] The quotation cited served a dual function. It could be termed an example used as evidence as had been stated previously. It also contains the elements of indirect comparison and contrast.

conquer nations. This indirect comparison was accomplished without enumerating contrasting events or actually mentioning Russia by name. Nixon more clearly defined this comparison by implication when he urged:

> May we ever keep faith with those who died, and with the traditions we cherish as American citizens, by having the courage always to speak out clearly on the differences between freedom and Communism.

This difference between freedom and Communism was the theme of the indirect comparison, not only in this particular situation in Argument 4, but throughout the presentation as a whole. Whenever Nixon talked about Communism or Russia in a derogatory manner, the inference was that the United States was the opposite. In the same manner, whenever Nixon discussed the United States in favorable terms, the implication was that Russia was in turn the opposite. Such was the case in Argument 2 when Nixon stated:

> Certainly the record is clear. No people could be more devoted to peace. We keep strong to preserve peace, not to threaten it.

He continued to clarify his position in light of the so-called record of the United States toward the furtherance of peace when he cautioned:

> But we shall not disarm unilaterally, and we shall enter into agreements to disarm only when we have a system of inspection and a control we can trust.

In this indirect comparison, then, it was not necessary to mention Russia or Communism directly for the content revealed that the United States had to keep strong militarily to insure the peace and that a trustworthy system of inspec-

tion should precede disarmament. The inference was that Russia could not be trusted and that her military strength was being used to threaten world peace.

It should be noted, then, that comparison and contrast was used as evidence in this presentation indirectly through inference. This indirect comparison was clearly apparent from the analysis of the content. There was, however, no attempt directly to compare or contrast specific elements in the speech.

Testimony: In this speech, Nixon did not rely on testimony or opinion as evidence. Nixon did, however, as he had in his Acceptance Address, use his personal experience as the authority for supporting some of his ideas. On three occasions, he relied on this personal experience as evidence:

(1) But I would like to emphasize just one point with regard to this record. In the ten years I have served in the House, in the Senate and in the Vice-Presidency, I have found that . . . ,

(2) As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House I have personally met and questioned scores of Communist Party members. During the past three and a half years I have visited thirty-two countries as the personal representative of the President. During this same period I have participated in the meetings of the National Security Council.

On the basis of this experience I believe these conclusions cannot be challenged. . . . , and

(3) But I cannot agree with those who seem to relish proclaiming that American prestige in the world is at an all-time low. I have traveled around the world two times in the past three and a half years. I have met and talked personally, not only to government leaders, but to thousands of people in all walks of life. I can tell you that there is a great well of friendship and respect . . .

These uses of personal experience to substantiate his ideas

served to build his own authority in the situations noted. It should be remembered that Nixon, as he himself said, had served in the House and the Senate and was an active member of the Committee on Un-American Activities. Thus, he could be considered an authority in his own right. The manner in which he explained his authority in each situation gave credence to the testimony which followed.

The discussion of forms of support in this speech indicated that evidence was an important feature of the address. Specifically, information and example were used most extensively. Information was used to substantiate primarily the first argument. In all, information was used as evidence on fourteen occasions. Example, however, was used throughout the entire proof of the arguments, with Argument 3 containing the largest concentration of this evidence. It was used as evidence on nine occasions. The supports of testimony and comparison and contrast were used in seven instances on this occasion.

Emotional Appeals

Emotional appeals will be discussed in this American Legion Address in terms of the motive appeals. The analysis of the appeals disclosed that the predominant motives found in this address were those to loyalty, reputation, and fair play.[1]

Loyalty: The first of these motive appeals, loyalty,

---

[1]Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 277.

was contained in three specific sections of the speech. In each of these situations, the appeal was given extended development. Because of this lengthy development, each of the appeals will be discussed individually.

The motive of loyalty was appealed to initially in the introduction of the speech. Nixon praised the Legionnaires for their loyalty to the United States not only as servicemen in time of war, but also for their efforts in peace time. He recognized their efforts in the following statement:

> As one who has been a Legionnaire for 10 years, I am proud to be associated with an organization whose members have contributed so magnificently to the defense of freedom at home and abroad.
>
> As a public official, I am honored to express the nation's gratitude to the members of this organization for your service to the nation in war and peace. You have understood the real spirit of America and have upheld it in the face of those who wish to destroy our institutions.
>
> It is to the eternal credit of the American Legion that, years before the true nation of the Communist conspiracy was generally recognized in this country, you saw the threat and proceeded to educate and alert the American people to the danger.

This lengthy motive appeal noted the Legion's loyalty in time of war, but more importantly, it pointed out the significant role that the Legion played in uncovering and meeting the problem caused by international Communism. This problem was in actuality the subject of Nixon's presentation.

The motive appeal to loyalty was again used in Argument 2 when Nixon called for additional sacrifices to maintain military strength. These sacrifices were called for in the following statement:

> I realize that it is always tempting to tell the voters that there is an easy way to meet difficult problems. I would like to tell you that we can safely cut our armed forces, get rid of the draft, cut our defense spending and, thereby, reduce taxes.
>
> Unfortunately, however, the easy way is seldom the right way.
>
> This is no time to suggest to our friends or our possible opponents abroad that America is getting soft and tired and is looking for an easy way out of our world responsibilities. In this critical moment of history, let us have the good sense and courage to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to carry out America's international responsibilities. We must never place a price tag on what freedom is worth to us or the world. As long as armed aggressors are on the loose in the world, free men must stay strong enough to keep the peace.

This strong appeal to the audience's interest in loyalty also embodied an appeal to duty. Through this emotional appeal, Nixon circumvented the difficult problem of defense spending. Instead of discussing the reduction of taxes and the abolition of the draft, he emphasized that it was the duty of loyal American people not to "place a price tag" on freedom. He wanted the audience to realize that not only would it take sacrifice to accomplish the peace, but that the peace might even be lost without such sacrifice.

A final appeal to the motive of loyalty occurred in the conclusion when Nixon stated:

> The entire problem of Communism, foreign and domestic, is too important for partisan criticism or political sniping. It is literally the question of America's security and of our national survival. The development of a program to deal with Communism, either at home or abroad, should never be an issue that divides us on party lines.
>
> When the security of the nation is at stake, we are Americans first and Democrats or Republicans second. When we fought side by side on fields of battle, we did not ask the politics or the social

> views of those who fought beside us. We were one in the defense of the country.
>
> The struggle against world Communism is the greatest challenge that free men have ever faced. But, as the President has so eloquently stated on many occasions, there is nothing that 167 million united Americans cannot accomplish. That is why I am proud to be associated with an organization that has contributed so magnificently to this noble aim--that Americans be united as we work together for the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world.

This appeal indicated that Nixon considered the problem of Communism to be beyond party lines and beyond the interest of any one group. It was a strong appeal to the citizen's loyalty and duty as an American in the face of potential and real Communist opposition. Nixon considered the struggle to be "the greatest challenge that free men have ever faced."

The emotions of fear and pride were particularly affected by the motive appeals to loyalty contained in the speech. The threat that the problem of Communism was "literally a question of America's security and of our national security" was carried throughout these appeals. The emotional appeal of pride was affected by Nixon's constant reference to the fact that the Legion not only was the first to uncover the threat, but was also continuing in its efforts to eliminate it. In this manner, then, the emotions of fear and pride were affected by the motive appeal to loyalty.

In summary, the analysis of loyalty in this address revealed that loyalty was appealed to at some length on three occasions. It was contained specifically in the introduction, Argument 2, and the conclusion. The number

of paragraphs devoted to this appeal on each of the three ocassions suggests that Nixon relied on it to establish the significance and importance of his message. It was further noted that the motive of loyalty effectively supported and emphasized the contention of audience responsibility with regard to the threat of Communism.

Reputation and Fair Play: The motive appeals to reputation and fair play were emphasized particularly in Argument 4. Because the appeals to these two motives were so closely related in this argument, they will be discussed as a unit. The content of Argument 4 was devoted to the description of America's moral position with regard to the problem of the Communist threat. To substantiate his stated position within this argument, Nixon relied heavily on the motive appeals of reputation and fair play. In every paragraph of the argument, whcih embodied sixteen paragraphs in all, there was an element of this appeal to reputation and fair play.

The significance of these appeals appeared to focus on the necessity for the United States to maintain a firm unyielding moral stand against Communist aggression. To support such a stand, Nixon developed his idea along two lines. First, he was principally concerned with an enumeration of examples which tended to point out the strength of the moral position of the United States in thwarting Communist inroads in friendly nations. Secondly, he appeared concerned with insuring that the audience rec-

ognized completely the fairness and justness exemplified by the United States' moral stand. The development of the moral position of the United States, then, in Argument 4, appealed specifically and as a whole to the motive of reputation and fair play. A number of paragraphs from the argument which characterize this appeal most clearly follow:

(1) We begin with a fundamental American belief. We respect the right of any nation to differ with us on international problems and to choose political neutrality and moral neutralism. We can understand, even in those instances when we may not approve, political decisions to be neutral. But we must never condone the placing of freedom and Communism on the same moral level. . . . ,

(2) We have our faults, but we do not enslave our citizens, try to wipe out religion or seek to subvert and conquer nations. We have fought three great wars on foreign soil in this century and lost over one million of our fighting men, and yet we have not sought to acquire sovereignty over one inch of territory after those wars. We fight to preserve freedom, not to destroy it. May we ever keep faith with those who died, and with the traditions we cherish as American citizens, by having the courage always to speak out clearly on the difference between freedom and Communism . . . . ,

(3) It is because we believe so deeply that our moral position is right that we have strongly supported the program for exchanging visitors with other nations. That is why we are not afraid to carry out this exchange even behind the Iron Curtain. Let people everywhere see what free men stand for and let them choose between freedom and Communism. . . . ,

(4) We shall not yield to blackmail and recognize a regime that imprisons our citizens and shoots down our planes. By its continued open defiance of the United Nations in Korea, the Government of Communist China has disqualified itself from being considered an honorable member of the family of nations. . . . ,

(5) At the same time, as I have said on several occasions before, we must be scrupulously fair and accurate in fighting Communism in the United States. We do this not only because it is right, but also because it is the most effective way to deal with this conspiracy. Wild charges and unfounded name-calling only play into the hands of

the Communists. . . . , and

(6) If we call a man a Communist merely because we disagree with his economic and social philosophy, we are only making Communism more respectable. We give Communists their full rights under the law, not because we want to be soft on them, but because respect for law is essential to preserve the American heritage which is such a bulwark of strength against tyranny of any type.

I realize that, because we recognize this fundamental principle, many Communists escape punnishment through the use of the Fifth Amendment. It is their right to plead that amendment under our Constitution.[1]

It should be noted that in this analysis of the motive appeals of reputation and fair play, there seemed to be a distinct pattern of development in Argument 4. Nixon began with an appeal to both motives in the very first paragraph of this argument. He then established the strength of the moral position of the United States in succeeding paragraphs, and by so doing, he was in effect appealing to the motive of reputation. He then concluded the argument with the motive appeal of fair play by showing how the fight against Communism was conducted in a very fair and moral manner.

Other than in Argument 4, the motive of reputation was used on only one other occasion. This occurred in Argument 3 when Nixon considered the inadequacies of economic aid alone as a solution to the problem created by the threat of Communism. The appeal was found in the statement below:

> We must recognize that the Communists also have military strength. And they are running their industrial machine overtime in an effort to outdo us in economic aid. In one area, and one area only, they cannot compete with us. They cannot come to the people and give a satisfactory answer to this

---

[1] This depiction of the fairness of American jurisprudence was appealing at the same time to the motive of reputation.

> question 'Did you come to save freedom or to destroy it?' They know that they offer slavery, not freedom.

This condemnation of Communism and its threat to freedom was also an attempt to depict the United States as the guardian of freedom, for as Nixon specifically stated, "They cannot compete with us to save freedom."

These examples of the motives of reputation and fair play show that Nixon relied on them primarily in the fourth argument of the speech. In Argument 4, the appeal affected primarily the audience's emotions of pride and confidence. Nixon attempted to show the audience the pride that was derived from the fact that they were Americans. This was accomplished through the portrayal of the justness and fairness of the American moral position in the fight against Communist aggression. The moral stand of the United States was also a source of confidence since the audience could have confidence in the fact that the strength of this moral position would, in the end, result in ultimate victory over the threat of Communist.

It should be concluded that emotional appeals were used extensively in the American Legion Address. Nixon appealed especially to the motives of loyalty, reputation, and fair play. The analysis of invention indicated that although Nixon relied on logical proofs, particularly in Argument 1, the primary appeal in the remainder of the speech was emotional.

Ethical Appeals

The analysis of ethical appeals will be divided into the elements of good will, character, and intelligence as discussed in Chapter I.[1] The elements of ethical appeal will be considered in the order listed above.

Good Will: Thonssen and Baird list six means of gauging good will within the content of an address.[2] Of this list, the following are pertinent to the analysis of Nixon's American Legion Address:

1. The ability to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of his audience.
2. The ability to identify himself properly with the hearers and their problems.
3. The ability to reveal, without guile or exhibitionism his personable qualities as a messenger of the truth.[3]

It was noted from the analysis of ethical appeals, that the means of gauging good will noted above were contained primarily in the introduction of this address. In this section, Nixon praised the Legion for its efforts in the defense of freedom in both war and peace. He specifically pointed to the Legion's leadership in recognizing and initiating the fight against international Communism. He did this as he stated:

(1) As one who has been a Legionnaire for 10 years, I am proud to be associated with an organization whose members have contributed so magnificently to the defense of freedom at home and abroad. . . . ,

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

(2) . . . for your service to the nation in war and peace. You have understood the real spirit of America and have upheld it . . . ,
(3) It is to the eternal credit of the American Legion that, years before the true nature of the Communist conspiracy was generally recognized in this country, you saw the threat and proceeded to educate and alert the American people to the danger . . . , and
(4) I have found that those who served the nation in time of war have a special interest in those programs which are designed to secure the peace and freedom which has been so dearly gained. I believe it is appropriate, therefore, that I report to you today on the policies your National Administration has adopted to further that great objective.

Nixon further established good will by identifying himself with the audience and their problems and revealing himself as a messenger of the truth when he suggested that the problem of veteran's legislation should not be a partisan issue. The statements which established good will in this manner in the introduction were:

(1) I should like to comment briefly on the subject of veteran's legislation. There have been some major accomplishments during the past four years in this field which I do not need to describe in detail to this organization. . . . ,
(2) But I would like to emphasize just one point with regard to this record. In the 10 years I have served in the House, in the Senate and in the Vice-Presidency, I have found that Democrats in the Congress have worked just as enthusiastically for veteran's legislation as have Republicans. . . . , and
(3) Whatever the results of the election this November, Democrats and Republicans will continue to work together with the leaders of veteran's organizations toward the objective which every American wants--a full measure of gratitude for those who served our country so ably and so well.

In the proof of the speech, Nixon continued to establish good will by making the audience a part of the presentation and by praising them for their "splendid work" in the "Back to God" program. The three instances which attempted to win the good will of the audience in the proof

were:

(1) How can we in the words of the Legion preamble 'safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy?' . . ,
(2) May I at this point commend the American Legion for its splendid work in bringing home to all the American people through the 'Back to God' program, that great fundamental truth: that the strength of America rests on the sound foundations of moral and religious faith. . . . and
(3) I am proud of the support the American Legion has given this program (Back to God program).

In the proof of the speech as well as in the introduction, then, Nixon used materials which served to win the good will of his listeners. The preponderance of such material, however, was found in the introduction.

Character: Nixon established probity of character in this presentation when he linked his opponent's cause with that which was not virtuous and associated his own message with that which was virtuous and elevated. He accomplished this throughout the entire speech. He seemed mainly concerned with the establishment of the probity of his character in the proof of the address. More specifically, the first argument contained the majority of this element of ethical appeal. Argument 1 was framed in such a manner that its primary function was to associate Communism (Nixon's opponent on this occasion) with that which was not virtuous. Since all seventeen paragraphs of the argument attempted to associate Communism with a lack of virtue, the following paragraphs were selected as an indication of the manner in which Nixon accomplished this end:

(1) The label differs in various countries, but the poison is just the same. Regardless of his nation-

ality, the Communist has one loyalty and only one--to the ruthless, power-hungry system that has enslaved almost half the world. . . . ,

(2) The leaders of the Kremlin are masters of talking one way and acting another. They have talked peace a great deal in recent months. But they are stirring up trouble in the Near East. They shot down an American plane off China. They have invaded Burma. They are testing nuclear weapons and are devising rockets to carry those weapons. This is a strange way to promote peace, unless by peace they mean the peace of the prison or the tomb. . . . ,

(3) In 1929 Stalin reversed the field again, wiped out private enterprise and forced farmers into collective farms. . . . ,

(4) Six years later Stalin was so terrorized by Hitler that he ordered Communists everywhere to become respectable and to co-operate with non-Communists in a united front against fascism. . . . ,

(5) Yet, in 1939, the bloody hands of Stalin and Hitler were clasped in a fast pact of friendship which made it possible for Hitler to start the second World War. . . . ,

(6) When Hitler turned on his partner in 1941, Stalin once again proclaimed devotion to freedom and democracy. Under the influence of this line Earl Browder (former General Secretary of the Communist Party in the United States) said, in 1943, that capitalism and Communism could co-exist after the war. . . . , and

(7) Two years later Earl Browder was purged and Soviet troops moved out to conquer defenseless peoples in Europe and Asia.

Thus, the association of the Communists and the Kremlin with unvirtuous motives tended by comparison to establish the probity of Richard Nixon's character.

Throughout the three other arguments of the presentation, Nixon continued to portray the Communists as having unvirtuous motives, and at the same time attempted to link his own message with that which was virtuous. He accomplished these two functions in the following paragraphs:

(1) Certainly the record is clear. No government or no people could be more devoted to peace. We keep strong to preserve the peace, not to threaten it. Beginning in 1946, at every opportunity since

> then we have advocated the control of nuclear weapons. And we are continuing to explore every means of finding a safe and workable method for controlling such weapons . . . ,
> (2) And they are running their industrial machine overtime in an effort to outdo us in economic aid. In one area, and one area only, they cannot compete with us. They cannot come to a people and give a satisfactory answer to this question, 'Did you come to save freedom or to destroy it?' They know that they offer slavery, not freedom. . . . , and
> (3) We have our faults, but we do not enslave our citizens, try to wipe out religion, or seek to subvert and conquer nations. We have fought three great wars on foreign soil in this century and lost over one million of our fighting men, and yet we have not sought to acquire sovereignty over one inch of territory after those wars. We fight to preserve freedom, not to destroy it. May we keep faith with those who died, and with the traditions we cherish as American citizens, by having the courage always to speak out clearly on the difference between freedom and Communism.

In this presentation, then, Nixon attempted to associate the Communist movement with that which was not virtuous. He also attempted to depict the American motives as being virtuous and elevated. He accomplished this primarily within Argument 1 of the proof. Through these two means, then, Nixon focused attention on the probity of his character.

Intelligence: The use of tact was noted particularly in the introduction of the speech when Nixon discussed the fact that veteran's legislation was not a matter for partisan politics. He stated that, based on his experience, Democrats and Republicans alike were devoted equally to this type of legislation. Thus, by placing the welfare of the veteran beyond partisan politics, Nixon was considering their problem with tact.

Further, Nixon exhibited prudence when he discussed

the handling of the Communist problem in a bipartisan manner. He implied that Americans should allow the Communists full rights under law, "not because we want to be soft on them, but because respect for law is essential to preserve the American heritage which is such a bulwark of strength against tyranny of any type." He stated that "unfounded name-calling" would merely aid the cause of the Communists. Throughout the address, and particularly in the conclusion, Nixon stressed that the threat of Communism was too important for partisan politics and that it was actually a matter of "national survival." The prudence exhibited in this development of the manner in which the problem should be handled, then, established the sagacity of Nixon.

The discussion of the problem of Communism also revealed Nixon's "broad familiarity with the interests of the day."[1] He referred specifically to current issues of national interest in 1956. This was particularly true in Argument 1 when he cited such current problems as:

(1) . . . they shot down an American plane off China. They have invaded Burma. . . . ,
(2) . . . our refusal to recognize Red China and to admit its representatives to the United Nations. . . . ,
(3) . . . the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu to the Chinese Communists. . . . , and
(4) Nor is economic aid the complete answer, as necessary and desirable as it is to many parts of the world.

These examples indicate to some extent that Nixon was

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

cognizant of the problems of the day.

It can be concluded from the analysis, then, that Nixon employed ethical appeals in the American Legion Address. The principal means of determining ethical appeals was through the appeals to good will, character, and intelligence. An attempt at obtaining good will was contained particularly in the introduction. The establishment of probity of character appeared within the proof and more specifically in Argument 1. The means of assessing sagacity were found throughout the speech as a whole.

Style

There were five predominant elements of style in this speech. These were the elements of directness, concreteness, rhetorical question, parallel structure, and vivid and figurative language. Each of these elements of style will be analyzed individually.

Directness: Directness can be assessed by an analysis of the use of personal pronouns and the elements of a conversational tone contained in an address. The analysis of directness in this speech reveals that many personal pronouns were used, those most frequent being "I," "we," and "our." The "I" pronoun was used forty-five times, the "we" pronoun eighty-seven, and the "our" pronoun twenty-nine times. Further, the personal pronoun "I" was used at least once in thirty-nine of the sixty-nine paragraphs of the presentation. It was also found that only eight paragraphs did not contain at least one personal pronoun. The majority

of these eight paragrapns were found in Argument 1. In all, 276 personal pronouns were used in the speech. The analysis also showed that Nixon did not use difficult words and that his language was that which would be easily recognizable to the average listener. The short sentences used in the speech also aided the directness of the presentation. The average sentence length was from twelve to sixteen words. From the analysis, then, it can be concluded that the content of this address indicated a high degree of directness from the use of numerous personal pronouns, lack of difficult language, and the use of short sentences and paragraphs.

Concreteness: The analysis of style reveals that a great number of items which contribute to concreteness were used in this speech. In fact, every paragraph in the speech included an element of concreteness. Nixon used such individual names as "Stalin," "Hitler," "Earl Browder," and "President Eisenhower." He cited specific countries such as "Estonia," "Lithuania," "United States," "Korea," "Quemoy," and "Matsu." He referred on a number of occasions to general classes of people such as "Legionnaires," "Communists," "Americans," and "Chinese." He included specific dates such as "1920," "1918," "1921," "1929," "1940," "1946," and "1943." He noted general statistics as he cited "ten years," "three and a half years," "thirty-eight years," "thirty-two countries," and "167 million united Americans." He did not, however, use illustrations, quotations, or brief anecdotes to any great extent with the exception of a brief quotation

from the American Legion preamble, quoted in the introduction of the address. From the examples listed, then, it would appear that the speech contained a great number of the elements contributing to concreteness.

Although the speech contained many elements of concreteness, it nevertheless contained many abstractions as well. For example, Nixon referred to the true nature of the Communist conspiracy without discussing specifically what the conspiracy embodied. He also discussed how the policy of the United States on disarmament was devoted to peace without specifically telling the audience what the policy was. He also noted on a number of occasions that the United States fought to preserve freedom but did not indicate exactly the manner in which the United States carried on this fight. In addition to these broad generalities, Nixon used emotionally abstract words and phrases. Such phrases as the following were included:

(1) . . . the ruthless, power-hungry system that has enslaved almost half the world. . . . ,
(2) They are always glad to rope in the wooly minded and self deluded. . . . , and
(3) Wild charges and unfounded name-calling only play into the hands of the Communists.

These emotionally charged generalities allowed the imagination of the audience to supply the proper specifics.

Rhetorical question: The rhetorical question as used in public address does not anticipate nor expect an answer. The speaker normally uses this technique to emphasize an idea he is about to develop. In this presentation, Nixon used this device to get himself into each argument

in his proof. The only deviation occurred between the second and third arguments where the rhetorical question was found within the third argument rather than at the beginning of it. The rhetorical question served as a transition from one thought to another. It was first used prior to Argument 1, when Nixon stated:

> How can we, in the words of the Legion preamble, 'safe-guard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy'?

This rhetorical question enabled Nixon to proceed into Argument 1 and develop the existing problem. After setting up the problem, Nixon progressed to possible solutions of the problem by asking at the outset of Argument 2, "How, then, are we to deal with this problem?" The rhetorical question in this case, allowed Nixon to enter into a discussion of the first possible solution to the threat of Communism. He did not use a rhetorical question between Argument 2 and Argument 3. He did, however, use this device within Argument 3 when he queried, "Did you come to save freedom or to destroy it?" He returned to his basic pattern at the beginning of Argument 4 when he asked, "What should our position be?" It should be noted that Nixon used the rhetorical question consistently as a means of transition from one argument or thought to another, with a single deviation coming between Arguments 2 and 3. The device was used on five occasions in all.

Parallel structure: The parallel structure has been defined as the recurring use of a given structure of words,

phrases, or sentences.[1] Nixon used this device in this speech, although not as extensively as in the Acceptance Address. His use of this device was confined primarily to Argument 1, although there was a minor use in Argument 4. The analysis revealed that the first argument was noteworthy because it was developed almost exclusively through the use of the parallel structure. This device, as used in Argument 1, took the form of a number of recurring sentences. These sentences read:

(1) They have talked peace . . . ,
They are stirring up trouble . . . ,
They shot down an American plane . . . ,
They have invaded . . . and
(2) In 1920 the Soviet Union . . . ,
In 1940 it enslaved . . . ,
In 1918 Lenin set out to Communize . . .,
In 1921 he changed the line again and began . . . ,
and
In 1929 Stalin reversed the field again . . .

This parallel structure enabled Nixon to include a great number of facts and specific instances in a short space of time. By so doing, he quickly set up the problem which he felt existed and was able to proceed to the solutions in the remainder of the speech,

Nixon used the parallel structure on one other occasion in the presentation. At that time, the parallel structure, used in Argument 4, took the form of a series of words. Nixon stated:

> I say that any individual who refused to disclose information with regard to a criminal conspiracy against the United States forfeits any claim he

---

[1]Baird and Knower, op. cit., p. 181.

might have to be an employee of our government--federal, state or local.

Although the parallel structure was not used extensively, it was a distinct feature of style, particularly in Argument 1 when Nixon discussed the existing problem caused by the threat of Communism.

Vivid and figurative language: Baird and Knower indicate that the individual word can often have a "definate suggestiveness" as well as "literal associations."[1] The use of vivid and figurative language was a distinct feature of this presentation. An analogy was formulated and was embodied in Nixon's description of the Communist problem. In other words, he created an extended comparison between the "new look" in fashions and the actions of the Communist Party.[2] He began this analogy within the proof of his presentation when he forwarded such statements as:

(1) This is particularly true now as we confront the so-called 'new look' in Soviet Diplomacy. . . . and
(2) What is behind the 'new look'?

To an American audience, these references were at once synonymous with the field of women's fashions and further explanations of the "new look" were not offered. In his development of this analogy, Nixon directly stated in Argument 1 the elements being compared when he forwarded the simile, "A switch in the Communist line is like a change in fashions." From this simile, it became apparent that Nixon was comparing the element of fashion to the Communist

---

[1]Baird and Knower, op. cit., p. 150. [2]Ibid.

"line."

The analogy was continued through the application of a number of terms from the world of fashion. Nixon used these terms when he referred to the actions of dictators as "they are always glad to rope in the woolly minded and self deluded." He also urged, "We must never place a price tag on what freedom is worth." He used another example of language from the fashion world when he said, "The label differs in various countries . . ." A final example of this use of the terminology of the fashion world was noted when he called the policy of the United States toward Communism, "our line toward." Thus, Nixon used terms such as "line," "label," "price tag," and " woolly" to maintain the analogy he had established. This analogy enabled Nixon to indicate how the actions of the Communists throughout the world were constantly changing. He pointed out that just as the fashions changed from season to season, so had the Communist "line."

This analogy was not the only use made of vivid and figurative language. Terms such as "poison," "bloody hands," "ruthless," "power-hungry," "wild charges," "parrot the cliché," "sweetness and light," and "peace of the prison or the tomb" were used to add color and vividness to his presentation. These emotionally toned words and phrases added emphasis to his arguments. He further emphasized his ideas through the use of metaphoric passages. That is to say, words were removed from their normal setting and significance

and placed into another realm for comparison and emphasis.[1]

The following metaphors were used in this address:

(1) Those who have plunged millions into darkness are now all sweetness and light. . . . ,
(2) But they are stirring up trouble in the . . . ,
(3) That is why they are so desperately trying to stamp out religion in the countries . . . ,
(4) . . . so that the fear of atomic war can be removed from the face of the earth. . . . ,
(5) They are always glad to rope in the woolly minded and self deluded . . . , and
(6) In 1929 Stalin reversed the field again, wiped out private enterprise . . .

Thus the use of vivid and figurative language added emotional impact to the ideas presented. A particular feature of this speech was the use of an analogy which centered around a comparison of the "new look" in fashions and the actions of the Communist Party.

In summary, it should be concluded that Nixon's American Legion Convention Address contained definate stylistic patterns. The predominant elements of style were vivid and figurative language, the parallel structure, the rhetorical question, aspects of concreteness, and the quality of directness.

Summary

1. Nixon's first speech as a candidate for re-election was delivered before the thirty-eighth National Convention of the American Legion. The meeting was held in the Shrine Auditorium in Los Angeles, California on September 6, 1956. His immediate audience consisted of

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 420.

approximately 5,000 Legionnaires.

2. The analysis of arrangement revealed that a logical method of development was used. This logical method followed closely the problem-solution order. It was further noted that the presentation contained the Aristotelian four part order of introduction, statement of case, proof, and peroration.

3. In the analysis of logical proof, it was noted that Nixon employed both the inductive and deductive process. The third argument was developed deductively employing the categorical syllogism. In the other three arguments, the generalizations were developed inductively through sub-arguments.

4. The analysis of invention noted that Nixon relied extensively on information and example as evidence in this address. Information was used to support particularly the first argument. In this case, a number of facts were used to substantiate the contentions forwarded in the argument. Although the example was used to support the speech as a whole, Argument 3 was supported exclusively by this type of evidence. Comparison and contrast and testimony were used but to a lesser degree.

5. Nixon used the appeal to emotional proofs extensively in this presentation. He appealed primarily to the motives of loyalty and reputation and fair play. The motive of loyalty was used in the introduction, Argument 2, and the conclusion. The appeals to reputation and fair play were

advanced almost exclusively in Argument 4.

6. Nixon established ethical appeal primarily by focusing attention on the probity of his character and establishing good will with the audience. The appeal to the probity of character was found throughout the speech as a whole.

7. The noteworthy features of style contained in this speech were directness, concreteness, rhetorical question, parallel structure, and vivid and figurative language. Of interest was the analogy between the "new look" in women's fashions and the actions of the Communist "line."

CHAPTER VI

THE CAMPAIGN SPEECH AT GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA

In the campaign of 1956, there emerged a "new Nixon."[1] As the campaign progressed, the emergence of this "new Nixon" warranted a great deal of news comment. For example, the Christian Science Monitor wrote, "Mr. Nixon says nothing to evoke memories of the '52 and '54 campaigns."[2] The New York Herald Tribune noticed that "the Vice-President's electioneering tactics have changed to an unusual extent."[3] And the Washington Sunday Star summarized, "Mr. Nixon, in a word, has become subtle in his attacks."[4] This change will be discussed more completely in Chapter IX of this study. It should be noted at this time, however, that there were significant indications of this change in campaign tactics in this address. The tone of the change can be noted in Nixon's comment in the Gettysburg speech concerning personal attacks when he stated, "I do not intend to--I don't believe that any of us should--reply in kind with personal attacks on the integrity of our opponents in the campaign." Thus, Nixon him-

---

[1]Barnet Baskerville, op. cit., p. 41.

[2]Christian Science Monitor, October 3, 1956.

[3]New York Herald Tribune, September 25, 1956.

[4]Washington Sunday Star, September 25, 1956.

self suggested that he was not going to engage in the invective he had in previous campaigns. The extent of this change will be discussed fully later in this study.

It is the purpose of this chapter to present a rhetorical analysis of Nixon's Gettysburg speech delivered at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, September 12, 1956. The analysis will begin with a discussion of the setting. This will be followed by an analysis of the speech itself in terms of the canons of arrangement, invention, and style.

The Immediate Setting

The Republican Party planned the official kick-off for the 1956 campaign at President Eisenhower's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania farm. Two large tents were erected on the front lawn of the farm to accommodate the audience.[1] The audience consisted of members of Eisenhower's cabinet and 500 Republican leaders from across the forty-eight states as well as approximately 200 newsmen who were there to cover the official kick-off of the campaign.[2] The majority of those attending this function came from Washington, D. C. by chartered bus.

Prior to the festivities, President Eisenhower conducted a special tour of the farm for Mr. Nixon and Mr. Hall. The corps of newsmen took that opportunity to take pictures for their respective periodicals. When the short tour had

---

[1] Gettysburg Times, September 13, 1956, p. 1.

[2] New York Times, September 13, 1956, p. 23.

concluded, the party convened and proceeded to the picnic tent which was the smaller of the two tents.

The picnic was prepared by the Hotel Gettysburg.[1] The size of the audience forced the hotel manager, Henry Scharf, to enlist the aid of relatives and friends of his hotel staff to act as kitchen help and bus boys for the festivities. The menu under each place setting at the picnic table read, 'Republican Campaign 'kick-off' at Gettysburg, Pennsylvania, Wednesday, September 12, 1956--a Pennsylvania picnic supper."[2] For the picnic, the party was served:

> Fried chicken, home-baked beans, celery hearts and pickles, cold roast beef, cold baked ham, Switzer cheese, potato salad, cold slaw, home grown tomatoes, pickled eggs, pickled beets, assorted rolls, coffee, and G. O. P. ice cream and cake.[3]

For the addresses of Richard Nixon and Dwight Eisenhower, the audience was gathered in the large tent. The party members were seated informally around small tables within the tent. The speaker's platform was located at one end. President Eisenhower and Vice-President Nixon were seated on the right side of the temporary platform and Mrs. Eisenhower and Mrs. Nixon sat together opposite them.[4] According to the New York Times, the crowd of 500 was extremely demonstrative as Richard Nixon presented the first address.[5] They interrupted his speech with applause on a number of

---

[1] Gettysburg Times, September 13, 1956, p. 1.

[2] New York Times, September 13, 1956, p. 22.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid., p. 23. [5] Ibid., p. 1.

occasions. A speech by President Eisenhower which followed that of the Vice-President, expressed the desire that the Republican campaigners work diligently to insure that all qualified voters exercise their voting rights.[1] He further expressed the hope that the independent voters as well as some Democrats could be converted to the Republican Party.[2] In the speech, Eisenhower also stressed the responsibility the audience had toward "setting the record straight" when any falsehoods arose.[3] The speeches delivered at this Republican function were not carried on radio or television.

Arrangement

The following is an outline of the address delivered by Nixon at the Republican kick-off on Dwight D. Eisenhower's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania farm. The major divisions of the outline will be indicated, whenever possible, in Nixon's own words. His words will be noted by the use of quotation marks.

Outline

I. Introduction: May I first express on behalf of all of us who are guests today what we feel in our hearts--a very deep appreciation for inviting us to your farm for this wonderful occasion. May I say that I am very proud to be a member of this Administration. It has a splendid record, and I believe that re-electing President Eisenhower and a Republican House and Senate, is in the best interests of the American people.

II. Statement of case: "I think since this is a working ses-

---

[1] New York Times, September 13, 1956, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 22. [3] Ibid.

occasions. A speech by President Eisenhower which followed that of the Vice-President, expressed the desire that the Republican campaigners work diligently to insure that all qualified voters exercise their voting rights.[1] He further expressed the hope that the independent voters as well as some Democrats could be converted to the Republican Party.[2] In the speech, Eisenhower also stressed the responsibility the audience had toward "setting the record straight" when any falsehoods arose.[3] The speeches delivered at this Republican function were not carried on radio or television.

Arrangement

The following is an outline of the address delivered by Nixon at the Republican kick-off on Dwight D. Eisenhower's Gettysburg, Pennsylvania farm. The major divisions of the outline will be indicated, whenever possible, in Nixon's own words. His words will be noted by the use of quotation marks.

Outline

I. Introduction: May I first express on behalf of all of us who are guests today what we feel in our hearts--a very deep appreciation for inviting us to your farm for this wonderful occasion. May I say that I am very proud to be a member of this Administration. It nas a splendid record, and I believe that re-electing President Eisenhower and a Republican House and Senate, is in the best interests of the American people.

II. Statement of case: "I think since this is a working ses-

---

[1] New York Times, September 13, 1956, p. 1.

[2] Ibid., p. 22. [3] Ibid.

sion and not a session in which we are here simply to praise ourselves, that it would be well for me perhaps to talk to you very frankly about what I visualize is our responsibility in this campaign, and particularly my own responsibility in my campaign activities."

III. Proof:

A. (Argument 1) We should meet the personal attacks on the President and the attacks on the Administration.

1. We should not "reply in kind with personal attacks on the integrity of our opponents in this campaign."

2. We should set the record straight when our opponents engage in misrepresentation and distortion of the Administration's accomplishments.

3. we should insure that the American people are given the facts "in order that they may make an intelligent decision at the polls."

B. (Argument 2) we "should debate foreign policy" in this campaign.

1. The Administration's record has brought peace and prestige to the United States.

2. Foreign policy is tremendously important "because of the great dangers in the world today."

3. Great Presidents such as Dwight D. Eisenhower believe in nonpartisan foreign policy.

4. we should not attack the problem of Communism at home as a partisan issue.

C. (Argument 3) We should set the record straight on the issue of prosperity in the United States.

1. We can compare the Administration's record on prosperity with the record established in 1948.

2. We should give the American public the facts concerning the status of the American worker.

3. "We are proud of the fact that our interest is in the people as individuals and not as

classes and masses."

4. "We are proud that we offer a forward looking program in fields of health, education, and welfare that will work."

D. (Argument 4) "We should have idealism, idealism in political leadership."

1. We should point out the fallacy of our opponent's idealism.

2. We can "compare the moral standards of the Eisenhower Administration to the Truman Administration."

3. We should point out "that President Eisenhower has restored dignity and respect to the highest office in the land."

IV. Peroration: We can be immensely proud of our President and his leadership. No man is more revered in the world. Ours is a noble cause because we have so much to fight for to win and so much to lose if we fail. I say let's set as our objectives getting the magnificent story of this Administration to every home in America. Let's see that no door bell remains unrung between now and November 6th.

Method of Arrangement

In general terms, the plan of development employed in this address was the distributive method. In other words, items having a common thought center and obvious connection were loosely grouped within specific sections. It can be said that the framework of the distributive method was apparent. Nixon, however, appeared to be inconsistent in the course of the address. The inconsistency stemmed from Nixon's repetition of a theme as a transitional device. This theme was established in the first argument when Nixon concerned himself with the means of handling the personal attacks on the President and the Administration. Then, throughout the

remainder of the address, the idea of personal attacks was repeated as a manner of moving from one thought to another. In this way, Nixon discussed the attacks on the specific policies of the Administration such as foreign policy, domestic policy (prosperity), and Eisenhower's political idealism. In this situation, then, the distributive method was employed correctly, although it was somewhat confused by the repetition of a theme used as a transitional device. This transitional device will be discussed in more detail later in the analysis.

Parts

The introduction of the presentation was extremely brief. In it, Nixon attempted to gain the attention and arouse the interest of the audience through an attempt at semi-related humor. He said:

> As a matter of fact, I have only one complaint, and it's personal. I knew that the President's farm would be quite unusual and a little different, and a little better, I would think, than any other, but I will admit your farm, like all other farms, is bad for those of us who have hay fever.

After this attempt at humor, Nixon then immediately stated that his purpose for speaking on that occasion was to outline the responsibility of the party as well as his personal responsibility in the campaign. Thus the introduction was brief and attempted to gain the attention of the audience through the use of humor.

Nixon's statement of the case was clear and to the point. It indicated that he was going to visualize the party's responsibility as well as his own responsibility in

the campaign. It also indicated the areas which he considered important to the success of the campaign.

As was noted in the discussion of the method of arrangement, Nixon used the repetition of a theme as a transitional device to link the arguments of the presentation. The theme was taken from the first argument and was used by Nixon throughout all of the arguments. He began to develop this theme in Argument 1 when he posed the rhetorical question, "What should we do about attacks on this Administration?" He then indicated that he was going to concern himself with only certain issues when he stated:

> Now there isn't time, of course, to discuss all the issues about which we are going to be talking during this campaign. But I would like to give you some examples of what I mean.

Examples of just what he meant were introduced through the repetition of the theme of personal attacks on the Administration and concerned the areas of foreign policy, prosperity, and political idealism. This connective, as used in Argument 2, enabled Nixon to develop the issue of the Administration's foreign policy when he stated:

> We heard over and over again for the past few weeks--as a matter of fact, for the past few months--that there is no peace in the United States.

Again in Argument 3, he offered a personal attack as a transitional device. He held:

> You have also heard there is no real prosperity in the United States in addition to the 'fact' that we have no peace.

Nixon then discussed the scope of the prosperity offered by the Administration's domestic policies. In the last argu-

ment, Nixon used as his entrance into the discussion of Eisenhower's philosophy of idealism, the statement:

> I think that perhaps the most ridiculous claim is that this Administration is shot through with crookedness and corruption.

Thus the repetition of the theme of personal attacks on the Administration was used as a transitional device. It served as an effective means of moving from one idea to another and it also unified the speech.

Within the speech, Nixon's movement from one instance to another was not as smooth as his transitions from argument to argument. As was indicated in the previous speech analyzed, Nixon seemed to have an affinity for the use of personal transitional phrases as, "Let us debate," "We call that," "May I say," "I have noted," and "May I conclude." He also had a fondness for the use of connective words whenever he was not using the personal type of transition.

Nixon's short conclusion incorporated two Aristotelian functions. First, he attempted to arouse the emotions of his audience, particularly to action, when he outlined important responsibilities in the coming campaign. Secondly, he emotionally summarized in general terms, the accomplishments he had implied the Administration had achieved. The motive appeals contained in the conclusion will be more fully discussed later in this chapter in the section on emotional proofs.

It should be noted that Nixon used the distributive method of development in this speech. His introduction employed humor to gain the attention and arouse the interest

of the audience. The statement of the case was clear and to the point. In the proof, Nixon used the repetition of the theme of attacks on the Administration as a means of moving from one argument to another. And the peroration was directed toward emotionally arousing the audience to action.

Invention

The analysis of invention will be developed through the study of logical, emotional, and ethical proofs.

Logical Proofs

From the analysis of arrangement of materials in the Gettysburg Speech, it was found that four arguments were used to develop the proof. Each of these arguments will be analyzed individually.

> Argument 1: We should meet the personal attacks on the President and the attacks on the Administration.

The inductive pattern of reasoning was used in Argument 1.[1] In this inductive pattern, three lines of argument were forwarded and they in turn led to the generalization stated as Argument 1. These lines of argument were:

1. We should not reply in kind with personal attacks on the integrity of our opponents in this campaign.
2. We should set the record straight when our opponents engage in misrepresentation and distortion of the Administration's accomplishments.
3. The American people should be given the facts in order that they may make an intelligent decision at the polls.

---

[1] Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

Each of the three statements appeared to terminate logically in the conclusion that "we should meet the personal attacks on the President and the Administration." Not all of the instances, however, were strictly consistent with the argument. The first line of argument was somewhat incongruent since the idea that "we should not reply in kind with personal attacks on the integrity of our opponents in this campaign" did not substantiate the argument that "we should meet the personal sttacks on the President and the Administration." In this statement, Nixon appeared to be ignoring the question and actually stating negatively what the party should not do. It seemed to be motivated by Nixon's response to what others in the party had voiced as a possible stratagem on this issue. He urged:

> Now, there are those--and among them those who want us to win--who say we should ignore them, pay no attention. There are others who say we should go to the other extreme--that we should attack the other side, and particularly the candidates on the other side.

This negative approach in the first line of argument appeared to be caused by a need to clarify his personal position on the issue of attacking the integrity of the opposition, since there was a difference of opinion on the policy to be followed during the campaign. In this light, then, it was relevant and indirectly led to the conclusion stated as Argument 1.

> Argument 2: We should debate foreign policy in this campaign.

The reasoning process as presented in this argument,

as in Argument 1, was inductive.[1] The method of inference was generalization from specific instances. In the argument, Nixon actually reasoned from four general assumptions to the ultimate generalization stated as Argument 2. These assumptions were:

1. The Administration's record has brought peace and prestige to the United States.
2. Foreign policy is tremendously important because of the great dangers in the world today.
3. Great Presidents such as Dwight D. Eisenhower believe in nonpartisan foreign policy.
4. We should not attack the problem of Communism at home as a partisan policy.

These assertions were representative and appeared to lead logically to the argument. There was some confusion, however, between the establishment of the argument that "we should debate the issue of foreign policy" and the idea of how the issue should be debated. The first generalization, for example, did not explain why they should debate foreign policy but rather it stated the record of the Administration on the foreign scene. Of course, the fact that Nixon inferred that the party should be proud of the Administration's foreign policy in itself revealed the reason why it should be debated.

The second assumption contributed directly to the generalization. That is, the fact that foreign policy was tremendously important because of existing dangers in the world, could, in fact, be a reason for debating the issue

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

in the campaign. There was somewhat of a deviation in the third generalization in that Nixon clarified the Administration's policy on the foreign issue and stated how it should be discussed. Finally, the fourth assumption was a complete deviation since it did not discuss the foreign policy but was rather a clarification of an entirely different issue; that of Communism on the domestic scene. Nixon himself stipulated the departure of this situation as "a related problem, the problem of Communism at home." The manner in which Communism on the domestic scene was related to the generalizations forwarded in the argument previously could not be ascertained from the content of the address. The only possible explanation was that Nixon felt that the Communists were responsible for the dangers enumerated in the second assumption. Perhaps in that manner, the assumption was related. It should be concluded, though, that the general assumptions in Argument 2 were not completely consistent with the generalization stated as Argument 2.

Argument 3: We should set the record straight on the issue of prosperity in the United States.

For the third time in this presentation, Nixon relied on the inductive reasoning process.[1] And, as in the previous two arguments, Nixon's mode of inference was from several lines of argument. In this argument, the four lines of argument appeared to terminate in the generalization listed as Argument 3. These lines of argument were:

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

1. We can compare the Administration's record on prosperity with the record established in 1948.

2. We should give the American public the facts concerning the status of the American worker.

3. We are proud of the fact that our interest is in people as individuals and not as classes and masses.

4. We are proud that we offer a forward looking program in fields of health, education, and welfare that will work.

Each of these lines of argument dealt directly with the issue of prosperity and the Administration's part in it. There were not the apparent inconsistencies in this argument that there were present in the previous arguments discussed.

Argument 4: We should have idealism, idealism in political leadership.

As in the previous arguments, the reasoning process used in Argument 4 was the inductive method.[1] In this argument, the generalization was inferred from an analogy.[2] In the argument, the analogy embodied a comparison of the Democratic and Republican Administrations. There were three elements in the formation of the analogy. These elements were:

1. We should point out the fallacy of our opponent's idealism.

2. We can compare the moral standards of the Eisenhower Administration to the Truman Administration.

3. We should point out that President Eisenhower has restored dignity and respect to the highest office in the land.

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 349.

The first element depicting the fallacies contained in the opponent's idealism noting a negative side of idealism. The second element compared directly the Eisenhower and Truman Administrations with emphasis on moral standards. And the final division depicted the positive side of the analogy which was embodied in the Eisenhower Administration and the result of this positive idealism. This comparison was undertaken between the two administrations in an attempt to furnish the obvious conclusion that the Administration "should have idealism, idealism in political leadership."

Nixon relied on the inductive pattern of reasoning in the four arguments of the speech. In the first three arguments, the generalization was inferred from various lines of argument. In Argument 4, the generalization was inferred through the use of an analogy.

Forms of Support

Within the arguments of this presentation, Nixon did not use a great number of forms of support. The analysis will be concerned with the following forms of support: information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony.[1]

Information: There were only three instances of the use of factual or statistical data used independently of the other forms of support in this address. The information used in the other forms of support will be discussed under the appropriate headings. In the introduction, Nixon

---

[1]Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 117.

cited his first fact when he referred to the anticipated tour he and his wife were going to take. This tour was "going to take us fifteen thousand miles and into thirty-two states." This fact was not used to substantiate an argument, but merely to indicate the extent of the first campaign tour planned by Mr. Nixon.

The actual use of factual information within the proof occurred in Argument 3 when Nixon referred to the fact that the United States had "65 million American workers." He immediately corrected himself with the statement, "I understand the President said, 'It's now 67 million' so I now correct myself." This citation of the number of workers employed in the United States at that time was the only use of statistical or factual data to be found within the arguments of the Gettysburg Speech.

The third use of factual information occurred in the conclusion. On that occasion, Nixon referred to his extensive travel, as he had in the two addresses previously analyzed. He stated, "I know because I have traveled and visited thirty-two countries in the past three and one-half years." Thus, it should be noted that Nixon relied on the use of the form of support of information as evidence to a very minor extent.

Example: Nixon did not use the example independently as a form of support in this presentation. He did, however, use the example as defined in Chapter I in developing another form of support, that of comparison and contrast.

Comparison and contrast: The use of this form of support predominated in this address. Nixon used this form of support in each argument of the proof and it appeared to be his major means of substantiating his ideas. In the majority of the instances when this type of evidence was used, Nixon attempted to discredit the opposition. He did this in two ways. First, he discredited the opposition's ability to make an accurate appraisal of the American political situation. This was especially true when Nixon contrasted examples to show that the opposition was incapable of judging foreign policy and prosperity. Secondly, he discredited the opposition's actions and motives in the campaign when he compared the opponent's contradictory statements. In the proof, Nixon compared and contrasted these ideas and situations on six occasions. The paragraphs in the proof which contained this comparison and contrast as evidence read:

(1) We have heard over and over again for the past few weeks--as a matter of fact, the past few months--that there is no peace in the United States, that our foreign policy has failed and our prestige is at an all-time low. . . ,

All I can say is this: It may not be surprising that those who defend an Administration which never recognized there was a war in Korea may not know the difference between war and peace. . . . ,

(2) You have also heard there is no real prosperity in the United States, in addition to the 'fact' that we have no peace. I would suggest those who bragged, as they did in 1948, 'You've never had it so good,' when there were twice as many unemployed in America as there are today, may not be the best judge of whether there is prosperity or not in the United States. . . . ,

And just to keep the record straight, let's let our position be known on this issue. First, we

> believe that casualty lists are too high a price to pay for prosperity. And second, we are proud that 65,000,000 American workers have the highest wages. The biggest wages, the highest take home pay, the greatest security that Americans have ever had at any time in our history.
>
> We call that prosperity and we have it. . . . ,
>
> (3) But I would suggest this also: That for a candidate for the Presidency of the United States to suggest one day that we're 'losing the cold war' and the next day that we might get rid of the draft at a time when our NATO friends are trying to meet their quota for our common defense, is the height of political fakery and irresponsibility. . . . ,
>
> (4) We hear this Administration, incidentally, has no interest in the problems of the people. And we've heard over and over again that we're for the rich, and against the poor; that we're against little business.
>
> Well, this is my answer to that: We're proud of the fact that our interest is in the people as individuals and not as classes and masses. . . . ,
>
> (5) We are also proud of the fact that we offer a forward looking program in the fields of health, education, and welfare that will work--instead of a cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky for political purposes that will not work. . . . , and
>
> (6) And I have noted, as you may have, that the statement of our opponent yesterday when he spoke of the fact--and I think I am quoting this accurately--that he had spoken out all over the country, from one end to the other, in support of the Supreme Court decision on schools and segregation.
>
> I would not question his integrity, his good intention. But I think it would be well to point this out: It is unfortunate that he spoke softly on this issue in Chicago and that his own party's platform which he accepted rejected that Supreme Court decision and refused to endorse it.

These examples of comparison and contrast contained a significant feature which should be noted. In his use of this type of evidence, Nixon was not comparing facts or statistics. In only one of the examples did he attempt to forward a fact. In that instance, he talked about unemployment and compared it to the level of unemployment in 1948 when he suggested that there 'were twice as many unemployed in

America then as there are today." Nixon then compared a portion of the Eisenhower Administration's record to this single fact.

In the other situations, Nixon was merely answering the opponent's allegations with allegations of his own or emotional condemnations. In the fourth example above, Nixon answered the opposition's criticism with the simple assertion "we are proud of the fact that our interest is in the people as individuals and not as classes and masses." And the following example contrasted the "forward looking program" of the Eisenhower Administration with the "cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky for political purposes" program of the opposition. Here again, the contrast was in the form of a simple allegation by Nixon which did not contain further substantiation or clarification. It should be noted, then, that although Nixon used the form of support of comparison and contrast extensively in the presentation, he was not comparing factual information. For the most part, he was merely answering allegation with allegation.

Testimony: Nixon did not rely heavily on the use of this form of support as evidence. It was used on only two occasions in this speech. Testimony occurred in Argument 4 and the conclusion. In Argument 4, Nixon relied on testimony as evidence to substantiate his contention that Eisenhower had restored dignity and respect to the office of the presidency. Nixon cited:

> We can be proud of the fact as General Kilpatrick pointed out, that President Eisenhower has restored

> dignity and self respect to the highest office in the land.

Nixon then used his own personal testimony in the conclusion to point out that Eisenhower's leadership was revered throughout the world. He related:

> We can be immensely proud of our President and his leadership. No man is more revered and respected in the world. I know because I have traveled and visited thirty-two countries in the past three and a half years.

The use of testimony in these two instances attempted to point out and substantiate Eisenhower's prestige on the domestic and foreign scenes.

It should be concluded that Nixon did use forms of support as evidence in this presentation, particularly the form of support of comparison and contrast. His use of these forms of support was not, however, backed by factual or statistical information and in many instances the comparison and contrasts were merely assertions by Nixon. The form of support, therefore, should not be termed complete evidence in this address.

Emotional Appeals

Emotional appeals will be discussed in the Gettysburg Speech in terms of motive appeals. The analysis will include an identification and discussion of the emotions arising from the motive appeals. Of the motive appeals noted in Chapter I, the most pertinent to this address were the appeals to reputation and duty.

Reputation and duty: The Gettysburg Speech embodied

a particular feature which the other addresses did not contain. The speech was primarily an emotional appeal to reputation and duty. The motive appeal to reputation and duty can best be understood when the occasion of the address is kept in mind. The address was not carried on radio or television. It was directed specifically at the approximately 500 key members of the Republican campaign organization from all parts of the United States as well as to newsmen covering the event. It was not unusual, therefore, for the major proof of the presentation to be emotional and that the appeal should be directed to the motives of reputation and duty. The appeal to reputation was embodied in the fact that the people in the audience were members of the party supporting the Eisenhower Administration which had been in office for four years. The appeal to duty was embodied in the fact that they, as party members, had the responsibility of informing the people of the "superb record of the Eisenhower Administration in the coming campaign."

The first appeal to reputation and duty appeared in the introduction of the speech. Nixon immediately related the feeling he had toward the Eisenhower record and his duty in the coming campaign. He followed this account of his personal responsibility with an appeal to the duty of the party and the audience in the campaign. The statements in the introduction containing this motive appeal read:

(1) First of all, may I say that I'm very proud to be a member of this Administration. It has a splendid record, and I believe that re-electing President Eisenhower and a Republican House and Senate is in

> the best interests of the American people. I consider it a privilege to tell what we have done in the last three and a half years and to paint, as well as I can, the great promise our leadership offers for the future. . . . , and
>
> (2) That is the primary responsibility that I have had that all Republicans have in this campaign--to follow the tone and the note that the President so well laid out for us in his great acceptance speech in San Francisco.

The motive appeals to the motives of reputation and duty in the introduction set the emotional tone of the speech.

In the proof, Nixon continued the appeals to reputation and duty. First, the motive of reputation was centered in Nixon's constant depiction of the quality of the Eisenhower Administration's record. In the portrayal of the "splendid record," Nixon implied that condemnation of the record of the Administration could only be accomplished by misrepresentation and distortion. Secondly, the motive of duty was embodied in the fact that the so-called "misrepresentation and distortion" should be challenged by some audiences and, therefore, it was important for speakers to "keep the record straight." The following paragraphs indicate the manner in which Nixon appealed to these motives:

> (1) I think that when misrepresentation and distortion of the Administration's accomplishments are engaged in by our opponents, it is our responsibility to set the record straight whenever we have an opportunity.
>
> There is a very practical reason for doing this:
>
> You don't win campaigns with a diet of dishwater and milk toast, but there is a more fundamental reason, and it is this:
>
> In our history we have had several great Presidents. Some of them have been Republicans and some of them have been Democrats. It seems that the American people have usually had a sense of what the nation needs in leadership, but the people of the United States, in order to make an intelligent deci-

sion at the polls, have to know the facts.

And where misstatement is repeated over and over again without any answer, it eventually is believed as the truth. So I say that we would be shirking our responsibility to the nation if we failed to point out such misrepresentation whenever it occurs. . . . ,

(2) We heard over and over again for the past few weeks--as a matter of fact, for the past few months--that there is no peace in the United States, that our foreign policy has failed and our prestige is at an all-time low.

All I can say about this is:

It may not be surprising that those who defend an administration which never recognized there was a war in Korea may not know the difference between war and peace.

But believe me--believe me--the American people do. They know the difference and they like an administration which got us out of one war, kept us out of others, and gives the best promise for leadership which will keep the peace in the future. . . . ,

(3) And just remember this: That all of our great Presidents in the field of foreign policy have been Americans first, and Republicans and Democrats second. And President Eisenhower is cast in that mold, believe me. . . . ,

(4) We are also proud of the fact that we offer a forward looking program in the fields of health, education, and welfare that will work--instead of a cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky for political purposes that will never work. . . . , and

(5) I think perhaps the most ridiculous claim is that this Administration is shot through with crookedness and corruption. And all I can say on that--we'll be glad to compare the moral standards of the Eisenhower Administration to the Truman Administration anytime of the day or night.

Nobody has a monoply on morality, or honesty or loyalty. We know that, but the test of an administration is what you do when a breach of trust is brought to your attention. We can be proud of the fact as General Kilpatrick pointed out, that President Eisenhower has restored dignity and respect to the highest office in this land.

And I can assure you that never has a breach of trust been defended or condoned by him as President of the United States--and as long as he is President it never will be.

In the conclusion of the Gettysburg Speech, Nixon again combined the motives of reputation and duty. The entire conclusion was an appeal to these two motives. He

began with a summary of the prestige and accomplishments of the party and highlighted its great duty and responsibility in the campaign as he stated:

> We can be immensely proud of our President and his leadership. No man is more revered or respected in the world. I know because I have traveled and visited thirty-two countries in the past three and one half years. Now the man who led the greatest armies in history to victory in Washington in 1953, is leading the most massive assult on misery, poverty, disease and hate that the world has ever seen.
>
> He deserves four more years to complete this task and he deserves a Congress that will help him do it. So let's give him what he deserves.
>
> Ours is a noble cause because we have so much to fight for to win and so much to lose if we fail.
>
> There isn't any easy way to win the campaign. What wins it is work at the precinct levels--this doorbell ringing that you have been talking about. I say let's set as our objective getting the magnificent story of this administration to every home in America. Let's see that no doorbell remains unrung between now and November sixth.
>
> I can pledge to you that every waking moment between now and then I shall be devoted to this cause. I know you, too, will be just as devoted.

Throughout the extensive appeals to the motives of reputation and duty, two of the emotions of the audience were particularly affected. These were the emotions of pride and confidence. The appeals affected the emotion of pride in that the audience was part of the Republican Administration which had established a "splendid record." Nixon alleged that the record of the Eisenhower Administration embodied such accomplishments as establishing peace, bringing prosperity to America, and exhibiting genuine interest for the welfare of the people. The zenith of party pride, according to Nixon, was to be found in the party's leader, President Eisenhower. Nixon stated that Eisenhower was "cast in the

mold" of all great presidents. The same elements which were a source of pride for the audience also were a source of confidence. Nixon continually pointed out that the audience could have confidence in the "superb record" established by the Administration, particularly since the American people would recognize the fact that the Eisenhower Administration offered "the best promise for leadership" for the future. Thus the appeals affected the emotions of pride and confidence in the audience. By actual count, twenty-two of the forty-four paragraphs of the speech were devoted to the motive appeals of reputation and duty. In appealing to these motives, the primary emotions affected were those of confidence and pride. The preponderance of emotional appeals in this address appeared to be directed at arousing the party members to action for the coming campaign.

Ethical Appeals

It was difficult in this address to separate ethical and emotional appeals distinctly. Many of the motive appeals to reputation were at the same time ethical appeals. Particularly in the cases where Nixon was attempting to discredit the opposition, the dual appeal was noted. He was appealing to the motive of reputation and also establishing the probity of his character. The motive appeal of reputation was also a means of establishing good will since the audience was mainly composed of Republicans. The major means of establishing ethical appeal, however, appeared to be through the establishment of Nixon's probity of character.

Good Will: The audience was favorably disposed toward Nixon at the outset of the speech and the numerous notations of the accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration undoubtedly aided in furthering the regard the audience already had for him. It has been pointed out that throughout the entire presentation, Nixon constantly appealed to the motive of reputation. Since the members of the audience represented the Republican Party, the motive appeals to reputation also served as a means of praise for themselves. In this manner, then, Nixon was building the good will of the audience. A means of gauging good will has been listed in Chapter I as "the ability to capture the proper balance between too much and too little praise of the audience."[1] The praise contained in the motive appeal to reputation, as has been previously discussed in this analysis, could satisfy this attribute of good will. The only question that might come to mind would center on the balance between "too much and too little praise." The entire speech embodied the motive appeal to reputation. The audience, being composed entirely of Republican dignitaries, would accept the praise as truth, and therefore, would not be disturbed by the fact that the speech was almost all praise. An enumeration of Nixon's praise of the Administration and its accomplishments can be noted in the following paragraphs:

(1) First of all, may I say that I am proud to be a member of this Administration. It has a splendid record, and I believe that re-electing President Eisenhower, and a Republican House and Senate, is

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

in the best interests of the American people. . . . ,

(2) But believe me--believe me--the American people do. They know the difference and they like an administration which got us out of one war, kept us out of others, and gives the best promise for leadership which will keep the peace in the future. . . . ,

(3) We're proud of the fact that our interest is in the people as individuals and not as classes and masses. . . . ,

(4) We are also proud of the fact that we offer a forward looking program in the fields of health, education, and welfare that will work . . . ,

(5) We can be immensely proud of our President and his leadership. . . . , and

(6) Ours is a noble cause because we have so much to fight for to win and so much to lose if we fail.

Thus, as has been stated, good will was established by praising the audience and the praise was closely associated with the motive appeal of reputation.

Character: A means of focusing attention on the probity of character has been described previously as occurring when the speaker associates "either himself or his message with what is virtuous or elevated."[1] It can also be accomplished by the speaker if he associates "the opponent or the opponent's cause with what is not virtuous."[2] While Nixon established the probity of his character in this address through these two means, they were closely interwoven, as has been indicated, with the motive appeals to reputation.

In the introduction of the address, Nixon related his task as the messenger of the virtuous or elevated record established by the Eisenhower Administration. Nixon continued to establish the probity of his character in the proof when

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387. [2]Ibid.

he attempted to discredit the motives of the opposition and to show that their cause was not virtuous. Not only did Nixon point out that the opposition lacked virtue, but he implied that they were also deceitful. He termed Stevenson's campaign statements as "the height of political fakery and irresponsibility." And he pointed out the inconsistency which existed between what Stevenson had said in a campaign speech on segregation and what the Democratic Party had stated as policy in their platform. Through these statements, Nixon was linking the opposition with unvirtuous motives. At the same time, he also pointed to the virtuous quality of his own cause and how it held the best promise for the future. The paragraphs in the proof which contained the elements contributing to the establishment of Nixon's probity of character read:

(1) It may not be surprising that those who defend an Administration which never recognized there was a war in Korea may not know the difference between war and peace.
    But believe me--believe me--the American people do. They know the difference and they like an administration which got us out of one war, kept us out of others, and gives the best promise for leadership which will keep the peace in the future. . . .,
(2) But I suggest also: That for a candidate for the Presidency of the United States to suggest one day that we're 'losing the cold war' and the next day that we might get rid of the draft at a time when our NATO friends are trying to meet their quota for our common defense, is the height of political fakery and irresponsibility. . . . .,
(3) We are also proud of the fact that we offer a forward looking program in the fields of health, education, and welfare that will work--instead of a cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky for political purposes that will never work. . . . , and
(4) And I have noted, as you may have, that the statement of our opponent yesterday when he spoke of the fact--and I think I am quoting this accurately--

> that he had spoken out all over the country, from one end to the other, in support of the Supreme Court decision on schools and segregation.
>
> I would not question his integrity, his good intentions: But I think it would be well to point this out: It is unfortunate that he spoke so softly on this issue in Chicago and that his own party's platform which he accepted, rejected that Supreme Court decision and refused to endorse it.

Intelligence: It was not possible to assess accurately from the content of the presentation the means of gauging the intelligence or sagacity of the speaker. Part of the difficulty was centered in the fact that the audience was favorably disposed toward Nixon. Because of this great rapport, much of what Nixon said could in some manner be referred to as common sense, tact, moderation, displaying a sense of good taste, or revealing a broad familiarity with the interests of the day.[1] Although these aspects cannot be clearly delineated, it should be stated that they appeared in a general way. Nixon took into consideration problems of importance in September of 1956. He considered in general terms such current problems as disarmament, segregation, and the economic situation of the day. His consideration of these problems revealed at least a familiarity with the interests of the day. From the content of the speech alone, however, it was not possible to ascertain all of the aspects contributing to Nixon's sagacity.

Style

The predominant elements of style in this speech were

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

directness, concreteness, restatement, and figurative language. Each of these elements of style will be analyzed individually in the order enumerated above.

Directness: A "we feeling" was established in this presentation, as in the previous speeches analyzed, through the use of personal pronouns such as "I," "we," "you," "us," and "our." All but one of the forty-five paragraphs in the presentation contained at least one personal pronoun. There were a total of 195 such pronouns. Of these, forty-eight were "I's," forty were "we's," and eighteen were "our's." It should be noted that there were more "I's" in this speech than in the others analyzed.

Another factor contributing to the conversational tone of the speech was the use of short sentences and paragraphs. All of the paragraphs contained no more than four sentences. The sentences averaged between fourteen and sixteen words.

A final factor contributing to the directness and conversational quality was Nixon's use of conversational quality was Nixon's use of conversational elements such as contractions rather than formal speech. He used the contractions "don't," "we're," "let's," and "I'm." These contractions together with the short paragraphs and sentences and the personal pronouns enhanced the directness and the conversational tone of this speech.

Concreteness: In this presentation, Nixon used some of the elements which contribute to concreteness. He referred

to such individual names as "President Eisenhower," "Len Hall," "Mr. Stevenson," "Alger Hiss," and "Mr. Truman." He referred to such specific places as "San Francisco," "Washington D. C.," and "President's farm." He also referred to general classes of people such as "Republicans," "Americans," "Administration," and "Democrats." There were very few references to specific dates, general statistics, illustrations, or quotations. He did quote Stevenson on one occasion as saying, "losing the cold war," and Truman on another as saying, "you've never had it so good." Beyond these two instances, there were only minor references to statistics such as the fact that the United States had "67,000,000" people employed and that he himself was going to travel "15,000 miles and cover thirty-two states" in the two weeks following the speech.

Even with the elements which contribute to concreteness, however, there was also an element of vagueness in the presentation. The speech contained abstractions, some of which actually came from the elements which would normally contribute to concreteness. For example, in Argument 2 when Nixon discussed the foreign policy, he did not state specifically what the policy was. This was also true in the case of his reference to "peace and prosperity." He did not specify what peace and prosperity embodied. In answer to these problems of foreign policy and peace and prosperity, Nixon offered generalities and vague assertions. He offered vague statements concerning the status of pros-

perity such as "high wages," "great security," and "forward looking program." He stated these as fact without elaborating or explaining specifically what these items were or what they meant.

In addition to these generalities, Nixon also forwarded abstract phrases such as "cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky," "the height of political fakery and irresponsibility," and "a diet of dishwater and milk toast."

These phrases contained a great deal of imagery, but at the same time, they were quite abstract. The speech, then, was somewhat vague even with the inclusion of a number of elements which contributed to concreteness. This degree of abstraction, however, added to the emotional tone of the presentation.

Restatement: Nixon used the technique of restatement to emphasize and clarify his ideas. This technique was used on eight occasions in this comparatively short address. Its extensive use would seem to indicate that Nixon was concerned with underscoring the importance of his statements. The use of restatement was not confined to any specific part of the speech. It was employed throughout the entire address. The eight statements in which this device was used read as follows:

(1) what should we do--what should I do . . . ,

(2) . . . I do not intend to--I don't believe that any of us should--reply in kind with personal attacks . . . ,

(3) We heard over and over again for the past few weeks--as a matter of fact, for the past few months--that there is no peace . . . ,

(4) But believe me--believe me--the American people . . . ,
(5) May I say, too, that we should have idealism--idealism in campaign--idealism in political leadership. . . . ,
(6) And I have noted, as you may have, that the statement of our opponent yesterday when he spoke of the fact--and I think I am quoting him accurately--that he had . . . , and
(7) What wins it is work at the precinct level--this doorbell ringing that you have been talking about.

In the sixth example above, Nixon used the device of restatement twice, once to emphasize the fact that all the audience may have heard the statement of the opponent and the other to clarify the accuracy of the statement being quoted. In all of the instances where the technique of restatement was employed, Nixon was attempting to emphasize or clarify a point that he was making. To that end, the device was quite effective. From the number of times and the manner in which it was used, it should be concluded that restatement was a distinct stylistic feature of this address.

Figurative language: The use of figurative language was in keeping with the over-all emotional tone of the address. The first use of figurative language occurred in the introduction as Nixon discussed his responsibility in the campaign:

> I consider it a privilege to tell what we have done in the last three and a half years and to paint, as well as I can, the great promise our leadership offers for the future.

Nixon used the word "paint" in an unusual manner. In this situation, it had literal meaning as well as definate suggestiveness and thus was used as a metaphor.

A metaphor was used again in Argument 1. Nixon used

a type of metaphor in the statement, "You don't win campaigns with a diet of dishwater and milk toast." Another metaphor occurred in Argument 2 when Nixon stated that "President Eisenhower is cast in that mold, believe me." This metaphor indicated that Eisenhower was cast in the mold of all great presidents. Thus the idea of the mold was used to describe mental faculties instead of physical attributes.

The final use of the metaphor occurred in the conclusion in the statement:

> Now the man who led the greatest armies in history to victory in World War II, who cleaned up the mess he found in Washington in 1953, is leading the most massive assault on misery, poverty, disease, and hate that the world has ever seen.

Nixon removed the ideas of "cleaned up the mess" and "massive assault" from their normal household and military contexts and used them to describe the Eisenhower Administration's efforts.

Two other figures were used by Nixon in this speech. These figures, sarcasm and irony, are closely associated with on another. That is, sarcasm is depicted as a figure "in which one contrary is signified by another; or in which we speak one thing and design another, in order to give the greater force and vehemence to our meaning."[1] Sarcasm is defined as being irony "in its superlative keeness and asperity."[2] The figures of irony and sarcasm occurred three times in the proof of the address. The paragraphs containing these figures read:

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 421. [2]Ibid.

(1) It may not be surprising that those who defend an administration which never recognized there was a war in Korea may not know the difference between war and peace. . . . ,

(2) But I would suggest this also: That for a candidate for the Presidency of the United States to suggest one day that we're 'losing the cold war' and the next day that we might get rid of the draft at a time when our NATO friends are trying to meet their quota for our common defense, is the height of political fakery and irresponsibility. . . . , and

(3) We are also proud of the fact that we offer a forward looking program in the fields of health, education, and welfare that will work--instead of a cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky for political purposes that will never work.

The figures contained in this speech although not used extensively, added impact to the over-all emotional tone of the presentation. The figures of sarcasm and irony were particularly effective because of the implied condemnation of the opposition that was inherent in each. The metaphors, on the other hand, aided in the portrayal of the elevated nature of the Eisenhower Administration.

Summary

1. The Gettysburg "kick-off" speech was delivered at President Eisenhower's farm in Gettysburg, Pennsylvania on September 12, 1956. The speech was not broadcast on either radio or television and the immediate audience consisted of approximately 500 Republican leaders from the forty-eight states.

2. It was determined from the analysis of arrangement that the primary method of development was the distributive method. The presentation contained the Aristotelian four part order of introduction, statement of case,

proof, and peroration. The introduction achieved the functions of gaining attention and arousing the interest of the audience. The peroration achieved the function of arousing the emotions of the audience to action.

3. It was noted in the analysis of logical proof, that Nixon used the inductive method in all of the arguments. The first three arguments were developed inductively through other lines of arguments. In Argument 4, the generalization was inferred through the use of an analogy.

4. The form of support of comparison and contrast was used extensively as evidence in the speech. It was found primarily in the proof. Although it was used as evidence, this support merely answered allegation with allegation. There was no attempt to contrast factual information. The forms of support of information, example, and testimony, however, were used only occasionally.

5. Nixon used emotional appeals extensively in this address. He appealed primarily to the motives of reputation and duty. These motives were found in twenty-two of the forty-five paragraphs of the address. Thus emotional proof was by far the major proof in this speech.

6. Nixon established ethical appeals by focusing attention on his probity of character and through the establishment of good will with the audience. These appeals were contained throughout the entire speech and were closely connected to the emotional proofs.

7. The most predominant stylistic elements in this

address were: directness, concreteness, restatement, and figurative language. In general, the elements of style noted contributed to the over-all emotional tone of the presentation. The figures used aided in the establishment of ethical proof, and restatement focused attention on specific ideas Nixon wanted emphasized. The analysis also revealed a degree of vagueness caused by the generalizations and assertions forwarded in the speech without proof or substantiation. Nixon, however, was able to establish a "we feeling" with the audience through the use of personal pronouns and informal language. Directness, therefore, appears to be a distinct feature of all of Nixon's presentations thus far.

CHAPTER VII

COLORADO SPRINGS ADDRESS

Not all of the news in the United States in September of 1956 concerned the political campaign. On the international level, the subject of disarmament was still a controversial issue. The Soviet Union was continuing to test nuclear weapons. The problem surrounding the control of the Suez Canal was newsworthy internationally. On the domestic scene, the economy of the nation was the largest news item. The number of employed in the United States reached 66,800,000. The economy in general reached a record level. On the campaign scene, Richard Nixon had started his first official tour of the campaign. One of the stops on this tour was a speech at Colorado Springs, Colorado. It is the purpose of this chapter to present a rhetorical analysis of Nixon's Colorado Springs Address delivered at Colorado Springs, Colorado on September 22, 1956. This chapter will include a description of the setting, an analysis of arrangement, an analysis of invention, and a discussion of style.

Immediate Setting

Richard Nixon delivered an address in Sioux City, Iowa on the afternoon of September 22, 1956.[1] He spoke be-

---

[1] Colorado Free Press, September 22, 1956.

fore an audience of approximately 4,000 people and the welcome he received in that town was considered by the corps of reporters following Nixon to be the most enthusiastic on the tour to that time.[1] Nixon left Sioux City, Iowa about mid-afternoon for his scheduled speech at Colorado Springs, Colorado that evening.

He arrived in Colorado Springs at approximately five o'clock on Saturday evening, September 22, 1956. Crowds that had welcomed him at previous cities on the tour were not present in Colorado Springs because of an abrupt storm. Despite the inclement weather, however, the auditorium at the Colorado Springs High School was filled to a capacity of approximately 1,500 persons.[2] The immediate audience at the high school auditorium was not Nixon's only audience for this address. His speech was carried over a three station television hook-up that covered the populated eastern half of the state.[3] It was also covered by radio and carried throughout the entire state as well as to areas in adjoining states. The address, thus, had a comparatively large potential audience. The immediate audience in the auditorium, according to newspaper reports the next day, appeared to be quite receptive to Nixon's address, and, one reporter related that the applause at the conclusion was long and hard.[4]

---

[1] Colorado Gazette Telegraph, September 22, 1956.

[2] New York Times, September 23, 1956, p. 21.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Colorado Free Press, September 23, 1956.

Arrangement

The following is an outline of Nixon's Colorado Springs Address. The introduction and peroration are a précis. An attempt has been made to use, whenever possible, Nixon's sentences to indicate the major divisions of the speech. His words have been set off by quotation marks.

Outline

I. Introduction: I want to speak tonight on the issue which presents to the voters the most clear-cut choice of all in this campaign--the economic policies of this Administration. Our political parties should not differ in their approach to the broad outlines of our foreign policy. We should not disagree on the necessity of opposing Communist at home. But when it comes to prosperity and the economic health of the nation we have sharp and real differences of opinion between the two candidates. The voters, therefore, must decide on November 6, whether they want to go back to the policies they repudiated in 1952 or whether they want to continue the Eisenhower policies which have been in effect for the past four years.

II. Statement of case: 'Tonight, I would like to discuss this problem (economic policies) not in the mass terms of gross national product, corporate income, profit after taxes, and so forth, but in reference to this simple and all-important question. Have the economic policies of this Administration been good for the average American family?"

III. Proof:

A. (Argument 1) 'The 66.6 million American wage earners have had it better under the Eisenhower Administration than they ever did before."

1. The wage earner's wants and desires were fulfilled.

2. 'The white collar workers, pensioners, and others living on fixed incomes" have been considered by the Administration.

3. The American farmer's problem has been recognized by the Administration and steps have been taken to solve his plight.

B. (Argument 2) A comparison of the economic policies of the Truman so-called Fair Deal which Mr. Stevenson supports and the Eisenhower Administration's economic policies indicates the reason why Truman's policy failed and Eisenhower's has succeeded.

1. An examination of the role of government under the Truman Administration indicates the reason for failure.

2. An examination of the results of the Fair Deal policy reveals failure.

3. An examination of the policies Eisenhower initiated in 1952 to provide peace and prosperity reveals success.

C. (Argument 3) The future under an Eisenhower Administration promises great hope for the economy of the nation.

1. The Administration will attempt "to wipe out the remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination in the United States."

2. The Administration will attempt "to wipe out bitterness and class struggle in our nation."

3. The Administration will attempt "to promote a new way of life in the United States--better than we have ever had before."

4. The Administration will attempt "to show the entire world the value of the philosophy that has led to our prosperity."

IV. Peroration: We have something new and good that has proved itself in action. Give it a chance and the future will be unbelievably prosperous. Ours is a real forward look. If you believe in America's greatness and trust in her future then stay on the truly liberal and progressive side. Vote for a President who has helped the little man instead of just talking about it. Keep the Administration that has gotten results.

Method of Arrangement

In this presentation, Nixon followed the distributive method of development.[1] From the analysis, it seemed

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

apparent that he considered carefully the three major arguments and included only pertinent information in each argument. There was not the over-lapping of ideas or the theme approach that had been present in the previous speeches analyzed. For example, in Argument 1, Nixon forwarded ideas related specifically to the argument that the "66.6 million American wage earners have had it better under the Eisenhower Administration." He did not deviate from the topical confines of this idea. This was equally true in the two other arguments of the address. Because of this close topical development of ideas, it should be noted that Nixon adhered to the distributive method of arrangement.

Parts

The introduction of this presentation satisfied the function of preparing the audience for what was to follow rather than the function of getting the attention or arousing the interest of the audience as was the case in the previous speech analyzed.[1] In the first sentence of this speech, Nixon stated specifically, "I want to speak to you tonight on the issue which presents to the voters the most clear-cut choice of all in this campaign--the economic policies of this Administration." He continued by enumerating the areas in which he felt there should be no political differences. He implied that the two parties should be in agreement "in their approach to the broad outlines of our

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 395.

foreign policy." He also stipulated that "we should not disagree on the necessity of opposing Communism at home." And he further stated that "we should be one in seeking an honest and efficient government." Thus, in the first paragraph of the introduction, Nixon stated positively that the issue with which he was going to be concerned was the nation's economy, and, in addition, he also eliminated certain areas which he felt should not be issues for partisan politics.

He then proceeded in the introduction to indicate that there was a sharp difference of opinion between the two candidates on the issue of economic policies. He made it clear that the difference was between Eisenhower and Stevenson and not between the two parties. He stated:

> I say between the two candidates rather than between the two parties because millions of Democrats, including many Democratic members of Congress, support the Eisenhower economic policies rather than those being advocated by Mr. Stevenson.
>
> Unfortunately however, these Democrats are not running the show.

After making this assumption, Nixon paid Mr. Stevenson a left-handed compliment while attempting to associate him closely with the Truman Fair Deal. In the final remarks of his introduction he stated:

> In 1952 Mr. Stevenson showed admirable statesmanship and independence in refusing to knuckle down to this group (Truman Fair Deal supporters) in the fields of farm and labor policies. But from what he has said in the campaign up to this time it appears that he now has completely accepted the economic policies of the Truman Fair Deal and has dressed them up in a new 1956 outfit.

It should be noted, then, that Nixon in this introduction was concerned with setting up and preparing his audience for the ideas that were to follow in the presentation. In so doing, he isolated the specific issue which he wanted to discuss, namely, the economic policies of the Adminiatration. In this manner, Nixon was able to discuss the Administration's economic policies and compare them to the philosophies of the "Truman Fair Deal." He was further able to discuss the results he felt were obtained by the two philosophies concerning the nation's economy.

In this speech, Nixon's statement of the case was clear and he stated precisely the issue that was of major concern to him that evening. It was by far the most specific statement of case in the speeches analyzed thus far. He stated that he was going to discuss "this problem (economic policies)--not in the mass terms of gross national product, corporate income, profit after taxes, and so forth," but in reference to this simple and all important question: "Have the economic policies of this Administration been good for the average American family?"

In the proof of the speech, Nixon's transitions from one argument to another and within the arguments were not as smooth as the transitions found in the previous speeches analyzed. He did not use an elaborate theme as he had previously, but rather he depended upon connective words or transitional sentences to take him from one idea to another. On a number of occasions, he used words such as "but,"

"now," "let us," "another," and "finally" to connect the segments of his presentation. When not using these connective words, he used phrases such as "consider for example," "compare this with," "by any standards of comparison," "consider the American farmer," "as a result," and "what this means" as connectives for the various segments. These transitional methods served to get Nixon from idea to idea, although it is possible that these connectives lost some of their effectiveness by repeated use. In addition to this, the use of the word "but" and the phrase "let us consider" on a number of occasions seemed to be parenthetical and in these cases the connectives did not add to the emphasis of his ideas.

In the peroration, Nixon was concerned with emotionally exciting the audience to vote according to his political convictions. He stated in a very brief peroration:

> Call it what you will, we have something new and good that has proved itself in action. Give it a chance and the future will be unbelievably prosperous. Cut down American industry, tie its hands behind its back with the tired old philosophies of the A. D. A. (Americans for Democratic Action) and we will have the stagnation and bitterness that were the curse of the 1930's. Ours is the real progressive approach. Ours is the really forward look.

He emotionally concluded in a final paragraph:

> If you believe in America's greatness and trust in her future then stay on the truly liberal and progressive side. Vote for a President who has helped the little man instead of just talking about him. Stick with prosperity and progress. Keep the Administration that has gotten results. This November let us not go backward to depression and futility but let us march forward to the fulfillment of America's destiny.

The brief two paragraph conclusion was directed at giving the audience the opportunity to decide between depression and futility on the one hand and prosperity and progress, and the fulfillment of America's destiny on the other. Thus the peroration was directed at arousing the emotions of the audience for a favorable reaction toward the Republican Party.

In summary, Nixon's plan of development was distributive. The introduction fulfilled the function of preparing the audience for what was to follow in the presentation.

Invention

Invention will be analyzed through the study of logical, emotional, and ethical proofs.

Logical Proofs

The analysis of arrangement of materials in this Colorado speech disclosed three arguments. Each of these arguments will be considered individually.

> Argument 1: The 66.6 million American wage earners have had it better under the Eisenhower Administration than they ever did before.

In the first argument, Nixon used the inductive pattern of reasoning.[1] The generalization stated as Argument 1 was inferred from three sub-arguments. These were:

1. The wage earner's wants and desires were fulfilled.
2. The white collar workers, pensioners, and others living on fixed incomes have been considered by the Administration.

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

3. The American farmer's problem has been recognized by the Administration and steps have been taken to solve his plight.

These three examples appeared to answer all of the questions which might arise concerning the argument that the wage earners had had it better under the Eisenhower Administration. That is, sub-argument one was concerned with the alleged wants and desires the wage earner expected to have fulfilled. This idea was developed in such a way that the fulfillment of these wants and desires was readily acknowledged.

In sub-arguments two and three, Nixon focused attention on the specific areas of wage earners which he felt were crucial in the campaign. These were the white collar and fixed income workers and the American farmer. As was indicated previously in this dissertation, the farmer's situation was a crucial issue and Nixon's assessment of this fact was not unwarranted.[1] In the two crucial areas depicted in these two lines of reasoning, Nixon pointed out the manner in which the fixed income workers and the farmer had benefitted under the Eisenhower Administration. The three sub-arguments, thus, led logically to the argument that "66.6 million American wage earners have had it better under the Eisenhower Administration than they ever did before." The examples appeared to be an accurate assessment of the problem and no contradictory sub-arguments were readily apparent.

---

[1] Newsweek, September-November, 1956.

Argument 2: A comparison of the economic policies of the Truman so-called Fair Deal which Mr. Stevenson supports and the Eisenhower Administration's economic policies indicates the reason why Truman's policy failed and Eisenhower's has succeeded.

As in the previous argument, the type of reasoning used was the inductive method.[1] In this argument, however, the generalization was from an analogy.[2] Nixon divided his analogy into four cases. These were:

1. An examination of the role of government under the Truman Administration indicates the reason for failure.
2. An examination of the results of the Fair Deal policy reveals the failure.
3. An examination of the policies Eisenhower initiated in 1952 to provide peace and prosperity reveals success.
4. An examination of the role of government under the Eisenhower Administration indicates the reason for success.

The analogy began in the first case with an examination of government's role under the Truman Administration. Nixon then proceeded to examine the results created by that Administration's philosophy of the role of government. The actual comparison began when Nixon gave an account of the results of the philosophy of the Eisenhower Administration toward the role of government, particularly with regard to economic policies. It should be noted that Nixon forwarded the results prior to the actual explanation of what the Administration's philosophy embodied. In this situation,

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

[2]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 349.

Nixon established through comparison and contrast, the advantageous results of the Eisenhower Administration philosophy as opposed to the failure under Truman's philosophy. He then completed the comparison by explaining the Eisenhower Administration's philosophy of the role of government in the economy of the nation. Implicit in this analogy was the inference that the Truman philosophy resulted in failure because it allowed government to solve all existing problems. Nixon implied that when there was unemployment under the Fair Deal Administration, the solution was that "the government should provide the jobs." Nixon alleged that this government control was the principal solution applied to most problems during the Fair Deal Administration of Truman. On the other hand, Nixon stated that the Eisenhower Administration was able to solve the economic problems they faced by depending upon the "initiative of ninety million American producers" to aid in solving economic difficulties rather than by depending upon the government. Thus the analogy in this argument was started with the definition of the opponent's philosophy which, according to Nixon, led to failure. It then proceeded to an enumeration of the successful results of the Eisenhower Administration, and concluded with an explanation of the philosophies which had achieved this success. This inductive pattern from analogy was detailed and appeared logical if the assumptions forwarded by Nixon were true.

> Argument 3: The future under an Eisenhower Administration promises great hope for the economy of the nation.

The type of reasoning used in Argument 3 was again the inductive method, as it was in both Arguments 1 and 2.[1] The generalization was from sub-arguments in this argument.[2] Nixon used four campaign promises which terminated in the generalization stated as Argument 3. These promises were:

1. The Administration will attempt to wipe out the remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination in the United States.
2. The Administration will attempt to wipe out bitterness and class struggle in our nation.
3. The Administration will attempt to promote a new way of life in the United States--better than we have ever had before.
4. The Administration will attempt to show the entire world the value of the philosophy that has led to our prosperity.

The argument appeared to point to a bright future if the promises forwarded by Nixon were fulfilled. Previously in the speech, Nixon had attempted to point out that the economy under the Eisenhower Administration was at an all time high, and he began Argument 3 with the promise of an even brighter future because the Administration was going to attempt "to wipe out any remaining areas of distress and economic discrimination." With the second promise, Nixon met the controversial problem of segregation and stated that the Administration would attempt to eliminate the "class struggle" in the nation. The third and fourth promises of the argument forecast a new way of life in the United States

---

[1] Baird, op. cit., p. 115.

[2] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 348.

and indicated that the world should be told of the value of the philosophies of the Eisenhower Administration. As far as promises can be assessed, these four statements appeared to terminate in the generalization that the "future under an Eisenhower Administration promises great hope for the economy of the nation." It should be noted that the fourth sub-argument was somewhat of a deviation from the argument in that Nixon was concerned with showing to the world the value of this philosophy.

This deviation appeared to be caused by Nixon's constant awareness of the threat of Communism. In this situation, he actually stated the reaction he felt the Communists had toward Eisenhower's economic philosophy when he related, "Communists are in awe of it." The deviation, then, would seem to have been caused by Nixon's affinity for continuing his attack on Communism.

Forms of Support

In this Colorado Springs Address, Nixon used a greater number of forms of support than he had in any of the previous speeches analyzed. The analysis will center around the forms of support of information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony.[1] The forms of support will be analyzed in the order listed above.

Information: In the proof of this address, Nixon appeared to be concerned with forwarding factual and sta-

---

[1]Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 117.

tistical information to a greater extent than he had in the previous speeches analyzed. The type of evidence here defined as information was confined primarily to Argument 1. In this argument, he began by citing the number of wage earners employed in America. The citation of this statistic introduced Argument 1, for it was with these "66.6 million American wage earners" that Nixon concerned himself in the argument. He stated:

> Consider, for example, those who make up the great bulk of the wealth producers in our population--the 66.6 million American wage earners.

Within the argument, Nixon then forwarded facts and statistics to support his assertions that the wage earner's wants and desires were fulfilled and that workers on fixed incomes were being aided by the Administration. In support of these ideas, Nixon used the following information:

> (1) In 1948, the average weekly wage for factory workers was $54.00. In 1956 the same factory worker is earning nearly $79.00 a week. . . . ,
> (2) He got an increase of eight dollars a week in real buying power in the last four years. . . . , and
> (3) During the four years of this Administration the value of the dollar has varied less than one and one half cents. To the 102 million who have government savings bonds, this means that the dollars they save today will be worth a dollar five, ten, and fifteen years from now provided the sound fiscal policies of the Eisenhower Administration are continued.

It should be pointed out that the first two examples of facts were supposed to support the assertion that the wage earner's wants and desires were fulfilled. When Nixon enumerated the wants and desires of the wage earners, he listed them as:

> He wants a job. He wants high wages. He wants

> purchasing power. He wants a security program for the future.

Actually the above facts, then, supported the assertion that the wants for higher wages and purchasing power were being fulfilled by the Administration. The assertion that the need for a job and a security program was being met by the Administration was not substantiated by the use of evidence. In addition to this partial support of his allegations, the third fact noted above bears closer investigation for the reasoning involved should be questioned. The fact that the dollar had varied less than one and one-half cents in the four years of Eisenhower's Administration and the assumption that the dollar would remain the same because of the alleged sound fiscal policies of the Eisenhower Administration were not necessarily contingent upon each other. By the same logic, however, it could be reasoned that other factors not considered by Nixon could have stabilized the dollar. These statistics, then, were forwarded as evidence to support Argument 1.

Throughout the remainder of the speech, Nixon used information independently of the other forms of support on only three occasions. In Argument 2, he was concerned with abuses occurring in certain labor organizations. The nation's interest concerning these abuses and the regulation of these abuses culminated, according to Nixon, in the Taft-Hartley Act. To substantiate this assumption, he stated:

> The national interest demanded some regulation of these abuses. To do this the Taft-Hartley Act was passed over a presidential veto with the support of

> a majority of both the Republicans and the Democrats in the House and the Senate.

The fact that it took a majority of both Republicans and Democrats in the House and the Senate to override a veto clearly indicated, according to Nixon, that the America people demanded labor legislation. It should be pointed out that the passage of the Act over a presidential veto may or may not have indicated the will of the people. There may have been, however, other significant pressures acting upon the legislators not considered by Nixon when he interpreted this fact. He used this alleged need for the Taft-Hartley Act to discredit Stevenson's motives in the campaign as he cited:

> This is the law which Mr. Stevenson has pledged to appeal without offering any alternative for curbing grave abuses in labor relations.

Thus, the single fact concerning the manner in which the Taft-Hartley Act was passed served to substantiate the need for some type of regulation with regard to labor relations we well as to discredit the motives of Mr. Stevenson on the issue.

The final two facts included in the speech were not used as evidence. In one case, Nixon stated the fact that there were "ninety million American producers in factories and farms," and in the other, he referred to the fact that the nation had "167 million Americans." These two facts were used in emotional arguments and were not directly used in support of his ideas.

Example: The analysis revealed that examples were

used as evidence on four occasions. They were used in the second and third arguments of the speech. The two examples found in Argument 2 were used to support the allegation that the policies of the Truman Administration ended in failure. The examples in the argument read:

> (1) For example, let us see what happened with regard to their labor policy. Labor was protected in its right to organize. This was good. But certain labor leaders let powers go to their heads. They called strikes that threatened to paralyze the nation. They ignored racketeering and dictatorship in their ranks. And some of them blinded themselves to the Communist influence in certain unions. . . . and
> (2) And the most devastating proof of the truth of this statement is that in twenty years these policies were never able to provide prosperity except during war or as a result of war. For example, in 1939 immediately before World War II there were nine million unemployed--four times as many as there are today. In 1950 immediately before the Korean War there were almost five million unemployed--twice as many as there are today.[1]

These examples were forwarded to support the ideas that the Truman Fair Deal policies had serious shortcomings. The first example pointed to the abuses which could befall even a good labor policy under the Truman Administration. The example was framed emotionally and did not support directly the reference that these abuses were caused by Fair Deal policies. And the second example highlighted the failure of the Fair Deal in the specific area of unemployment. It should be noted that this example of the unemployed embodied elements of two forms of support. In addition to its in-

---

[1]The almost five million unemployed Nixon was speaking of was actually 3,142,000 unemployed according to the Economic Report of the President dated January, 1957, page 142. The same report noted that 1956 had 2,551,000 unemployed. The figure of unemployed in 1950 was not twice the figure of 1956 as Nixon stated.

clusion here as an example which pointed out the weaknesses in the Fair Deal policies, it also compared and contrasted the level of prosperity achieved under the two administrations.

In Argument 3, the example was used on two occasions to support Nixon's assertions that there were still areas which needed aid and that the Republican Party was aware of these areas and promised future improvements to meet the challenge. Nixon used the first example to indicate what the "remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination" were. And the second example supported Nixon's promise that the Administration was going to create a "new way of life in the United States." These examples used to support Argument 3 were:

(1) Another area of distress involves our so-called minority groups in this country. A substantially large portion of our poorer citizens are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. We have also the problem of our migrant farm workers. . . . and
(2) We will do this by unleashing the research facilities of our scientists and technicians so that new forms of production will evolve. Back-breaking toil and mind-wearying tension will be left to machines and electric devices.

The emotional tone in these quotations will be discussed later in this analysis. These four examples in all, then, were the only examples used in the presentation and point to the fact that it was not used extensively as evidence.

Comparison and contrast: Comparison and contrast was used as evidence in this presentation in Arguments 1 and 2. Its use has already been noted in the discussion of the use of example. This type of evidence was particularly

important in this address. In Argument 1, comparison and contrast was used to compare the economic status of the "66.6 million American wage earners" under the Administrations of Eisenhower and Truman. In Argument 2, the reasoning process employed by Nixon was the inductive process inferred through an analogy; therefore, in the entire argument, comparison and contrast was implicit.

Nixon used comparison and contrast initially to establish a close alliance between Mr. Stevenson and the Truman Fair Deal. This comparison was of particular importance because it enabled Nixon to compare the Administrations of Truman and Eisenhower in the remainder of the speech.

After having established the alleged fact that Stevenson endorsed the policies of Truman, Nixon then proceeded to compare and contrast the status of the "66.6 million American wage earners" under the Eisenhower and Truman Administrations. The analysis revealed the following uses of this type of evidence in Argument 1:

(1) Here are some comparisons which bear out the statements I have just made. In 1948, Mr. Truman said: 'You've never had it so good.' In 1948, the average weekly wage for factory workers was $54.00. In 1956, the same factory worker is earning nearly $79.00 a week. . . . ,

(2) The dollar earner who thinks he gets raises when his dollars are being cheapened is only being kidded. From 1944 to 1952 the wages of the average factory worker increased from $46.00 a week to $68.00 a week. This sounds good but when you adjust for price increases in that same period he didn't get a raise at all. The actual purchasing power of his weekly take-home pay check declined two dollars during the seven year period of the Truman Fair Deal. . . .

> Compare this with what happened during the Eisenhower Administration. He got an increase of $8.00 a week in real buying power in the last four years. . . . , and
>
> (3) But what is even more important to those who live on fixed incomes is that today they have real security rather than cut-rate security because we have a government which insists on a balanced budget and thereby insures a sound dollar.

Through this comparison of related situations under the Eisenhower and Democratic Adminstrations, Nixon attempted to substantiate his assertion that those who have "fixed incomes have been considered by the Administration." The strength of this evidence was contingent upon the creation of Truman and Stevenson as synonymous labels. If the assumption implied by Nixon that Stevenson would follow the exact pattern of leadership of Truman were true, then, the evidence in Argument 1 would be significant. It has been pointed out previously in this section that this connection was not fully developed in this address, and therefore, the evidence was open to question.

In Argument 2, the generalization in the inductive process was inferred through an analogy. Therefore, the entire argument was comparing and contrasting the Truman Fair Deal and Eisenhower's Administration. The analogy in this argument was also contingent upon the alliance between Truman and Stevenson and should be considered in the same manner as the comparison and contrast in Argument 1. The analysis of this comparison and contrast was included in the discussion of the reasoning process within Argument 2. The preceding examples, then, were the only other instances

in which Nixon used the form of support of comparison and contrast as evidence.

Testimony: As in the previous addresses analyzed, the use of testimony as evidence was not used extensively in the presentation. Nixon relied on the use of testimony as evidence on only one occasion. This testimony was forwarded in the first argument when Nixon was concerned with the wage earners. He quoted from a report by the American Federation of Labor to substantiate his assertion that the American wage earner was witnessing more real wages under the Eisenhower Administration. He cited:

> What is even more important, however, is that as the report of the American Federation of Labor for February, 1955 said 'These real wage increases provided more of a gain in real wages than in other post-war years because they were almost entirely over the amount needed to compensate for the rise in the cost of living.'

This single quotation was the only use of testimony as evidence in the speech. By way of summary, it should be stated that Nixon used a variety of forms of support as evidence in this address. The majority of the forms of support occurred in the first argument. He used all of the forms of support in Argument 1. In the other arguments, he used examples primarily to substantiate and support his ideas.

Emotional Appeals

Emotional appeals will be discussed in the Colorado Springs Address in terms of motive appeals. The analysis of the motive appeals will include an identification and discussion of the emotions affected by the motive appeals.

The predominant motive appeals contained in the speech were health, wealth, opportunity, and fair play.[1]

Health and wealth: The motives of health and wealth or well-being were the major appeals in this speech. This should not be considered unusual since the theme of the Republican Party in the campaign of 1956 was "peace and prosperity." Nixon, in his role as a party campaigner, was attempting to show that the prosperity enjoyed by the American people at that time was secured for them by the Republican Administration then in power. The appeal to these motives were found particularly in the proof and conclusion. within the proof, the appeals to the desires for health and wealth were especially important in Argument 1. In the argument, Nixon was concerned with the portrayal of the manner in which the Eisenhower Administration had allegedly been responsible for the fulfillment of the wants and desires of "66.6 million American wage earners." The paragraphs in Argument 1 which contained the appeals to these motives were:

(1) . . . what does count is not what is said but what happens to wages, prices and taxes under an Administration. And I say on that score that no amount of misrepresentation, distortion or demagoguery can hide the fact that the great majority of Americans have had the best four years of their lives during the Eisenhower Administration. . . . ,

(2) By any standard of comparison, the 66.6 million American wage earners have had it better under Eisenhower than ever before and I believe that regardless of contrary views which may be expressed by a few union leaders, a majority of union members are going to vote for four more years of the same

---

[1]Bryant and Wallace, op. cit., p. 277.

kind of government. . . . ,

(3) We can point with pride to the fact that Social Security has been extended to ten million not previously covered and unemployment insurance to four million not previously covered. But what is even more important to those who live on fixed incomes is that today they have real security rather than cut-rate security because we have a government which insists on a balanced budget and thereby insures a sound dollar. . . . , and

(4) I could give other examples but in summary this has been the effect of the Eisenhower economic policies. This Administration is now proving for the first time in nearly twenty-five years that we can have prosperity without war, full employment outside of uniform, and security without regimentation and controls. We are proud of that record and we believe that the American people whom we represent are proud of it too.

The remainder of the proof contained three appeals to the motives of health and wealth. In Argument 2, there was only one fully developed appeal to these desires. This appeal was contained in the comparison between the Eisenhower Administration and the Democratic Administrations of the New Deal and Fair Deal years. On the other hand, the two appeals contained in Argument 3 centered around Nixon's promises for the future. His forecast predicted a future of "comfort and even luxury to every American family." The paragraphs containing these appeals to health and wealth in Arguments 2 and 3 read:

(1) . . . the New Deal, Fair Deal policies sounded good. All problems were solved by saying the government would provide the answer to everything. But the difficulty was this simply did not work. And the most devastating proof of the truth of this statement is that in twenty years these policies were never able to provide prosperity except during war or as a result of war. For example, in 1939 immediately before World War II there were nine million unemployed--four times as many as there are today. In 1950 immediately before the Korean War there were almost five million unemployed--twice as many as there are today. . . . ,

(2) But great as these results are, we are not satisfied. This is only the beginning. Let us look for a moment into the exciting future toward which the Eisenhower Administration is working with every resource at its command. We look forward to a future in which poverty will be a forgotten word in the United States. We want an economic system that brings comfort and even luxury to every American family. . . . , and

(3) Our third goal is to promote a new way of life in the United States--better than we have ever had before. We will do this by unleashing the research facilities of our scientists and technicians so that new forms of production will evolve. Back-breaking toil and mind-wearying tension will be left to machines and electronic devices. We want man's work to be pleasant so that he can go home each day with abundant energy for enjoying the comfort and friendliness if his family. We see the time not too far distant when we can have a four-day work week and family life will be even more fully enjoyed by every American.

These are not dreams or idle boasts, they simply are projections of the gains we have made in the last four years.

Nixon concluded his appeal to the motives of health and wealth in the conclusion of the Colorado Springs Address. He furthered the idea that if the nation wanted to continue to develop its prosperity, it should retain the Administration that had brought about the prosperity and which was promising even greater advances. Nixon urged:

> I do not have a name which adequately describes it. It has been called the new capitalism; the people's capitalism, or consumer capitalism. It has been described as a philosophy of moderation or partnership. Whatever it is, it is something new and far better than anything the world has ever seen before. Communists are in awe of it. Visitors from older industrial countries are amazed at its results.
>
> Call it what you will, we have something new and good that has proved itself in action. Give it a chance and the future will be unbelievable prosperous. Cut down American industry with the tired old philosophies of the ADA and we will have the stagnation and bitternes that were the curse of the 1930's. Ours is the real progressive approach. Ours is the really forward look.
>
> If you believe in America's greatness and trust in her future then stay on the truly liberal and pro-

> gressive side. Vote for a President who has helped the little man instead of just talking about him. Stick with prosperity and progress. Keep the Administration that has gotten results. This November let us not go backward to depression and futility but let us march forward to the fulfillment of America's destiny.

The manner in which Nixon developed his ideas within these appeals affected particularly the emotions of confidence and fear. Nixon was trying to impart to his audience the belief that they could have confidence in the administration that had brought them prosperity and which would continue to maintain and further the level of prosperity to a height never before witnessed by the American people. He highlighted specific areas such as the fulfillment of the wage earner's wants and desires, the stability of the dollar, the level of employment, and the anticipated progress of the future as the basis for the confidence which should be felt. In addition, the emotion of fear was affected principally through the references to the evils which Nixon believed were inherent in the philosophy of the opposition. He summed up the fearful consequences that would result from the re-election of the Democratic candidates when he warned in the conclusion:

> Cut down American industry, tie its hands behind its back with the tired old philosophies of the ADA and we will have the stagnation and bitterness that were the curse of the 1930's.

Thus Nixon appealed to the emotion of fear as well as confidence. He pointed to the confidence that could be found under the Eisenhower Administration, and at the same time, he contrasted this with the thought of the unfavorable re-

sults that would occur if the opposition were returned to power. This technique seemed to pervade all of the appeals to health and wealth in this address.

In this way, Nixon strengthened the audience's confidence in the leadership that had given them prosperity and instilled fear in them through the alleged fact that their prosperity might again revert to years of unemployment, inflation, and insecurity that they had witnessed before Eisenhower was elected.

In summary, the analysis revealed that motives of health and wealth were contained in the proof and conclusion of the address. The majority of these appeals were confined to Argument 1 of the proof and the conclusion. These appeals had one significant similarity in that all implied that the Eisenhower economic policies were responsible for the prosperity being enjoyed in 1956.[1] Most of the appeals also included a portrayal of the unsatisfactory conditions that would arise if the voters were to elect a Democratic President. These undesirable effects were implied through a detailed comparison of the results of the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations.

Opportunity and fair play: In addition to the motive appeals of health and wealth, Nixon also appealed to the motives of opportunity and fair play. The appeals to these motives were not used as extensively as the appeals

---

[1] In the discussion of the economic conditions of the year 1956, it was noted that economic conditions were good.

to health and wealth. The single appeal to these motives occurred in Argument 3 when Nixon was concerned with the bright future promised if the Eisenhower Administration was continued in office. As he enumerated the goals the Administration hoped to achieve, he included a problem he felt needed to be resolved. The problem concerned discrimination and class struggle. Nixon felt that this area presented "a real challenge to all of us." He called for the consideration and help of the audience as he urged:

> Our first aim is to wipe out the remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination in the United States. Even with our great prosperity there are a few who do not share equitably in the general progress. Certainly we must finish the work we have begun in wiping out farm surpluses. We must take positive steps jointly with state, local and private groups to help those areas which have suffered loss of industry.
>
> Another area of distress involves our so-called minority groups in this country. A substantially large portion of our poorer citizens are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. We have also the problem of our migrant farm workers. The problems of these groups offer a real challenge to all of us. It is a challenge which was never met by the New Deal, Fair Deal policies. We accept that challenge. We believe that with our successful economic policies we can finish this job and abolish poverty in the United States.
>
> Our second great aim is to wipe out bitterness and class struggle in our nation. They do not belong here. They are leftovers from the socialism and class distinction of older nations. We believe in freedom and equality for all citizens. There are no classes in the United States. In our economy of abundance there is no reason for one person to begrudge the wealth of another--there is enough for all.

Nixon's appeal to fair play for these groups of Americans who had been discriminated against is related to the listener's emotion of sympathy. It would seem that Nixon wished

to instill compassion in the audience for these people and groups who "do not share equitably in the general progress." There was also an appeal to the emotion of confidence in this motive appeal to opportunity and fair play. This was embodied in the promises offered by the Administration for the future. Nixon pointed out confidently that the Administration would eliminate the "remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination." He indicated this could be accomplished through the "successful economic policies" of the Administration. In this manner, then, the motive appeal affected the audience's emotions of sympathy and confidence. Nixon's appeal to the motives of opportunity and fair play in Argument 3 was the only use of this motive appeal in the Colorado Springs Address.

In conclusion, the primary motive appeal found in this speech was to the motives of health and wealth. It was found throughout the entire address. The appeal to these motives was in keeping with the Republican Party's campaign slogan of "peace and prosperity."[1]

Ethical Appeals

The discussion of ethical appeals will be divided into the qualities of good will, intelligence, and character.

Good Will: From the analysis, it was found that the Colorado Springs Address did not contain a clear attempt

---

[1]The discussion of campaign issues in Chapter III noted that the literature disseminated by the Republican Party embodied the slogan "peace and prosperity."

to win the good will of the audience. Nixon did not specifically employ any of the means of gauging good will that were listed in Chapter I of this study. Therefore, it should be noted that the content of the address did not reveal directly any means of gauging the establishment of good will with the audience.

Intelligence: It was difficult to ascertain Nixon's intelligence or sagacity from the content of the address. A close analysis of content did not reveal the specific means of gauging intelligence or sagacity as listed by Thonssen and Baird. In this campaign speech, however, Nixon did exhibit a broad familiarity with the interests of the day when he discussed, particularly in argument 1, the level of prosperity in America. This discussion of the nation's economy could be considered to some extent as a means of ascertaining his sagacity. The identification of intangible elements such as tact, common sense, moderation, and good taste as factors of importance would be conditioned by the political beliefs of individual members of the audience.

Character: Of the qualities which reveal ethical appeal, the most prevalent in this address was the quality of character. Nixon focused attention on the probity of his character primarily when he associated "either himself or his message with what was virtuous or elevated" and when he "associated the opponent or the opponent's cause

with what was not virtuous."[1]

Nixon began to establish his character in the introduction when he pointed to the choice the audience had in the coming election. He offered prosperity and economic health as a determining factor in the audience's selection of the candidates.

It should be remembered that Nixon, as the running mate of Eisenhower, reflected Eisenhower's political sentiments in all of his campaign presentations and that whenever Eisenhower was placed in a virtuous or elevated light, then Nixon also benefited from the association. In his introduction, Nixon stressed the fact that Eisenhower's economic policies were supported by "millions of Democrats, including many Democratic members of Congress." He lamented the fact that these Democrats were "not running the show." Nixon was implying that the economic politics of Eisenhower were so virtuous that even the opposition supported them.

After he initially established character in the introduction, Nixon continued to focus attention on the probity of his character in the proof of the address. The purpose of this establishment of character was to associate Eisenhower with virtuous motives and the opposition with unvirtuous motives. This was done primarily in two ways. First, he depicted the elevated nature of the Administration in terms of the benefits the wage earners had derived supposedly through the efforts of the Eisenhower Administra-

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 387.

tion. Nixon confidently told the audience in Argument 1 that they not only had higher wages, purchasing power, and greater security, but "they have peace to boot and a government they can trust." Secondly, he not only depicted the opposition in an unfavorable light in Argument 2 by pointing out that the opposition's policies lacked virtue and common sense, but he actually implied that the Eisenhower Administration had achieved its goal of bringing peace and prosperity to America by rejecting the policies of the Truman Fair Deal Administration. In so doing, he was again discrediting Mr. Stevenson because, as Nixon had pointed out previously, Stevenson was said to be in full support of former President Truman's policies. An indication of the manner in which Nixon focused attention on his character can be noted in the following paragraphs:

(1) Today America's wage earners have more jobs at higher wages with greater purchasing power, sounder security and fewer strikes than at any time in history. And they have peace to boot and a government they know they can trust. . . . ,
(2) In twenty years of the Fair Deal and the New Deal, there was never prosperity on the farm except in wartime or as a result of war. We all know surpluses are the basic cause for low farm prices. These surpluses were created by the crisis demands of war and by the rigid price supports which encouraged farmers to grow products that were not needed and could not be sold. No attack was made on this problem during the Truman Administration. . . . ,
(3) In this Administration we are boldly and imaginatively reducing these surpluses by finding new markets abroad and at home through the adoption of our soil-bank program. For the first time in a quarter of a century the American farmer is seeing a way to solve the surplus problem and achieve the goal he wants, prosperity in peacetime. And I am sure that when he compares the program of the Eisenhower Administration with the dreary alternative offered by our opponents of going back to the

> policies which created the farm problem and never solved it, the American farmers will vote overwhelmingly for this Administration. . . . , and
>
> (4) For this reason the American people in 1952 decided to give President Eisenhower a chance to do what his predecessors had been unable to do--provide prosperity in peacetime. These are some of the things he did in order to bring about this result. He removed controls that were strangling our industrial system. He gave American business and labor a chance to work out their own destinies. He pinned his faith on the brains and initiative of ninety million American producers in factories and farms rather than on the planning of a few so-called experts in Washington offices. And his faith has been completely justified.
>
> Our key was to encourage people to work together to do things themselves.
>
> Carrying out this idea we rejected three basic Truman, Fair Deal ideas.
>
> That government should be a dictatorship over our economic life.
> The federal government should step in and try to solve all problems.
> That the government should promote class struggle and take sides in this struggle.

From the analysis it was noted that character was revealed equally in all of the arguments. Of the thirty-seven paragraphs of the proof, character as reflected through "noble" choices by the speaker was established in nineteen. Thus it should be concluded that the establishment of character was an important element of the proof of this address.

The final instance of the establishment of character was contained in the conclusion. Nixon again depicted the opposition in an unfavorable manner and the Eisenhower Administration favorably. By this means of linking the opposition with that which was not virtuous and of portraying his message as virtuous, Nixon focused attention on

the probity of his character throughout the Colorado Springs Address.

Style

Four elements of style were predominant in this address. These were the elements of directness, concreteness, parallel structure, and vivid and figurative language.

Directness: Nixon did establish a "we feeling" in this speech. He used a number of personal pronouns such as "I," "we," "us," and "our." He also included a number of personal phrases such as "let us consider," "let us look," and "let us admit." In the speech, there were a total of 170 personal pronouns. Nixon used forty-six "we's," twenty "our's," and sixteen "I's." It should be pointed out, however, that the personal pronoun "I" was used to a lesser degree in this speech than in the previous speeches analyzed. He used thirty-eight "I's" in the Acceptance Address, forty-eight in the American Legion Address, and forty-five in the Gettysburg Speech. The use of the pronoun "we" again predominated.

Another factor contributing to the directness was the use of short sentences. The average sentence contained from eighteen to twenty-four words. Although these sentences averaged a few more words than the previous speeches analyzed, the sentences were for the most part simple and direct.

A final factor contributing to the directness of the speech was the use of colloquial language.[1] Nixon used such

---

[1]Baird and Knower, op. cit., p. 145.

colloquialisms as "knuckle-down," "peace to boot," "only being kidded," "cut-rate," "key-idea," "stick with," "running the show," and "in a nutshell." These colloquialisms together with the short sentences and paragraphs and the numerous personal pronouns contributed to the directness of this presentation.

Concreteness: This address contained a number of the elements contributing to concreteness. Nixon referred to individual names such as "Stevenson," "Truman," and "Eisenhower." He also referred on a number of occasions to general classes of people such as "Republicans," "Democrats," "Congress," "Negroes," "Puerto Ricans," "farmers," "white collar workers," "pensioners," and "factory workers." He frequently included specific dates and general statistics as "1952," "1948," "1944," "1946," "1939," "1950," "66.6 million," "$8.00," "$46.00," "$54.00," "$68.00," and "$79.00." He did not, however, use illustrations, quotations, or brief anecdotes to any great extent. The use of these elements that contribute to concreteness would seem to indicate that the presentation was basically concrete. There were, however, a number of abstractions in the speech.

The abstractions contained in this address centered particularly around the economic policies of the two administrations. Nixon referred to the misrepresentation and distortion that was being propagated by the opposition, but did not specifically indicate what the misrepresentation and distortion actually embodied. Another instance of

Nixon's vagueness occurred in the first argument when he referred to the "sound fiscal policies of the Eisenhower Administration." He intimated that these sound policies were responsible for the "sound dollar," but did not enumerate or elucidate these policies. The audience was not permitted to see the manner in which these policies could insure the "sound dollar." In the same argument, as he discussed the farmer's improved situation, Nixon generalized that when the farmer compared "the program of the Eisenhower Administration with the dreary alternative offered by our opponents . . ." the farmer would back the Eisenhower Administration.

Throughout the entire second argument, Nixon offered generalities as he compared the policies of the Eisenhower and Truman Administrations. He spoke of how the Truman solution to every problem was solved by allowing the government to solve the problem. He did not at any time note a specific example when this had taken place. He intimated that it happened with regard to unemployment, schools, hospitals, and "all problems." Beyond these alleged facts, Nixon did not substantiate the generalizations. He also accused the Truman Administration of pitting class against class, siding with labor against business, siding with organized labor against unorganized labor, and with pitting small farmers against large farmers. Nixon accused Truman of these non-virtuous actions, but he did not cite examples of this action nor did he indicate when these policies took

place. In the same vague and general manner, Nixon offered the Eisenhower remedies for these problems created by the Truman Administration. He alleged that Eisenhower gave "American business and labor a chance to work out their own destinies" and "pinned his faith on the brains and initiative of ninety million American producers . . ."

In this presentation, then, there were a number of elements that contributed to concreteness. They did not, however, materially clarify the major generalizations offered by Nixon. The generalizations concerning the economic policies did not contain elements contributing to concreteness. Most of the elements noted appeared with regard to the results of the two administrations and these results were said to have been caused by the policies of the two administrations. As has been indicated, however, Nixon did not explain how this had occurred. It should be noted, then, that the presentation had many passages which were relatively abstract.

Parallel structure: The parallel structure has been defined as the recurring use of a given structure of words, phrases, or sentences.[1] This device was used on seven occasions throughout the proof of the presentation. Examples of this technique read as follows:

(1) . . . are interested only in the rich, not the poor; in big business, not small business; in employers rather than the workers. . . . ,
(2) He wants a job. He wants high wages. He wants purchasing power. He wants a security program for

---

[1] Baird and Knower, op. cit., p. 181.

the future. . . . ,
(3) We can have prosperity without war, full employment outside of uniform, and security without regimination or controls. . . . ,
(4) . . . they do not trust American business . . .
They try to pit class against class . . .
They side with labor as against business, with organized labor as against unorganized labor, with small farmers as opposed to large farmers. . . . ,
(5) If there is unemployment . . .
If schools or hospitals are needed . . .
If one area of the country lags behind another . . . ,
(6) That government should . . .
That federal government should . . .
That the government should . . . , and
(7) It has been called . . .
It has been described . . .
It is something . . .

Thus it can be noted that the parallel structure was an important stylistic device in this presentation. It appeared to be used to emphasize and highlight the ideas Nixon was forwarding to the audience.

Vivid and figurative language: Figurative language was found throughout the speech. In most cases, the figurative language took the form of a metaphor when Nixon used words out of their normal context to embellish the meaning and impact of his ideas. The first of twenty metaphors was used to depict the manner in which Stevenson had accepted the Truman Fair Deal economic policies when Nixon suggested:

> But from what he has said in the campaign up to this time it appears that he now has completely accepted the economic policies of the Truman Fair Deal and has dressed them up in a new 1956 outfit.

Nixon used figurative language in Argument 1 when he discussed and compared the status of the economy under the Eisenhower and Truman Administrations. He inferred,

through the use of a metaphor, the type of security both Administrations offered in the statement, ". . . today they have real security rather than cut-rate security . . ." The word "cut-rate" offered a suggestive comparison which gave a picturesque meaning to the type of security offered by the opposition.

In Argument 2, Nixon used six metaphors which gave emphasis to his comparison of the Truman Fair Deal and the Eisenhower policies. The metaphors in this argument read:

(1) They begin by putting government into the driver's seat in economic life. . . . ,
(2) But all of these were only tools. . . . ,
(3) He removed controls that were strangling our industrial system. . . . ,
(4) He pinned his faith on the brains and initiative of ninety million American producers . . . ,
(5) And some of them blinded themselves to the Communist influence in certain labor unions . . . , and
(6) Our key idea was to encourage people to work together to do things themselves . . .

In these metaphors, the words "driver's seat," "tools," "strangling," "pinned," "blinded," and "key" were removed from their normal literary context and used to connote an unusual meaning.

In Argument 3, Nixon used the metaphor on four occasions to indicate the Administration's promises for the future. He indicated:

(1) Our first aim is to wipe out the remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination in the United States. . . . ,
(2) We will do this by unleashing the research facilities of our scientists and technicians . . . ,
(3) Back-breaking toil and mind-wearying tension will be left to machines and electronic devices . . . , and
(4) . . . which above all will unleash and encourage . . .

These metaphors not only offered a definite suggestiveness in addition to their literary meaning, but also portrayed a vivid picture of the goals the Administration had promised.

The final uses of figurative language occurred in the conclusion as Nixon was emotionally summarizing the choices available to the audience. He used the following metaphors:

> . . . tie its hands behind its back with the tired old philosophies of the ADA and we will . . .

In these statements, there were several words or phrases used in unusual meanings. These were "tie its hands behind its back" and "tired old philosophies." The connotative meaning in each of these instances aided in establishing imagery.

In addition to the use of the metaphor, the speech contained vivid language which served to give Nixon's ideas a definate suggestiveness. For example, when Nixon spoke of the opposition, he used words which had a negative meaning. These words were "demagoguery," "misrepresentation and distortion," "racketeering," "dictatorship," "devastating proof," "dreary alternative," and "depression and futility." The connotative meaning of these words placed the Democratic opposition and its policies in an unfavorable light. On the other hand, when Nixon spoke of the Republican Administration and its policies, his words had a positive favorable meaning. Words such as "unbelievably prosperous," "vote overwhelmingly," "boldly and imaginatively," "unparalleled prosperity" and "sound fiscal policies" were used.

Thus Nixon used words with a positive implication to depict the Eisenhower Administration and words with a negative implication to describe the Democratic candidates and their policies. These words added color and imagery to the ideas Nixon was relating.

It should be noted that Nixon relied heavily on the use of vivid and figurative language to enhance the meaning of his presentation. The connotative meaning of the figures and words and phrases added emotional impact and a definite suggestiveness.

Summary

1. The Colorado Springs Address was delivered in the Colorado Springs High School auditorium on September 22, 1956. The immediate audience numbered approximately 1,500 persons. The speech was also broadcast on state-wide radio and television.

2. The analysis of arrangement revealed that Nixon employed the distributive method of development. The speech was divided into the four parts of introduction, statement of case, proof, and peroration. The introduction fulfilled the function of preparing the audience for what was to follow in the presentation. The peroration attempted to emotionally arouse the audience to vote for the Republican Party in the coming election.

3. The analysis of proof revealed that Nixon used the inductive method in all of the major arguments of the address. Arguments 1 and 3 were developed through the use

of sub-arguments. Argument 2 was inferred through the use of an analogy.

4. Nixon used the forms of support of information, example, and comparison and contrast extensively in this speech. Testimony was used on one occasion. Information, in the form of facts and statistics, was used throughout the speech. The majority of the facts, however, were used in support of the assertions in Argument 1. The example was used on four occasions; two examples each in Arguments 2 and 3. Testimony was used on one occasion in Argument 1.

5. Nixon appealed to the motives of health and wealth particularly in Argument 1, although there were minor appeals to these motives throughout the proof as well as the conclusion of the speech. The motives of opportunity and fair play were appealed to only in Argument 3.

6. In the speech, Nixon established ethical appeals particularly by focusing attention on the probity of his character. All of the parts of the speech contained elements related to the "noble" choices which Nixon had made. The extent to which Nixon focused attention on the probity of his character can be noted in the fact that nineteen of the thirty paragraphs of the proof contained this type of ethical appeal.

7. There were a number of stylistic characteristics in the presentation. The most predominant were directness, concreteness, parallel structure, and vivid and figurative language. The analysis revealed, as it had in the previ-

ous speeches, that directness was a distinct feature of Nixon's style. The content contained a number of elements which contributed to an over-all "we feeling." One of the elements contributing to the "we feeling" was Nixon's abundant use of personal pronouns. In addition, parallel structure was another distinct feature of his style. This device was used throughout the speech. A feature especially important in the address was figurative language which Nixon used on at least twenty occasions.

CHAPTER VIII

ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL DINNER ADDRESS

Toward the end of the second month of the campaign, Richard Nixon departed from the campaign trail to accept an invitation to speak at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner in New York City. The dinner was the twelfth annual dinner honoring the late Governor Smith. The funds of the $100 a plate affair were used for the amortization of the Smith Memorial Building of St. Vincent's Hospital in New York City.[1]

According to the New York Times, the affair was attended by Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. This bipartisan gathering paid tribute to Alfred E. Smith, the former Democratic Governor of New York State. Smith was also the Democratic nominee for the presidency in 1928.[2] The dinner in his honor had been established and financed by an unknown admirer of Alfred E. Smith. In 1956, for the first time, Cardinal Spellman, president of the Smith Foundation, disclosed that Mrs. Evelyn Mendelssohn of Grosse Point, Michigan was the unknown benefactress of the twelve

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune, October 19, 1956, p. 7.

[2] New York Times, October 20, 1956.

annual dinners.[1]

Immediate Setting

The Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner was held in the Walforf-Astoria Hotel Ballroom on October 18, 1956.[2] Richard Nixon arrived at the hotel after a day's campaigning in the state of Connecticut.[3] His day's activities had included a nine hour, 180 mile motorcade trip from Providence, Rhode Island to New York City.[4] A featured stop of this trip was a rally at Yale University.[5] The hotel ballroom contained a crowd of 2,500 persons for the annual dinner.[6] In addition to Nixon, other honored guests paying tribute to the memory of the former New York Governor included Cardinal Spellman, Governor Averill Harriman, Mayor Wagner, Charles Silver, President of the Board of Education of New York City, singer Dennis Day, and Attorney General Jacob K. Javits, Republican candidate for United States Senator opposing Mayor Wagner.[7] It was noted in the daily papers the following day that the speeches delivered at the dinner, were for the most part, nonpartisan.[8] Governor Harri-

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune, October 19, 1956, p. 7.

[2] Ibid. [3] New York Times, October 19, 1956, p. 1.

[4] New York Herald Tribune, October 19, 1956, p. 1.

[5] Ibid. [6] Ibid.

[7] New York Times, October 19, 1956. p. 1.

[8] New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Chicago Tribune, October 19, 1956.

man and Mayor Wagner's presentations were entirely tributes to the late Governor Smith.[1] Governor Harriman characterized Governor Smith as "the Lincoln of the lower East Side."[2] Mayor Wagner called Governor Smith "a great man, a great Catholic, a great public servant and a great American."[3]

Vice-President Nixon was introduced by Cardinal Spellman as "one of America's first citizens."[4] Mr. Nixon's remarks on this occasion centered around the subject of segregation and were, for the most part, non-political. His speech included no reference to the attack directed toward him on the previous day by Adlai E. Stevenson at Flint, Michigan. Stevenson had described Nixon as the "man of many masks."[5] An editorial appearing in the New York Times stated that Mr. Nixon "risked some votes in some states--Tennessee, Florida and Texas, for example--when he said what he did about segregation."[6] The editorial further praised Nixon for his stand on this subject when it commented:

> Mr. Nixon has his adverse critics even among those who intend to vote the Republican national ticket, but he deserves unqualified credit for what he said on this crucial subject on Thursday evening--and for the courage that led him to say it.[7]

---

[1] New York Herald Tribune, October 19, 1956, p. 1.

[2] Ibid. [3] Ibid.

[4] New York Times, October 19, 1956, p. 1. [5] Ibid.

[6] New York Times, October 20, 1956, p. 20.

[7] Ibid.

Following the Memorial Dinner, Nixon resumed his campaigning with rallies in Wilmington, Delaware and Baltimore, Maryland.[1]

Arrangement

The following is an outline of Richard Nixon's address delivered at the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner. The major divisions of the outline are noted whenever possible by Nixon's own words. Nixon's words are set off by quotation marks. The introduction and conclusion are a précis.

Outline

I. Introduction: "When I received your invitation to address this dinner honoring Alfred E. Smith, I tried to think of a single theme that would explain his greatness. That was difficult because he had so many fine qualities. He was a magnificent example of the American dream."

II. Statement of case: "He typifies the truth of the statement that in America there is no forgotten man, no common man, no little man, no average man. There is only our fellow man."

III. Proof:

A. (Argument 1) "The basic rights of the individual as detailed in the Constitution, have been the foundation of American greatness."

1. "Other nations have been wealthy and powerful. But their wealth was for the few."

2. "Other ages spoke of the divine right of kings. We speak of the divinely granted rights of every man."

B. (Argument 2) "We seek to prove to the Communist world that freedom, and freedom alone, can bring

---

[1] New York Times, October 20, 1956, p. 4.

out the best energies of mankind."

1. "It is important that we remember that Communism and Nazism are evil things in themselves."

2. "It is necessary for our national leaders to meet with the leaders of such states, in the hope of forging a secure peace for the world."

3. "Our purpose is to lessen their burdens today, and to hasten the tomorrow when they will be free."

C. (Argument 3) The American nation, in its early history, experienced and resolved problems concerning "equality of opportunity."

1. "We had slavery during the first 76 years of our nation's history."

2. "When our Constitution was written, the founding fathers were preparing for the day when slavery would be abolished."

3. "We lived through the anti-foreign riots of the Know-Nothing days and the hooded terror of the Ku Klux Klan."

D. (Argument 4) "Our churches and schools, our labor unions and employer associations, farm groups, city groups, and the countless associations and societies we have formed all must work together toward our great objective" of equality.

1. We have fused "the best ideals and the strongest energies of all the peoples that have come to our shores."

2. "We must always remember that our nation has achieved so much precisely because of our willingness to accept what each new American has to offer."

3. We hold that "equality is basically a religious ideal."

4. "We have gone further and placed this religious belief under the sanction of civil law."

5. "We who hold office in the federal government

would be the last to hold that our efforts along will suffice."

IV. Peroration: "America cannot afford the moral, the economic and the international cost of prejudice and discrimination. We know the moral cost--we know the economic cost--I can testify from experience as to the international cost. I have often expressed the idea that the world struggle today is a contest for men's minds. It is mainly in the realm of the spirit, and only secondarily in the military, diplomatic, and economic fields. In such a struggle, the kind of people we are counts much more than what we say. To the diverse peoples of the world--different in race, religion, and national origin, but one in the sight of our Creator--let us show forth the highest meaning of our democracy, a nation under God to seek the welfare of all, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, powerful and weak."

Method of Arrangement

The method of arrangement used by Nixon was a combination of two methods; the indirect and the chronological. The indirect method, which is defined by Glen Mills in Composing the Speech as a type of series of illustrations followed by a conclusion, was developed in this speech in conjunction with a chronological arrangement.[1] In other words, the four major arguments used in the indirect method followed a chronological pattern. These major arguments were:

1. The basic rights of the individual as detailed in the Constitution, have been the foundation of American greatness.

2. We seek to prove to the Communist world that freedom, and freedom alone, can bring out the best energies of mankind.

3. I feel sure that we will pass through our present crisis with equal credit for men of good will in

---

[1]Mills, op. cit., p. 222.

all sections of our land are working with complete devotion toward the day when the American ideal of equality of opportunity is a reality for all of our people.

4. Our churches and schools, our labor unions and employer associations, farm groups, city groups, and the countless associations and societies we have formed all must work together toward our great objective of equality.

The chronological method was employed to the extent that Nixon had a "past-present-future" plan of arrangement as described by Thonssen and Baird.[1] Nixon began his discussion of the problem of segregation in Argument 1 by including several historical elements concerning the problem. These historical elements concerned primarily early America. Then, in the remainder of the proof, Nixon proceeded to an evaluation of the "present" status of the problem and an indication of the importance of "future" progress toward the ultimate resolution of the problem. These illustrations led Nixon to the conclusion that America cannot afford the moral, the economic, and the international cost of prejudice and discrimination. Thus, Nixon was able to develop the subject of segregation and equality indirectly through a discussion of the factors which contributed to the greatness of America. This approach may have been warranted because of the controversial nature of the subject at that time. The New York Times commented on the effectiveness of this indirect approach when it stated that Nixon "delivered a nonpartisan speech."[2] The Times commented on the critical

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

[2]New York Times, October 20, 1956, p. 20.

nature of the subject and the stand Nixon took when it stated, 'He deserves unqualified credit for what he said on this crucial subject on Thursday evening--and for the courage that led him to say it."[1] The importance of this issue may have led Richard Nixon to develop his speech in an indirect order, for, as Glen Mills pointed out in his discussion of the indirect order, it is generally used to "minimize the shock of an unpopular conclusion."[2]

Parts

The previous section dealt with the method of arrangement used by Nixon in the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address. This section will be concerned with the order of the parts of the address: the introduction, the statement of case, the proof, and the conclusion. The analysis will be concerned with the function of these parts.[3]

In this presentation, Nixon had an introduction of two short paragraphs which fulfilled the purpose of establishing contact with the audience. This was accomplished primarily through what Mills' termed reference to the occasion for this particular presentation.[4] In the first sentence, Nixon identified himself with the occasion when he stated:

---

[1] New York Times, October 20, 1956, p. 20.

[2] Mills, op. cit., p. 222.

[3] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

[4] Mills, op. cit., p. 244.

> When I received your invitation to address this dinner honoring the memory of Alfred E. Smith, I tried to think of a single theme that would explain his greatness.

After this initial identification with the occasion, Nixon used the remainder of the introduction to forward indirectly the theme of his presentation. That is, his reference to a single theme in seeking to explain the greatness of A. E. Smith led him to the theme of the presentation and the statement of his case.

The statement of case fulfilled the function of setting forth clearly and concisely the nature of the thought to be developed in the presentation.[1] It indicated that Nixon was going to talk about the men and women of America and their importance to the greatness of America.

Within the proof of the presentation, Nixon used the repetition of a theme to carry him from one idea to another. He stated this theme at the outset of the presentation with the rhetorical question, "Why is America a great nation?" The theme, then, centered around the greatness of America. The repetition of this theme was used in the following manner:

(1) The greatness of America does not lie in our economic strength . . . ,
(2) But the greatness of America lies in the fact that the nation as a whole . . . ,
(3) We are also right in the greatness of our . . . , and
(4) The real secret of American greatness lies in . . .

Although the theme was repeated four times, as noted above, it was not used in Argument 2. As was stated previously,

---

[1]Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 395.

Argument 2 was a digression altogether from the main theme of the speech. It incorporated the idea of the threat of Communism and stemmed from comments forwarded in Argument 1 concerning what Nixon called "slave states of the present century." Even though the repetition of the theme of American greatness was not carried in all of the arguments of the speech, it was an effective means of unifying the speech as a whole.

From the analysis of the parts, it was significant that Nixon used the repetition of a theme as a transitional device in four of the five speeches analyzed, the Colorado Springs Address being the only exception. This device appeared to be the predominant means of unifying the ideas Richard Nixon used in his speeches.

Within the arguments of the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, Nixon relied on connective words such as "but," "and," "if," and personal pronouns to get from one idea to another. These connective words, although not as elaborate as the repetition of the theme used in the speech as a whole, served to unite the ideas Nixon was forwarding.

The conclusion fulfilled two functions in this speech. It summarized the main ideas covered in the speech and aroused the audience emotionally. In summary, Nixon pointed out:

(1) We know the moral cost . . . ,
(2) We know the economic cost . . . , and
(3) I can testify from experience as to the international cost . . .

After pointing out these various areas he had forwarded in

the presentation, he inspired the audience in the following manner:

> This was the revolutionary ideal which caught the imagination of the world in 1776. Our history books tell us that the American Revolution ended in Yorktown. But the American Revolution will not be complete until the ideals of independence, equality and freedom which kept men fighting at Valley Forge are a reality not only for Americans but for peoples throughout the world.

The conclusion, thus, fulfilled the functions of pointing up the main ideas of the presentation and emotionally inspiring the audience.

In summary, the introduction fulfilled the purpose of identifying Nixon with the occasion. The statement of the case was clear and concise and forwarded the theme of the presentation. Within the proof of the presentation, Nixon employed the repetition of a theme as a transitional device. The conclusion fulfilled the function of pointing up the main ideas and of emotionally inspiring the audience.

Invention

Logical Proofs

The analysis of arrangement of materials showed that the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address had four major arguments. Each of these arguments will be discussed individually.

> Argument 1: The basic rights of the individual as detailed in the Constitution, have been the foundation of American greatness.

The inductive method of reasoning was used in Argument 1. In this argument, the generalization was arrived

at through an analogy. Nixon divided his analogy into two general areas for comparison. These were:

1. Other nations have been wealthy and powerful but their wealth was for the few.

2. Other ages spoke of the divine right of kings. We speak of the divinely granted rights of every man.

The areas in this analogy centered around the historical concept of the basic rights of the individual in the philosophies founded in the government of early America as opposed to other non-democratic forms of government. In the two comparisons, Nixon did not establish or specifically name any given nation or group of nations. It was apparent, however, that his comparison was with those early nations which were ruled by kings or aristocracy as opposed to democratic rule.

In the first area noted above, Nixon examined the implications behind a government in which "power vested in an aristocracy of blood or of class" was supreme. He contrasted this with what he called the "daring" philosophy of the founding fathers of America when they said, "All men were created equal." Nixon implied, then, that the wealth and power of other nations was for the privileged few, while in America, all men had equal opportunity to share in the wealth and power of the nation.

In the second area noted above, Nixon further compared the aristocratic philosophy of the divine right of kings with the philosophy of America's founding fathers that "man's rights were granted by the Creator." Nixon stated

that the rights of man are an American heritage and found in the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. By comparing the specific aspects of equality and the rights of man as found in the Democratic form of government in America to those same aspects found in other forms of government, Nixon was able to establish the generalization that the basic rights of man were the foundation of American greatness.

> Argument 2: We seek to prove to the Communist world that freedom, and freedom alone, can bring out the best energies of mankind.

The reasoning process employed in Argument 2 was the inductive pattern. Nixon began with an enumeration of sub-arguments which led to the generalization stated as the argument. The three sub-arguments used were:

1. It is important that we remember that Communism and Nazism are evil things in themselves.
2. It is necessary for our national leaders to meet with the leaders of such states, in the hope of forging a secure peace for the world.
3. Our purpose is to lessen their burdens today, and to hasten the tomorrow when they will be free.

These three lines of argument appeared to lead logically to the generalization stated as Argument 2. In each of the sub-arguments, there was the implication that Communism and Nazism were the opposites of Democracy and that they denied the dignity and freedom of man. The sub-arguments further pointed out the role of the United States in the formulation of world peace. The generalization from sub-arguments, then, indicated that the United States was actively attempting to

prove to the Communist world that "freedom, and freedom alone, can bring out the best energies of mankind."

Argument 3: The American nation, in its early history, experienced and resolved problems concerning "equality of opportunity."

The inductive process of reasoning was again used in Argument 3. The generalization was arrived at through the enumeration of specific cases. In this argument, however, the generalization was not stated per se, but rather, was implied. The three instances were:

1. We had slavery during the first 76 years of our nation's history.
2. When our Constitution was written, the founding fathers were preparing for the day when slavery would be abolished.
3. We lived through the anti-foreign riots of the Know-Nothing days and the hooded terror of the Ku Klux Klan.

These instances appeared to lead logically to the implied generalization stated as Argument 3. Nixon indicated, through the development of his specific instances, the difficulties the American people had to surmount in the ultimate attainment of the "ideal of equality." The instances Nixon selected pointed out that (1) America was not perfect in that it had witnessed slavery in its history, (2) the nation possessed great foresight since the Constitution had been preparing for "the day when slavery would be abolished," and (3) America had emerged from the "Know-Nothing days" of the Ku Klux Klan as a "stronger nation." Because of these facts, the implied generalization that America experienced and resolved problems concerning "equality of opportunity"

was readily apparent.

> Argument 4: Our churches and schools, our labor unions and employer associations, farm groups, city groups, and the countless associations and societies we have formed all must work together toward our great objective of equality.

The inductive pattern of reasoning was used to develop this argument. Nixon began with an enumeration of general assumptions or sub-arguments which led to the ultimate generalization which is stated as Argument 4. The six lines of argument used were:

1. We have fused the best ideals and the strongest energies of all the peoples that have come to our shores.
2. We must always remember that our nation has achieved so much precisely because of our willingness to accept what each new American has to offer.
3. We hold that equality is basically a religious ideal.
4. We have gone further and placed this religious belief under the sanction of civil law.
5. We who hold office in the federal government would be the last to hold that our efforts alone will suffice.

These five sub-arguments appeared to lead logically to the generalization stated as Argument 4. Through these lines of argument, Nixon offered various reasons why "we should all work together to promote understanding, brotherhood, and national unity." In the first two arguments, he implied that the American nation had achieved greatness because of its willingness to accept and share "in the diversity and richness that each has to contribute." In the other three sub-arguments, Nixon developed the status of equality in

America at the time of the speech. Inherent in these lines of argument was the implication that further progress was needed. This implied need for further progress led Nixon to the generalization that the responsibility should be shared by all Americans. The sub-arguments were developed, therefore, in such a manner as to terminate in the generalization that "our churches and schools, our labor unions and employer associations, farm groups, city groups, and the countless associations and societies we have formed all must work together toward our great objective of equality."

From the analysis of the four arguments, it was found that Nixon developed all of the arguments inductively. In the first argument, the generalization was arrived at through an analogy. In the remaining three arguments, an enumeration of lines of argument or sub-arguments led to the ultimate generalizations. It is interesting to note that Argument 2 concerned the subject of Communism. It would seem that Nixon had a special affinity for this general subject area, for a discussion of the threat of Communism was included in each of the five speeches analyzed regardless of the central idea of the various speeches.

Forms of Support

This analysis will be concerned with the following forms of support; information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony.

Information: The form of support of information was used extensively in this presentation. Factual and

statistical data which can be verified independently of the speaker using it will be considered within this category. In the analysis, an attempt was made to include information used as evidence independently of the other forms of support. That is, facts and statistics used within the examples or as comparison and contrast will not be discussed in this category, but rather will be found under the appropriate headings of the other forms of support.

The form of support of information was used as evidence throughout the entire presentation. The first use of information was made in the introduction when Nixon discussed Alfred E. Smith the man. Nixon offered the following two facts concerning the background of the late Governor Smith; (1) "He was a poor boy from the East Side of New York" and (2) "He had little in the way of formal education." These two facts were not used in the true sense of evidence in support of ideas. Rather, they were used to highlight that phase of Alfred E. Smith's background which most advantageously led Nixon to the central theme of his speech. These two facts enabled Nixon to show how an individual could rise from meager beginnings to a station of prominence in America. This idea, then, prepared for the discussion of equality and segregation which followed.

Within the proof of the presentation, Nixon used information on a number of occasions to support his ideas. This use of information occurred in all of the arguments of the proof. An indication of the manner in which these facts

were used within the proof can be found within the following examples:

(1) Our basic rights are spelled out in more detail in our Constitution and its first ten amendments, the Bill of Rights. . . . ,
(2) Twenty-three years ago a new state was created in Germany. . . . ,
(3) Thirty-nine years ago next month a new state was created in Russia. . . . ,
(4) But, when we take these steps, we are not absolving a system that has enslaved eight hundred million of our fellow men. . . . ,
(5) We had slavery during the first 76 years of our nation's history. . . . ,
(6) Our fathers came from all nations and from all continents. We are English, Irish, German, Italian, Polish, French. We are European, Asian, African. . . . ,
(7) Our constitution, and particularly the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment, ordain that the full majesty and power of our federal government shall be used to protect and enforce this equality. . . . ,
(8) The decision of the Supreme Court on segregation in schools is but one step in a continuing process of giving substance and vitality to our Democracy. . . . , and
(9) Our constitution has strictly limited the scope and powers of government.

These facts were used throughout the four arguments and no argument contained any significant majority of them. The facts forwarded as evidence were unusual in that they were, for the most part, universally acceptable to the audience. Facts were drawn from such irrefutable sources as the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights, Supreme Court decisions, and early American history. The controversial nature of the subject may have necessitated the selection of these acceptable facts as evidence.

Example: The example, as defined previously in this dissertation, was not used independently as a form of support in this speech. It was, however, used in connection

with the form of support of comparison and contrast. The discussion of example will therefore be contained in the analysis of comparison and contrast.

Comparison and Contrast: The form of support of comparison and contrast was used extensively in this presentation. It was particularly important as evidence in Arguments 1 and 2. In Argument 1, Nixon developed his ideas through the use of an analogy.

In the analogy, Nixon compared and contrasted the democratic philosophy of government with the governments of non-democratic nations. The analogy supported the generalization that the philosophy which recognized the rights of the individual was the basis for American greatness. The comparison and contrasts in the analogy which supported the generalization were:

(1) The control of wealth and power in other nations and the United States,
(2) The philosophies of other governments and the United States, and
(3) The daring concept of the American Bill of Rights in relation to its period in history.

In Argument 2, Nixon, in concerning himself with the basic evils inherent in Communist and Nazism, offered an implied comparison contrasting the philosophies of these two forms of government with those of the United States. Nixon indicated in his contrast that the United States must work with these conflicting forms of government in world affairs in order to prove to these governments that freedom "can bring out the best energies of mankind." The examples used implied a comparison and contrast between the

United States and the following:

(1) The contrasting slave states of Russia and Germany and
(2) The inherent evils in Communism and Nazism.

The form of support of comparison and contrast was not significantly important throughout the remainder of the address. The majority of the use of this form of support, then, as evidence was contained in Arguments 1 and 2 of this address.

Testimony: The form of support of testimony was used as evidence on five occasions in this address. Nixon used a variety of testimony, relying on personal testimony on two occasions and on the authority of the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln, and Alfred E. Smith on three occasions.

In Argument 1, Nixon relied on the Declaration of Independence and Lincoln to support his ideas in the following manner:

(1) It took faith to assert that 'every man was endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights.' . . . and
(2) In the words of Lincoln, 'Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'

The testimony in this argument was used to support the idea that early Americans were concerned with the rights of the individual.

In Argument 3 and in the conclusion, Nixon relied on personal testimony, as he had in the previous four speeches analyzed, to support his ideas. He testified to the importance of the segregation problem by relating the work being accomplished by "men of good will" toward its

ultimate resolution. He further testified to the "international cost" of segregation. The paragraphs which contained the personal testimony read:

(1) And I can report to you tonight that men of good will in all sections of our land are working with complete devotion toward the day when the American ideal of equality of opportunity is a reality for all of our people. . . . and
(2) I can testify from experience as to the international cost.

The fifth use of testimony occurred in Argument 4 when Nixon quoted Alfred E. Smith to support his own allegation that 'equality means one thing--in the words of Al Smith--'We believe in the common brotherhood of man under the common Fatherhood of God.'" The form of support of testimony then, was used as evidence on five occasions in this address. Nixon relied on personal testimony twice and on the authority of Lincoln, A. E. Smith, and the Declaration of Independence.

Emotional Appeals

The analysis of motive appeals in the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address will include an identification and discussion of the emotions affected by these appeals. The most important of the motives found in this speech were the appeals to reputation and opportunity and fair play. These motives were interwoven within the framework of this presentation and therefore will be discussed as an entity.

Reputation and opportunity and fair play: The central theme of the A. E. Smith Memorial Dinner presentation was concerned with the problem of segregation. Richard

Nixon did not attack the problem directly, however. He approached the problem, as was suggested in the discussion of arrangement, by recalling those elements of American greatness which embodied or focused attention on equality and the rights of man. This discussion of the greatness of America and the recalling of the American heritage was an appeal to the motives of reputation in the audience. This appeal to reputation was an appeal to Americanism and was contained throughout the presentation. Closely connected with this appeal to Americanism was the appeal to the motive of opportunity and fair play. In the appeals to the motive of reputation, Nixon included those American qualities and philosophies which dealt with the motives of opportunity and fair play. This was particularly true when Nixon focused attention on equality and the rights of man.

The first indication of an appeal to reputation and opportunity and fair play appeared in the second paragraph of the text of the speech. The motive in this instance was contained in the latter part of the introduction. Nixon alluded briefly to the humble background and later achievements of Alfred E. Smith and in this manner forwarded the theme of the speech. The development of this appeal in the introduction reads as follows:

> He was a poor boy from the East Side of New York. He had little in the way of formal education. But he achieved distinction as a leader of men, a tower of strength in the business community, and, above all, as a man of unblemished character. He was a magnificent example of the American dream. He typifies the truth of the statement that in America there is no forgotten man, no common man, no

> little man, no average man. There is only our fellow man.
>
> Why is America a great nation?

The appeal to the motives of reputation and opportunity and fair play in the introduction gave a clear indication of the manner in which these motives were to be developed in the speech. Nixon indicated at the outset that A. E. Smith was an "example of the American dream." The implication was that the American dream was embodied in "our fellow man." There was the suggestion, then, that Nixon was going to concern himself with the average American citizen in whom the greatness of America was embodied. This was precisely what Nixon did in the proof of the speech.

Within the proof, the appeals to the motives of reputation and opportunity and fair play were found in all of the arguments. In each case, the motives centered around an aspect of American greatness in which the greatness was embodied in or stemmed from equality or freedom of the individual. The proof in its entirety contained thirty-four paragraphs. Of these paragraphs, three paragraphs did not contain the motive appeals to reputation and opportunity and fair play. These three paragraphs were found in Argument 2. It should be said, then, that the entire proof contained these motives. The following paragraphs indicate the manner in which Nixon appealed simultaneously to these motives:

(1) The greatness of America does not lie in our economic strength or our unequalled wealth. It cannot be measured by military power or diplomatic prestige.

Other nations have been wealthy and powerful. But their wealth was for the few. Their power was vested in an aristocracy of blood or of class. In these nations, privilege and right were restricted to the ruling elite. The remainder, the so-called masses or common men, had duties rather than privileges.

It took daring on the part of our founding fathers to say that all men were created equal. It took faith to assert that 'every man was endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights.' Thr world of 1776 was not cast in this image.

In the words of Lincoln, 'Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.'

These moving passages from two of our greatest national documents carry a message which America today should never forget. It is a message of the dignity of man as a child of God.

Other ages spoke of the divine right of kings. We speak of the divinely granted rights of every man. In our government, no man is so lowly that he is beneath its protection. We are free men, equal under law. . . . and

(2) We had slavery during the first 76 years of our nation's history. There has been discrimination based on race, religion, and national origin. Even today there is resistance to the granting of our Negro citizens their full rights under law.

But the greatness of America lies in the fact that the nation as a whole has fought to eliminate these injustices and to seek evermore forcefully our ideal of equality.

When our Constitution was written, the founding fathers were preparing for the day when slavery would be abolished. When that day came, this nation went to war--brother against brother--to establish our ideal of freedom.

We lived through the anti-foreign riots of the Know-Nothing days and the hooded terror of the Ku Klux Klan. Each time we emerged a stronger nation, ashamed of prejudice and hate, and more determined to give equal justice to all.

I feel sure that we shall pass through our present crisis with equal credit. Most of us here will live to see the day when American boys and girls shall sit, side by side, at any school--public or private--with no regard paid to the color of their skin. Segregation, discrimination, and prejudice have no place in America. And I can report to you tonight that men of good will in all sections of our land are working with complete devotion toward the day when the American ideal of equality of op-

portunity is a reality for all of our people.

The preceding examples from Arguments 1 and 3 indicate the extensive use made of the motives of reputation and opportunity and fair play. The remainder of the motives to these appeals were contained in the following ideas:

(1) The Constitution safeguards to individual freedoms,
(2) The implications of the Supreme Court decisions concerning segregation,
(3) The limiting factors imposed upon Federal legislators concerning the problem of segregation, and
(4) The responsibilities of individuals concerning the problems of segregation.

Implicit in all of the motives of reputation and opportunity and fair play was the dual function of portraying to the audience the greatness of America, as well as depicting the manner in which the American desires for equality and individual rights contribute to the continuance of American greatness.

The final appeal to these motives was contained in the conclusion when Nixon rephrased and reinforced the ideas concerning American greatness and individual rights. The paragraphs which contained the appeals to the motives of reputation and opportunity and fair play read:

> I have often expressed the idea that the world struggle today is a contest for men's minds. It is mainly in the realm of the spirit, and only secondarily in the military, diplomatic, and economic fields. In such a struggle, the kind of people we are counts much more than what we say. To the diverse people of the world--different in race, religion, and national origin, but one in the sight of our Creator--let us show forth the highest meaning of our democracy, a nation under God to seek the welfare of all, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, powerful and weak.
>
> This was the revolutionary ideal which caught the imagination of the world in 1776. Our history

> books tell us that the American Revolution will not be complete until the ideals of independence, equality, and freedom which kept men fighting at Valley Forge are a reality not only for Americans but for peoples throughout the world.

The motive appeals contained in this presentation affected two emotions primarily. These were the emotions of pride and confidence. The constant references to American greatness and the manner in which this greatness was achieved were a source of pride to the audience. The audience could be proud of its American heritage, particularly the manner in which early Americans strived to protect and insure the individual freedom and rights of the "common man." In addition, the audience could be confident in the knowledge that whatever imperfections still existed in the American nation with regard to equality and individual rights, these would eventually be resolved, for as Nixon assured then, 'We are willing to change, we are never satisfied with second best." Nixon discussed an imperfection when he talked about the problem of segregation. He underscored this problem when he stated, 'Even today there is resistance to the granting of our Negro citizens their full rights under law." But he quickly indicated, however, that the audience could be confident that 'we shall pass through our present crisis with equal credit."

It should be pointed out that these motive appeals to reputation and opportunity and fair play could also be considered as examples of fallacious reasoning. The manner in which Nixon appealed to Americanism and the American heritage

might be considered an appeal to tradition and custom or eulogy of the people. These appeals are considered a source of fallacious reasoning when they "obscure or leave out logical material."[1]

In summary, motive appeals to reputation and opportunity and fair play were used extensively in this speech. Elements of these motives were found in thirty-eight of the forty-three paragraphs. Thus, it could be said that the speech was predominantly an appeal to these motives.

Ethical Appeals

The discussion of ethical appeals will be divided into the qualities of good will, intelligence, and character. Because the analysis revealed that the qualities denoting ethical appeal were subtly interwoven into the text, the analysis will deal with those elements as revealed directly from the content of the speech.

Good Will: The audience in this speaking situation was composed of both Republicans and Democrats. There was a strong possibility, however, that the audience was predominantly democratic in their political beliefs since the occasion was a memorial dinner for the late Democratic Governor Alfred E. Smith. It should be further noted that on October 18, 1956, Nixon had campaigned extensively for his own re-election as a Republican vice-presidential candidate. Therefore, his appearance as a guest speaker in

---

[1]Baird, op. cit., p. 184.

memory of a revered member of the opposition party was significant in that it placed Nixon in an unusual circumstance. On this occasion, Nixon established good will with his audience in two principal ways. These were, first, the manner in which he praised the audience, and secondly, the ability with which he identified himself with the audience.

Nixon praised the audience, not as members of a particular political party, but rather as Americans united in a cause for the maintenance of American greatness. At the outset of the speech, Nixon developed his materials in such a manner that his message appeared to stem from or was suggested by Alfred E. Smith, the man. Nixon suggested that A. E. Smith was able to "achieve distinction" even though he was a poor boy with "little formal education" because of the American philosophy toward individual rights and freedom. Nixon implied that this philosophy regarding individual rights was the source of American greatness for which the audience could be justifiably proud. Nixon then praised the audience as Americans and established a feeling of good will in the following manner:

(1) He recalled the early American heritage which made the rise of a man such as A. E. Smith possible,
(2) He depicted the manner in which the American philosophy was not only a "daring concept" during America's early times, but also how it was endeavoring to prove to "the Communist world that freedom and freedom alone can bring out the best energies of mankind,"
(3) He praised them for the manner in which the American people had fused "the strongest energies of all peoples who have come to our shores,"
(4) He praised the audience confidently for their competency to resolve the "present crisis with equal credit," particularly since history had shown that the American people had always "emerged a stronger

nation" after facing any crisis infringing on individual rights, and

(5) He praised the audience for the present efforts of the American people toward the elimination of infringment on individual rights. He specifically pointed with pride to the efforts of the courts, the legislators and the people themselves.

Throughout his indirect praise of the audience, Nixon continually referred to the problem under discussion as a problem shared by the American people rather than by any particular party or group. He talked in terms of "we" and "our" when discussing the problem, and in this way made himself a part of the audience and a part of the problem. In so doing, Nixon identified himself as an individual American whose responsibility it was to work toward the solution of the problem of segregation. Throughout the address, then, Nixon established good will by identifying himself with the audience and praising them as Americans.

Character: A means of focusing attention on the probity of character has been noted by Thonssen and Baird as occurring when the speaker associates his message with "what is virtuous and elevated."[1] This was the principal means employed by Nixon in establishing character in this presentation. As was indicated in the discussion on good will, the problem under consideration was depicted as being of importance to the American people as a whole. With this fact in mind, Nixon associated the problem of segregation with that which was not virtuous and elevated in the following manner:

---

[1] Thonssen and Baird, op. cit., p. 394.

(1) He quoted the American antecedents on the question of equality when he quoted the Declaration of Independence as stating, "Every man was endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights,"
(2) He linked his message with Abraham Lincoln when he quoted from Lincoln's Gettysburg Address in the following manner, "Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal,"
(3) Nixon depicted the manner in which the American antecedents felt that "man's rights as granted by the Creator" placed equality beyond "the pale of government,"
(4) Nixon associated his message with the Consitution and its first ten amendments commonly referred to as the Bill of Rights, and
(5) Nixon associated his message with the moral, the economic, and the international welfare of the American nation.

The focusing of attention on the probity of character from the content of the presentation was accomplished, then, by associating the message with that which was virtuous and elevated in the eyes of all factions of the audience. Nixon associated his message with such documents as the Constitution and Declaration of Independence; with such individuals as Abraham Lincoln and Alfred E. Smith; and finally, by stating that individual rights were divinely endowed by "the Creator."

Intelligence: The means of gauging sagacity or intelligence found in this presentation were: (1) Nixon acted with tact and moderation and (2) he displayed a sense of good taste. These means were particularly apparent in the selection of materials and development of ideas. This was noted with regard to the selection of the subject itself and the selection of ideas chosen to substantiate the main theme. Since this speech was delivered in the midst

of a national campaign, the selection of the topic of segregation, or equality as Nixon called it, lent itself to a bipartisan coverage for this politically mixed audience. There was no condemnation of the opposite political party, nor was there any praise of his own party in the speech.

The aforementioned means of gauging intelligence or sagacity could again be noted in the development of the general theme. Nixon approached the problem of segregation, not in terms of forwarding any specific problem faced in the nation at that time nor with a condemnation of any section of the country for its stand on the issue, but rather he approached the problem indirectly by discussing the greatness of America. In his discussion, Nixon selected as his items contributing to American greatness those which predominantly stressed the contribution made by the individual or common man to the American heritage. The following examples note those elements Nixon forwarded which stressed this importance:

(1) The American heritage highlights the "inalienable rights" of man through such works as the Declaration of Independence, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, and the Constitution of the United States,
(2) The history of the American nation includes many struggles which led to the granting of individual rights to its citizens,
(3) The philosophy of granting the individual "full rights under law" has enabled the American nation to benefit from the contribution of all its citizens,
(4) Although the legislators and the courts have led in the struggle for complete equality in America, there is a need on the part of every American to share in the responsibility of promoting "understanding, brotherhood, and national unity," and
(5) The importance of the entire nation sharing in the responsibility for individual equality can be felt morally, economically, and internationally.

Thus Nixon indirectly discussed the problem of segregation by discussing in general terms the history of equality, its significance and its importance to the American people.

In summary, the analysis of the content revealed that Nixon employed elements which contributed to his personal or ethical appeal. He established good will by identifying himself and his message with the audience and by praising the audience for its American heritage. He established his character by associating his message with sources commonly considered reputable, virtuous, or elevated, such as the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights. He relied on testimony such as quotations from Abraham Lincoln and A. E. Smith which was acceptable to the majority of the audience. Finally, Nixon displayed intelligence primarily through his selection of materials and his development of ideas.

Style

It was noted from the analysis of style that there were four predominant elements of style in this address. These were the elements of directness, concreteness, parallel structure, and vivid and figurative language.

Directness: Directness can be assessed by an analysis of the use of personal pronouns and the elements of a conversational tone. From the analysis of directness in this speech, it was noted that there was, as was true in the other four speeches analyzed, a great reliance on personal pronouns such as "I," "we," "our," and "us." It

should be pointed out, however, that this speech did not have as great a number of these personal pronouns as did the other speeches analyzed. In this forty-two paragraph speech, there were 163 such pronouns whereas the Acceptance Address had 274, the American Legion Address 276, the Gettysburg Speech 195, and the Colorado Springs Address 170. Even though there were not as many personal pronouns used in this address, only three one-sentence paragraphs did not contain at least one personal pronoun. An unusual feature of this presentation was the numerous use of the personal pronouns "we" and "our." Although the other speeches also contained a great number of these two personal pronouns, this speech was almost exclusively of the "we" and "our" variety. Nixon used sixty "we's" and fifty-four "our's" for a total of 114 of the 163 pronouns found in this address. By striking contrast, Nixon did not rely on the personal pronoun "I" as he had in previous presentations. On only eight occasions was "I" used in this speech compared to thirty-eight "I's" in the Acceptance Address, forty-five in the American Legion Address, forty-seven in the Gettysburg Speech, and sixteen in the Colorado Springs Address. Thus the repeated use of personal pronouns was again a significant feature of style in this speech.

The second feature of directness which was found in all of Nixon's presentations analyzed and in this one as well, was the reliance on short simple sentences. All of the sentences were simple and could be considered in the category of short sentences. Very few sentences were more

than ten to fifteen words in length.

From the analysis of directness, it can be concluded that because of the use of numerous personal pronouns and the use of simple, direct sentences and paragraphs that this speech contained a great number of the elements contributing to directness.

Concreteness: Of the attributes which contribute to concreteness, as noted in previous chapters, Nixon employed names, places, general classes of people, and general statistics in this Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address. The attributes used by Nixon contributing to concreteness were:

(1) (Names) Alfred E. Smith, Lincoln, Creator, and God . . . ,
(2) (General classes of people) Americans, English, Irish, German, Italian, Polish, French, European, Asian, African, legislators, Negro citizens, slaves, doctors, engineers, skilled craftsmen, national leaders, Ku Klux Klan, teachers, lawyers, farm groups, city groups, employer associations, labor unions, founding fathers, ruling elite, kings, free men, master race, citizens, and eight hundred million of our fellow men . . . ,
(3) (Places) America, East Side of New York, Russia, Germany, Yorktown, and Valley Forge . . . ,
(4) (Specific instances) 76 years ago, 39 years ago, and 23 years ago . . . ,
(5) (Dates) 1776 . . . and
(6) (Specifics) American Revolution, Declaration of Independence, Constitution, Bill of Rights, Iron Curtain, Supreme Court, Fourteenth Amendment, Federal Courts, Federal Government, and civil law.

It can be noted, thus, that there were a number of attributes in the speech which contribute to concreteness. In addition, there were a number of abstractions in the speech.

The general tone of the presentation was abstract. This was particularly true because Nixon talked in general terms and, although there were specific elements which were

recognizable, the content of the speech was largely general. In the first argument, for example, Nixon discussed the fact that American greatness does not lie in economic strength and unequalled wealth. He pointed to "other nations" as being wealthy and powerful, but he did not name them. In the same argument, he talked about the "ruling elite," the "common man," "inalienable rights," and the fact that the average man was free and equal "under law" but he did not specifically indicate what he meant nor did he elaborate upon these generalizations.

Throughout the remainder of the presentation, Nixon talked in general terms about the greatness of America and how this greatness was vested in the individual. He did not, however, offer any specific examples or specific instances which might have clarified his points. The one notable example, the success of Alfred E. Smith in attaining political stature from meager social and educational backgrounds, was found in the introduction. The proof of the presentation, therefore, was essentially abstract. As was pointed out, the major generalizations were substantiated by still other generalizations rather than by specific instances or clarification.

Parallel structure: In this presentation, Nixon used the parallel structure extensively. Although the speech did contain the repetition of a given structure of sentences, the predominant use of this device occurred in the form of a recurring structure of words. This repetition of a

given structure of words is commonly referred to as a series.

The parallel structure was used as a recurring structure of sentences on only one occasion. This use occurred in the introduction in the following manner:

> He was a poor boy . . .
> He had little in the way . . .
> But he achieved . . .
> He was a magnificent example . . .
> He typifies the . . .

The series, on the other hand, was used on eleven occasions throughout the presentation. The following examples indicate the extensive use of the series in this address:

(1) . . . no forgotten man, no common man, no little man, no average man. . . . ,
(2) . . . life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. . . . ,
(3) We are English, Irish, German, Italian, Polish, French. . . . ,
(4) We are European, Asian, African. . . . ,
(5) State law and actions of the federal government are moving forward to eliminate bias in employment, discrimination in housing and bigotry in any form. . . . ,
(6) . . . we should all work to promote understanding, brotherhood, and national unity. . . . ,
(7) America cannot afford the moral, the economic and the international cost. . . . ,
(8) . . . in the military, diplomatic, and economic fields. . . . ,
(9) To the diverse people of the world--different in race, religion, and national origin, but one in the sight of our Creator . . . ,
(10) . . . a nation under God to seek the welfare of all, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, powerful and weak. . . . , and
(11) But the American Revolution will not be complete until the ideals of independence, equality and freedom . . .

Thus the parallel structure in the form of a series was an important feature of style in this address.

Vivid and figurative language: The use of vivid and figurative language contained in this address was in keeping with its over-all emotional and abstract tone.

The first use of figurative language occurred in the introduction when Nixon described Alfred E. Smith in the following manner:

(1) But he achieved distinction as a leader of men, a tower of strength in the business community . . . and
(2) . . . a man of unblemished character.

Within the proof, Nixon employed figures in the following manner:

(1) The world of 1776 was not cast in this image . . . ,
(2) Liberty vanished behind the barbed wire . . . ,
(3) Even if these threats had disappeared . . . ,
(4) . . . raised their blasphemous hands . . . ,
(5) We have taken advantage of the partial lifting of the Iron Curtain to try to let the Communists see freedom in action . . . ,
(6) We hope to remove from all mankind the paralyzing fear of war and the crushing burden of armament . . . ,
(7) We have been blessed by the richness of our land . . . ,
(8) The result has been a fusion of the best ideals and the strongest energies of all the peoples . . . ,
(9) Race and religious hatred strike at the roots . . . ,
(10) The survival of our highest ideals . . . , and
(11) We must eradicate them from the face of our society . . .

These figures used in the proof of the presentation indicate the manner in which Nixon used the specific words and phrases underlined above out of their normal context thus giving a "definite suggestiveness" to their literal meaning.

The presentation also contained a number of vivid words and phrases which gave a suggestiveness and impact to the literal connotations involved. The following vivid language was used in the speech:

(1) . . . aristocracy of blood or of class . . . ,
(2) . . . the pale of government . . . ,

(3) . . . life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness . . . ,
(4) . . . the dignity of man . . . ,
(5) . . . energies of mankind . . . ,
(6) . . . materialistic assumptions . . . ,
(7) . . . Know-Nothing days . . . ,
(8) . . . hooded terror . . . ,
(9) . . . enslaved eight hundred million of our fellow men . . . ,
(10) . . . segregation . . . ,
(11) . . . prejudice . . . ,
(12) . . . supreme dignity . . . ,
(13) . . . great resources . . . ,
(14) . . . full majesty of power . . . ,
(15) . . . giving substance and vitality . . . ,
(16) . . . bigotry . . . ,
(17) . . . dead and meaningless words . . . ,
(18) . . . dust covered parchment . . . ,
(19) . . . true greatness . . . ,
(20) . . . quiet suffering of millions . . .

These words and phrases added color and imagery to the ideas Nixon was setting forth. They also had an impact and important effect on the ideas Nixon forwarded. When Nixon forwarded ideas which he wanted the audience to accept, the words had a positive connotation. The reverse was true when he wanted the audience to reject an idea. The following list indicates the negative and positive connotation of the words Nixon used in this address:

Negative	Positive
Hooded terror	dignity
bigotry	true greatness
dead and meaningless words	substance
segregation	vitality
Know-Nothing days	full majesty of power
blasphemous hands	great resources
paralyzing fear	blessed by the richness
crushing burden	fellow man
survival	dignity of man
eradicate	energies of mankind
enslaved	

It should be noted, then, that Nixon relied heavily on the use of vivid and figurative language in this presen-

tation. And the use of this vivid language added a definite suggestiveness and emotional impact to the presentation as a whole.

Summary

1. The Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address was delivered at the twelfth annual dinner honoring the late Governor Smith. The dinner was held in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel ballroom on October 18, 1956. The immediate audience was composed of Democrats, Republicans, and Independents and numbered approximately 2,500 persons. The speech was not carried on radio or television.

2. It was noted from the analysis of arrangement that Nixon used a combination of the chronological and indirect methods of development. The speech was divided into the four parts of introduction, statement of case, proof, and peroration. The introduction fulfilled the function of identifying Nixon with the occasion. The peroration fulfilled two functions. It summarized the speech and aroused the emotions of the audience toward the subject.

3. From the analysis of logical proofs, it was found that all four of the arguments were developed inductively. In Argument 1, the generalization was arrived at through an analogy. In the remaining three arguments, the generalization was developed through the use of subarguments.

4. Nixon used the forms of support of information, testimony, and comparison and contrast extensively in this

speech. Information was used as evidence on twelve occasions throughout the address. Testimony was used as evidence on five occasions within the proof. Comparison and contrast, on the other hand, was important as evidence primarily in Arguments 1 and 2 of the proof.

5. Nixon appealed primarily to the motives of reputation and opportunity and fair play. These appeals were contained throughout the presentation. The extensive use of these motives can be noted in the fact that elements of these appeals were found in thirty-eight of the forty-three paragraphs of the address.

6. It was noted from the analysis that the ethical appeal of Richard Nixon was revealed in the qualities of good will, intelligence, and character. Nixon established good will by identifying himself with the audience and by praising the audience as Americans. Nixon focused attention on the probity of his character by associating himself and his message with that which was elevated and virtuous. Finally, Nixon focused attention on his sagacity or intelligence specifically when he acted with tact and good taste in the selection of his material and the development of his ideas. These qualities of ehtical appeal were found throughout the entire address.

7. The predominant elements of style in this address were directness, concreteness, parallel structure, and vivid and figurative language. The element of directness was a significant feature of Nixon's style. In the

presentation, 163 personal pronouns were used. Of this number, 114 were "we" and "our" pronouns. These pronouns and short simple sentences aided in the creation of a "we feeling." Although the speech contained a number of attributes which contribute to concreteness, the analysis revealed that the speech employed a large number of emotionally toned abstract terms.

CHAPTER IX

SPEECH PREPARATION AND REACTIONS TO NIXON AS A SPEAKER

On October 7, 1956, William M. Blair, in an article in the New York Times, commented on the stature of Richard M. Nixon as a speaker when he stated:

> But for all his evangelistic fervor in public, Mr. Nixon still is regarded as the calculating politician. In only ten years of public life he has developed an oratorical style that is acclaimed as a match best (sic) on political platforms today.[1]

These sentiments were repeated by Barnet Baskerville in his article entitled, "The New Nixon," published in the Quarterly Journal of Speech dated February, 1957. Mr. Baskerville noted that "Nixon is regarded by many as the best political speaker in America today."[2] These two reactions to the speaking ability of Richard Nixon strongly suggest a favorable response to his oratorical abilities. The extent to which these comments were representative will be investigated in this chapter.

It is the purpose of this chapter to analyze and discuss Richard M. Nixon's methods of speech preparation and to investigate the reactions of newsmen concerning his

---

[1] New York Times, October 7, 1956.

[2] Barnet Baskerville, op. cit., p. 39.

effectiveness as a speaker. In the discussion of Nixon's speech preparation an attempt will be made to outline the procedure he followed in preparing his addresses for the convention and campaign of 1956. The discussion of the reactions to Nixon as a speaker will include editorial comments concerning his addresses not only from the 1956 campaign, but also from previous campaigns in which he took part. Information dealing with editorial comment from earlier campaigns is necessary because of the repeated references by writers during the 1956 campaign to what has been labeled "the new Nixon."[1]

Speech Preparation

Speech writing: In this era of mass media and communication, the use of a speech writer has not been uncommon. Roosevelt, Truman, and Eisenhower were but a few of the political figures of the United States who relied on speech writers to aid them in fulfilling their many speaking commitments. Richard Nixon, as was noted, delivered approximately 120 speeches during the campaign of 1956.[2] In this campaign, he personally wrote all of his addresses.[3]

While the Vice-President personally wrote his own presentations, an aide was added to his staff in 1957 whose primary responsibility was the preparing of Nixon's rough

---

[1]New York Times, October 7, 1956.

[2]Personal Interview, Miss Waldron, Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 24, 1958.

[3]Ibid.

draft presentations for publication.[1] This aide should not be confused with a speech writer, for the task of writing the presentations remained with Nixon. The fact that Nixon prepared all of his presentations could account for a reliance on basic speeches during the campaign. This aspect of basic speeches will be discussed at greater length later in this analysis.

Preliminary research: Two major research functions were fulfilled by the Vice-President's staff prior to the actual formulation of each speech. First, information was assessed concerning the probable audience of a given speech. The information on specific audiences was sent to the Vice-President well in advance of each speaking situation.[2] During the majority of the campaign, such information was concerned with sections of the country rather than with a given audience in a specific city.[3] These data, therefore, could be used for a number of speeches to be delivered in any one area. Secondly, technical or unusual information to be included in the presentation was investigated.[4] At the request of the Vice-President, his staff checked all technical and factual data prior to its incorporation in the presentation. If the problem was scientific in nature or concerned an issue of policy, advice was sought from area experts or members of the Republican Party. On one occasion

---

[1]Personal Interview, Members and Staff of the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1958.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid. [4]Ibid.

during the campaign, specifically the Colorado Springs Address analyzed previously in this dissertation, an entire address was sent to the President and his staff for approval.[1] The use Nixon made of experts with regard to specific information was unusual. He discussed aspects of a given problem with an expert rather than having the expert check the authenticity of the manuscript.[2] The expert, thus, was not brought in to attest to the accuracy of any given example or use of facts, but rather his services were utilized to insure that the Vice-President would be well grounded on all facets of the problem which might arise during the speech and the informal questioning period which often followed its conclusion. This type of speech preparation was in keeping with the Vice-President's fondness for an informal type of presentation.

In an article in the Saturday Evening Post, Nixon voiced a preference for the informal question and answer type of speaking situation as opposed to the formal platform speech.[3] While the campaign did not offer a great number of these informal speaking situations, Nixon did, however, engage in two question and answer programs which should be noted here. These were (1) the nation-wide television program with editors of collegiate publications

---

[1]New York Times, September 23, 1956, p. 7.

[2]Personal Interview, Members and Staff of the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1958.

[3]Saturday Evening Post, December 28, 1957, p. 77.

which took place on October 17, 1956 at Cornell University, and (2) his news conference with eight leading newsmen on October 4, 1956 from the National Broadcasting Studio in the Sheraton Park Hotel, Washington, D. C.[1]

The preliminary research, then, centered around the general audience or audiences to be addressed and any special problems which might arise from the content of the speech which would necessitate expert opinion.

Speech composition: Since Nixon followed essentially the same procedure in composing all of his presentations, this aspect of preparation will be discussed in general terms prior to the specific description of the preparation for the 1956 campaign. Nixon began preparing each speech by noting the general outline he would use on a "yellow scratch pad."[2] His use of the "yellow pad," according to Miss Agnes Waldron, secretary to the Vice-President, was a standard operating procedure when preparing a speech.[3] After this initial outline, Nixon would do one of two things. He would either dictate a tentative speech to one of his secretaries or he would record the material on a dictaphone.[4] This rough draft was then typed by one of the secretaries in what Nixon called an outline format. This reference to an outline format may be somewhat misleading since the typed copy

---

[1] Republican National Committee News Release, October 1, 1956.

[2] Personal Interview, Miss Waldron, Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1958.

[3] Ibid. [4] Ibid.

returned to the Vice-President was, for all practical purposes, an entire manuscript. It differed from a manuscript in that the ideas were grouped in short paragraphs which were usually one to two sentences in length. The essentials of a manuscript, however, were contained in the outline. The Vice-President would then edit and polish the presentation himself and return it to his secretaries.

After this editing, the speech, still in short paragraph outline format, was cut on a stencil.[1] From the stencil, a number of copies were cut and the Vice-President received several of these.[2] These stencil copies were used by Mr. Nixon as he rehearsed his speech. It must be noted that a great deal of the rehearsal of presentations usually took place enroute to the speaking situation.[3] This rehearsal was usually thorough enough to enable him to deliver his speeches extemporaneously. His rehearsal included underlining of specific words or phrases for emphasis.[4] After each presentation, the manuscript or the detailed speech outline was edited prior to its release for publication.

In the campaign of 1956, Nixon resorted to the use of several basic speeches for the campaign. These "basic speeches" were developed according to the procedure detailed above. During the campaign, the individual speeches

---

[1]Personal Interview, Miss Waldron, Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 25, 1956.

[2]Ibid. [3]Ibid. [4]Ibid.

were built around the previously prepared texts.[1] It should be noted that the introduction and conclusion of each speech were generally adapted to the specific audience, but the issues were selected from the previously prepared "basic speeches." The use of "basic speeches" caused a particular problem for the newsmen in this campaign because they were hearing the same general material over and over during the tours. Barnet Baskerville commented on this problem when he stated:

> Speaking extemporaneously, Nixon adhered to a basic formula carefully worked out before he left Washington, departing from what reporters soon came to call 'The Speech' only to make appropriate local references and to comment upon his opponent's speeches and other developments in the campaign.[2]

To compensate for this repetition of material, Nixon developed the technique of holding a pre-speech press conference at each new stop. Roscoe Drummond, reporting in the New York Herald Tribune, reflected on the effectiveness of this technique when he stated:

> He holds a press conference at every stop he makes, sometimes two or three a day. This is part of his campaign technique. He makes more news at his press conferences than he does in his speeches which follow in pretty much the same pattern every time.[3]

---

[1]Personal Interview, Miss Waldron, Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 24, 1958. (Also noted in Barnet Baskerville, "The New Nixon," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XLIII (February, 1957), p. 41, New York Herald Tribune, October 1, 1956, Birmingham News, November 18, 1956, Christian Science Monitor, September 28, 1956).

[2]Baskerville, op. cit., p. 39.

[3]New York Herald Tribune, October 1, 1956.

It should be noted, then, that for the campaign of 1956, the major portion of the preparation centered on the several basic speeches formulated early in September prior to the campaign.

Each of the basic speeches was a compilation of lines of arguments which could be used in the proof of a presentation. As such, Nixon was able to select part or all of any one of the three basic speeches and incorporate it into his presentation. The Colorado Springs Address included for analysis in this dissertation, for example, contained elements of all three basic speeches. The general theme of all of the basic speeches was aptly phrased by the Republican National Committee as "peace, prosperity and progress." Nixon presented this theme in the basic speeches and in the addresses in the campaign in the following manner according to William Blair:

> His campaign has seemed to resemble a revival tour more than a hard-hitting political foray across the country. He sings a hymn of praise for President Eisenhower as the 'symbol of peace.' He acclaims the President as a man who has given Americans the 'best four years of our lives,' a man Americans can 'proudly hold up to their children as a man who has restored dignity and honesty to the highest office in the land.'[1]

Since the basic speeches were actually lines of argument, their consideration as speeches for analysis was not feasible. Their inclusion in this dissertation, however, was necessary to indicate the problem caused by the repetition of ideas throughout the campaign and because of the fact that they

---

[1]New York Times, October 7, 1956.

were an integral part of the addresses in general.

Reactions to Nixon as a Speaker

Barnet Baskerville concerned himself with the speaking of Richard Nixon in an article appearing in the Quarterly Journal of Speech published after the campaign of 1956. In this article, Dr. Baskerville offered the following composite account concerning Nixon the speaker:

> His voice is good, his manner is dynamic and ingratiating, his contact with and adaptation to his audience excellent. He has mastered the skills of the platform to an unusual degree of perfection. He has remarkable verbal facility; he handles questions adroitly and confidently. There is, moreover, a disarming simplicity about what he says which makes many listeners wonder how anyone could doubt or mistrust this forthright young man. But close observation reveals that his forthrightness is too frequently more apparent than real.[1]

This description characterized Nixon as an able speaker while questioning the integrity of his motives. This portrayal of Nixon deserves a more complete discussion for two reasons. First, the extent of editorial comment during the 1956 campaign regarding the speaking ability of Richard Nixon should be ascertained. Secondly, the reason for and the extent of the emergence of a so-called "new Nixon" in the 1956 campaign should be investigated. For, from all indications, it appeared that Vice-President Nixon conducted the 1956 campaign in a different manner from any of his previous campaigns. Because of these two reasons, a description of the campaign activities prior to and including the campaign of 1956 is necessary to portray adequately the

---

[1] Baskerville, op. cit., p. 41.

reactions to Richard Nixon as a speaker.

Nixon as a speaker prior to the 1956 campaign: Previously in this dissertation, mention was made of the fact that Richard Nixon had been criticized for his campaign tactics, particularly in the Voorhis and Helen Gahagan Douglas campaigns of 1946 and 1950, respectively. Further, the manner in which he conducted the campaigns in the 1952 and 1954 national elections also received some editorial comment of a derogatory nature. The conduct of Richard Nixon in these campaigns caused some writers to label him with such nicknames as "Tricky Dicky" and "the hatchet man."[1] His opponents also alleged that Mr. Nixon was "an unprincipled demagogue" and that he attacked his political rivals with "smear tactics" based on emotional rather than logical proofs.[2] Earnest Brashear, writing in the New Republic, called the 1950 campaign of Mr. Nixon the "most underhanded campaign in California's history."[3] The full extent of this condemnation was discussed in Chapter III of this work in connection with the objection raised by Harold Stassen to the candidacy of Nixon in 1956. The anti-Nixon drive instigated by Stassen was based on the contention that the personal reputation established by Nixon, primarily from his campaign tactics, would tend to harm the chances the party had

---

[1] Newsweek, October 1, 1956, p. 27.

[2] Earnest Brashear, "Who Is Richard Nixon," New Republic, September 1, 1952, p. 10.

[3] Ibid.

for re-election.[1] Richard Nixon, as a campaigner, then, had created a distinct type of impression. And this impression, in turn, had given rise to many unfavorable comments and labels.

The New Nixon--Nixon in the 1956 campaign: By way of contrast to previous campaigns, there emerged in 1956 a "new Nixon."[2] The difference in campaigning tactics between the "new Nixon" and the established Nixon was so marked that it received repeated comment from the press. Some of the comment was speculative and concerned with the reason for the change. This change was noted as early as September by William Blair, writing in the New York Times. He explained the change in the following manner:

> He is the same Nixon with a 'new look.'
> The 'new look' was explained by Mr. Nixon himself in his opening pronouncements on the kind of campaign he intends to conduct. Issues, he said this week, are far more important than personalities. He praised Adlai E. Stevenson as a man of 'character and integrity,' a description the Democratic Presidential nominee did not hear from Mr. Nixon four years ago. He also had kind words for Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, whom, he said, he found on his world tours to be a much loved lady.[3]

On the same day, the Washington Sunday Star also commented on the formation of this new campaign personality. The Star, however, offered a different reason for the change. The Star commented:

---

[1] Supra., Chapter III, p. 58.

[2] "New Nixon Is Result of Political Experience," Washington Sunday Star, September 23, 1956, p. A-4.

[3] New York Times, September 23, 1956.

> Reasons for the change in tactics are obvious. Four years ago Mr. Nixon was an attacker. Now he is a defender. Four years ago he was trying to buy. Now he is the seller--the No. 1 salesman of the Eisenhower administration's record in office. He simply has changed his methods to fit the needs of the situation.[1]

Toward the end of the first month of the campaign, there was little to remind the reporters of the "old Nixon." On September 28, 1956, however, the Christian Science Monitor noted that Nixon reverted briefly to his favorite subject of Communism:

> Stevenson's type of leadership 'would inevitably lead to Communist aggression in other parts of the world.' Reporters note this as the first time the 1952 and 1954 theme linking Democrats to Communists has been revived in the new Nixon campaign.[2]

Richard Strout summed up what he considered to be the "shock" the press got from the changed Nixon in the statement:

> Equipped with a sheaf of Mr. Nixon's fiery speeches from the 1954 campaign the reporter flying with the mellow candidate in 1956 cannot but feel moments of surprise.
>
> On this trip, Mr. Nixon has a patient attitude even for former President Truman, whose foreign policies he attacked two years ago, on October 28, 1954, at Los Angeles, as those of 'weakness, inconsistency, and compromise' which 'led to their (the Communists) gaining 600 million people in seven years without the loss of a single Russian soldier in combat.'
>
> Again on this trip Mr. Nixon gave a soft answer and gracious word to Mrs. Roosevelt (after she had harshly attacked him). A few years ago Mr. Nixon was lambasting alike the whole New and Fair Deal regimes.
>
> More especially at a press conference during this current tour Mr. Nixon mildly described Adlai

---

[1] Washington Sunday Star, op. cit., September 23, 1956.

[2] Christian Science Monitor, October 3, 1956.

> E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential aspirant, as a man of 'character' and 'integrity.'
>
> The shock of this comment for some of the newspapermen who have accompanied and enjoyed Mr. Nixon in other days will linger for weeks. In 1952 they recalled Mr. Nixon at one point said that Governor Stevenson had a degree all right--a 'Ph. D. from the Acheson College of Cowardly Communist Containment,' and added, according to a United Press dispatch from Las Vagas, dated October 25, 1954, that Mr. Stevenson 'has not changed since he testified for Alger Hiss,' and that if a Congress of Mr. Stevenson's choosing were elected, 'the security risks which have been fired by the Eisenhower administration will all be hired back.'
>
> These were stout, swinging phrases, more like Mr. Truman, perhaps, than the demure candidate of today.[1]

As the campaign progressed, the reporters continued to comment on the change in Nixon's campaigning. Courtney Shelton went so far as to report in the Christian Science Monitor that "Mr. Nixon says nothing to evoke memories of the 1952 and '54 campaigns."[2] Such comment concerning the "new Nixon" appeared during the entire campaign and as the campaign neared its conclusion, an editorial appeared in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle which summed up the feeling which attended Nixon at his speaking situations. The editorial read in part:

> His noon-day crowd obviously was friendly although sprinkled with some curiousity seekers who had dared steal a glimpse of the 'ogre' in person. What they found was a vigorous man who knew what he was talking about and who could express himself clearly and forcefully.[3]

Thus, there was an emergence of a so-called "new Nixon."

---

[1] Christian Science Monitor, September 29, 1956.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, October 18, 1956.

From the comments of the reporters, it would seem that Nixon had changed in a period of two years from a bombastic and aggressive campaigner to one that was somewhat subdued, who even complimented his opponents.

It should be pointed out, however, that although the general consensus of opinion was that a "new Nixon" had emerged, the newscasters were quick to point out that some elements of the old Nixon were still present. The Washington Sunday Star noted some of these elements in the statement:

> But this added impression might be hazarded: Mr. Nixon hasn't changed much. Already, as in his attacks on Senator Estes Kefauver for a slighting reference to President Eisenhower, he has shown that he is ready, if not eager, for a little dirty in-fighting.
>
> Also a careful ear for his campaign speeches and an eye for the lifted eyebrow here and there in his platform theatrics will reveal that much of the old Nixon is still there. There are numerous sly digs at his Democratic opponents on the war and communism issues which may or may not impress a hearer. Mr. Nixon, in a word, has become subtle in his attacks.[1]

Reference to such so-called subtle attacks was also noted by Earl Mazo in the New York Herald Tribune. He reported:

> There have been occasions when, by innuendo, he implied his opponents were or may be guilty of dark deeds or intentions, and times when an observer felt Mr. Nixon was biting his tongue to hold back a here-to-fore normal blast.[2]

Richard Strout commenting in the Christian Science Monitor, felt that perhaps Richard Nixon couldn't hold back and would revert to his former campaign aggressiveness. He conjectured:

---

[1]Washington Sunday Star, September 23, 1956.

[2]New York Herald Tribune, September 23, 1956.

> The President dislikes and generally tries to avoid political conflict, Mr. Nixon doesn't--he relishes it. When he strikes he strikes with all his force, and he has an instinct for those issues on which the deepest emotions can be aroused: The lives of 'our boys' in Korea, Communist spies in government, or, on the other side, peace, morality, and the fatherly image of Mr. Eisenhower. Mr. Nixon presents his arguments in stark terms.
>
> Even on the present excursion there are some evidences of this, and reporters wonder whether--before the battle is over--the same fierce campaigner will not reappear.[1]

After the campaign, one reporter, LeRoy Anderson, felt that Nixon had, for the most part, succeeded in attaining a new stature. Anderson stated:

> Nixon, under the most intense fire of untruths, lies and half-truths, carried the message of peace, progress and prosperity.
>
> The abuse carried by this wonderful young man in delivering this message was greater than any man has endured in recent American history. He told the truth. Although lied about, he did not deal in lies. He was dignified, calm, courageous and patient.[2]

Jane Free, reporting in the Birmingham News, felt even more strongly than Mr. Anderson when she interpreted the opinions of the newsmen following the campaign, "Newsmen feel he has made himself heir apparent to G. O. P."[3]

The consensus, then, acknowledged the fact that a "new Nixon" had emerged. There were, however, some indications that the old Nixon had not been completely overcome or eliminated. Thus Richard Nixon the campaigner in 1956 had presented a changed appearance. While the motives

---

[1]Richart Strout, Christian Science Monitor, op. cit. September 29, 1956.

[2]LeRoy Anderson, Los Angeles Times, November 18, 1956.

[3]Jane Free, Birmingham News, November 18, 1956.

attributed to him for this new stature varied, there was agreement on one fact; there was a "new Nixon."

Editorial comment on delivery: Earlier in this analysis, it was noted that Barnet Baskerville evaluated the speaking abilities of Richard Nixon by stating, "He is one of the best political speakers in the nation today."[1] This evaluation was shared by several reporters following Nixon during the campaign. Earl Mazo of the New York Herald Tribune summed up what he felt to be the consensus of opinion of the press corps when he commented:

> There is no disagreement among those dogging his trail that the forty-three year old Vice-President is a polished campaigner, or that he is likely to succeed all objectives--if success depends solely on careful planning, hard, relentless work, extensive know-how, quick thinking and ambition.[2]

The success that Earl Mazo attributed to Vice-President Nixon because of his "relentless work" was further highlighted in an editorial in the Birmingham News. The News intimated that, although Nixon followed the same basic speech over and over, his speaking ability compensated in some measure for the repetition of ideas. The News reported:

> However bored the newsmen got hearing Nixon deliver the same basic speech over and over, to a man they came to respect his prowess as a campaigner and speaker.[3]

The opinions forwarded through these three editorial comments were not isolated examples. A number of reporters appeared

---

[1]Baskerville, op. cit., p. 41.

[2]New York Herald Tribune, September 25, 1956.

[3]Birmingham Alabama News, November 18, 1956.

to have noted the effectiveness of Nixon's delivery and his appearance on the platform throughout the campaign. The Christian Science Monitor, on October 3, 1956, gave a representative example of the editorial comment concerning Richard Nixon when it discussed his effectiveness in the Democratic city of Manchester, New Hampshire:

> The Vice-President's set speech, given extemporaneously in this overwhelmingly Democratic city, was par for the campaign for almost any office seeker. It was forceful without being intemperate and partisan without being florid. . . . ,
>
> Rather crowds seem to be trying to gauge from his appearance and forensic ability whether he is, in their judgment, mature enough for the presidency. On this score Mr. Nixon's conversational friendliness, vigorous style of delivery and debating logic, however partisan, are major assets.[1]

In order to gain an insight into the type of editorial comment registered concerning Richard Nixon the speaker, the following periodical articles are cited. These comments supplement the reactions already noted within the discussion of the emergence of the "new Nixon." The following articles appeared during the campaign and are representative of the type of comment most often reported in the press:

(1) Boston Chronicle, September 29, 1956:

> Whatever the outcome of the election, history will record that the much maligned Vice President made a notable speech, which met a major issue--civil rights for Negro Americans--squarely and head on, thereby projecting a new phrase of the Presidential campaign--pre-occupation with the fundamental issues of peace and prosperity.

(2) The Christian Science Monitor, September 28, 1956:

(a) He shows the eager earnestness that is his

---

[1]Christian Science Monitor, October 3, 1956.

trademark. Reporters have heard most of the talk before; what seems new is the tougher tone. . . . and

(b) There is no question of his oratorical effectiveness.

(3) Kansas City Star, September 18, 1956:

He's a fighter. Even his foes concede he is the most effective campaigner the administration has. In heat of battle, he has made some slips, no question of it, using language susceptible to distortion.

It couldn't be otherwise considering the number of speeches he has made, with his foes studying every word. The only wonder is that he hasn't stubbed his toe more often. Granted also that the vice-president's not as photogenic on TV as some public figures, somehow carrying an impression of pugnacity that hasn't appealed to many women especially. Yet the impression created by the 'Nixon smear' is entirely belied by the sincerity and ability of the man himself. You just have to know him.

(4) Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, October 18, 1956:

(a) What they found was a vigorous man who knew what he was talking about and who could express himself clearly and forceably. . . . ,
(b) The Vice-President was friendly, poised, direct--and obviously well informed. . . . ,
(c) His answers obviously were sincere. . . . , and
(d) His very bearing refutes the slurs of political foes. His appearance in the flesh carries an impact which cannot be duplicated either in print or in the shadows of T. V.

(5) Rochester Times Union, October 17, 1956:

(a) What he offers is not oratory in the manner of Governor Frank Clement of Tennessee, but a kind of informal 'talking to,' part sermon, part temperance lecture, partly July 4th exhortation. It is plain, simple, and effective. . . . and

(b) Nixon, who seems to have a 'second sense' about crowd responses, told this writer a few of his secrets. In Toledo, for example, he spotted a man in blue work shirt and cap, standing well up front at the court house rally, who failed to clap as the vice president walked on stage.

'From that moment on, I addressed my re-

> marks to him,' Nixon disclosed. 'Of course I didn't look at him all the time, but I couched every remark in language he would understand. I gave arguments which would strike a responsive chord in him.'
> 'He applauded none of my remarks, but at the end, he flashed a smile, and brought his thumb and middle finger together in the time-honored sign of approval. I'm convinced that we made a convert there.'

(6) Warren Ohio Tribune Chronicle, October 16, 1956:

> Mr. Nixon, with his natural, beaming smile and his dynamic personality, showed this community why his stature is so great in the political world.
> The humaneness of the vice president was evident in his friendly greeting to the crowds. His keen grasp of the problems of the day and issues of the campaign were apparent in his vigorous talk before the Giddings Club at Packard Music Hall.

(7) Washington Sunday Star, September 23, 1956:

> Mr. Nixon is a folksy sort of campaigner with a ready flashing smile as quick as Tennessee's ambient Senator Kefauver. His platform manner is one of cozy intimacy with his listeners and he resorts to little strategems as 'believe me' (used five times by actual count in one brief talk) to make the audience feel more at home with him.
> He also has an appeal to the bobby-sox crowd and plays it up for all its worth. A cynic forgetting or ignoring that the Vice President has two children to whom he is devoted might think he was looking down the political horizon to another presidential year.

The major portion of editorial comment concerning the delivery and platform appearance of Richard Nixon pointed to his oratorical prowess. Personal attributes such as friendliness, directness, and poise were attributed to his speaking personality. Some reporters referred to his friendly and direct approach as a "folksy" manner. Others considered it to be a kind of "informality," a "talking to," or "conversational friendliness." Still other reporters

interpreted this directness and friendliness to be a kind of "warmth" or "sincerity." Regardless of the label, it should be noted that a great many reporters commented upon Nixon's contact with his audience in this manner. The reporters further felt that Nixon was in complete command of each speaking situation and that he was at all times a "polished campaigner" who appeared to be "dignified, calm, courageous, and patient" on the speaker's platform. In addition, there was a great deal of agreement regarding the force and vigor with which Nixon presented his speeches. The newsmen concluded, for the most part, that Nixon was a "fighter" who enjoyed the atmosphere of the campaign speaking situations. They further noted that he was a "vigorous man" who could "express himself clearly and forceably."

On the other hand, there appeared to be some editorial restraint as the newsmen considered Nixon as a speaker. Although the consensus was that he was a speaker of great prowess, there was an undercurrent of mild condemnation toward what some reporters called "the theatrics" which were in reality a part of the "old Nixon" and had not been completely overcome in this campaign. Newsmen were quick to point out that Nixon still attacked the opposition, although with "sly digs," and that he had, at times, displayed a willingness and even a "desire" to engage in a "little dirty in-fighting." It was further pointed out that his constant references to the accomplishments of the Eisenhower Administration were reminiscent of a "revival tour"

rather than a political campaign. Although these undercurrents were noted, the newsmen did admit that the attacks made by Nixon on the opposition were now subtle and that he seemed to have restrained his desire to meet the opposition with the "biting" attacks which were more a part of the "old Nixon" of former campaigns.

Summary

1. Vice-President Nixon personally prepared and wrote all of his speeches. He did not rely on the efforts of a speech writer.

2. Factual or technical data often were obtained for Mr. Nixon by his staff or by technical experts. Area experts were generally brought in to discuss the problem in general rather than to insure the accuracy of any given statement in a particular speech.

3. Vice-President Nixon followed the same basic procedure in preparing his presentations. He began with a "yellow-scratch pad" outline. He then either dictated the speech to a secretary or into a dictaphone. The speech was then typed out completely in a short sentence paragraph outline. After editing, the speech was placed on a stencil and reproduced.

4. Nixon often rehearsed his speeches from the stenciled copies. He often underlined specific words or phrases he wished to emphasize. This rehearsal was usually thorough enough to enable him to deliver his speeches extemporaneously.

5. Prior to the campaign of 1956, Richard Nixon prepared several basic speeches to be used in that campaign. These basic speeches formed the framework of the majority of his presentations during the campaign.

6. Nixon instigated the technique of holding press conferences prior to each speaking situation while on his tours. Newsmen felt that these news conferences aided in creating news for their daily news releases since Nixon's presentations usually were quite repetitious.

7. Nixon had established a considerable reputation in his campaigns prior to the 1956 campaign. The reputation he had established was not all favorable. During the 1956 campaign, there was an emergence of a "new Nixon." The "new Nixon" was a "somewhat subdued campaigner who even complimented his opponents."

8. Editorial comment indicated that Nixon was a polished campaigner. He appeared to be in complete command of the speaking situations and his friendliness, directness, and poise enabled him to create a close contact with his audience. While newsmen generally recognized his speaking ability, some writers also pointed to his subtle attacks on his opposition and to his sometimes apparent theatrics.

CHAPTER X

CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study has been to present a rhetorical analysis of selected speeches delivered by Richard Milhous Nixon during the 1956 Republican National Convention and presidential campaign. To fulfill this purpose, it was necessary to investigate contemporary periodicals as well as visit the Office of the Vice-President in Washington, D. C. in order to secure worthwhile primary material not otherwise available. Further, in order to place the analysis in its proper perspective, it was necessary to include biographical information which may have had a bearing on the speaking ability of Richard Nixon. Similarly, a description of the economic and political conditions existing in 1956 was also included because these matters were directly related to the issues of the campaign. This investigation contributes to the realm of rhetorical criticism since it presents an analysis of selected speeches of a contemporary speaker who attained a position of leadership. From this analysis certain conclusions can be drawn.

(1) A study of the educational training of Richard Nixon shows that his speaking ability was well founded because of his maintenance of a high scholastic average and his participation in extra-curricular speech activities.

Throughout all of his educational training, Nixon maintained a high scholastic average. His scholastic abilities in high school were rewarded with the California Interscholastic Federation Gold Seal Award and the Harvard Award as the "best all-around student" in his class. At the completion of his studies at Whittier College, his scholastic standing enabled him to secure a scholarship to the Duke University School of Law. While at Duke University, Richard Nixon continued to excel scholastically. He was elected to the Order of the Coif for his outstanding work.

In addition to the maintenance of a high scholastic average, Richard Nixon participated successfully in a number of speech-centered activities. In high school, he won several oratorical contests and was a member of the high school debate squad. In college, he continued his participation in speaking contests, winning the Reader's Digest Southern Conference Extemporaneous Intercollegiate Speaking Contest and becoming the Southern California Intercollegiate Extemporaneous champion. He was also a member of a championship debate team in his college conference.

Nixon also took an active part in campus activities. He was president of his freshman class at Whittier College and served as both vice-president and president of the student body. At Duke University, he was elected to the presidency of the Duke Bar Association. He served as an editor of the campus newspaper at Whittier College and was on the staff of the honorary Law Review while at Duke University.

(2) The economic conditions existing in the nation in 1956, prior to the national election, were good.

In 1956, the wage earner had realized a greater personal income, employment was up and unemployment was down, and the income of the farmer had improved over the previous year. The business world had witnessed an extension of the prosperity it had had in 1955. The over-all economic conditions in the United States indicated that 1956 was a prosperous year.

(3) Two important political problems faced the Republican Party in the 1956 presidential election year.

The first problem concerned the two illnesses suffered by President Eisenhower which caused speculation concerning his re-election. The first illness was a heart attack suffered in September of 1955. By February of 1956, he had recovered and had expressed his willingness to run for another term as President. In June of 1956, however, the President underwent an ileitis operation and again his health became a topic of major concern. The President recovered from this second illness and reaffirmed his original intention of becoming the presidential candidate of the Republican Party in the election of 1956. In general, medical and public opinion seemed to favor a second term for President Eisenhower.

The second problem concerned the suitability of Richard Nixon as the Republican vice-presidential candidate. Harold Stassen was the principal instigator of a movement

to replace Nixon as the vice-presidential nominee. Stassen indicated that a personal poll revealed that a ticket of Eisenhower and Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts would be at least six per cent stronger than a ticket of Eisenhower and Nixon. The controversy created by the objection of Stassen to Vice-President Nixon had lessened materially by the time of the Republican National Convention in August of 1956. During the convention, Christian A. Herter, the candidate Stassen had favored, placed the name of Richard Nixon in nomination for the vice-presidency and Harold Stassen seconded the nomination.

(4) The Stassen objection to Richard Nixon as a vice-presidential candidate was not the first questioning of the personal appeal of Richard Nixon.

The reputation of Richard Nixon was first questioned because of the manner in which he conducted his political campaigns. In his campaigns against "Jerry" Voorhis and Helen Gahagan Douglas, Nixon was criticized for using "name-calling" and "guilt by association." During his terms of office in the House and in the Senate, Nixon also received some unfavorable comment because of his so-called "over-zealous" investigations into corruption and Communist infiltration into government. A third incident which focused attention upon Nixon's reputation occurred during the presidential campaign of 1952. In that campaign, Nixon's use of a fund, contributed by California businessmen during his term of office as a Senator, was questioned. Then, in 1956,

Harold Stassen indicated that Richard Nixon's personal appeal would hinder the Republican Party in the forthcoming presidential election.

(5) In the analysis of arrangement of the five speeches, it was determined that Nixon did not rely on a specific method of development.

Nixon employed three methods of development in the five speeches analyzed: the distributive method, the logical method, and a combination of the chronological and indirect methods. The distributive method of arrangement was followed in the Acceptance Address, the Gettysburg Speech, and the Colorado Springs Address. These speeches were of a partisan nature. In the more nonpartisan presentations, delivered at the American Legion National Convention in Los Angeles, California and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address delivered in New York City, Nixon deviated from the distributive plan. He used the logical method of development when discussing the problem caused by the threat of international Communism in the American Legion Address. He used a combination of the indirect and chronological plans of development when he discussed the controversial problem of segregation in his nonpartisan speech in honor of the late Democratic Governor Alfred E. Smith.

(6) The four-part arrangement of introduction, statement of case, proof, and peroration or conclusion was used in all of the speeches analyzed.

The five introductions fulfilled a number of specific

functions. Four of the introductions fulfilled the same functions of enlisting the attention and interest of the audience and rendering them well disposed toward the speaker. The single deviation from this pattern was the Colorado Springs Address. In this presentation, the introduction fulfilled the function of preparing the audience for what was to follow in the speech.

The statement of case in all five of the speeches fulfilled an identical function, that of setting forth clearly and concisely the nature of the thought to be developed in the addresses.

From the analysis of arrangement, it was noted that Nixon used the repetition of a theme within the proof of the presentations as a transitional device to carry his thoughts from one major argument to another. Nixon established this type of transitional theme in four of the five speeches analyzed. The Colorado Springs Address was the only address in which Nixon did not employ an elaborate transitional device.

The conclusions in the five speeches all fulfilled the same functions, namely, that of arousing the audience emotionally. Within the conclusions of the Convention Address, the Gettysburg Speech, and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, an additional function of summarization was also fulfilled.

(7) It was noted from the analysis of logical proofs that Nixon presented arguments in both inductive and

deductive forms.

In the majority of the arguments as advanced in the five speeches, Nixon followed the inductive reasoning process. In the five speeches there were nineteen major arguments advanced. In four of the speeches, the proof contained four major arguments while in the Colorado Springs Address the speech was largely centered around three basic arguments. In seventeen of the nineteen arguments, the inductive process was employed. Fourteen times when the inductive process was used, the generalization was arrived at through an enumeration of sub-arguments. In the remaining three inductive processes, the generalization was arrived at through the use of an analogy. The deductive process, on the other hand, was used on two occasions, once in the Acceptance Address and once in the American Legion Address. In the Acceptance Address, the deductive process was stated in the form of a hypothetical syllogism; while in the American Legion Address, the generalization was stated and several lines of argument followed from this major premise.

(8) Information, example, comparison and contrast, and testimony were the major forms of support found in the five speeches.

Information was particularly important as a form of support in three of the speeches. In the American Legion Address, it was used principally in Argument 1, although it was found to some extent throughout the address. In the

Colorado Springs Address, it was of primary importance in the first argument. In the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, however, it was used to support ideas throughout the body of the speech.

Example was of particular importance as a form of support in three of the speeches. In the Acceptance Address, example was found in Arguments 1 and 3 of the proof. In the American Legion Address, it was used in connection with all of the arguments. In the Colorado Springs Address, it was particularly important in the second and third arguments.

Comparison and contrast was the most extensively used form of support in the five speeches analyzed. It was of major importance in four of the speeches. In the American Legion Address and the Gettysburg Speech it was used to substantiate ideas throughout the body of the speech. In the Colorado Springs Address and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, however, it was employed principally in Arguments 1 and 2.

Testimony was used to a minor extent in all five of the presentations. The majority of the testimony used by Nixon was, however, of a personal nature. The most extensive use of testimony was found in the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address when this form of support was used on five occasions. On two occasions in this address, the testimony was of a personal nature.

(9) Nixon used emotional appeals extensively in the

five speeches analyzed. The principal motive appeals found in these addresses were those to reputation, loyalty, duty, health and wealth, and opportunity and fair play.

Elements of the motive appeal to reputation were found in four of the five speeches. In the Acceptance Address, the Gettysburg Speech, and the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, this motive appeal was used throughout the presentations. In the American Legion Address, however, it was of primary importance only in Argument 4.

The motives of opportunity and fair play were also found in four of the speeches. In the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, the motive was found throughout the address. In the remaining three speeches, this appeal to opportunity and fair play was found principally in a specific argument; in Argument 3 in the Acceptance Address, in Argument 4 in the American Legion Address, and in Argument 2 in the Colorado Springs Address.

The motive appeal to duty was found in two of the speeches; the Acceptance Address and the Gettysburg Speech. This motive appeal was found throughout the speech in the Gettysburg presentation while in the Acceptance Address, the appeal to duty was limited primarily to the fourth argument.

The remaining motive appeals, health and wealth and loyalty, were each found in one speech. The motives of health and wealth were contained throughout the Gettysburg Speech. The motive of loyalty was an extensive appeal throughout the American Legion Address.

(10) Nixon established ethical appeal in the five addresses principally by focusing attention on the probity of his character and by the establishment of good will with his audience.

Nixon established good will with his audience in the same manner in four of the five speeches analyzed; the exception being the Colorado Springs Address. He praised the audience and identified himself with them and their problems. These means of establishing ethical appeal were contained, for the most part, in the introductions although they were found, to some extent, throughout the proof of each of the presentations.

Nixon focused attention on the probity of his character in two principal ways. First, in all of the addresses, he attempted to associate himself and his message with that which was virtuous and elevated. Secondly, in all but the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address, he attempted to associate the opposition with that which was not virtuous. The Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address was a nonpartisan presentation on the controversial subject of segregation. In that address, Nixon employed an indirect approach and no opposition was readily apparent.

To a limited extent, Nixon focused attention on his sagacity or intelligence within all the presentations by exhibiting a broad familiarity with the interests of the day.

(11) The predominant elements of style found in the speeches analyzed were directness, concreteness, parallel

structure, restatement, rhetorical question, and vivid and figurative language.

A particular feature of Richard Nixon's style in all of the speeches analyzed was that of directness. The presentations contained a number of elements contributing to directness, notably an abundant use of personal pronouns. The fewest number of personal pronouns employed was found in the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address. In that speech, Nixon used 163 such pronouns in a forty-three paragraph presentation. The greatest number of personal pronouns was found in the American Legion and Acceptance Addresses. Nixon used 276 and 274 pronouns respectively in these two addresses. More specifically, the use of certain personal pronouns appeared to be of particular importance to the presentation. The following summary of the number of "I," "we," and "our" pronouns used in the five addresses indicates the importance of these pronouns to the oral style of Richard Nixon:

Speeches	Total Pronouns	I	We	Our
Acceptance Address	274	38	103	47
American Legion Address	276	45	87	29
Gettysburg Speech	195	48	40	21
Colorado Springs Address	184	16	46	25
Alfred E. Smith Memorial Dinner Address	163	8	60	54

Another element contributing to directness in these presentations was the use of short sentences. The average sentence length in the speeches was between fifteen and twenty words. Nixon seldom used sentences of more than thirty words.

From the analysis of style, it was noted that the speeches contained a number of attributes which contribute to concreteness, such as the use of names, general classes of people, dates, and statistics. In addition to these elements of concreteness, the speeches also contained a number of abstract words and phrases and broad generalities. These abstractions appeared to be in keeping with the use of emotional proofs in the various presentations.

The use of the parallel structure in the form of the repetition of given sentences and the more specialized series was a particular feature of style in all but the Gettysburg Speech. This device was related to both the logical and emotional forms of persuasion and appeared to be used to highlight specific ideas and to create a sense of climax.

The stylistic device of restatement was used to emphasize ideas particularly in two of the presentations. This device was especially used by Nixon in the Acceptance Address and the Gettysburg Speech.

The rhetorical question was an important element of style in the American Legion Address. In that address, it was used in conjunction with the repetition of a theme as a

transitional device. It was used five times in the presentation as a whole.

The final significant feature of Richard Nixon's style was his use of vivid and figurative language. This aspect of style was of primary importance in all but the Acceptance Address. Nixon particularly used metaphors and analogies in his addresses. In general, the use of vivid and figurative language added color and imagery to the ideas Nixon was setting forth and aided in the over-all emotional tone of the speeches.

(12) It was noted in the analysis of speech preparation that Richard Nixon personally prepared his presentations for the convention and campaign of 1956.

Richard Nixon followed the same basic procedure in preparing each of his addresses. He began with an outline and then either dictated a speech to a secretary or into a dictaphone. The speech was then typed in a short paragraph outline and returned to Nixon. He then edited the copy and this corrected copy was placed on a stencil and reproduced.

Richard Nixon rehearsed his presentations from the stenciled copies. He would often underline specific words or phrases he wished to emphasize. His rehearsals were usually thorough enough to enable him to deliver his speeches extemporaneously.

For the campaign of 1956, Richard Nixon prepared, prior to the campaign, several basic speeches from which he drew material which he used in specific campaign speeches.

The use of basic speeches warranted editorial comment from the newsmen following the Vice-President on his campaign tours. There was a general feeling that Nixon created more news at his news conferences than he did during his formal speeches.

(13) The significant feature of Richard Nixon's platform appearance was the emergence of a so-called "new Nixon."

Editorial comment appearing during the campaign of 1956 continually underscored the speaking ability of Richard Nixon. The news reporters commented on his warmth and informal directness, and highlighted his vigor and personal appeal as a speaker. There was a great deal of news comment on the so-called emergence of a "new Nixon." The consensus was that Nixon was no longer the bombastic and attacking campaigner he had been in his previous campaigns. The reporters felt that he had become somewhat subdued and that his attacks in the 1956 campaign were more subtle. In the final analysis, Nixon was considered by most to be an accomplished speaker.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ITINERARY OF VICE-PRESIDENT NIXON

First Tour, September 18 to October 3

Tuesday, September 18

Washington, D. C.
Noon meeting - Indianapolis, Indiana
Evening meeting - Whittier, California

Wednesday, September 19

Noon meeting - Reno, Neva
Evening meeting - Eugene, Oregon

Thursday, September 20

Noon meeting - Nampa, Idaho
Evening meeting - Spokane, Washington

Friday, September 21

Morning meeting - Rapid City, South Dakota
Air Stop - Fargo, North Dakota
Evening meeting - Minneapolis, Minnesota

Saturday, September 22

Morning meeting - Sioux City, Iowa
Evening meeting - Colorado Springs, Colorado

Monday, September 24

Noon meeting - Phoenix, Arizona
Evening meeting - Salt Lake City, Utah

Tuesday, September 25

Noon meeting - Oklahoma City, Oklahoma
Evening meeting - Houston, Texas

Wednesday, September 26

Noon meeting - Springfield, Missouri
Evening meeting - Kansas City, Kansas

Thursday, September 27

Noon meeting - Louisville, Kentucky
Evening meeting - Springfield, Illinois

Friday, September 28

Morning meeting - Nashville, Tennessee
Noon meeting - Cincinnati, Ohio
Evening meeting - Wheeling, West Virginia

Saturday, September 29

Morning meeting - Hagerstown, Maryland
Noon meeting - Martinsburg, West Virginia
Evening meeting - St. Petersburg, Florida

Monday, October 1

Noon meeting - Grand Rapids, Michigan
Evening meeting - Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Tuesday, October 2

Morning meeting - Hartford, Connecticut
Air stop - Manchester, New Hampshire
Evening meeting - Syracuse, New York

Wednesday, October 3

Breakfast meeting - Elizabeth, New Jersey
Noon meeting - Springfield, Massachusetts
Evening meeting - Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Second Tour, October 9 to October 19

Tuesday, October 9

Morning meeting - Fort Worth, Texas
Noon meeting - San Antonio, Texas
Evening meeting - El Paso, Texas

Wednesday, October 10

Morning meeting - San Jose, California
Rally - Stockton, California
Noon meeting - San Francisco, California
Evening meeting - Oakland, California

Thursday, October 11

Morning meeting - Elko, Nevada
Noon meeting - Denver, Colorado
Evening meeting - Boulder, Colorado

Friday, October 12

Lincoln, Nebraska
Noon meeting - Columbus, Nebraska
Train rally - Northern Michigan

Saturday, October 13

Rally - Alexandria, Minnesota

Monday, October 15

Train rally - Dayton, Ohio
Train rally - Toledo, Ohio
Noon rally - Defiance, Ohio
Evening rally - Youngstown, Ohio

Tuesday, October 16

Morning meeting - Evansville, Indiana
Fort Wayne, Indiana
Evening meeting - Buffalo, New York

Wednesday, October 17

Rochester, New York
Schenectady, New York

Thursday, October 18

Motorcade rally - Providence, Rhode Island
Motorcade rally - Norwich, Connecticut
Motorcade rally - New London, Connecticut
Noon rally - New Haven, Connecticut
Motorcade rally - Bridgeport, Connecticut
Evening meeting - New York, New York

Friday, October 19

Morning meeting - New Castle, Delaware
Noon meeting - Wilmington, Delaware
Rally - Baltimore, Maryland

Saturday, October 20

Motorcade - Fort Lauderdale, Florida

Third Tour, October 22 to November 3

Monday, October 22

Morning rally - Alpena, Michigan
Noon rally - Saginaw, Michigan

Train rally - Pontiac, Michigan
Train rally - Lapeer, Michigan
Train rally - Imlay City, Michigan
Evening rally - Flint, Michigan

Tuesday, October 23

Train rally - Lansing, Michigan
Train rally - Battle Creek, Michigan
Train rally - Kalamazoo, Michigan
Train rally - Niles, Michigan
Evening rally - South Bend, Indiana

Wednesday, October 24

Rally - Carbondale, Illinois
Train rally - Centralia, Illinois
Train rally - Champaign, Illinois
Train rally - Kankakee, Illinois
Evening rally - Evanston, Illinois

Thursday, October 25

Motorcade - Chicago, Illinois
Evening rally - Rockford, Illinois

Friday, October 26

Plane rally - Great Falls, Montana
Plane rally - Walla Walla, Washington
Evening rally - Medford, Oregon

Saturday, October 27

Rally - Santa Rosa, California
Rally - Fresno, California
Rally - Bakersfield, California
Evening rally - Los Angeles, California

Monday, October 29

Breakfast meeting - Los Angeles, California
Rally - Pacific Palisades, California
Rally - Panorama, California
Noon rally - Glendale, California
Rally - Pasadena, California
Evening meeting - Occidental College

Tuesday, October 30

Morning meeting - Arcadia, California
Rally - Riverside, California
Rally - Santa Ana, California
Rally - Longbeach-Lakewood, California
Evening rally - San Diego, California

Wednesday, October 31

Rally - Detroit, Michigan
Rally - Harlem, New York
Rally - Nassau County, New York
Rally - Queens County, New York

Thursday, November 1

Rally - Scranton, Pennsylvania
Rally - Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania
Train rally - Berwick, Pennsylvania
Rally - Sudbury, Pennsylvania
Rally - Williamsport, Pennsylvania
Evening rally - Pittsburg, Pennsylvania

Friday, November 2

Train rally - Greensburg, Pennsylvania
Rally - Johnstown, Pennsylvania
Train rally - Altoona, Pennsylvania
Train rally - Huntingdon, Pennsylvania
Train rally - Lewiston, Pennsylvania
Rally - Hershey, Pennsylvania

Saturday, November 3

Train rally - Marietta, Ohio
Train rally - Athens, Ohio
Train rally - Chillicothe, Ohio
Train rally - Galion, Ohio
Train rally - Mansfield, Ohio
Evening rally - Canton, Ohio

APPENDIX B

THE 1956 ACCEPTANCE ADDRESS[1]

Mr. Chairman, delegates and alternates to this Convention, guests of this Convention here in the Convention hall and on television and radio and, last but by no means least, Mr. Smith:

I know you realize how honored and privileged I am to share with you one of the great moments of history. This Convention has truly been a mountain-top experience for those of us who have been fortunate enough to attend it. We've enjoyed the unsurpassed hospitality of a beautiful and gracious city. We have been served by a superb Convention organization, under the leadership of two of the greatest Republicans--Len Hall and Joe Martin. We have been moved by one of the most unforgettable, spontaneous demonstrations ever to occur at a political convention--a tribute to one of those rare individuals who lives to hear the overwhelmingly favorable verdict of history on his career--Herbert Hoover.

And I know that we shall go back to our homes inspired to greater efforts by those who have so eloquently addressed this Convention.

Most of what has been said here will not long be remembered, but what we have done here will leave an indelible mark on the history of our nation and on the history of mankind. And I speak of the privilege which has been ours to renominate a President whose name is revered throughout the world.

In the past three years, Mrs. Nixon and I have traveled in mileage four times around this earth. We have visited 32 countries, and I can tell you that to millions of persons in other countries as well as in the United States, President Eisenhower is a living symbol of peace and freedom.

Our nation and the world is most fortunate that we shall have his wise and enlightened leadership for four more years and that we shall have.

No man could be more highly honored than to be selected as the running mate of such a great President. I

---

[1]This text was received from the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January, 1958, and was checked with the text published in the New York Times, August 24, 1956.

accept this nomination in that spirit and, to the extent that physical limitations of time and space and stamina permit, I pledge to you today that I shall carry the great message of the magnificent record of this Administration to every corner of this land as I work with you for an even greater victory in 1956 than we had in 1952--a victory which will assure what any great President needs and deserves--a House and Senate with a majority of his own party in control of the machinery of those organizations.

I should like to talk to you this evening, as we look forward to the coming campaign, on how we should dedicate ourselves to the ideals that have made this nation great. And I would hope that, in this campaign, we could express to the people of the world the qualities that have made America honored and respected in every part of the globe. What is the greatness and the nobility of America?

Well, first of all, it is the love of freedom and independence that inspired the men of Valley Forge as they broke from a foreign tyranny. It is that freedom which is grounded in an abiding faith in the dignity of the individual--a faith embodied in that magnificent charter that we call the Bill of Rights. It is that love of freedom that, three times in this century, sent American soldiers abroad to help other men keep their freedom and their liberty. And it is that same love of freedom that today impels us to sacrifice, sacrifice willingly, so that the flood tide of Communism will not blot out decency from the face of the earth. Our greatness, then, is in our love of freedom.

And our people are great, too, because we have courage. From the pioneers who braved the wilderness to the scientists who today harness the atom, we are a people who challenge the unknown and often achieve what seems impossible.

And America is great because we have faith. We are one nation under God. Our Declaration of Independence proclaims that man's rights spring from the Creator, and that our cause has been committed to the providence of the Almighty. We do not idly say, "In God we trust."

And there is another American quality that is particularly important to which I would like to refer. I refer to the American sense of vision. We Americans are never content even with remarkable achievements of the past. "Good enough" is not good enough for us.

And that is why the American people approve of President Eisenhower's record, and in my opinion they will overwhelmingly re-elect him on that record. But standing pat on that record is not enough for the Republican Party or for the nation, and we can be proud of the fact that we have a President who does not feel that his job is complete. He needs more time to carry out the program that he feels to be so vital to the future of our nation, and we are going to give him the time that he needs to do that job.

Now, what are some of these unfinished tasks that face us? First, we must build ever stronger the foundations

for the prosperity we have all enjoyed. Our nation must continue to be strong and prosperous--strong in the moral fiber of its people, and prosperous in terms of economic opportunity for all. A prosperous America is the foundation on which we can build opportunity for our youth, vigorous defense against any potential aggressor and an imaginative program for world peace.

We believe, with justification, that the sound economic policies of the Eisenhower Administration can assure such prosperity in America.

May I state these policies simply for you tonight?

We believe that government should be a partner with business and with labor and not a partisan to encourage one to fight with the other.

We hold that government should stimulate the productive energies of the nation, but it should not try to dictate to business or to labor the detailed policies that they should follow.

We believe in human welfare, but not the welfare state.

We seek social gains, but we reject completely the well-intentioned but mistaken theories of those who would socialize, federalize or nationalize basic American institutions.

In a nutshell, individual Americans should be free, subject only to the laws necessary for the welfare of all. Operating under this philosophy during the past three and a half years, we Americans, as you have been told over and over again this week, have enjoyed the greatest prosperity in the history of the world. We have never had more jobs, higher real wages, greater security against the hazards of unemployment, sickness or old age.

And I submit that we could rest here on our laurels but there is more to be done, and we eagerly accept the responsibility and the opportunity of doing it.

Let me touch briefly on some areas in which this Administration believes further progress can and should be made.

First, not all Americans have shared equally in the common prosperity most of us are enjoying. We must move ahead with vigor and imagination to root out any pockets of poverty in our midst. We must assist the States and the communities in bringing in new industries in depressed areas.

And our aim should be this: No able and willing worker should be without a job in our nation.

And, second, we are happy to note that our farmers, whose income has been depressed because of the mountainous surpluses of farm products, are now beginning to move forward with other segments of our economy. But we recognize that they do not yet have a fair share of America's increasing prosperity. We are confident that the program we have adopted, which is aimed at reducing surpluses, increasing productivity, and conserving our land, will provide the

farmer with his share of the national income. We did not create this problem, but we are determined to solve it, and we believe we have the answer.

And, third, a problem with which I have had personal responsibility in this Administration--our prosperity in this land must be more fully shared by the 17 million Negro Americans. We are proud, as we should be, of the great progress that has been made in the last three and a half years. But I say to you that we should not and we will not rest until every Negro has an equal opportunity to obtain proper housing, decent medical care, good education, and the unlimited chance for employment according to his ability, which is every American's right.

Here we offer more than promises because we can show performance. But, proud as we are of this performance, we shall continue to drive forward until we achieve the goal for which the first Republican President made the supreme sacrifice.

We believe that our prosperity should be such that the young people of America will always find this a land of opportunity.

We should go forward until every American is guaranteed the chance for the finest education which a nation can provide. It is indeed a tragedy when young men and women of proven ability and talent are denied education merely because they lack financial resources. This is a great injustice to our young people. It is also a national tragedy, since their undeveloped talents could contribute so much to the prosperity and strength of the nation. And, in this connection, we must never forget that the Soviet Union is devoting every energy to training millions of scientists and engineers and technicians. We shall not, we will not allow them to outstrip us in this vital race.

There is another kind of opportunity for young Americans, and for their elders as well, and I refer to the opportunity for qualified Americans to go into business for themselves, to use their training and their talents as they wish. A healthy climate for small business is essential to American freedom. We need the independence and the conservatism that goes with widespread ownership of business if our economy is to continue to be strong, productive and free.

We can be proud--immensely proud--of the progress we have made in the economic field in the last three years, but I say to you that Americans will never be satisfied as long as avoidable misery, disease or ignorance exists anywhere in this great land of ours.

The economic prospects I have spoken of are bright, but, as you are aware, all these domestic achievements can be nullified by the terrifying destruction of atomic war, and that is why we must be equally skilled and resourceful in our drive for permanent peace in a troubled world. We are justifiably proud in this field of the magnificent leadership which first secured the peace and then has re-

tained it.

But, here again, I say we are not going to rest on our laurels. We are not going to be satisfied with the achievements of the past three and a half years, because the task is not yet finished. If I may apply the words of Abraham Lincoln to the present situation, "Our task will not be finished so long as the world is half slave and half free." The enslavement of any people in the world is a threat to peace. The triumph of aggression in any part of the globe is a cloud of war over the entire world, and, when freedom loses anywhere, it is threatened everywhere.

We must recognize today that the Soviet Union is mounting a massive new offensive--economic in method, political in purpose, and backed by a vast and growing military machine. To counter this offensive, our foreign policy must be both imaginative and flexible. We must be ready to meet Soviet moves, but we must also be prepared with all peaceful and honorable means to take the initiative in advancing everywhere the cause of human freedom.

There is no need on our part, believe me, for cringing at every Soviet gesture or for feeling that we must always be on the defensive. Our record in support of the dignity of man and the independence of peoples needs no apologies any place in this world. We can stand on this platform proudly before the nations of the world.

Now, in our unceasing struggle for world peace, I should mention briefly three areas in particular which we must always constantly consider.

First, we must have the military strength to clearly deter any aggressor. And, to keep this strength, it is true that we must all sacrifice. The young men who enter military service must sacrifice, as well as the rest of us who pay the high cost of essential defense. But I also say this to you: No sacrifice is too great if it is the price of freedom.

In addition to our military strength, we must continually seek to keep the free world independent in the face of Communist aggression. American partnership in the alliance of free nations is essential to our own safety, because the security of one nation in the world is the security of all.

In addition, we must maintain a long-range foreign economic policy, designed to bolster, when needed, the economic strength of our allies. Economic assistance may add to our sacrifice, but we should never force a nation--and I repeat--we should never force a nation to choose between bankruptcy and submission to the Kremlin. That we will never do.

Third, and perhaps more important than the other two points, if that is possible, we must continue to develop a bold and imaginative program to win the minds and hearts of men to the ideals of freedom and democracy.

Communism has long sought to capture the leaders and the thinkers of the world. The true ideals of freedom

and democracy can win out over the deceptive and false ideals of Communism if people have a chance to compare them. Let's give them this chance. We should not lose this war by default, and I can assure you that we shall not.

In this great contest we can never relax. We are dealing, as I know from experience, with a dedicated enemy, quick to pounce on any weakness or resolve on our part. And for the sake of millions in the world who depend upon our leadership, we must never falter in this vital struggle for freedom. Great as the temptation may be at times to think only of our security at the moment, we shall never resort to that cynical type of compromise which may seem to promise peace for ourselves but which would inevitably bring war or surrender for our children.

And I say to you that we face this task that I have outlined inspired by the vigor and the vision of the man of the century--President Eisenhower.

The Republican Party is a hundred years old. But under his leadership it is again young and imaginative; it has captured the idealism and faith that is the greatness of America. But I believe that it would be a great mistake if we were to become smug and complacent because we have done so well under a great leader.

Our party, I say to you, if is not a party of drift and self-satisfaction. The greatest moments of the Republican Party have been those many years in which it was progressive and forward-looking. We are conservative only in the sense that we keep what is sound and proven from the past. And of that we are certainly proud.

But we use this true conservatism as a springboard for progress in the future. We look not to the past but to the future, and we point with pride to how much we have done in the past only as an indication of how much more we can do in the future.

These are our ideals as we face the American people to ask their support this November. And I can say to you that I am immensely proud of those ideals as a Republican and as an American. We believe that they show the youth and the vigor of our party and its dedicated work for our nation.

I need not tell you how great the stakes are as we go forward into this campaign. But I say to you tonight, with all the conviction at my command, that America cannot settle for less than the best leadership it can get in the next four years. Because, make no mistake about it, the quality of America's leadership will determine the difference between life and death, slavery and freedom, plenty and poverty, happiness and sorrow for millions of people on this earth.

And let us recognize, then, that our party is more than a machine designed to perputate its adherence in power. Under President Eisenhower it has been welded into a mighty instrument--a mighty instrument for good which will lead America into that new age in which the dreams and hopes of our fathers will be realized, not only for our-

selves but for peoples throughout the world.

Mr. Chairman, my fellow delegates, may I at this point be permitted a personal reference. Mrs. Nixon and I have been deeply moved by the very generous support that you have given us at this Convention, and we want to express particular appreciation for the hundreds of wires, letters and messages which came to us in Southern California during the past two days.

I can tell you this: The skill of the fine doctors who are attending my father could not possibly have equaled the lift which he has received from the events for which you were responsible yesterday. For that we thank you--good-by and good luck.

APPENDIX C

THE AMERICAN LEGION ADDRESS[1]

May I first thank you for the privilege of appearing for the third time before the national convention of the American Legion.

As one who has been a Legionnaire for ten years, I am proud to be associated with an organization whose members have contributed so magnificently to the defense of freedom at home and abroad.

As a public official, I am honored to express the nation's gratitude to the members of this organization for your service to the nation in war and peace. You have understood the real spirit of America and have upheld it in the face of those who wish to destroy our institutions.

It is to the eternal credit of the American Legion that years before the true nature of the Communist conspiracy was generally recognized in this country, you saw the threat and proceeded to educate and alert the American people to the danger. For that leadership in peace, as well as for your service in war, the nation owes a debt which I am proud to acknowledge to you today.

I have found that those who served the nation in time of war have a special interest in those programs which are designed to secure the peace and freedom which has been so dearly gained. I believe it is appropriate, therefore, that I report to you today on the policies your National Administration has adopted to further that great objective.

Before doing so, however, I should like to comment briefly on the subject of veteran's legislation. There have been some major accomplishments during the past four years in this field which I do not need to describe in detail to this organization.

But I would like to emphasize just one point with regard to this record. In the ten years I have served in the House, the Senate and in the Vice-Presidency, I have found that Democrats in the Congress have worked just as enthusiastically for veteran's legislation as have Republicans.

In a political campaign there is understandably a tendency for one side to try to outbid the other in proving

---

[1]This text was received from the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January, 1958.

its devotion to the needs of the nation's veterans. I am sure that you will agree with me when I say that there is just as little place for politics in developing our veteran's programs in time of peace as there is in moblizing our fighting men in time of war.

Whatever the results of the election this November, Democrats and Republicans will continue to work together with the leaders of veteran's organizations toward the objective which every American wants--a full measure of gratitude for those who served our country so ably and so well.

May I turn now to the subject I have selected. How can we, in the words of the Legion preamble, "safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy?"

I should like to devote a major portion of my remarks to an analysis of the only serious threat to freedom in the world today--the international Communist movement. I do not discuss this subject because of my belief that there is any need to convince the members of this audience of the evils of Communism. As a matter of fact, it is difficult to find anyone in the United States today who is not against Communism. But the problem is how we can intelligently and effectively meet and defeat, without war, those whose aim it is to destroy freedom wherever it exists in the world.

Let me begin by stating that what we need today is more common sense about Communism and less wishful thinking. This is particularly true now as we confront the so-called "new-look" in Soviet diplomacy.

Let's consider some hard facts as we analyze the new Communist tactics. Those who have plunged millions into darkness are now all sweetness and light. What is really behind the "new-look?"

As a member of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House I have personally met and questioned scores of Communist Party members. During the past three and a half years I have visited 32 countries as a personal representative of the President. During this same period I have participated in the meetings of the National Security Council.

On the basis of this experience I believe these conclusions cannot be challenged. The label differs in various countries, but the poison is just the same. Regardless of his nationality, the Communist has one loyalty and one only--to the ruthless, power-hungry system that has enslaved almost half the world.

The leaders of the Kremlin are masters at talking one way and acting another. They have talked peace a great deal in recent months. But they are stirring up trouble in the Near East. They shot down an American plane off China. They have invaded Burma. They are testing nuclear weapons and devising rockets to carry those weapons. This is a strange way to promote peace, unless by peace they mean the peace of the prison or the tomb.

A switch in the Communist line is like a change of fashions. It lasts for a while until something more salable comes along. Let us liik at this record.

In 1920 the Soviet Union gave independence to the Baltic States of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

In 1940 it enslaved them again.

In 1918 Lenin set out to communize Russia.

In 1921 he changed the line and began to encourage private business.

In 1929 Stalin reversed the field again, wiped out private enterprise and forced farmers into collective farms.

Six years later Stalin was so terrorized by Hitler that he ordered Communists everywhere to become respectable and to co-operate with non-Communists in a united front against fascism.

Yet, in 1939, the bloody hands of Stalin and Hitler were clasped in a fast pact of friendship which made it possible for Hitler to start the second World War.

When Hitler turned on his partner in 1941, Stalin again proclaimed devotion to freedom and democracy. Under the influence of this line Earl Browder (former General Secretary of the Communist Party in the United States) said, in 1943, that capitalism and Communism could coexist after the war.

Two years later Browder was purged and Soviet troops moved out to conquer defenseless peoples of Europe and Asia.

And now, today, the Communist line has shifted back to the one Earl Browder followed in 1943.

Here, then, are 10 complete about-faces in Communist policy in the space of 38 years.

This record explains why President Eisenhower has called for deeds, not words, in dealing with the latest shift in Soviet tactics. We are willing to negotiate at any time to bring peace to the world. But we have the right and responsibility to demand foolproof guarantees that the negotiations are sincere. Until we have this, we shall keep the military, political and economic strength needed to deter any aggressor.

I am stating our position strongly because there are well-intentioned but misguided people here and elsewhere who contend that our line toward Communism is too hard and that we should soften it in view of their changed attitude. It is time that we realize that well-intentioned but mistaken men can be as great a threat to a nation's security as admitted Communists or fellow travelers. The best example of this is Czechoslovakia. The leaders of that unhappy nation, with the best of motives, took Communists into their government. The Communists in turn took over the country.

How, then, are we to deal with this problem? I believe that history proves that the leaders of totalitarian states have the type of mentality which respects strength and strength alone. They pay attention to what you say

only when you have military and economic strength to back it up. They fear, and therefore, respect moral strength. That is why they are so desperately trying to stamp out religion in the countries they control.

The effective way to deal with dictators wherever you find them is to make them respect you. They are always glad to rope in the woolly minded and the self-deluded. But they despise those whom they deceive.

In summary, then, we will always negotiate for peace but we will negotiate from strength, not from weakness. This means we must begin with effective military strength. We must be strong enough that no one would dare attack us. And we must make it clear that an attack on freedom anywhere is an attack on freedom everywhere.

In the modern world military strength means, above all, mastery of nuclear weapons. I realize that there are those in the United States who sincerely believe that we should have discontinued testing of hydrogen bombs if other nations would have offered to follow a similiar policy.

I respectfully submit that for us to have followed this advice would have been not only naive but dangerous to our national security. To have taken such action would have been like telling police officers that they should discard their weapons provided the lawbreakers would offer to throw away their machine guns.

Let us get one simple fact straight once and for all. An agreement to restrict or reduce armaments would not be worth the paper it was written on unless there was first put into effect a full inspection system.

Certainly the record is clear. No government or no people could be more devoted to peace. We keep strong to preserve peace, not to threaten it. Beginning in 1946, at every opportunity since then we have advocated the control of nuclear weapons. And we are continuing to explore every possible means of finding a safe and workable method for controlling such weapons so that the fear of atomic war can be removed from the face of the earth.

But we shall not disarm unilaterally, and we shall enter into agreements to disarm only when we have a system of inspection and control we can trust.

I realize that it is always tempting to tell the voters that there is an easy way to meet difficult problems. I would like to tell you that we can safely cut our armed forces, get rid of the draft, cut our defense spending and, thereby, reduce our taxes.

Unfortunately, however, the easy way is seldom the right way.

This is no time to suggest to our friends or our possible opponents abroad that America is getting soft and tired and is looking for an easy way out of our world responsibilities. In this critical moment of history, let us have the good sense and courage to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to carry out America's international responsibilities. We must never place a price tag on what freedom

is worth to us or the world. As long as armed aggressors are on the loose in the world, free men must stay strong enough to keep the peace.

We recognize, then, the importance of military strength, but it is not the sole solution to our problem.

Nor is economic aid the complete answer, as necessary and desirable as it is in many parts of the world. For example, those who parrot the cliche that, if we could give every Asian another bowl of rice, there would be no Communism in that part of the world are making a superficial and false analysis of a complex and difficult problem.

We must recognize that the Communists also have military strength. And they are running their industrial machines overtime in an effort to outdo us in economic aid. In one area, and one area only, they cannot compete with us. They cannot come to a people and give a satisfactory answer to this question, "Did you come to save freedom or to destroy it?" They know that they offer slavery, not freedom.

In the final analysis it is our moral position that will be decisive in the struggle for men's minds and loyalties. May I at this point commend the American Legion for its splendid work in bringing home to all of the American people, through the "Back to God" program, that great fundamental truth: that the strength of America rests on the sound foundations of moral and religious faith.

If we are to prevail on this issue, we must know what we are for and what we are against, and not be afraid to state our convictions when opportunities are presented to do so.

We should always have a proper respect for the opinion of those who disagree with us, but we should not cringe every time our policy is criticized at home or abroad. We should have the courage to speak out when we think we are right.

Let us examine some of the moral aspects of this problem.

We have heard a great deal lately about the neutrals in the world conflict. What should our position be?

We begin with a fundamental American belief. We respect the right of any nation to differ with us on international problems and to choose political neutrality in the present world situation. But we say there is a difference between political neutrality and moral neutralism. We can understand, even in those instances when we may not approve, political decisions to be neutral. But we must never condone the placing of freedom and Communism on the same moral level.

We have our faults, but we do not enslave our citizens, try to wipe our religion or seek to subvert and conquer nations. We have fought three great wars on foreign soil in this century and lost over 1 million of our fighting men, and yet we have not sought to acquire sovereignty over one inch of territory after those wars. We fight to

preserve freedom, not to destroy it. May we ever keep faith with those who died, and with the traditions we cherish as American citizens, by having the courage always to speak out clearly on the difference between freedom and Communism.

It is because we believe so deeply that our moral position is right that we have strongly supported the program for exchanging visitors with other nations. That is why we are not afraid to carry out this exchange even behind the Iron Curtain. Let people everywhere see what free men stand for and let them choose between freedom and Communism. I am proud of the support the American Legion has given to this program.

Another example of our moral position in action is the policy we have adopted with regard to Communist China. There are some who tell us that from a practical standpoint we are foolish to persist in our refusal to recognize Red China and to admit its representatives to the United Nations. But the executive and legislative branches of our Government have flatly rejected cowardly expediency in this matter.

We shall not yield to blackmail and recognize a regime that imprisons our citizens and shoots down our planes. By its continued open defiance of the United Nations in Korea, the Government of Communist China has disqualified itself from being considered an honorable member of the family of nations.

Our moral principles also come into play when we refuse to listen to the siren song of those who urge appeasement of potential enemies. Experience has shown us that there is no such thing as a little bit of appeasement. Appeasement is the first step to surrender because the appetite of an aggressor knows no limit. We found that out in Korea. South Korea was invaded because the Communists were led to believe that we would not fight to defend it. We must never make this mistake again.

I believe that one of the finest examples of leadership this nation has witnessed in the past four years was the refusal of those well-meaning but mistaken individuals who would have had us seek the surrender of Quemoy and Matsu to the Communist Chinese. We proceeded in that instance on a sound principle: that the right moral position also serves best our national interests. We knew that a bully picks only on those he considers weak or cowardly, and that the best way to avoid war was to show that we were not afraid to fight.

These same moral principles warn us that, just as we cannot be soft on international Communism, we cannot be soft on domestic Communism. All evidence that has come to my attention shows that the Communists are stepping up international subversion in the United States and other countries, rather than reducing it. The soft new line they are adopting internationally makes them more dangerous domestically, rather than less. Now is the time to increase our vigi-

lance--not to relax it.

At the same time, as I have said on several occasions before, we must be scrupulously fair and accurate in fighting Communism in the United States. We do this not only because it is right, but also because it is the most effective way to deal with this conspiracy. Wild charges and unfounded name-calling only play into the hands of the Communists.

If we call a man a Communist merely because we disagree with his economic and social philosophy, we are only making Communism more respectable. We give Communists their full rights under the law, not because we want to be soft on them, but because respect for law is essential to preserve the American heritage which is such a bulwark of strength against tyranny of any type.

I realize that, because we recognize this fundamental principle, many Communists escape punnishment through the use of the Fifth Amendment. It is their right to plead that amendment under our Constitution. But let us make one thing absolutely clear. I say that any individual who refuses to disclose information with regard to criminal conspiracy against the United States forfeits any claim he might have to be an employe of our government--federal, State or local, and includes our tax-supported schools.

I would like to add just one word with regard to our government loyalty and security program. We should constantly work to improve these programs so that they will be as fair and effective as possible. But I find it difficult to understand those who condemn an entire program because of occasional mistakes.

And, likewise, I have little patience with those who criticize a program without offering anything better in its place. The problem of internal security is deadly serious. One spy in the wrong place can cost the lives of millions of American men. Because of this, those who criticize a program by telling us what not to do, without trying to tell what we ought to do, are rendering a disservice to their country.

May I state finally some conclusions which I think represent the views of this audience and of the great majority of the American people, regardless of political affiliation?

In the next two months we shall and should hear a great deal of criticism and discussion of our foreign policy. We should welcome the opportunity to put our programs to the test of healthy and constructive debate in the American tradition.

But I cannot agree with those who seem to relish proclaiming that American prestige in the world is at an all-time low. I have traveled around the world two times in the past three and a half years. I have met and talked personally, not only to government leaders, but to thousands of people in all walks of life. I can tell you that there is a great well of friendship and respect for the people and the

Government of the United States in every country I have visited.

And make no mistake about this: No man in the world today is more respected or more revered as the symbol of peace and liberty than the President of the United States.

That does not mean that his foreign policies are perfect or that we should be immune to criticism. But let us remember that, like all our great Presidents, his leadership and his policies in the international field are American, not Democrat or Republican, and let us debate them and discuss them in that spirit.

The entire problem of Communism, foreign and domestic, is too important for partisan criticism or political sniping. It is literally the question of America's security and of our national survival. The development of a program to deal with Communism, either at home or abroad, should never be an issue that divides us on party lines.

When the security of the nation is at stake, we are Americans first and Democrats or Republicans second. When we fought side by side on fields of battle, we did not ask the politics or the social views of those who fought beside us. We were one in the defense of the country.

The struggle against world Communism is the greatest challenge that free men have ever faced. But, as the President has so eloquently stated on many occasions, there is nothing that 167 million united Americans cannot accomplish. That is why I am proud to be associated with an organization that has contributed so magnificently to this noble aim--that Americans be united as we work together for the cause of peace and freedom throughout the world.

APPENDIX D

THE CAMPAIGN SPEECH AT GETTYSBURG, PENNSYLVANIA[1]

Mr. President, Mrs. Eisenhower:

May I first express, on behalf of all of us who are guests today, what we feel in our hearts--a very deep appreciation for inviting us to your farm for this wonderful occasion.

As a matter of fact, I have only one complaint, and it's personal. I knew that the President's farm would be quite unusual and a little different, and a little better, I would think, than any other, but I will have to admit your farm, like all other farms, is bad for those of us who have hay-fever.

Reference has already been made to the fact that Pat and I are going to leave on a trip next Tuesday that is going to take us in two weeks 15,000 miles and into thirty-two states. And I think since this is a working session and not a session in which we are here simply to praise ourselves, that it would be well for me perhaps to talk to you very frankly about what I visualize is our responsibility in this campaign, and particularly my own responsibility in my campaign activities.

First of all, may I say that I'm very proud to be a member of this Administration. It has a splendid record, and I believe that re-electing President Eisenhower and a Republican House and Senate is in the best interests of the American people. I consider it a privilege to tell what we have done in the last three and a half years and to paint, as well as I can, the great promise our leadership offers for the future.

That is the primary responsibility that I have and that all Republicans have in this campaign--to follow the tone and the note that the President so well laid out for us in his great acceptance speech in San Francisco.

But then we have a problem. It's a problem to which Len Hall has referred to, incidently, and it is this: What should we do--what should I do, for example--about per-

---

[1]This text was received from the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January, 1958, and was checked with the text published in the New York Times, September 13, 1956.

sonal attacks on the President by the other side?

What should we do about attacks on this administration?

Now, there are those--and among them those who want us to win--who say we should ignore them, pay no attention. There are others who say we should go to the other extreme--that we should attack the other side, and particularly the candidates on the other side.

I want to tell you what I have decided to do.

First of all, I do not intend to--I don't believe that any of us should--reply in kind with personal attacks on the integrity of our opponents in this campaign. But I want to say one other thing: I think that when misrepresentation and distortion of the Administration accomplishments are engaged in by our opponents, it is our responsibility to set the record straight whenever we have an opportunity.

There is a very practical reason for doing this:

You don't win campaigns with a diet of dishwater and milk toast, but there is a more fundamental reason, and it is this:

In our history we have had several great Presidents. Some of them have been Republicans and some of them have been Democrats. It seems that the American people have usually had a sense of what the nation needs in leadership, but the people of the United States, in order to make an intelligent decision at the polls, have to know the facts.

And where misstatement is repeated over and over again without any answer, it eventually is believed as the truth. So I say that we would be shirking our responsibility to the nation if we failed to point out such misrepresentation whenever it occurs.

When we make mistakes, it is their responsibility to point them out to the people; and when they make mistakes, it is our responsibility to do likewise. And regardless of well meaning advice to the contrary, that's what I intend to do.

Now, there isn't time, of course, to discuss all the issues about which we are going to be talking during this campaign. But I would like to give you some examples of just what I mean.

We heard over and over again for the past few weeks--as a matter of fact, for the past few months--that there is no peace in the United States, that our foreign policy has failed and our prestige is at an all-time low.

All I can say about that is:

It may not be surprising that those who defend an administration which never recognized there was a war in Korea may not know the difference between war and peace.

But believe me--believe me--the American people do. They know the difference and they like an administration which got us out of one war, kept us out of others, and gives the best promise for leadership which will keep the peace in the future.

Then what should we talk about in this campaign on

this issue?

Simply this: Foreign policy is tremendously important. It should be debated in American political campaigning because we face great dangers in the world today, and we need the very best thinking if the men of both parties are to develop the program best calculated to deal with those dangers.

But I would suggest this also: That for a candidate for the Presidency of the United States to suggest one day that we're "losing the cold war" and the next day that we might get rid of the draft at a time when our NATO friends are trying to meet their quota for our common defense, is the height of political fakery and irresponsibility.

And just remember this: That all of our great Presidents in the field of foreign policy have been Americans first, and Republicans and Democrats second. And President Eisenhower is cast in that mold, believe me.

Let us debate foreign policy in this campaign, but let us debate it in that spirit.

We have a related problem, the problem of communism at home. This should not be an issue in this campaign. It shouldn't be an issue which would divide Americans on party lines because I know, as you know, that some of the most vigorous and effective leaders in the fight against communism have been members of the Democratic party.

But I also say this: If Mr. Stevenson does not repudiate the statement of Mr. Truman, who still says that Alger Hiss was not a spy, then we have no choice but to discuss this issue and let the people decide whether we or our opponents are better qualified to handle this difficult problem.

You have also heard there is no real prosperity in the United States, in addition to the "fact" that we have no peace. I would suggest those who bragged, as they did in 1948, "You've never had it so good," when there were twice as many unemployed in America as there are today, may not be the best judge of whether there is prosperity or not in the United States.

And just to keep the record straight, let's let our position be known on this issue. First, we believe that casulty lists are too high a price to pay for prosperity. And second, we are proud that 65,000,000 American workers have the highest wages. The biggest wages, the highest take home pay, the greatest security that Americans have ever had at any time in our history.

We call that prosperity and we have it.

I understand the President said, "It's now 67,000,000," so I now correct myself.

We hear this administration, incidently, has no interest in the problems of the people. And we've heard over and over again that we're for the rich, and against the poor; that we're against little business.

Well, this is my answer to that: We're proud of the fact that our interest is in the people as individuals and

not as classes and masses.

We are also proud of the fact that we offer a forward looking program in the fields of health, education, and welfare that will work--instead of a cynical promise of pie-in-the-sky for political purposes that will never work.

May I say, too, that we should have idealism--idealism in campaign, idealism in political leadership.

And I have noted, as you may have, that the statement of our opponent yesterday when he spoke of the fact--and I think I am quoting this accurately--that he had spoken out all over the country, from one end to the other, in support of the Supreme Court decision on schools and segregation.

I would not question his integrity, his good intention: but I think it would be well to point this out: It is unfortunate that he spoke softly on this issue in Chicago and that his own party's platform which he accepted, rejected that Supreme Court decision and refused to endorse it.

I think perhaps the most ridiculous claim is that this Administration is shot through with crookedness and corruption. And all I can say on that--we'll be glad to compare the moral standards of the Eisenhower Administration to the Truman Administration anytime of the day or night.

Nobody has a monoply on morality, or honesty or loyalty. We know that, but the test of an administration is what you do when a breach of trust is brought to your attention. We can be proud of the fact as General Kilpatrick pointed out, that President Eisenhower has restored dignity and respect to the highest office of this land.

And I can assure you that never has a breach of trust been defended or condoned by him as President of the United States--and as long as he is President it never will be.

May I conclude in this light: We can be immensely proud of our President and his leadership. No man is more revered or respected in the world. I know because I have traveled and visited thirty-two countries in the past three and one-half years. Now the man who led the greatest armies in history to victory in World War II, who cleaned up the mess he found in Washington in 1953, is leading the most massive assult on misery, poverty, disease and hate that the world has ever seen.

He deserves four more years to complete this task and he deserves a Congress that will help him do it. So let's give him what he deserves.

Ours is a noble cause because we have so much to fight for to win and so much to lose if we fail.

There isn't any easy way to win the campaign. What wins it is work at the precinct levels--this doorbell ringing that you have been talking about. I say let's set as our objective getting the magnificent story of this administration to every home in America. Let's see that no doorbell

remains unrung between now and November sixth.

I can pledge to you that every waking moment between now and then I shall be devoted to this cause. I know you, too, will be just as devoted.

APPENDIX E

THE COLORADO SPRINGS ADDRESS[1]

I want to speak tonight on the issue which presents to the voters the most clear-cut choice of all in this campaign--the economic policies of this Administration. Our political parties should not differ in their approach to the broad outlines of our foreign policy. We should not disagree on the necessity of opposing Communism at home. We should be one in seeking an honest and efficient government. In these areas the choice is primarily one of leadership--whether, for example, President Eisenhower or Mr. Stevenson is better qualified by experience and background to lead the nation toward a lasting peace.

But when it comes to prosperity and the economic health of the nation we have sharp and real differences of opinion between the two candidates. I say between the two candidates rather than between the two parties because millions of Democrats, including many Democratic members of the Congress, support the Eisenhower economic policies rather than those being advocated by Mr. Stevenson.

Unfortunately, however, these Democrats are not running the show. It is quite obvious that Mr. Stevenson's economic policies are being dictated by certain labor leaders, turned politicians, and by the intellectual advisors of his campaign organization, the Americans for Democratic Action.

In 1952 Mr. Stevenson showed admirable statesmanship and independence in refusing to knuckle down to this group in the fields of farm and labor policies. But from what he has said in the campaign up to this time it appears that he now has completely accepted the economic policies of the Truman Fair Deal and has dressed them up in a new 1956 outfit.

The voters, therefore, must decide on November 6 whether they want to go back to the policies they repudiated in 1952 or whether they want to continue the Eisenhower policies which have been in effect for the past four years.

Tonight I would like to discuss this problem not in the mass terms of gross national product, corporate income, profits after taxes, etc., but in reference to this simple and all-important question. Have the economic policies of

---

[1]This text was received from the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January, 1958.

this Administration been good for the average American family?

Mr. Stevenson and Mr. Truman have made some very serious charges against this Administration in the past few weeks. What all these charges add up to is that President Eisenhower and his Administration are interested only in the rich, not the poor; in big business rather than small business; in employers rather than workers.

Now, I could say exactly the opposite until I was blue in the face but it wouldn't mean anything to you except that one side had claimed one thing and the other something else. But what does count is not what is said but what happens to wages, prices and taxes under an Administration. And I say on that score that no amount of misrepresentation, distortion or demagoguery can hide the fact that the great majority of Americans have had the best years of their lives during the Eisenhower Administration.

Consider, for example, those who make up the great bulk of the wealth producers in our population--the 66.6 million American wage earners. What does the wage earner want? He wants a job. He wants high wages. He wants purchasing power. He wants a security program for the future. Today America's wage earners have more jobs at higher wages with greater purchasing power, sounder security and fewer strikes than at any time in history. And they have peace to boot and a government they know they can trust.

Here are some comparisons which bear out the statement I have just made. In 1948, Mr. Truman said: "You've never had it so good." In 1948, the average weekly wage for factory workers was $54.00. In 1956, the same factory worker is earning nearly $79.00 a week. What is even more important, however, is that as the report of the American Federation of Labor for February, 1955 said 'These wage increases provided more of a gain in real wages than in other post-war years because they were almost entirely over the amount needed to compensate for the rise in the cost of living."

The wage earner who thinks he gets raises when his dollars are being cheapened is only being kidded. From 1944 to 1952 the wages of the average factory worker increased from $46.00 a week to $68.00 a week. This sounds good but when you adjust for price increases in that same period he didn't get a raise at all. The actual purchasing power of his weekly take-home pay check declined two dollars during the seven year period of the Truman Fair Deal.

Compare this with what happened during the Eisenhower Administration. He got an increase of $8.00 a week in real buying power in the last four years.

By any standard of comparison, the 66.6 million American wage earners have had it better under Eisenhower than ever before and I believe that regardless of contrary views which may be expressed by a few union leaders, a majority of union members are going to vote for four more

years of the same kind of government.

Let us consider the millions of white collar workers, pensioners, and others living on fixed incomes. We can point with pride to the fact that Social Security has been extended to ten million not previously covered and unemployment insurance to four million not previously covered. But what is even more important to those who live on fixed incomes is that today they have real security rather than cut-rate security because we have a government which insists on a balanced budget and thereby insures a sound dollar.

What this means can be seen when we realize that a man who saved a dollar and put it into Social Security, Life Insurance, or government bonds in 1942, received only sixty-one cents back when he retired in 1952. During the four years of the Eisenhower Administration the value of the dollar has varied less than one and one-half cents. To the 102 million Americans who have life insurance, the 70 million who have Social Security, the over forty million who have government savings bonds, this means that the dollars they save today will be worth a dollar five, ten, and fifteen years from now provided the sound fiscal policies of the Eisenhower Administration are continued.

Consider the American farmers. The charge is being made that this Administration is against the farmer and at best for the big farmer and against the small farmer. But let's look at the record. In the twenty years of the Fair Deal and the New Deal, there was never prosperity on the farm except in wartime or as a direct result of war. We all know that surpluses are the basic cause for low farm prices. These surpluses were created by the crisis demands of war and by the rigid price supports which encouraged farmers to grow products that were not needed and could not be sold. No attack whatever was made on this problem during the Truman Administration.

In this Administration we are boldly and imaginatively reducing these surpluses by finding new markets abroad and at home and through the adoption of our soil-bank program. For the first time in a quarter of a century the American farmer is seeing a way to solve the surplus problem and to achieve the goal he wants, prosperity in peacetime. And I am sure that when he compares the program of the Eisenhower Administration with the dreary alternative offered by our opponents of going back to the policies which created the farm problem and never solved it, the American farmers will vote overwhelmingly for this Administration.

I could give other examples but in summary this has been the effect of the Eisenhower economic policies. This Administration is now proving for the first time in nearly twenty-five years that we can have prosperity without war, full employment outside of uniform, and security without regimentation and controls. We are proud of that record and we believe that the American people whom we represent are proud of it too.

Let us examine now the economic policies of the

Truman so-called Fair Deal which Mr. Stevenson supports. They begin by putting government into the driver's seat in economic life. Government makes the main decisions. Private business, labor, and farming tag along but they are regulated, controlled, stimulated or repressed as the Federal Government chooses. In a nutshell, they do not trust American business, labor, and agriculture to do a job on their own. They try to pit class against class. They side with labor as against business, with organized labor against unorganized labor, with small farmers as opposed to large farmers.

This is how their program works in practice.

If there is unemployment they say that the government should provide jobs.

If schools or hospitals are needed, the Federal Government should build them.

If one area of the country lags behind another, the Federal Government should straighten out the problem.

The answer to all problems is the same--spending, controls, and centralizing of political power in the Federal Government.

Now what are the results of this approach? Let us admit at the outset that some of the programs of the New Deal and Fair Deal were good for the country. Certainly, the majority of Americans today support the Social Security Act; the protection of the consumer in the matter of pure foods, drugs and cosmetics; the protection of labor's rights to organize; the regulation of securities exchanges; the needed powers given to the Federal Reserve System. But all of these were only tools. If they were used rightly they could do a lot of good. But if misused they might do a lot of harm.

For example, let us see what happened with regard to their labor policy. Labor was protected in its right to organize. This was good. But certain labor leaders let power go to their heads. They called strikes that threatened to paralyze the nation. They ignored racketeering and dictatorship in their ranks. And some of them blinded themselves to the Communist influence in certain unions.

As a result, the national interest demanded some regulation of these abuses. To do this the Taft-Hartley Act was passed over a presidential veto with the support of a majority of both the Republicans and the Democrats in the House and the Senate. This is the law which Mr. Stevenson has pledged to repeal without offering any alternative for curbing grave abuses in labor relations.

In summary, the New Deal, Fair Deal policies sounded good. All problems were solved by saying the government would provide the answer to everything. But the difficulty was that this simply did not work. And the most devastating proof of the truth of this statement is that in twenty years these policies were never able to provide prosperity except during war or as a result of war. For example, in 1939

immediately before World War II there were nine million unemployed--four times as many as there are today. In 1950 immediately before the Korean War there were almost five million unemployed--twice as many as there are today.

For this reason the American people in 1952 decided to give President Eisenhower a chance to do what his predecessors had been unable to do--provide prosperity in peacetime. These are some of things he did in order to bring about this result. He removed controls that were strangling our industrial system. He gave American business and labor a chance to work out their own destinies. He pinned his faith on the brains and initiative of ninety million American producers in factories and farms rather than on the planning of a few so-called experts in Washington offices. And his faith has been completely justified.

There were many changes made in the nation's economic policies during the past four years but I am not going to bother you with the details. What I would particularly like to emphasize tonight is the really important change that this Administration made. I call it the idea of partnership. Our key idea was to encourage people to work together to do things themselves.

Carrying out this idea we rejected three basic Truman, Fair Deal ideas.

That government should be a dictator over economic life.

The federal government should step in and try to solve all problems.

That the government should promote class struggle and take sides in this struggle.

Under this Administration, the government is a partner with the people--not the boss. It deals with state and local governments as mature agencies of their citizens, not as children to be led around by the hand. It promotes cooperation between business and labor; between farm and city. We do all these things because we believe that hatred and strife weaken a nation but that 167 million Americans working together can accomplish anything we set out to do. This Administration is not opposed to business, or to labor, or to the farmers. It favors them all and it discriminates against none. We are not against little business or big business, but we are for good business.

I have already spoken of the results of the application of these policies. Even the critics of this Administration agree that the United States is enjoying an era of unparalleled prosperity.

But great as these results are, we are not satisfied. This is only the beginning. Let us look for a moment into the exciting future toward which the Eisenhower Administration is working with every resource at its command. We look forward to a future in which poverty will be a forgotten word in the United States. We want an economic system that brings comfort and even luxury to every American family.

Our goals are more than mere statistics. We could

say that our hope is to double everyone's standard of living in ten years. We could promise two automobiles, three television sets, a better house and a dozen other comforts that could mean so much to every American.

But I prefer to dwell on the human side of the story and say what all of this means to the average American citizen.

Our first aim is to wipe out the remaining pockets of distress and economic discrimination in the United States. Even with our great prosperity there are a few who do not share equitably in the general progress. Certainly we must finish the work we have begun in wiping out farm surpluses. We must take positive steps jointly with state, local and private groups to help those areas which have suffered loss of industry.

Another area of distress involves our so-called minority groups in this country. A substantially large portion of our poorer citizens are Negroes and Puerto Ricans. We have also the problem of our migrant farm workers. The problems of these groups offer a real challenge to all of us. It is a challenge which was never met by New Deal, Fair Deal policies. We accept that challenge. We believe that with our successful economic policies we can finish this job and abolish poverty in the United States.

Our second great aim is to wipe out bitterness and class struggle in our nation. They do not belong here. They are leftovers from the socialism and class distinction of older nations. We believe in freedom and equality for all citizens. There are no classes in the United States. In our economy of abundance there is no reason for one person to begrudge the wealth of another--there is enough for all.

This Administration has made great progress in wiping out the tensions that have divided Americans from one another. Because we have favored all groups and opposed none we have broken down barriers erected by the extreme philosophies of the right and of the left. Our policies promote good will between business and labor. They show how both little and big business can prosper. They help farmers without penalizing city dwellers. This is as it should be and we intend to keep it that way.

Our third goal is to promote a new way of life in the United States--better than we have ever had before. We will do this by unleashing the research facilities of our scientists and technicians so that new forms of production will evolve. Back-breaking toil and mind-wearying tension will be left to machines and electronic devices. We want man's work to be pleasant so that he can go home each day with abundant energy for enjoying the comfort and friendliness of his family. We see the time not too far distant when we can have a four-day week and family life will be even more fully enjoyed by every American.

These are not dreams or idle boasts, they simply

are projections of the gains we have made in the last four years. We can do all these things if we have an Administration in Washington which does not say "let the government do it" but which adopts policies which will tap all the resources of our federal, state and local governments and which above all will unleash and encourage the ingenuity and the inventive genius of the American people.

Finally, we hope to show the entire world the value of the philosophy that has led to our prosperity. I do not have a name which adequately describes it. It has been called the new capitalism; the people's capitalism, or consumer capitalism. It has been described as a philosophy of moderation or partnership. Whatever it is, it is something new and far better than anything the world has ever seen before. Communists are in awe of it. Visitors from older industrial countries are amazed at its results.

Call it what you will, we have something new and good that has proved itself in action. Give it a chance and the future will be unbelievably prosperous. Cut down American industry, tie its hands behind its back with the tired old philosophies of the ADA and we will have the stagnation and bitterness that were the curse of the 1930's. Ours is the real progressive approach. Ours is the really forward look.

If you believe in America's greatness and trust in her future then stay on the truly liberal and progressive side. Vote for a President who has helped the little man instead of just talking about him. Stick with prosperity and progress. Keep the Administration that has gotten results. This November let us not go backward to depression and futility but let us march forward to the fulfillment of America's destiny.

APPENDIX F

ALFRED E. SMITH MEMORIAL DINNER ADDRESS[1]

When I received your invitation to address this dinner honoring the memory of Alfred E. Smith, I tried to think of a single theme that would explain his greatness. It was difficult to do this because he had so many fine qualities.

He was a poor boy from the East Side of New York. He had little in the way of formal education. But he achieved distinction as a leader of men, a tower of strength in the business community, and above all, as a man of unblemished character. He was a magnificent example of the American dream. He typifies the truth of the statement that in America there is no forgotten man, no common man, no little man, no average man. There is only our fellow man.

Why is America a great nation?

The greatness of America does not lie in our economic strength or our unequalled wealth. It cannot be measured by military power or diplomatic prestige.

Other nations have been wealthy and powerful. But their wealth was for the few. Their power was vested in an aristocracy of blood or of class. In these nations, privilege and right were restricted to the ruling elite. The remainder, the so-called masses or common men, had duties rather than rights, favors rather than privileges.

It took daring on the part of our founding fathers to say that all men were created equal. It took faith to assert that "every man was endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights." The world of 1776 was not cast in this image.

In the words of Lincoln, "Our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

These moving passages from two of our greatest national documents carry a message which America today should never forget. It is a message of the dignity of man as a child of God.

Other ages spoke of the divine right of kings. We

---

[1]This text was received from the Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January, 1958, and was checked with the text published in the New York Times, October 19, 1956.

speak of the divinely granted rights of every man. In our government, no man is so lowly that he is beneath its protection. We are free men, equal under law.

When our founding fathers spoke of man's rights as granted by the Creator, they put certain rights beyond the pale of government. The State does not grant these rights. It cannot take them away. It can only protect and enforce them. These rights were stated simply in the Declaration of Independence. They are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Our basic rights are spelled out in more detail in our Constitution and its first ten amendments, the Bill of Rights.

This was a daring concept, in the light of history at that time. It also stands out in striking contrast to the slave states of the present century. Thirty-nine years ago next month a new state was created in Russia. Twenty-three years ago a new state was created in Germany. Both denied the dignity of man and the sovereignty of God and His moral law. To them the state was absolute: the citizen nothing. There was no right to life. Liberty vanished behind the barbed wire of slave labor camps and concentration camps. There was no happiness, because slaves can never be really happy.

It is important that we remember that Communism and Nazism are evil things in themselves. They are not wrong merely because they have threatened American security and the freedom of other nations. Even if these threats had disappeared, they would still be wrong, because they denied human freedom and raised their blasphemous hands against the Creator.

These things must be said, lest some of the steps taken by our Government be misunderstood.

It is necessary for our national leaders to meet with the leaders of such states, in the hope of forging a secure peace for the world. We have even taken advantage of the partial lifting of the Iron Curtain to try to let Communists see freedom in action.

But, when we take these steps, we are not absolving a system that has enslaved eight million of our fellow men. That we must never do.

Our purpose rather is to lessen their burdens today, and to hasten the tomorrow when they will be free. We hope first to remove from all mankind the paralyzing fear of war and the crushing burden of armament.

Then we seek to prove to the Communist world that freedom, and freedom alone, can bring out the best energies of mankind. By a free exchange of persons, we hope to show them that, even on their materialist assumptions, they must restore full freedom if their society is to work.

The contrast between the lot of the citizen in their society and ours is a contrast between darkness and light. It is not that we are without fault or that we have perfectly lived up to our ideals. We had slavery during the first 76 years of our nation's history. There has been dis-

crimination based on race, religion, and national origin. Even today there is resistance to the granting of our Negro citizens their full rights under law.

But the greatness of America lies in the fact that the nation as a whole has fought to eliminate these injustices and to seek ever more forcefully our ideal of equality.

When our Constitution was written, the founding fathers were preparing for the day when slavery would be abolished. When that day came, this nation went to war--brother against brother--to establish our ideal of freedom.

We lived through the anti-foreign riots of the Know-Nothing days and the hooded terror of the Ku Klux Klan. Each time we emerged a stronger nation, ashamed of prejudice and hate, and more determined to give equal justice to all.

I feel sure that we shall pass through our present crisis with equal credit. Most of us here will live to see the day when American boys and girls shall sit, side by side, at any school--public or private--with no regard paid to the color of their skin. Segregation, discrimination, and prejudice have no place in America. And I can report to you tonight that men of good will in all sections of our land are working with complete devotion toward the day when the American ideal of equality of opportunity is a reality for all of our people.

The wealth of America does not lie merely in the productivity of our factories and our farms.

We are also right in the greatness of our people. But who are the people of America? Ours is no master race. Our fathers came from all nations and from all continents. We are English, Irish, German, Italian, Polish, French. We are European, Asian, African. But first, last, and always, we are Americans.

We enjoy a better life than most of our cousins who remained behind. Is this merely because of the great resources of a new continent? We have been blessed by the richness of our land but other nations with such resources have not progressed as we have.

The real secret of American greatness lies in the fact that from the time of our foundation we have recognized the supreme dignity of men and women as individuals. All of us, no matter how diverse our origins, have had the right to equal opportunity under law. And year by year we have been taking ever stronger steps to implement this right for all Americans.

The result has been a fusion of the best ideals and the strongest energies of all the peoples that have come to our shores. In the "melting-pot" of America we have not tried to shape everything according to one pattern. Rather we have welcomed all and have all shared in the diversity and richness that each has to contribute.

We must always remember that our nation has achieved so much precisely because of our willingness to accept what

what each new American has to offer. We are strong in our unity, but we are stronger still because of our diversity. We do not force conformity. There is no one settled pattern that is the American way. We are a progressive people, constantly experimenting to see what may be better than what we had before. Because we are willing to change, we are never satisfied with second-best.

But underneath these changes are certain eternal principles which we must cherish, if we are to retain our greatness. One of the most fundamental of these principles is that of equality under law, the basis of our civil rights. Let me explain these two terms; equality and under law as I understand them.

Equality to us is basically a religious ideal. It does not refer to talent, ability, culture or background, for we differ in those respects. It does not even refer to equality of opportunity; this is a consequence, rather than the substance, of our belief. Equality means one simple thing--in the words of Al Smith-- "We believe in the common brotherhood of man under the common Fatherhood of God."

But we have gone further and placed this religious belief under the sanction of civil law. Our constitution, and particularly the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment, ordain that the full majesty and power of our federal government shall be used to protect and enforce this equality. The sovereignty of federal courts shall strike down any law, ordinance or action that tries to make any American a lesser person before the law. We upnold these rights even for those who would subvert and overthrow our system of law. We grant full rights to Communists, for example, not because we are soft on Communism, but because we dare not be soft in regard to the great principles of law that have molded our nation. We will vigilantly protect our nation against treason and subversion, but we shall do this within the frame-work of due process and our proved concepts of justice.

The decision of the Supreme Court on segregation in schools is but one step in a continuing process of giving substance and vitality to our democracy. State law and actions of the federal government are moving forward to eliminate bias in employment, discrimination in housing and bigotry in any form that can be touched by law. Race and religious hatred strike at the roots of that remarkable unity that is the achievement of our nation. For the survival of our highest ideals, we must eradicate them from the face of our society.

But we who hold office in the federal government would be the last to hold that our efforts alone will suffice. The most perfect law legislators can write is only as good as the will of the people to obey it. And that will must come from within us. It cannot be imposed from without. Laws which do not have the support of the people will in the end be nothing more than dead and meaningless words on dust-covered parchment.

If laws are not the complete answer to our problem, where must we look for its solution? Our Constitution has strictly limited the scope and powers of government. We must always remember that those powers not specifically granted to government are retained by the people. And with power goes responsibility.

This means that all of us have responsibility for implementing the American dream of equality. Our churches and schools, our labor unions and employer associations, farm groups and city groups, and the countless associations and societies that we have formed all must work together toward our great objective.

I do not like to phrase this goal in negative terms of avoiding bias and discrimination. Let me put it positively--we should all work to promote understanding, brotherhood, and national unity. In this way alone can we retain and advance the national ideals which are the true greatness of America.

Why is this cause so important?

America cannot afford the moral, the economic and the international cost of prejudice and discrimination.

We know the moral cost--the thousands of skilled craftsmen, engineers, teachers, lawyers, and doctors, whom we need if we are to develop our resources to the full, but who are not trained because they are denied the equality of of opportunity for education which is their right.

I can testify from experience as to the international cost. Every instance of prejudice in America is blown up a thousand fold by the enemies of freedom and does irreparable harm to our cause abroad.

I have often expressed the idea that the world struggle today is a contest for men's minds. It is mainly in the realm of the spirit, and only secondarily in the military, diplomatic, and economic fields. In such a struggle, the kind of people we are counts much more than what we say. To the diverse people of the world--different in race, religion, and national origin, but one in the sight of our Creator--let us show forth the highest meaning of our democracy, a nation under God to seek the welfare of all, rich and poor, learned and unlearned, powerful and weak.

This was the revolutionary ideal which caught the imagination of the world in 1776. Our history books tell us that the American Revolution ended in Yorktown. But the American Revolution will not be complete until the ideals of independence, equality, and freedom which kept men fighting at Valley Forge are a reality not only for Americans but for peoples throughout the world.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BOOKS

A. Biographical

Current Biography 1948. New York: H. W. Wilson Co., 1949.

de Toledano, Ralph. Nixon. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956.

Koegh, James. This Is Nixon. New York: J. P. Putnam's Son's, 1956.

Williams, Irving. The Rise of the Vice-Presidency. Washington: Public Affairs Press, 1956.

B. Political

Barker, Sir. Ernest. Principles of Social and Political Theory. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press, 1951.

Beard, Charles A. The Economic Basis of Politics. New York: A. Knopf, 1945.

Bone, Hugh Alvin. American Politics and the Party System. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Brinkley, Wilfred Ellsworth. American Political Parties. New York: Knopf, 1958.

Bury, John Bagnell. The Ancient Greek Historian. London: Macmillian and Co., LTD., 1909.

Goodman, William. The Two-Party System in the United States. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1956.

Hinderaker, Ivan. Party Politics. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1956.

Jenkins, Thomas P. The Study of Political Theory. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1955.

Key, V. O., Jr. Politics, Parties and Pressure Groups. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1952.

Merriam, Charles Edward. The American Party System. New York: Macmillian Co., 1949.

Merrian, Robert E. and Bethea, John A. Understanding Politics. Chicago Science Research Associates, 1952.

Moos, Malcolm Charles. Politics, Presidents and Coattails. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1952.

Moos, Malcolm Charles. The Republicans. New York: Random House, 1956.

Porter, Kirk H. and Johnson, Donald B. National Party Platforms (1840-1956). Urbana, Illinois: The University of Illinois Press, 1956.

Ranney, Austin. The Doctrine of Responsible Party Government, It's Origin and Present State. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1954.

Ranney, Austin and Kendal, Willmore. Democracy and the American Party System. New York: Harcourt, Brace Co., 1956.

Tourtellot, Arthur Bernon. An Anatomy of American Politics. Indianapolis: Babs-Merrill, 1950.

Turner, Henry A. Politics in the United States. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1958.

C. Criticism

Baird, A. Craig. Argumentation, Discussion and Debate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1950.

Baird, A. Craig and Knower, Franklin H. General Speech. McGraw-Hill, 1949.

Brooks, Cleanth and Warren, Robert P. Modern Rhetoric. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949.

Bryant, Donald C. and Wallace, Karl R. Fundamentals of Public Speaking. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953.

Cooper, Lane. The Rhetoric of Aristotle. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1932.

Dewey, John. How We Think. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1910.

Flesch, Rudolph. Art of Plain Talk. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1946.

Hummel, William and Huntres, Keith. The Analysis of Propaganda. New York: William Sloan Associates, Inc., 1949.

McBurney, James H. and Hance, Kenneth G. Discussion in Human Affairs. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

McBurney, James H., O'Neill, James M. and Mills, Glen E. Argumentation and Debate. New York: The Macmillian Co., 1951.

McBurney, James H. and Wrage, Ernest J. Guide to Good Speech. New York: Prentice;Hall, Inc., 1955.

Mills, Glen E. Composing the Speech. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1952.

Monroe, Alan H. Principles and Types of Speech. New York: Scott Foresman and Co., 1955.

Oliver, Robert T. The Psychology of Persuasive Speech. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1950.

Thonssen, Lester A. and Baird, A. Craig. Speech Criticism.

Thouless, Robert H. Straight and Crooked Thinking. New York: Simon and Shuster, 1932.

II. ARTICLES

A. Authors Listed

Baskerville, Barnet. "The New Nixon," The Quarterly Journal of Speech. February, 1957.

Bean, L. H. "Analyzing The Vote," Nation. November 24, 1956.

Begeman, Jean. "Who Is Richard Nixon," New Republic. October 6, 1952.

Blackburn, Mark. (editorial) New Republic. November 3, 1952.

Bowers, L. and Blair, D. "How T. Pick A Congressman," Saturday Evening Post. March 19, 1949.

Brashear, Earnest. "1950 Campaign," New Republic. September 1, 1952.

Brashear, Earnest. "Who Is Richard Nixon?" New Republic. September 1, 1952.

de Tolendano, Ralph. "Different Nixon," Newsweek. October 1, 1956.

de Tolendano, Ralph. 'Road Show: How It's Doing," Newsweek. October 15, 1956.

de Tolendano, Ralph. 'Roaring Races," Newsweek. October 30, 1950.

Goodman, W. 'Fatal Passion of Harold Stassen," New Republic. August 6, 1956.

Hazlett, H. 'Economic Meaning," Newsweek. November 12, 1956.

Lindley, Earnest K. 'The Nixon Episode," Newsweek. September 29, 1952.

McKenzie, R. I. "Ike: Stuck With Dick," Nation. September 1, 1956.

Miller, W. L. 'Debating Career of Richard M. Nixon," Reporter. April 19, 1956.

Moley, R. 'Nixon vs Douglas," Newsweek. August 28, 1950.

Rovere, R. H. 'Letter from San Francisco," New Yorker. September 1, 1956.

Rovere, R. H. 'Reporter At Large," New Yorker. October 13, 1956.

Sevareid, Eric. 'Coming Campaign," Reporter. March 22, 1956.

Woods, Rose Mary. 'Nixon's My Boss," Saturday Evening Post. December 28, 1957.

B. Author Not Listed

"Acting Captain," Time. October 10, 1955.

"An Issue of Principle," Nation. October 4, 1952.

"Atlantic Report on the World Today," Atlantic Monthly. October, 1955.

'Bundle of Calm," New Republic. October 8, 1956.

'Business Issues in the Campaign," Business Week. August 25, 1956.

'California Foot Race," Newsweek. June 5, 1950.

'Campaign '56 Windup," Newsweek. October 29, 1956.

'Camapigner At Work," Time. September 17, 1956.

"Equality Under Law," Vital Speeches. November 1, 1956.

"High Type vs Tin Type," Time. October 15, 1956.

"In Financial Undress," Business Week. October 4, 1956.

"Inside Story of Fight Against Nixon: Battle Stassen Started," U. S. News and World Report. August 3, 1956.

"Letter from Washington: National Security Council under the Direction of Richard M. Nixon," New Yorker. October 8, 1955.

"Man in Between," Newsweek. September 3, 1956.

"Man Who Might Be President," U. S. News and World Report. October 7, 1955.

"Nation's Choice," Nation. September 1, 1956.

"Nixon Abroad," New Republic. October 29, 1956.

"Nixon and G. O. P. Ticket," Newsweek. October 1, 1956.

"Nixon Issue," Harpers. September 1, 1955.

"Nixon's Speech," New Republic. December 17, 1956.

"Nixon Story," U. S. News and World Report. May 11, 1956.

"Nixon vs Douglas," Newsweek. August 28, 1950.

"Onward Christian Soldiers: American Legion Convention," New Republic. September 17, 1956.

"Record of the Nixon Affair," U. S. News and World Report. October 3, 1952.

"Richard M. Nixon," Scholastic. September 27, 1956.

"Telling What Happened in the Election," U. S. News and World Report. November 17, 1950.

"The Nixon Story," U. S. News and World Report. May 11, 1956.

"The Vice-Presidency," Time. December 9, 1957.

"Those Nixon Haters Never Tell You Why!" Saturday Evening Post. October 27, 1956.

"Top That! Campaign Promises," Commonwealth. October 5, 1956.

"Victory with Vitamins," Time. October 8, 1956.

"Winning Team," U. S. News and World Report. November 16, 1956.

III. PERIODICALS

Birmingham News, November 18, 1956.

Boston Chronicle, September 29, 1956.

Chicago Daily News, October 25, 1956.

Chicago Daily Tribune, August 22, 1956, August 24, 1956, August 26, 1956, September 20, 1956, September 22, 1956, September 23, 1956, September 24, 1956, October 1, 1956.

Clear Lake South Dakota Courier, October 11, 1956.

The Christian Science Monitor, September 28, 1956, September 29, 1956, October 3, 1956.

Colorado Free Press, September 22, 1956, September 23, 1956.

Colorado Gazette Telegraph, September 22, 1956, September 23, 1956.

Glendale News-Press, November 19, 1956.

Kansas City Star, September 18, 1956.

Life Magazine, August 28, 1950, September 29, 1952, October 6, 1952, December 14, 1953.

Los Angeles Herald and Express, September 7, 1956, September 8, 1956, September 9, 1956.

Los Angeles Mirror-News, September 7, 1956, September 8, 1956, September 9, 1956.

Los Angeles Times, September 7, 1956, September 8, 1956, September 9, 1956.

Nashville Banner, September 28, 1956.

Newsweek, October 30, 1950, September 29, 1952, October 6, 1952, January 9, 1956, March 26, 1956, April 23, 1956, May 7, 1956, June 25, 1956, August 20, 1956, August 27, October 1, 1956.

New York Times, November 7, 1946, October 25, 1950, October 29, 1950, November 1, 1950, November 8, 1950, September 19, 1952, September 22, 1952, September 24, 1952, July 8, 1953. July 16, 1953, December 14, 1953, April 6, 1954, September 8, 1954, February 6,

1955, January 4, 1956, January 22, 1956, February 9, 1956, February 14, 1956, February 17, 1956, February 20, 1956, March k, 1956, March 7, 1956, March 15, 1956, March 20, 1956, March 26, 1956, April 27, 1956, June 3, 1956, June 7, 1956, July 24, 1956, July 25, 1956, August 8, 1956, August 19, 1956, August 21, 1956, August 22, 1956, August 23, 1956, August 24, 1956, September 7, 1956, September 13, 1956, September 18, 1956, September 23, 1956, October 7, 1956, October 15, 1956, October 16, 1956, October 17, 1956, October 18, 1956, October 19, 1956, October 20, 1956, November 4, 1956.

New York Herald Tribune, September 25, 1956, September 22, 1956, October 1, 1956, October 16, 1956, October 16, 1956, October 17, 1956, October 19, 1956.

Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, October 18, 1956.

Rochester Times-Union, October 17, 1956.

San Francisco Chronicle, August 21, 1956, August 22, 1956, August 23, 1956, August 24, 1956.

San Francisco Examiner, August 21, 1956, August 22, 1956, August 23, 1956, August 24, 1956.

San Francisco News, August 21, 1956, August 22, 1956, August 23, 1956, August 24, 1956.

The Washington Sunday Star, September 23, 1956.

Time, July 21, 1956, August 25, 1952, August 27, 1956.

U. S. News and World Report, October 3, 1952, November 14, 1952, October 2, 1953, January 6, 1956, January 13, 1956, February 3, 1956, March 2, 1956, March 16, 1956, August 3, 1956, August 10, 1956, August 24, 1956, August 31, 1956.

Warren Tribune Chronicle (Ohio), October 16, 1956.

IV. PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

Congressional Record, Washington D. C. Government Printing Office, Volume 93, Parts 1, 7, 8, Volume 94, Parts 1, 3, 8, Volume 95, Part 1, Volume 96, Part 1.

Economic Report of the President. Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1957.

State of California Statement of Vote General Election November 1948. Sacramento, California, California Printing Office, 1949.

Statistical Abstract of the United States. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Commerce, U. S. Government Printing Office, 1951.

U. S. Statutes at Large, 1950-51. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1952.

V. UN-PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS

1956 Republican Platform. Washington: Issued by the Republivan National Committee, 1956.

1956 Republican Speaker's Handbook. Washington: prepared by the Republican National Committee, 1956.

Republican National Committee News Release. Washington: prepared by the Republican National Committee, August 15 through November 8, 1956.

University of Michigan Survey Research Center Study # 417. Ann Arbor, Michigan: unpublished document, 1956.

VI. PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

James D. Hughes, Aide to the Vice-President, Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958, February 1, 1958.

Floyd E. McCaffree, Director of Research, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958.

Richard M. Nixon, Vice-President of the United States, Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958--February 1, 1958.

Agnes Waldron, Speech Secretary to the Vice-President, Office of the Vice-President, Washington, D. C., January 23, 1958-February 1, 1958.