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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND DEFINITION OF TERMS

Working with arguments becomes a complexity of life as man strives to influence others, or as he is persuaded by those who influence him. Stephen Toulmin, a British logician noted for developing a contemporary model of argument analysis, has likened the complexities of an argument to the form of an organism replete with an anatomical and physiological structure. This physiological level of form has important implications for those concerned with a search for meaning in the analysis of arguments. "It is," as Toulmin states, "at this physiological level that the idea of logical form has been introduced and here that the validity of our arguments has ultimately to be established or refuted."

Therefore, it is this form of argumentation and the Toulmin mode of reduction which will become the area of focus in a study investigating a contemporary method of argument analysis.

Traditionally the syllogism has served as a

---

prototype for the reduction of deductive arguments into their various elements. Since Aristotle the three propositions of the syllogism, the major premise, the minor premise and the conclusion, have served as a foundation for structuring the various forms of deductive argumentation. As recently as 1958, Stephen Toulmin proposed a replacement for this traditional form. The Toulmin Model, as the proposal has come to be known, refashions the three propositions of the syllogism and supplements these elements with a second tripartite: support for the major premise, the qualification and the rebuttal used for the conclusion. Thus, the employment of the Toulmin format offers to the analyst a system of six elements for simplifying the reduction of arguments. Three of these are basic in argumentation, and the other three are those factors which distinguish the Toulmin model from the traditional syllogism and add particular emphasis to the concentration of an argument's elements within the context of a single unit of proof, which in a syllogistic mode requires extra- logical operations. Toulmin developed his six element model to, as he states, "build up from scratch a pattern of analysis which will do justice to all the distinctions which proper procedure forces upon us."2

2Ibid., p. 97.
Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede first recognized the importance of the Toulmin model to argumentation theory. In 1960, they introduced this relationship and have, more recently expanded Toulmin's model in their work *Decision By Debate*.\(^3\)

Since its introduction, the relationship of the model to argumentation theory has been the subject of a number of textbooks, dissertations, and related articles. A consensus of these writings notes the significance of the model as a tool for the restructuring of arguments.

It has been the structural difference between Toulmin and the traditional syllogism that has generated a question of suitability. Proponents of Toulmin point to the expanded model as one that fills the need for a mode of analysis designed to synthesize complex arguments. They also call attention to the advantage of using six elements instead of three in the layout of arguments. The significance of using Toulmin to analyze arguments is cited by A. J. Freeley:

> By laying out his arguments in the form of the structural model, the advocate gains an additional opportunity to analyze the whole complex of the

---

arguments, and to select certain portions of the argument for further examination by the application of appropriate tests of evidence and reasoning.  

The advantages gained from using six elements becomes apparent in the case with which one reduces a complex argument. Preliminary exercises using both models on arguments of the kind sampled in this study have indicated the reduction process which offers additional elements for restructuring permits for an ease of handling in argument layout. A commentary on an exercise noting advantages and shortcomings of each layout will be made in a later chapter.

Toulmin developed his concepts for the laying out of arguments from a conflict between classical thought and two personally held convictions; first, he objected to tradition in that a syllogistic conclusion is redundant because it offers no new information; and second, he pointed to the difficulty of using the syllogism in checking the validity of everyday disputes. Of the many types of claims one makes in the advancement of arguments, Toulmin noted that:

We make claims about the future, and back them by reference to our experience of how things have

---

gone in the past; we make assertions about a man's feelings or about his legal status, and back them by references to his utterances and gestures, or to his place of birth or to the statutes of nationality; we adopt moral positions and pass aesthetic judgment, and declare support for scientific theories or political causes, in each case producing as grounds for our conclusion statements of quite other logical types than the conclusion itself. Whenever we do any of these things, there can be no question of the conclusion's being regarded as a mere restatement in other words of something already stated implicitly. . . .

The opinion that Toulmin held on the syllogism's inadequacy in mirroring the rational processes man uses to argue and settle claims grew from a divergence existing between a philosopher's question about the world, and the world that ordinary man experiences. This difference led to a belief on the part of Toulmin that, "... testing our ideas against our actual practice of argument-assessment, rather than against a philosopher's ideal, we shall eventually build up a picture very different from the traditional one."6

Due to the abundance of complex arguments advanced in today's multi-media society the attainment of a workable form of argument analysis has been a critical goal. It is the view of this study that the Toulmin model holds

5Toulmin, op. cit., pp. 124-25.
6Ibid., p. 10.
great potential for the criticism and analysis of such complex arguments.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study is to investigate a contemporary model of argument analysis and pass judgment on the value of employing the Toulmin model in the analysis of complex arguments. This study investigates the nature of the model in its working relationship to various arguments chosen for analysis, and from this process conclusions are drawn as to the model's value and workability.

Limitations of the study. The arguments used in this study will be samples selected from the acceptance speech of Richard Nixon given before the 1972 Republican National Convention. Although the arguments will be treated to a systematic analysis of content on the Toulmin model, and many inferences could be drawn from such an analysis, it is not a goal of this study to make a critical appraisal of the speech or the speechmaker. It is felt that the importance of the study lies in its stated purpose and that a classification of rhetorical proofs should be made from the results of the analysis for the intent of enhancing conclusions made on the model's value.
Importance of the study. The custom of establishing value of a new theory through inquiry is a universally recognized procedure. The Toulmin model was selected for this inquiry because of a need to add to an existing body of knowledge which states but does not prove the value which Toulmin holds for argument analysis. The campaign speeches of Richard Nixon were selected as they seem to typify this rhetorical mode common to contemporary political discourse.

The analysis of Nixon's arguments on the Toulmin model will provide (1) data for commenting on the value of the model as a process through its use as a tool of analysis; (2) a commentary on (a) Richard Nixon's use of logic and reasoning for the conclusions offered, and (b) the validity of the material used in the samples; and (3) a suggestion for variations in utilizing the Toulmin model.

The critical need for attaining a workable tool used in the analysis of complex arguments was alluded to earlier. Wayne Brockriede and Douglas Ehninger have written of the importance of this model, and in a call for further study they have stated:

Toulmin has supplied us with a contemporary methodology, which in many respects makes the traditional unnecessary. The basic theory has herein been amplified, some extensions have been made, and illustrations of workability have been supplied.
All this is not meant to be an end, but rather the beginning of an inquiry into a new, contemporary dynamic, and usable logic for argument.\(^7\)

It is hoped that this inquiry will point up the usefulness of the Toulmin model as an integral systems approach to argument analysis.

**DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED**

**The Toulmin Model**

For the purpose of this study the "Toulmin model" is interpreted to mean that construct described by Toulmin in his work, *The Uses of Argument*.\(^8\) The model, designed for the purpose of analyzing arguments, employs a special pattern for the layout of an argument's six elements. These elements are identified by Toulmin as data (D), warrant (W), claim (C), backing (B), qualifier (Q), and rebuttal (R). As described by Toulmin these elements take on the specific meaning:

**Data (D).** Fact and opinion that answers the question, "What have you got to go on?" In the traditional sense, the minor premise can be recognized as the data of

---


8Toulmin, loc. cit. (An illustration of argument analysis employing the Toulmin construct can be found on pages 47 and 48).
the Toulmin model. In its dynamic relationship to the elements of an argument data is regarded as a departure point as reasoning moves toward a conclusion.

Warrant (W). A warrant is the dynamic force of an argument. It answers the question, "How do you get there?", and in this sense it is the step involved as one reasons from data to claim. It is the inference made, and it may be stated or left unstated. In a syllogism it is termed the major premise and in the Toulmin format it is the assertion that typifies a specific kind of proof.

Claim (C). The claim of the Toulmin construct is the conclusion of the syllogism. It is the controversial statement of an argument—the explicit appeal.

The preceding elements of the Toulmin model parallel the three propositions of the syllogism in meaning and function, and are the indispensable parts of a deductive argument. Beyond this, the resemblance of Toulmin to the syllogism ends as the model under study expands to a second tripartite of elements, each of which may or may not be present in the subject under analysis, depending upon the argument's degree of complexity.

Backing (B). Assurances given for warrants of an
argument become backing in the Toulmin formation. Because of their affinity to a warrant, kinds of backing will change as different arguments are scrutinized.

Qualifier (Q). A qualifier addresses itself to the claim of an argument. The claim might be limited by a qualifying term of "presumably," "almost certainly," "always," etc.; and in its relationship to a warrant, a qualifier indicates the strength conferred on the claim by a warrant.

Rebuttal (R). The term rebuttal in the Toulmin sense is a condition of exception to an argument. A rebuttal supplements a claim and is an indicator of conditions needed to set aside a warrant.

Argument Analysis. Throughout this inquiry argument analysis is interpreted to mean that operational procedure used in the separation and classification of an argument's elements and the identification of rhetorical proofs.

Rhetorical proofs. As reasoning moves from data to claim the resulting argument may develop into one of three rhetorical proofs: substantive, authoritative, or motivational. For the purpose of this study the meaning
of these three terms is:

Substantive arguments. Type I proofs are understood to be this kind of argument, and are so ordered from the assumption made concerning the relationship about phenomena in the external world. This is carried to the argument in the sense of a warrant, and traditionally the argument was typified under the category termed logical.

Authoritative arguments. Type II proofs are traditionally referred to as ethical and they reflect an assumption made about the source of an argument's data.

Motivational arguments. Type III proofs were known as the genre of pathetic, and are a derivation generated out of an assumption concerning itself with the inner being and behavior of the audience being addressed.
Advocates on both sides of the Toulmin controversy have raised important issues in the discussion of the model and the implications it holds for the study of rhetoric or philosophy. It is of interest, to note where the division lies on the question of this relationship. Rhetoricians, for the most part are to be considered pro Toulmin, while logicians have been censorious of the model and of the meaning it holds for philosophy. This chapter will review important writings concerned with this dialogue and the discussion will be aligned along this proponent-opponent split.

Douglas Ehninger and Wayne Brockriede have made an in depth evaluation of the Toulmin model and suggest that, "traditional Aristotelian logic provides an imperfect description of how men actually reason in argumentative controversies. A more accurate and useful logic may be inferred from the formulations of the contemporary English logician, Stephen Toulmin."¹ The Ehninger and Brockriede

work is a debate textbook, and their interest in Toulmin is an outgrowth of their mutual belief in the shortcomings of the syllogism.

Toulmin's new perspective for the layout and analysis of arguments has been the subject of discussion in other texts. Wilson and Arnold, Rogge and Ching, and Barrett are writers in the field of speech who have recognized the value of the Toulmin model to argument analysis.\(^2\)

Wilson and Arnold note that Toulmin's model helps the analyst identify the rational justifications of an argument. Rogge and Ching suggest that the analyst is able intuitively to see the weakness of an argument by putting points in their proper relationship on the Toulmin model. Finally, Barrett points to the model's value in checking the source's reasoning patterns that might not surface in the syllogism.

Gary Cronkhite, in his book on persuasive processes, has recognized the Toulmin model as possessing "great

utility in describing a part of the process of persuasion." Cronkhite answers those critics questioning the model's ability to handle complicated arguments by suggesting a design variation whose distinctive feature is a quality resembling the "flow principle" peculiar to the field of computer programming.

In his work, Message Preparation: The Nature of Proof, E. Bettinghaus points to the advantage of using Toulmin to detect the effect that errors and omissions have on an argument's claim; but here again, as in most instances where claims have been advanced for the model, the author makes no examination or analysis to justify his assertion. 4

Two doctoral dissertations support the Toulmin model in its relationship to the study of rhetoric.

Robert G. Smith analyzed three examples of abolition petitions, given before the House of Representatives, December, 1835 and the Toulmin model was employed for his analysis. Smith's purpose was to demonstrate that the

---


model "gives a good picture of an argument, but for it to be of optimum value to the critic it needs adaptation."\textsuperscript{5} He completed an analysis of "real life" samples and from that derived several conclusions, among which is the point of view that, "Toulmin's method gives the rhetorician another tool with which to work. Only as it is used can its strengths and weaknesses be discerned."\textsuperscript{6} 

Holt V. Spicer's dissertation differed from the Smith investigation in its approach to the Toulmin model and its philosophical relationship to the study of rhetoric. The study was a philosophical positioning of the school of Analytic Philosophy in its affinity to rhetoric. The analytic philosophers are a school that, as Spicer points out, "solve philosophical problems by discovering their meaning."\textsuperscript{7} This functional approach to analyzing arguments has important implications for the rhetorician, "For," as Spicer clearly points out, "if functional analysis can clarify concepts, Toulmin's observations on reasoning about


\textsuperscript{6}Ibid., p. 289.

ethical, scientific, and ordinary questions may well be of
value to the rhetorician."\(^8\) And, from this point of view
it was a logical step to the conclusion that, "The branch
of philosophy seems especially well adapted to rhetoric.
Its emphasis on common language and common reasoning and
its concern with ethical problems relate it closely to the
major concerns of rhetoric and would seem to justify fur­
ther rhetorical investigation."\(^9\)

Three philosophical criticisms of the Toulmin ap­
proach for the uses of argument were voiced by Otto Bird,
Hector Castanada, and J. C. Cooley.\(^10\) Each criticism took
a definite approach to drawing the relationship existing
between Toulmin and the meaning that thesis has for philos­
ophy. Each criticism discussed the weakness observed in
the terminology of the logician which has little meaning
in a study concerned with the worth Toulmin has for the
body of rhetoric.

Jimmie D. Trent in his dissertation, "Stephen E.

\(^8\)Ibid., p. 65.
\(^9\)Ibid., p. 171.
\(^10\)Otto Bird, "The Rediscovery of the Topics: Pro­
fessor Toulmin's Inference Warrants," Mind, LXX (July,
1961), 534-39; see also Hector Castanada, "On a Proposed
Revolution in Logic," Philosophy of Science, XXVII (July,
1960), 279-92; J. C. Cooley, "On Mr. Toulmin's Revolution
Toulmin's Argument Model as an Instrument for Criticism of Forensic Speeches," attempts as Trent states, "to test the Toulmin system as an instrument for criticizing arguments in speeches by applying as a criteria the advantages claimed for it by Brockriede and Ehninger."\(^{11}\)

Trent listed twenty judgments which comment on the functional relationship existing between Toulmin and the traditional method of analysis. Item fifteen is of interest here. Trent noted that, "when arguments are of minimum complexity, Toulmin's spatial positioning aids analysis by providing immediate identification of any step in the argument."\(^{12}\)

After analyzing the sample arguments on the Toulmin model Trent concluded that, "in most aspects neither system was superior,"\(^{13}\) and, "in short, Toulmin's four most basic changes in argument makes analysis of forensic arguments more difficult."\(^{14}\)

An effort has been made in the present review of


\(^{12}\)Ibid., p. 90.

\(^{13}\)Ibid., p. 92.

\(^{14}\)Ibid., p. 94.
literature to point up both the pro-Toulmin and anti-Toulmin criticisms of the model. These criticisms have focused upon the problem of a working logic versus an idealized logic. Toulmin asserted that the categories of formal logic are simplistic, unresponsive, and misapplied as a tool available for analysis of the complex issues of the day.\textsuperscript{15} This assertion has been challenged by some and supported by others who wish to prove the value of the Toulmin model. Both the negative and positive criticism has, for some reason, stopped short of advancing acclaim or censure for the form Toulmin uses in the layout of arguments. It is noted that in only two of the instances cited, have arguments of the "real-world" been investigated in a study. It is a desire of the writer to take this further step and utilize contemporary arguments in the formulation of a commentary on the form of the model and its role in the analysis of the arguments sampled.

\textsuperscript{15}Toulmin, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 146-210.
CHAPTER III

THE TOULMIN MODEL

Since the advent of the Toulmin model a question of value arises whenever the syllogism is employed in the reduction of a complex argument: "Is the syllogism with its traditional propositions equal to the force of a construct employing six elements to analyze complicated arguments?" The inadequacy of the syllogism is at the center of the issue. If the elements of an argument are thought to be critical entities in the establishment of proof, then the advantage of using the model with a greater number of elements is an important consideration for the reduction of complex arguments. The worth of analyzing a contemporary argument on the Toulmin construct comes from the advantage of restructuring a complicated argument on a construct employing six elements.

Toulmin analogized argumentation as a series of steps beginning with the concept of evidence offered as data, proceeding through inferences made, and moving towards an accepted claim. In offering a model for the analysis of these steps, the syllogism was expanded to correct deficiencies in the traditional method of analysis.
which might negate a complex argument or question its validity. These imperfections emerging as fragmented operations are used as elements in the course of analyzing the support material of a complicated argument. As each operation occurs, the probability for the error that would fault the total process increases. The Toulmin model on the other hand accounts for the support of an argument's claim and warrant through the elements of qualifier, rebuttal and backing, and in a unified operation it formulates these additional elements into a spatial pattern nonlinear in design. It is this unifying quality that dramatizes the dynamic nature of the argument by accenting forces existing between the elements of the Toulmin model.

The six elements and their relationship to one another was set forth by Toulmin in the following manner:

\[
\text{Data} \rightarrow \text{(so) Qualifier, Claim}
\]

\[
\text{(since)}
\]

\[
\text{Warrant} \rightarrow \text{(unless)}
\]

\[
\text{(on account of)}
\]

\[
\text{Backing}
\]

This is the formula which will be applied to an argument
under analysis in this study. There are two basic steps to this process; first, adjustments are made in the content of a sample being analyzed by the concise restatement of an argument and the division of its text into particular elements; second, a realignment of these elements into the Toulmin construct is accomplished. It is believed that the nature of this model can be understood by employing it to analyze a political argument of the type to be sampled in this study.

In 1968, Richard M. Nixon delivered a speech accepting the Republican presidential nomination. In this speech Mr. Nixon developed an argument for ending the Vietnam War. The thesis of the Nixon proposal is found in three paragraphs of his speech. That portion of the text published in Vital Speeches of the Day, September, 1968, follows:

... For four years this Administration (the reference is to the Johnson Presidency) has had at its disposal the greatest military and economic advantage that one nation has had over another in a war in history. For four years America's fighting men have set a record for courage and sacrifice unsurpassed in our history. For four years this administration has had the support of the loyal opposition for the objective of seeking an honorable end to the struggle.

Never has so much military and economic and diplomatic power been used so ineffectively. And if after all of this time, and all of this sacrifice, and all of this support there is no end in sight,
then I say the time has come for the American people to turn to new leadership not tied to the mistakes of the past. That is what we offer to America.

And I pledge to you tonight that the first priority foreign policy objective of our next administration will bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam.\(^1\)

Following is the restatement of the main point of Nixon's argument and a placement of the elements on the Toulmin model:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{DATA:} & \quad \text{(so) QUALIFIER, CLAIM} \\
\text{For four years the Johnson Administration has had the resources to end the war in Vietnam.} & \quad \text{I pledge that the first priority of the changing administration will bring an (honorable) end to the Vietnam War.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[(since)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{WARRANT:} & \\
\text{Americans are motivated by a desire to end the war and it still goes on. (Unstated Warrant)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[(because)\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{BACKING:} & \\
\text{Never has so much material been used so ineffectively, and after all this - if there is no end in sight to the war - the time has come for change.} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The arrangement of elements of the Nixon argument was based

on tests suggested by Toulmin in developing his model. First, the statement about the Johnson history of resource deployment conforms to the requirements suggested for the element of data. It answers the question: "What do you have to go on?" Second, the connection tying the concepts of claim to data is the Nixon appeal to end the war stated in the claim and understood to be the motivating factor of the unstated warrant. These tests, the connecting appeal and the establishment of support for the claim which necessarily follows, clearly denote the data of the Nixon argument.

The claim of the argument is an explicit appeal for a change of administration which will bring about an honorable end to the war. This appeal, in an oblique manner, ties the need for change to the failure of the Johnson administration to reach an end to the war. This goal, although it is stated specifically in the claim, is an implicit factor of the warrant. The relationship between this desired goal and content of the argument's elements establish an actuative claim to effect change and it enunciates the role of the warrant. This motivational line of reasoning is underscored by the warrant making an assumption about the wants of an audience and links these wants to the desired goal. The backing for this warrant
takes the form of a reminder that there "is no end in sight to the war," and is a stronger motivating factor than the reported fact that resources have been used effectively.

It should be noted that Nixon employs the qualifying term "honorable" to describe the kind of ending which will be sought. Of historical interest, is the fact that Nixon failed in his attempt to reach an honorable end to the war before his election to a second term and that this commitment never became a decisive campaign issue of 1972.

It has been shown through the analysis of an argument on the Toulmin model the ease with which the sample is reduced into a unified pattern clearly separating the individual elements and allowing for their recognition. From this layout, a line of reasoning was identified and a judgment was made as to the type of rhetorical proof employed.

Have the claims regarding the ease with which the Toulmin model can be used to analyze complex deductive arguments been substantiated? It is felt that an analysis annotating the premise and the conclusions of Nixon's argument is needed for comparison. The following layout is this annotation:

1. For four years Johnson has had the resources to end the war. Premise
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>There is no end to the war.</td>
<td>Premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The resources to end the war have been used ineffectively.</td>
<td>From 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A desire to end the war motivates most Americans.</td>
<td>Premise Unstated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>As leader of the Republican Party I pledge that a Republican Administration will bring an honorable end to the war.</td>
<td>Premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Those who desire an end to the war will desire and vote for a Republican Administration.</td>
<td>From 4 &amp; 5 Unstated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>After all of the ineffectiveness and war of the Johnson Administration the time has come to elect a Republican Administration who will effect change.</td>
<td>From 3 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Republicans offer Americans change.</td>
<td>Premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A vote for a Republican Administration will bring change and an end to war and ineffectiveness.</td>
<td>From 7 &amp; 8 Unstated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of both examples of analysis immediately focuses on the concentration and unity that the Toulmin model affords to the content of the total argument being analyzed. In employing Toulmin's model, a complex argument is condensed into a format with a maximum of six elements instead of an open-ended schema required in the process of annotation. Thus, the choice of Toulmin does short-circuit many of the extralogical steps inherent in the syllogism, and the dynamic relationship between
elements of an argument becomes apparent and easily recognizable. It is understood that a choice between the Toulmin model or a syllogism is one of personal preference. But, it is the position of this study that Toulmin does offer more options to the analyst dealing in complex arguments.
CHAPTER IV

THE NIXON ARGUMENTS: AN ANALYSIS

On August 23, 1972, President Richard M. Nixon addressed the Republican National Convention accepting its nomination for Office of the President of the United States. In his speech Nixon advanced several arguments discussing the policy differences between his administration and those of the opposition Democrats. The general areas in which Nixon perceived differences were those of discrimination, economy, law and order, and peace and security. These differences emerged as a series of good-willed arguments and were warranted by sociopolitical conditions perceived by the candidate. The economy of the country had recovered during four years of Nixon

1The complete text of the remarks of the President to the 1972 Republican National Convention are contained in Appendix A. The source for the appendix was a press release from the Office of the White House Secretary, The White House (Miami Beach, Florida), dated August 23, 1972, 10:27 P.M. EDT to 11:08 P.M. EDT. The title of the release: Remarks of the President to the 1972 Republican National Convention: Convention Hall, Miami Beach, Florida. The text of the release was authenticated against a tape recording made from the Columbia Broadcasting System television coverage of the event and in the writer's personal library.

27
administrative policies. He was proud of this record. American involvement in Vietnam continued to be a divisive force in this country, and a majority of Americans were discouraged by the war. Yet, Nixon was confident of his administration's role in the search for peace. The national trend of using quotas in employment, school desegregation and the processes of a political convention had alarmed many Americans. Nixon answered this alarm. Finally, a concern for law and order was prevalent in many communities of America. Nixon responded to this concern. This is how Nixon related his arguments to the audience he was addressing. His issues mirrored what he felt were issues in the minds of a majority of Americans. Using the Toulmin model, the arguments related to these issues will be analyzed.

DISCRIMINATION

The thrust of Nixon's argument to end discrimination \((D-1)^2\) is carried by an attack on the use of quotas, a system introduced by the advocates of reform in the 1972 Democratic Party Convention process. The thesis of the argument is embodied in Nixon's appeal to reject the quota

\[^2\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 63.\]
system which is characterized as a form of reverse discrimination.

Finally, as the Vice President has indicated, you have demonstrated to the nation that we can have an open convention without quotas.

Let us commit ourselves to rule out every vestige of discrimination in this country of ours. But my fellow Americans, the way to end discrimination against some is not to begin discrimination against others.

Dividing Americans into quotas is totally alien to American tradition.

Americans don't want to be part of a quota. They want to be part of America. This nation proudly calls itself the United States of America. Let us reject any philosophy that would make us the divided people of America.³

This argument can be analyzed by use of the Toulmin model in the following manner:

DATA: It has been demonstrated that we can have an open convention without dividing Americans into quotas.

CLAIM: Let us commit ourselves to rule out discrimination. But the way to end discrimination is not to discriminate against others. Let us reject a philosophy that would divide America.

WARRANT: Americans don't want to be part of a quota.

BACKING: Dividing Americans into quotas is totally alien to America.

³Ibid.
The elements as they are diagrammed illustrate that Nixon in his remarks on discrimination, argued from the evidence that the Republicans have just held an open convention without quotas, to a claim for ruling out discrimination and rejecting the philosophy of the quota system.

The data, whose role in an argument is the reporting of evidence, states that the Republican Party has just held an open convention. The warrant, assuring a continuum of reason from data to claim, is a statement about the existence of a relationship between Americans and their feelings about quotas. It is because of this feeling that an appeal for rejection of the quota system, although implicit, is the option left open to claim. It is this aspect of the warrant that generates a claim in the form of an appeal to reject the quota system which would divide Americans. Also tied to this claim is a philosophy that any quota system is a form of reverse discrimination.

Finally, to the listener who is not convinced of the relationship between an open convention with the rejection of quotas and ruling out of discrimination with the rejection of quotas, Nixon argues, in backing for the warrant, that dividing Americans into quotas is totally alien to tradition. This backing certifies the principle
that "Americans don't want to be part of a quota."

Nixon, arguing for putting an end to discrimination, employs a motivational proof in making an actuative claim. The function of a warrant and its backing in an actuative claim is the motivation of a listener to the acceptance of an appeal. In this case, the ruling out of discrimination and the rejection of a quota philosophy is the appeal, and the warrant and its backing are the reasons given for its acceptance. Thus, the Nixon argument becomes a restatement in principle of the relationship Ehninger and Brockriede observed existing within a motivational proof: "when a claim calls for an evaluation or a willingness to act (italics not in original), the warrant must state some motive which underwrites it." 4

ECONOMICS

Nixon debated the differences between a Republican and Democratic economic program on the issues of unemployment, taxes and welfare. This discussion notated as arguments E-1 through E-3 in Appendix A, 5 is a restatement of


the general theme: this Republican administration's workable economic policies have resulted in the United States having the highest growth rate of any industrial nation. Following are remarks which underline this theme and introduce Nixon's three economic arguments:

We have the greatest rate of growth of any industrial nation.

Americans have more jobs at higher wages than in any country of the world. Our rate of inflation is less than that of any industrial nation.

The incomparable productivity of America's farmer has made it possible for us to launch a winning war against hunger in the United States, and that productivity of our farmers also makes us the best fed people in the world with the lowest percentage of the family budget going to food of any country in the world.6

The Nixon argument on unemployment (E-1)7 questions the worth of a Democratic program whose results would "end the employment hopes of every American wanting work." In arguing for the continuation of his administration's program, Nixon employs a substantive proof in making a designative claim. The layout of argument E-1 on the Toulmin model follows:

6Ibid., p. 65.
7Ibid., p. 66.
DATA: The new economic policies of this administration have created millions of jobs reducing unemployment averages of the preceding Democratic Administrations.

CLAIM: The way to reach this goal is to stay on the new road we have chartered to move America forward.

WARRANT: The goals and the policies of this administration are the same, a job for every unemployed American.

REBUTTAL: Unless we take a sharp detour to the left, following the philosophy of the Democrats and dashing the hopes of the American people.

BACKING: Because the goals and the policies of this administration are tied to an unparalleled increase in new jobs without war and inflation.

This sample argument illustrates the explicit relationship between data and claim described by Toulmin in the development of his model. The phrase "moving America forward" appeals explicitly to data reporting "the reduction of unemployment because of economic policies which have created millions of jobs." An appeal to "stay on the new road" examines the unemployment gains attributed to these policies in conjunction with the failure of the Democratic program preceding them.

When the explicit relationship of data to claim in
argument E-1 is examined together with the implicit relationship of warrant to claim already noted as existing in argument D-1, the rule, "data are appealed explicitly, warrants implicitly" established by Toulmin\(^8\) for distinguishing between data and warrants, is attested to.

The designative nature of this claim establishes a causal relationship between the three elements of the substantive proof. The warrant states a "cause to effect" expectancy generated from information within the data and claim. The additional element of backing functions in its role as assurance for acceptance of the warrant.

It is noted that the functional criteria outlined by Toulmin for the element of backing are met, in that "backing for warrants can be expressed as categorical statements of fact."\(^9\) In this case the backing categorically states that this "administration's goals and policies are tied to an increase in employment without war and inflation." This statement certifies the principle of "no change" expressed in the warrant, and it is apparent that the rebuttal-warrant relationship indicates that an

---


\(^9\)Ibid., p. 105.
appeal for "no change" would be cancelled if the circumstance of a "sharp detour to the left" were effected. Toulmin, writing of the element of rebuttal, commented on this ability to affect "the bearing of a warrant."\textsuperscript{10} In a case where the setting aside of the warrant through the circumstance of rebuttal occurs, it becomes apparent that the very nature of an argument will change and that a claim already expressed will need reworking.

Nixon's opposition to any spending program which would increase the cost of government to the nation's taxpayers was forcefully stated in the claim of his argument on the issue of taxes (E-2).\textsuperscript{11} The argument is another example of a substantive proof where the cause to effect relationship is predictable from the warrant. A Toulmin layout reflecting on this relationship follows:

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid., p. 101.
\textsuperscript{11}Richard M. Nixon, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 67.
DATA: The American people are knowledgeable enough not to be taken in by a political scheme of giving $1,000 back through the increase of taxes.

CLAIM: The Democratic proposals would mean an increase in taxes of 50% and I oppose any new spending program which will increase taxes.

WARRANT: The Democratic platform and proposals will increase the budget $144 billion and an increase in the cost of programs is always tied to an increase in taxes.

BACKING: Because you know that the promises of every politician causes an increase in taxes.

Argument E-2 relates the data that "the American people can see through the $1,000 Democratic scheme" to a claim that "this and other programs would increase taxes" which is the pivotal point for the Nixon opposition. If the data of this argument pattern is acceptable to a listener then the logic of the cause to effect characteristic of its proof line leads to acceptance of its claim. The warrant is the key element in this line of reasoning. In argument E-1, the warrant predicted the claim. In argument E-2, the tax increase portion of the claim was predictable from the information within the warrant, while the Nixon opposition to a tax increase was an added factor, and even this factor was predictable considering the
nature of the data.

Of interest at this point in a discussion of argument E-2 is a noticeable omission of the qualifier in conjunction with the element of claim. Ehninger and Brockriede have written of the qualifier and its use:

The effect expressed in the claim may be predicted with relatively great assurance if (a) the evidence reports events or conditions accurately, (b) the warrant states a dependable causal relationship, and (c) intervening and countereacting causes are not present. To the extent that a unit of proof lacks these conditions, the claim must be qualified.12

Nixon, in making an unqualified claim in the argument, appealed to what he felt would be the inevitable reaction of an American electorate to the $1,000 Democratic proposal and its resultant increase in taxes. He was certain of its rejection.

The argument on welfare (E-3)13 is a composite formed from two sub-arguments similar in their mutual opposition to an increase in taxes. Our discussion will now focus on the source of the data for these two sub-arguments.

12Ehninger and Brockriede, op. cit., pp. 128-29.
In the development of his welfare arguments, Nixon patterned the claim of a preceding proof as the data for a succeeding argument. Thus, the unit of proof in the claim of argument E-2 becomes the data of the first sub-argument in E-3, and the data of the second sub-argument of E-3 is derived from the claim of the proof preceding it.

Argument E-3 will be explored in an analysis using the Toulmin model:

**SUB-ARGUMENT #1**

**DATA:** I oppose any new spending program that will increase taxes.

**CLAIM:** I say that instead of providing incentives for increasing welfare we need incentives for decreasing welfare rolls.

**WARRANT:** The Democrats have proposed legislation which would increase the welfare rolls with the resultant increase in taxes.

**SUB-ARGUMENT #2**

**DATA:** I say that instead of providing incentives for increasing welfare we need incentives for decreasing welfare rolls.

**CLAIM:** Let us be generous to those who can't work without raising the taxes of those who work.

**WARRANT:** We believe it wrong for anyone to receive more on welfare than someone who works.
In a sense, example E-3 is a chain argument on the subject of welfare. At one end of the chain, the opposition of Nixon to any program that would increase taxes functions as the first sub-argument's data, and the warrant of this substantive proof asserts a relationship between an increase in welfare rolls and an increase in taxes. In marked contrast the warrant of the second sub-argument asserts an assumption about a belief in the goals of welfare assistance, thereby forming a motivational proof leading to an actuative claim at the other end of the chain.

Argument E-4\textsuperscript{14} is a summation of what Democratic economic program costs would mean to Americans. The argument is an example of a motivational proof establishing an actuative claim asking for voter rejection of his opponent's economic programs.

The warrant of argument E-4 functions in the role of supplying the motives for accepting the claim advanced by viewing with alarm the costs to America of the Democratic program. The claim of the argument appeals to an electorate to veto this program by voting for an administration who will build and not destroy America. This

\textsuperscript{14}Ibid., p. 68.
argument is founded in acceptance of the data which predicts the increase of an American's tax load if the Democratic economic programs are adopted. A Toulmin analysis of this argument follows:

DATA: Americans pay one third of their income in taxes. Our opponent's programs would increase an American's tax load to over one half of his income.

CLAIM: We cannot and we will not let the Democrats destroy America.

WARRANT: The cost of the Democratic economic program would destroy the American economic system.

BACKING: Their programs have been tried in other countries and those who have tried them have regretted it.

LAW AND ORDER

The Nixon argument on law and order (LO-1)\(^\text{15}\) is an examination of the accomplishments made over the rise in crime during a four year period. The warrant of argument LO-1 makes an assertion that the Nixon administration has waged a four year offensive in a fight on crime, and

\(^{15}\text{Ibid., p. 69.}\)
the claim asks support for this same administration who will "keep the peace at home."

Following is the analysis of this argument using the Toulmin model:

**DATA:**
This administration has launched an all out offense against crime, narcotics and against permissiveness in our country.

**CLAIM:**
My fellow Americans, I ask your support for a program which will keep the peace at home.

**WARRANT:**
Four years ago crime was rising in America and I promised to stop this rise.

**BACKING:**
I have kept my promise and I shall continue to implement a philosophy which strengthens America's peace forces against America's criminal forces.

In asking his fellow Americans for support of his law and order program, Nixon is making an actuate claim established through a motivational argument. The warrant states the motive for acceptance of the claim. If Nixon's audience is sympathetic to an arresting of the rise in crime they will accept the claim and support the administrative program with their votes in November. To the individual who questions the warrant a promise to continue a policy already in effect is given. It is this backing
which is the next subject of evaluation.

Toulmin proposed the following general rule in regards to the element of backing:

The kind of backing we must point to if we are to establish its (the warrants) authority will change greatly as we move from one field of argument to another.\textsuperscript{16}

In the analysis of the foregoing arguments the differences have been established. The backing of argument D-1 is related to the moral question of classifying Americans into quotas. The warrants of arguments E-1 and L0-1 are defended by appealing to policies which have had a successful history of implementation. These differences point up what Toulmin calls the variability or field dependence factor in the element of backing.

PEACE AND SECURITY

This section will sample three arguments in the related areas of peace and United States security. Argument PS-1 will focus on the role of bipartisan politics in the search for peace; PS-2 makes an historical evaluation of the first Nixon administration's progress in the

\textsuperscript{16}Toulmin, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 104.
search for peace; and argument PS-3 examines a Democratic proposal that would affect the security of the United States.

An outline of each argument on the Toulmin model follows:

ARGUMENT PS-3

DATA: Not one president in history believed that America should seek peace terms which would betray our allies and destroy respect for the United States.

CLAIM: Peace is too important for partisanship and as your president I pledge that I shall [always] uphold that proud bipartisan tradition.

WARRANT: There have been five presidents in my political lifetime. They had differences but they were united in the belief that America's security interests and America's world peace interests required American leadership and we should not be divided into Democrats or Republicans on the issue.

BACKING: (Unstated) Since a president's beliefs are [always] worthy of support.

---

17Richard M. Nixon, op. cit., p. 69.
ARGUMENT PS-218

DATA: Through this administration's policies we have reduced U.S. involvement in the war and have made the initial moves to negotiate a settlement.

CLAIM:

WARRANT:
Four years ago I pledged to seek an honorable end to the Vietnam war.

REBUTTAL:
But there are three things we have not and will not do.
1. We will not abandon our POW's.
2. We will not impose communism on South Vietnam.
3. We will never stain the honor of the U.S.

BACKING:
We have made great progress towards ending the war.

\[18\text{Ibid., pp. 70-71.}\]
ARGUMENT PS-319

DATA: Our opponents have proposed massive cuts in our defense budget.

CLAIM: We will never spend less than we need. If we do, the initiatives for peace would be destroyed and the security of the U.S. and the rest of the world would be threatened.

WARRANT: If the U.S. reduces its defense the danger of war will increase.

BACKING: It can truly be said that as a result of our initiatives, the danger of war is lessened and the chances for peace are greater.

Our administration has cut defense expenditures. It now takes the lowest percentage of our national product in 20 years.

Argument PS-1 is an example of an authoritative argument in which the credibility of five previous Presidents is used for the advancement of a claim. The argument moves from data to claim on the authorization of a warrant which reflects on the historical significance of the fact that five Presidents put their differences aside and were unified in their belief on the issue of peace.

19Ibid., p. 73.
The claim of this argument is modified by addition of a qualifier. Nixon uses the term "always" in a way that adds to the believability of the claim through registering the fact that any attempted rebuttal to Nixon's pledge will "always" be refuted by the action of upholding the tradition of bipartisanship on his part.

Proof PS-2 is another example of a substantive argument. A detail of the argument which needs a particular commentary at this point is the absence of a claim.

Historically, Nixon could not make a claim for peace which would have been the natural product of the evidence and warrant as they were stated in the argument. Instead, the strategy of setting aside the claim through the use of rebuttal was executed, and it was accomplished through the statement of three counterproofs that held greater validity at a particular moment in history than the potential claim.

The final argument in this series is an example of a straightforward cause to effect substantive proof. The warrant of PS-3 predicts that the danger of war will increase if defense spending is cut, and the claim advanced relates a threat to United States security and destruction of peace initiatives to the Democratic proposal for defense cuts.
AMNESTY

A minor issue raised by Nixon before the convention, and one related to the United States involvement in the Vietnam war was the question of amnesty (A-1) for those who chose not to serve their country in the Armed Services. Nixon took a hard line on this issue and his claim to honor and respect those in the Armed Forces who served in the war was an indirect rejection of amnesty for those who "chose to desert their country rather than serve it in Vietnam."
The hard line that the Nixon argument followed is analyzed in this manner:

DATA: There has been a great deal of talk about providing amnesty for those Americans who chose to desert their country.

CLAIM: Let us give those who serve America in war the honor and respect that they have earned.

WARRANT: It is time we put the emphasis where it belongs.

REBUTTAL: But there is the tendency to run down those who serve America.

BACKING: The heroes of the war are those who chose to serve their country rather than desert it.

---

20 Ibid., pp. 71-72.
In this motivational argument Nixon is asking for the audience to respond by evaluating and accepting a claim to give respect and honor to those who have served their country. To garnish acceptance Nixon offers a token rebuttal with the negative implications of "running down those who have served America," a motivating factor which the great majority of listeners would disfavor.

NUCLEAR ARMAMENT

Also tied to the issue of United States security is the question of nuclear arms limitation (NA-1).\[^{21}\] Nixon employed an authoritative proof using a personal perspective of history in furnishing the data of the argument. The positive tone of the argument indicates a strongly held conviction that the initial steps already accomplished will lead to the eventuality of total nuclear arms control.

A Toulmin analysis of this argument follows on page 49:

\[^{21}\text{Ibid.}, \text{p. 72.}\]
DATA: When the history of this period is written, I believe that it will be recorded that our most significant contributions to peace resulted from our trips to ... Moscow.

CLAIM: We have laid the foundation for further limitation on nuclear weapons and eventually reducing the armaments in the nuclear area.

WARRANT: We have taken the first step in limiting the nuclear arms race.

BACKING: Within the space of four years we have moved from confrontation to negotiation to cooperation with the Soviet Union.
CHAPTER V

A SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the Toulmin model and to assess its value in the analysis of complex arguments. The model has been used in analysis of selected arguments of a contemporary politician, and it was found that the design of the model, coupled with the advantage of having six elements for use, are contributing factors to the ease with which the parts of an argument are determined. Further, it is felt that these factors aid greatly in the recognition and classification of argument types.

In testing the model's workability it has been shown that a particular line of reasoning is typified by the warrant used in the body of the argument. In a motivational mode of argumentation assumptions are made in an argument's warrant about the psychological factors of the audience being addressed. Substantive arguments are shown to employ a warrant pattern relating to facts of an external nature. And, authoritative proofs are warranted by assertions made about the source of an argument's data.

It is noted that the study revealed the three
instrumental elements basic to any type of argument remain
a constant while the added elements peculiar to the Toulmin
construct are variables dependent upon the needs of the
claim. The pattern of employment of these additional ele-
ments changed in each argument studied, and it was shown
how the use of an additional element contributed to the
nature of an argument's claim.

The examples of argument analysis in this study have
established that the Toulmin model does reduce a complex
argument to a single unifying construct, and this prin-
ciple, it is felt, simplified the analysis and classifi-
cation process that followed.

The analysis of reasoning completed in the body of
this study sustained a number of rules established during
the design of the Toulmin model. The rules gaining a
measure of confirmation from the study were:

1. Data of some kind must be produced if there is
to be an argument: a conclusion without data
for support is no argument.

2. Data are applied to explicitly, warrants
implicitly.

3. The element of backing will change greatly as
we move from one field of argument to another
due to the field dependent factor of backing.

4. An argument's claim can be modified by the ele-
ments of rebuttal and qualifier. The modifier
of rebuttal refutes the force of a claim and the
qualifier alters its degree of believability.
This study suggests that the Toulmin model does have a breadth of application in the field of argumentation. It offers to the speechmaker a tool for the analysis and selection of material in the structuring of deductive arguments. For the listener it offers a mode of critical evaluation leading to the recognition of an argument's strengths and weaknesses. Thus, the model has value for anyone in need of a tool for the analysis of arguments.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

There is a characteristic of the model which offers great potential for innovation in the field of argumentation. Gary Cronkhite, in writing of the alternatives of a simple or a complex model, puts faith in the "glorious prospect" of computer simulation in handling the complexities of a model needed for mirroring the reality of arguments with even greater complexities known now.¹ It is apparent to this writer that there is more than a noticeable similarity between the Toulmin model and the "flow chart principle" used in computer simulation, and it is this apparent affinity to a systems approach of argument

analysis which has led the present writer to design a variation of this principle using the Toulmin model as a base for its logic. The design of this model is presented in Figure 1.

Before this model for the computer simulation becomes a concrete method for analyzing arguments, a firm foundation for a systems approach to argumentation must be constructed. The Toulmin model offers the building blocks for this foundation, yet, there has been little exploration undertaken to discover the weaknesses of the model in this new role. Before a computer program for the analysis of arguments becomes a reality this must be accomplished. Establishing the system's parameters is of paramount importance. This can only come through additional study and as each bit of information is discovered, it will add to a body of knowledge which will determine the future potentialities that the Toulmin model holds for argumentation theory, and it is this writer's prediction that the systems approach to argument analysis is moving out of the realm of possibility because of the sophistication of advanced computer techniques, and rapidly becoming a reality. This is the future of the Toulmin model.
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APPENDIX
MR. CHAIRMAN, DELEGATES TO THIS CONVENTION, MY FELLOW AMERICANS:

FOUR YEARS AGO, STANDING IN THIS VERY place, I PROUDLY ACCEPTED YOUR NOMINATION FOR PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

WITH YOUR HELP AND WITH THE VOTES OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS, WE WON A GREAT VICTORY IN 1968.

TODAY, I AGAIN PROUDLY ACCEPT YOUR NOMINATION FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

LET US PLEDGE OURSELVES TO WIN AN EVEN GREATER VICTORY THIS NOVEMBER IN 1972.

I CONGRATULATE CHAIRMAN FORD. I CONGRATULATE CHAIRMAN DOLE, ANNE ARMSTRONG AND HUNDREDS OF OTHERS WHO HAVE LAID THE FOUNDATION FOR THAT VICTORY BY THEIR WORK AT THIS GREAT CONVENTION.

OUR PROGRAM IS A DYNAMIC PROGRAM FOR PROGRESS FOR AMERICA AND FOR PEACE IN THE WORLD.

SPEAKING IN A VERY PERSONAL SENSE, I EXPRESS MY DEEP GRATITUDE TO THIS CONVENTION FOR THE TRIBUTE YOU HAVE PAID TO THE BEST CAMPAIGNER IN THE NIXON FAMILY--MY WIFE PAT. IN HONORING HER, YOU HAVE HONORED MILLIONS OF WOMEN IN AMERICA WHO HAVE CONTRIBUTED IN THE PAST AND WILL CONTRIBUTE IN THE FUTURE SO VERY MUCH TO BETTER GOVERNMENT IN THIS COUNTRY.

AGAIN, AS I DID LAST NIGHT, WHEN I WAS NOT AT THE CONVENTION, I EXPRESS THE APPRECIATION OF ALL THE DELEGATES AND OF ALL AMERICA FOR LETTING US SEE YOUNG AMERICA AT ITS BEST AT OUR CONVENTION. AS I EXPRESS MY APPRECIATION TO YOU, I WANT TO SAY THAT YOU HAVE INSPIRED US WITH YOUR ENTHUSIASM, WITH YOUR INTELLIGENCE, WITH YOUR DEDICATION AT THIS CONVENTION. YOU HAVE MADE US REALIZE THAT
this is a year when we can prove the experts' predictions wrong, because we can set as our goal winning a majority of the new voters for our ticket this November.

I pledge to you, all of the new voters in America who are listening on television and listening here in this convention hall, that I will do everything that I can over these next four years to make your support be one that you can be proud of, because, as I said to you last night, I feel it very deeply in my heart: years from now I want you to look back and be able to say that your first vote was one of the best votes you ever cast in your life.

Mr. Chairman, I congratulate the delegates to this convention for renominating as my running mate the man who has just so eloquently and graciously introduced me, Vice President Agnew.

I thought he was the best man for the job four years ago.

I think he is the best man for the job today.

And I am not going to change my mind tomorrow.

Finally as the Vice President has indicated, you have demonstrated to the nation that we can have an open convention without dividing Americans into quotas.

Let us commit ourselves to rule out every vestige of discrimination in this country of ours. But my fellow Americans, the way to end discrimination against some is not to begin discrimination against others.

Dividing Americans into quotas is totally alien to the American tradition.

Americans don't want to be part of a quota. They want to be part of America. This nation proudly calls itself the United States of America. Let us reject any philosophy that would make us the divided people of America.
In that spirit, I address you tonight, my fellow Americans, not as a partisan of party, which would divide us, but as a partisan of principles which can unite us.

Six weeks ago, our opponents at their convention rejected many of the great principles of the Democratic Party. To those millions who have been driven out of their home in the Democratic Party, we say come home. We say come home not to another party, but we say come home to the great principles we Americans believe in together.

And I ask you, my fellow Americans, tonight to join us not in a coalition held together only by a desire to gain power, I ask you to join us as members of a new American majority bound together by our common ideals.

I ask everyone listening to me tonight--Democrats, Republicans, Independents, to join our new majority--not on the basis of the party label you wear in your lapel, but on the basis of what you believe in your hearts.

In asking for your support I shall not dwell on the record of our administration which has been praised perhaps too generously by others at this convention.

We have made great progress in these past four years.

It can truly be said that we have changed America and that America has changed the world. As a result of what we have done America today is a better place and the world is a safer place to live in than was the case four years ago.

We can be proud of that record, but we shall never be satisfied. A record is not something to stand on; it is something to build on.

Tonight I do not ask you to join our new majority because of what we have done in the past. I ask your support of the principles I believe should determine America's future.

The choice in this election is not between radical change and no change. The choice in this election is between change that works and change that won't work.
I begin with an article of faith.

It has become fashionable in recent years to point up what is wrong with what is called the American system. The critics contend it is so unfair, so corrupt, so unjust, that we should tear it down and substitute something else in its place.

I totally disagree. I believe in the American system.

I have travelled to 80 countries in the past 25 years, and I have seen Communist systems, I have seen Socialist systems, I have seen systems that are half Socialist and half free.

Every time I come home to America, I realize how fortunate we are to live in this great and good country.

Every time I am reminded that we have more freedom, more opportunity and more prosperity than any people in the world.

We have the highest growth rate of any industrial nation.

Americans have more jobs at higher wages than in any country of the world. Our rate of inflation is less than that of any industrial nation.

The incomparable productivity of America's farmer has made it possible for us to launch a winning war against hunger in the United States, and that Productivity of our farmers also makes us the best fed people in the world with the lowest percentage of the family budget going to food of any country in the world.

We can be grateful in this country that the people on welfare in America would be rich in most of the nations of the world today.

Now, my fellow Americans, in pointing up those things, we do not overlook the fact that our system has its problems.
Our administration, as you know, has provided the biggest tax cut in history, but taxes are still too high.

That is why one of the goals of our next administration is to reduce the property tax which is such an unfair and heavy burden on the poor, the elderly, the wage earner, the farmer and those on fixed incomes.

As all of you know, we have cut inflation in half in this administration, but we have got to cut it further. We must cut it further so that we can continue to expand on the greatest accomplishment of our economic policy: for the first time in five years, wage increases in America are not being eaten up by price increases.

As a result of the millions of new jobs created by our new economic policies, unemployment today in America is less than the peace time average of the 60's, but we must continue the unparalleled increase in new jobs so that we can achieve the great goal of our new prosperity—a job for every American who wants work, without war and without inflation. The way to reach this goal is to stay on the new road we have charted to move America forward and not to take a sharp detour to the left, which would lead to a dead end for the hopes of the American people.

This points up one of the clearest choices in this campaign. Our opponents believe in a different philosophy.

Their is the politics of paternalism, where master planners in Washington make decisions for people.

Ours is the politics of people--where people make decisions for themselves.

The proposal that they have made to pay $1,000 to every person in America insults the intelligence of the American voters.

Because you know that every politician's promise has a price--the taxpayer pays the bill.
The American people are not going to be taken in by any scheme where government gives money with one hand and then takes it away with the other.

Their platform promises everything to everybody, but at an increase not in the budget of $144 billion, but listen to what it means to you, the taxpayers of this country. That would mean an increase of 50 percent in what the taxpayers of America pay. I oppose any new spending programs which would increase the tax burden on the already overburdened American taxpayer.

And they have proposed legislation which would add 82 million people to the welfare rolls.

I say that instead of providing incentives for millions of more Americans to go on welfare, we need a program which will provide incentives for people to get off of welfare and to go to work.

We believe that it is wrong for anyone to receive more on welfare than for someone who works. Let us be generous to those who can't work without increasing the tax burden of those who do work.

And while we are talking about welfare, let us quit treating our senior citizens in this country like welfare recipients. They worked hard all their lives to build America. And as the builders of America, they have not asked for a handout. What they ask for is what they have earned—that is retirement in dignity and self-respect. Let's give that to our senior citizens.

Now, when you add up the cost of all the programs our opponents have proposed, you reach only one conclusion: They would destroy the system which has made America number one in the
Listen to these facts: Americans today pay one-third of all their income in taxes. If their programs were adopted, Americans would pay over one-half of what they earn in taxes. This means that if their programs are adopted, American wage earners would be working more for the government than they would for themselves.

Once we cross this line, we cannot turn back because the incentive which makes the American economic system the most productive in the world would be destroyed.

Their is not a new approach. It has been tried before in countries abroad, and I can tell you that those who have tried it have lived to regret it.

We cannot and we will not let them do this to America.

Let us always be true to the principle that has made America the world's most prosperous nation—that here in America a person should get what he works for and work for what he gets.

Let me illustrate the difference in our philosophies. Because of our free economic system, what we have done is to build a great building of economic wealth and money in America. It is by far the tallest building in the world and we are still adding to it. Now because some of the windows are broken, they say tear it down and start again. We say, replace the windows and keep building. That is the difference.

Let me turn now to a second area where my beliefs are totally different from those of our opponents.

Four years ago crime was rising all over America at an unprecedented rate. Even our nation's capital was called the crime capital of the world. I pledged to stop the rise in crime.
In order to keep that pledge, I promised in the election campaign that I would appoint judges to the Federal courts, and particularly to the Supreme Court, who would recognize that the first civil right of every American is to be free from domestic violence.

I have kept that promise. I am proud of the appointments I have made to the courts, and particularly proud of those I have made to the Supreme Court of the United States. And I pledge again tonight, as I did four years ago, that whenever I have the opportunity to make more appointments to the courts, I shall continue to appoint judges who share my philosophy that we must strengthen the peace forces against the criminal forces in America.

We have launched an all-out offensive against crime, narcotics, against permissiveness in our country.

I want the peace officers across America to know that they have the total backing of their President in their fight against crime.

My fellow Americans, as we move toward peace abroad, I ask you to support our programs which will keep the peace at home.

Now, I turn to an issue of overriding importance, not only to this election, but for generations to come—the progress we have made in building a new structure of peace in the world.

Peace is too important for partisanship. There have been five Presidents in my political lifetime—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

They had differences on some issues, but they were united in their belief that where the security of America or the peace of the world was involved we are not Republicans, we are not
Democrats. We are Americans, first, last and always.

These five Presidents were united in their total opposition to isolation for America and in their belief that the interests of the United States and the interests of world peace require that America be strong enough and intelligent enough to assume the responsibilities of leadership in the world.

They were united in a conviction that the United States should have defense second to none in the world.

They were all men who hated war and were dedicated to peace.

But not one of these five men and no President in our history believed that America should ask an enemy for peace on terms that would betray our allies and destroy respect for the United States all over the world.

As your President, I pledge that I shall always uphold that proud bipartisan tradition.

Standing in this Convention Hall four years ago, I pledged to seek an honorable end to the war in Vietnam. We have made great progress toward that end. We have brought over half a million men home and more will be coming home. We have ended America's ground combat role. No draftees are being sent to Vietnam. We have reduced our casualties by 98 percent. We have gone the extra mile, in fact, we have gone ten thousands of miles trying to seek a negotiated settlement of the war. We have offered a ceasefire, a total withdrawal of all American forces, an exchange of all prisoners of war, internationally supervised free elections with the Communists participating in the elections and their supervision.

There are three things, however, that we have not and that we will not offer.
We will never abandon our prisoners of war.

Second, we will not join our enemies in imposing a Communist government on our allies—the 17 million people of South Vietnam.

And we will never stain the honor of the United States of America.

Now I realize that many, particularly in this political year, wonder why we insist on an honorable peace in Vietnam. From a political standpoint they suggest that since I was not in office when over a half million American men were sent there, that I should end the war by agreeing to impose a Communist government on the people of South Vietnam and just blame the whole catastrophe on my predecessors.

This might be good politics, but it would be disastrous to the cause of peace in the world. If, at this time, we betray our allies, it will discourage our friends abroad and it will encourage our enemies to engage in aggression.

In areas like the Mideast, which are danger areas, small nations who rely on the friendship and support of the United States would be in deadly jeopardy.

To our friends and allies in Europe, Asia, the Mideast and Latin America, I say the United States will continue its great bipartisan tradition—to stand by our friends and never desert them.

Now in discussing Vietnam, I have noted that in this election year there has been a great deal of talk about providing amnesty for these few hundred Americans who chose to desert their country rather than serve it in Vietnam. I think it is time that we put the emphasis where it belongs. The real heroes are two and one-half million young Americans who chose to serve their country rather than desert it. I say to you tonight, in these times when there
is so much of a tendency to run down those who have served America in the past and who serve it today, let us give those who serve in the Armed Forces and those who have served in Vietnam the honor and the respect that they deserve and that they have earned.

Finally, in this connection, let one thing be clearly understood in this election campaign: The American people will not tolerate any attempt by our enemies to interfere in the cherished right of the American voter to make his own decision with regard to what is best for America without outside intervention.

Now it is understandable that Vietnam has been a major concern in foreign policy.

But we have not allowed the war in Vietnam to paralyze our capacity to initiate historic new policies to construct a lasting and just peace in the world.

When the history of this period is written, I believe it will be recorded that our most significant contributions to peace resulted from our trips to Peking and to Moscow.

The dialogue that we have begun with the Peoples Republic of China has reduced the danger of war and has increased the chance for peaceful cooperation between two great peoples.

Within the space of four years in our relations with the Soviet Union we have moved from confrontation to negotiation, and then to cooperation in the interest of peace.

We have taken the first step in limiting the nuclear arms race.

We have laid the foundation for further limitations on nuclear weapons and eventually of reducing the armaments in the nuclear area.
We can, therefore, not only reduce the enormous cost of arms for both our countries, but we can increase the chances for peace.

More than on any other single issue, I ask you, my fellow Americans, to give us the chance to continue these great initiatives that can contribute so much to the future of peace in the world.

It can truly be said that as a result of our initiatives, the danger of war is less today than it was; the chances for peace are greater.

Our opponents have proposed massive cuts in our defense budget which would have the inevitable effect of making the United States the second strongest nation in the world.

For the United States unilaterally to reduce its strength with the naive hope that other nations would do likewise would increase the danger of war in the world.

It would completely remove any incentive of other nations to agree to a mutual limitation or reduction of arms.

The promising initiatives we have undertaken would be destroyed.

The security of the United States and all of the nations in the world that depend on our friendship and support would be threatened.

Let's look at the record of defense expenditures. We have cut spending in our administration. It now takes the lowest percentage of our national product in 20 years. We should not spend more on defense than we need. But we must never spend less than we need.

What we must understand is, spending what we need on defense will cost us money. Spending less than we need will cost us our lives or our freedom.
So tonight, my fellow Americans, I say, let us take risks for peace, but let us never risk the security of the United States of America.

It is for that reason that I pledge that we will continue to seek peace and the mutual reduction of arms. The United States, during this period, however, will always have a defense second to none.

There are those who believe that we can entrust the security of America to the good will of our adversaries.

Those who hold this view do not know the real world. We can negotiate limitation of arms and we have done so. We can make agreements to reduce the danger of war, and we have done so.

But one unchangeable rule of international diplomacy that I have learned over many many years is that, in negotiations between great powers, you can only get something if you have something to give in return.

That is why I say tonight: Let us always be sure that when the President of the United States goes to the conference table, he never has to negotiate from weakness.

There is no such thing as a retreat to peace.

My fellow Americans, we stand on the threshold of one of the most exciting and challenging eras in the history of relations between nations.

We have the opportunity in our time to be the peacemakers of the world, because the world trusts and respects us, and because the world knows that we shall only use our power to defend freedom, never to destroy it; to keep the peace, never to break it.

A strong America is not the enemy of peace; it is the guardian of peace.

The initiatives that we have begun can result in reducing the danger of arms, as well as the danger of war which hangs over the world today.

Even more important, it means that the enormous creative energies of the Russian people and of the Chinese
people and the American people and all the great peoples of the world can be turned away from the production of war and turned toward production for peace.

In America it means that we can undertake programs for progress at home that will be just as exciting as the great initiatives we have undertaken in building a new structure of peace abroad.

My fellow Americans, the peace dividend that we hear so much about has too often been described solely in monetary terms—how much money we could take out of the arms budget and apply to our domestic needs. By far the biggest dividend, however, is that achieving our goal of a lasting peace in the world would reflect the deepest hopes and ideals of all the American people.

Speaking on behalf of the American people, I was proud to be able to say in my television address to the Russian people in May: "We covet no one else's territory. We seek no dominion over any other nation. We seek peace not only for ourselves, but for all the people of the world."

This dedication to idealism runs through America's history.

During the war between the States, Abraham Lincoln was asked whether God was on his side. He replied, "My concern is not whether God is on our side, but whether we are on God's side."

May that always be our prayer for America.

We hold the future of peace in the world and our own future in our hands. Let us reject therefore the policies of those who whine and whimper about our frustrations and call for us to turn inward.

Let us not turn away from greatness.

The chance America now has to lead the way to a lasting peace in the world may never come again.

With faith in God and faith in ourselves and faith in our country, let us have the vision and the courage to seize the moment and meet the challenge before it slips away.
On your television screen last night, you saw the cemetery in Leningrad I visited on my trip to the Soviet Union--where 300,000 people died in the siege of that city during World War II.

At the cemetery I saw the picture of a 12 year old girl. She was a beautiful child. Her name was Tanya.

I read her diary. It tells the terrible story of war. In the simple words of a child she wrote of the deaths of the members of her family. Zhenya in December. Grannie in January. Then Yeka. Then Uncle Vasya. Then Uncle Losha. Then Mama in May. And finally--these were the last words in her diary: "All are dead. Only Tanya is left."

Let us think of Tanya and of the other Tanya's and their brothers and sisters everywhere in Russia, in China, in America, as we proudly meet our responsibilities for leadership in the world in a way worthy of a great people.

I ask you, my fellow Americans, to join in our new majority not just in the cause of winning an election, but in achieving a hope that mankind has had since the beginning of civilization. Let us build a peace that our children and all the children of the world can enjoy for generations to come.