UDC 007 : 304 : 004.9 + 659.3

PhD Minielli Maureen
(Klaipeda, Lithuania)

AN INTRODUCTION TO AMERICAN RHETORICAL CRITICISM: A CASE STUDY OF CLOSE TEXTUAL ANALYSIS AND M. NIXON'S 'RADIO AND TELEVISION ADDRESS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SOVIET UNION' OF MAY 28, 1972

In its traditional form, American rhetorical criticism addresses the analysis, evaluation and critique of public messages. Traditional approaches often focused on orations, but modern approaches have expanded to other entities that "communicate," including written documents and visual objects. This article introduces readers to US rhetorical criticism as means of closing intellectual knowledge gaps between global scholars. The article begins by briefly surveying traditional and newer methods of rhetorical criticism in the States. It then offers an example of rhetorical criticism, namely a close textual analysis former American president Richard M. Nixon's radio and television address to the Soviet people of the Soviet Union on May 28, 1972 as part of his Moscow summit with General Leonid Brezhnev and other Soviet government dignitaries. The article then addresses criticisms of the close textual analysis approach, and offers one remedy, namely the use of archival research. This article concludes by explicating criticism's usefulness and applicability to a variety of communication and communications.

Keywords: rhetorical criticism, close textual analysis, Richard M. Nixon, Moscow Summit, archival research

1. Introduction

The American approach to the traditional study of rhetoric is different from our Eastern European counterparts. While we both analyze traditional and modern rhetorical artifacts, our respective theoretical methodologies and critical approaches are diverse, resulting in little overlap between international colleagues. One result is the lack of familiarity by one scholar of another, leading to a *disconnect* between foreign scholars.

On reason for this disconnect is the nature of communication(s) study globally. In Eastern Europe, there are very few Western-style academic departments devoted to the study of communication like the U.S. In the States, communication scholars are generally divided into two groups and typically housed in different academic homes. Those who study the singular form of *communication* focus on the humanities and applied communication. Those who study the plural form of *communications* devote their attention to mediated or mass communication like radio, television, film, video, journalism, broadcasting, advertising, public relations, and/or social media. There is of course overlap between the two groups, and their academic training and research interests often guide which department or discipline they call home.

Eastern European approaches to the broader study of communication(s) typically arises from the perspectives of linguistics, philology, mass media, public relations, business and organizational communication, intercultural communication, and social communication (computer-mediated communication) and our academic counterparts are often dispersed over several academic departments as opposed to being housed in one or two academic departments as in the case in America. Hazen (2008) determined that out that while three different streams of communication(s) study emerged in the early twentieth century, namely speech/rhetoric, journalism, and social sciences, only the latter two are also found in Russia [1], and other Eastern European countries.

A second reason for this disconnect stems from these departmental divisions. Eastern Europeans study rhetoric in the traditional form (and by traditional I mean rhetorical address or oratory) but they approach it from the perspectives of linguistics, philology, semiotics, or political science. In the U.S. we have Linguistics and Political Science Departments, do not have Philology Departments (they may be housed in a broader Classics or World Languages departments) and semiotics is often studied in our English Department. In the US, rhetoric is traditionally studied in Communication (oral words) and English (written words) Departments, as well Philosophy and Political Sciences. Very few American communication scholars have nothing more than a rudimentary introduction to the fields of the Eastern European counterparts, and if so, would most likely occur during their doctoral programs through a single "outside" course mandated by their program. As such, it is difficult for international rhetorical scholars to meet each other unless they are attending mutual international conferences or connect through colleagues of colleagues.

It is time that we all begin the process of connecting and sharing our respective academic efforts so that we may draw closer together as we work to advance the study of rhetoric within the broader realms of communication and communications study. This article attempts to repair the disconnect by briefly introducing readers to the American study of rhetorical criticism, identify traditional and modern approaches to criticism, briefly demonstrate its practice through a case study of former American president Richard M. Nixon's 'Radio and Television Address to the People of the Soviet Union' on May 28, 1972 as part of his Moscow summit with General Leonid Brezhnev and other Soviet government dignitaries. Through the critical approach of close textual analysis, this case study demonstrates the complexities and usefulness of rhetorical criticism in communication scholarship. It also addresses criticisms of the approach and suggests one remedy of those criticisms, namely the use of archival research. This article concludes with a call for global communication scholars to become familiar with the approaches of their international counterparts so that intellectual gaps can be diminished and awareness of additional approaches can broaden our collective scholarship as it applies to the analysis and criticism of communication(s).

2. The Study of Rhetorical Criticism in America

Traditionally, American rhetorical scholars are trained in two broad areas: rhetorical theory and rhetorical criticism. Both areas draw from an eclectic array of academic fields, including history and political science, logic, argumentation and persuasion, philosophy, psychology and sociology, and media, public relations, and journalism. This section introduces the reader to American rhetorical criticism by briefly discussing traditional and modern approaches.

2.1 Neo-Aristotelian Criticism

The most traditional approach for rhetorical criticism is neo-Aristotelian (based on the works of Aristotle) and examines a rhetorical artifact in terms of *ethos* (credibility), *logos* (logical arguments), and *pathos* (emotional appeals). This approach, once popular amongst scholars in the early and middle twentieth century, is now reserved for upper level undergraduate and entry level graduate rhetoric courses as a student entry point into the study of rhetorical theory and criticism. If we were to apply Neo-Aristotelian criticism to Nixon's address to the Soviet citizens, we would most likely focus on *pathos* since the address is predominantly ceremonial in nature and employs numerous emotional appeals. Background research about the speech would also support our decision to focus on this persuasive appeal. As Nixon speechwriter Raymond Price (1977) noted, Nixon's address "drew heavily on the soft of homespun analogies and simple folk tales so popular in Russian tradition. It also played to the strong emotional feelings the Russian still have about World War II, and particularly to the intense concern for children which is characteristically Russian" [2]. The critical rhetorical scholar would then examine these intentional acts and interpret the emotional appeals as a means of measuring the speech as a success or failure. The scholar would also take particular note of the American president's speech peroration, for Nixon's Chief of Staff H.R. Haldeman (1994) stated that Nixon felt a speech's conclusion was the most important part of a public speech [3]. In Nixon's May 1972 address, the president chose to conclude with a World War II story of a young girl named Tanya Savicheva. Savicheva was the young Soviet girl who kept a diary and recorded the atrocities of World War II, and in particular the siege of Leningrad, as well as the deaths of her family members [4]. Price noted that while the reference to Savicheva drew "snickers" of derision from the American press, it emotionally appealed and resonated with the Russian listeners [5] and contributed to the speech's success. Haldeman also noted that the president thought the reference to Savicheva was the most important part of his speech [6].

This brief introduction to a traditional American rhetorical criticism method illustrates just one of many ways a communicative artifact can be evaluated. The artifact can be analyzed in several ways like levels of success, immediate and/or long term effects, or degrees of influence on listeners. Coupled with background research, it is critical assessment and evaluation like the example above that helps us produce effective evaluations of public addresses.

2.2 Additional Traditional Theorists and Philosophers

There exists a litany of other traditional theorists and philosophers whose ideas have been utilized in rhetorical criticism. Cicero [7] remains a popular philosopher from the Ancient Greece period as does St. Augustine [8] from the Roman period. The works of Archbishop Richard Whatley [9], Hugh Blair [10], David Hume [11], and Edmund Burke [12] also populated early American rhetorical criticism approaches in the twentieth century.

2.3 Additional Traditional Methodologies

Other traditional methods include the narrative paradigm [13], metaphors [14], genres [15], and ideographs [16], as well as the perspectives of fantasy-theme analysis and symbolic convergence [17] and feminism [18]. Like neo-

Aristotelianism, these methodological approaches serve as "lens" to observe and evaluate a rhetorical event, or what rhetorical scholar Lloyd Bitzer called "the rhetorical situation" [19]. For example, Hillary Clinton's 2016 Democratic National Convention Acceptance speech [20] could be examined through her use of narrative, metaphors, or ideographs, compared to past convention acceptance speeches as part of a generic approach, investigated for her message's effectiveness toward reaching her audiences, or analyzed from a feminist perspective. These and other traditional approaches offers rhetorical scholars an eclectic array of perspectives to interpret and criticize a rhetorical event. In addition, these perspectives also transcend academic disciplines and illustrate past and current American theoretical cross-disciplinary interests, including literature, philosophy, and psychology.

2.4 Burkean Criticism

A popular method to the study of rhetoric that has transcended time is Burkean criticism. It is based on the writings of Kenneth Burke, who works on literary theory and criticism continue to be studied by scholars from different academic fields. His book *A Rhetoric of Motives* is a standard graduate course text that introduces his theories of imagery, identification and consubstantiality, and other elements related to the study of rhetoric [21]. One of Burke's most popular approaches is that of the *dramatistic pentad*, which analyzes human relationships and motives. The pentad, consisting of Act, Scene, Agent, Agency, and Purpose, is a critical method for analyzing symbol-using humans and subsequent actions that create what he terms "drama" [22]. Burke's works are notably difficult to read and understand, and a scholarly, academic association is devoted solely to the study of ideas, the Kenneth Burke Society (http://www.kbjournal.org/kbs).

2.5 Modern Rhetorical Criticism Theorists and Philosophers

As American interest in rhetorical criticism expanded in the late twentieth century, so did its array of theorists and philosophers of the modern era. Some of the more notable ones include Hannah Arendt [23], Mikhail Bakhtin [24], Michel Foucault [25], Jürgen Habermas [26], and Chaim Perelman [27]. This progression from the ancient philosophers to more contemporary ones occurred in part to greater awareness of the works from international scholars and theorists. In many ways it also paralleled the interests in these individuals from colleagues in different disciplines, including philosophy, comparative literature, political science, and sociology.

2.6 Postmodern Criticism

The traditional and modern approaches have gradually given way to the twentieth-century's postmodern period of critical approaches that parallel updated interests from the mainstream and academic status quos. These newer approaches include queer [28], social movements [29], public memory [30], postcolonial [31], and framing [32]. These newer approaches also embrace and reflect the trends, sentiments, and perspectives of certain societal entities. In many ways it also mirrors what is occurring politically and culturally in a given, regional society, and appears to quickly become integrated in other societal entities thanks to immediate information sharing between traditional and contemporary forms of technology.

3. Close Textual Analysis and Richard M. Nixon's 'Radio and Television Address to the People of the Soviet Union' of May 28, 1972

Another popular method for rhetorical criticism is *close textual analysis* (CTA) [33]. Close textual analysis is an interpretive method, and its goal, as Browne (2016) points out, is to "explain how texts operate to produce meaning, effect persuasion, and activate convictions in public contexts" [34]. Masterson (1985) indicates it is important to focus on its organization as that assists readers with understanding the orator's rhetorical techniques and the meanings they are trying to create [35].

In order to use this approach, the critic must be intimately familiar with a number of elements. The first element is knowledge of the *orator* – their biographical history, the ascension to their current position, their personality and temperament, their style of speaking and argumentation, and their peculiarities with word choice. The second element is knowledge of the *event*, or what occurred, who was involved, and what was the event's end result. The third element is knowledge of the *situation* – or the competing events or activities of that time frame that enveloped the event and prompted the speaker to speak. Coupled with the situation is knowledge of the event's *context*. In this sense, the critic needs to understand the status quo at the time of the oration, or the climate in which the oration was delivered. Critics also have to know of competing events that were occurring concurrently for the orator to understand issues like timing of the speaker's oration as well as any rhetorical constraints that shaped the final address. It is also important for the

critic to examine an oration as it was delivered at that moment in time to understand how activities were conducted and speakers spoke (as opposed to criticizing through a contemporary lens). The fourth element is *historical knowledge*. Strong awareness of the legacy of the event and past responses by previous orators helps the rhetorical critic understand better why the current orator said and acted as he or she did. The fifth element is knowledge of *rhetorical strategies*, or the various techniques speakers use to convey their message and its meaning. These techniques include the different aforementioned traditional, modern, and post-modern approaches to rhetorical criticism but often include news lenses as well, including exclusion [36], anti-politics and negativity [37], and irony [38]. It is also not uncommon to employ multiple critical approaches within one study, depending on the orator, artifact, or situation [39]. This is due in part to awareness of a message's rich complexity. It is also due in part to greater awareness of critical approaches that, when combined, offer deeper interpretations of a rhetorical artifact.

To illustrate the CTA approach, this article examines former president Richard M. Nixon's address to the citizens of the Soviet Union at the end of May, 1972. This address was part of the larger summit held in Moscow between the American president and various White House personnel and Soviet General Secretary Leonid Brezhnev and other high-ranking Soviet officials. The address was delivered on the evening of Sunday, May 28, 1972, from the Green Room of the Grand Kremlin Palace in Moscow. As was customary at the time, the speech was approved by the Soviets in early May [40] and was broadcast live via television and radio in the U.S.S.R. and simultaneously via satellite back to the US [41].

Deemed a "mildly successful" oration by the *New York Times* [42], Nixon's address was rhetorically situated within several contexts that are important to examine as part of the measure of a message's effectiveness. The first and more immediate contextual sphere that situated the speech was the temporal context of May 1972, which witnessed the Nixon administration ordering the Haiphong Harbor mining and renewal of the bombing of Hanoi as part of its efforts to resolve the Vietnam War. Internal White House documents suggested that Nixon's aides thought that the Soviets would cancel the summit due to bombing of the harbor that resulted in the damage of four Russian ships and the loss of life of a lone Russian seaman [43]. Haldeman (1994) noted that the days following the mining depicted a White House president and staff anxious about the Summit's status until they received word from the Soviets that it would occur as planned [44]. The immediate contextual sphere itself was situated within a larger contextual sphere of the Vietnam War that had transcended several American presidencies and was a foreign policy situation that Nixon actively sought to resolve. Also, the war was an issue that created immense domestic strife and division in the US and was the subject of repeated citizen and media attacks on the President.

A third contextual sphere present was Nixon's trip to the People's Republic of China that had occurred three months earlier in February 1972. Historic and unprecedented in of itself, the trip was also part of a larger Nixon administration and presidential first term foreign policy strategy called "triangulation" [45]. That strategy pitted the Soviets and the Chinese against each other to assist the US with North Vietnamese negotiations with the end goal of resolving the Southeast Asian conflict. In return, the Americans would extend favors and privileges to the country offering the most assistance, like "favored nation status," or American food items like grain. Internal White House documents also suggested the Soviets were using the Summit for their own political gain. One document suggested that Soviets were eager to host the Summit to demonstrate that "the USSR enjoys a more intimate and substantive relationship with Washington than Peking can command" [46]. Other documents illustrate what the Nixon administration saw as angst and fear on the part of the Soviets as the new American relationship with the Chinese began to develop [47].

A fourth contextual sphere present was the impending 1972 presidential elections and Nixon's quest for a second presidential term. Although he was presumed to be the Republican Party's nominee, there were numerous Democratic opponents who were vying for their party's nomination. During the winter and spring of 1972, Nixon was well aware of the political mileage he could generate from historic China trip as well as the Moscow Summit, and he often directed his staff to constantly and consistently massage the public relations aspect of these events in ways that would enhance his chances for re-election [48].

Historical analysis of available literature like presidential and staff memoirs suggest Nixon carefully and strategically crafted his presidential orations [49], and that his May 1972 Soviet address intentionally utilized notable rhetorical techniques designed to resonate with the Soviet citizenry. The speech was also carefully designed to highlight the Summit's successes and minimize the issues that had yet to be finalized between the two nations, but also present an American perspective on various foreign issues to Russian citizens [50].

A close reading of his speech reveals standard Nixon oratorical themes and techniques as well as specific, strategic strategies employed specifically to appeal to Soviet listeners. For example, a common rhetorical theme for

Nixon orations was *peace*. Against the backdrop of an unpopular war, the American president was dedicated to ending the Southeast Asian conflict and achieving global peace.

Another standard Nixon rhetorical technique is what I would call *ask and answer*. Nixon used this technique of stating a question and then answering it. The president would state to his listeners that someone had asked him a question to which he publicly responds with an answer. There are problems with this approach, though. First, the "someone" asking the question is rarely identified by name or occupation, so it is unclear if this individual actually exists or if this technique has been employed to allow the president to introduce and discuss topics of his choosing, but cloaks or reframes it as a question coming from an interested American citizen. Second, audiences expect the orator to be truthful with their words. Because the individual has not been identified, audiences will believe the orator is truthful when he or she says this person actually exists. This is especially true of American presidents [51]. This technique opens the door for potential audience manipulation by the speaker, particularly those who know that those who are loyal to the orator will assume his words to be real and authentic, and will not question the actual existence of the "someone." Finally, the orator has the opportunity to respond publicly and share his answer with his attentive audiences. This allows the orator to direct the topics to be discussed in the address and affords him or her the manufactured opportunities to respond in front of the listeners. This technique is popular when leaders want to appear as a leader, or depict him or her as fulfilling a leadership role. As such, this strategy is very popular and successful as it allows the orator to control what topics are discussed and respond in a way that they choose in an oratorical moment that he or she has created.

It is also evident that Nixon's address to the people of the Soviet Union was carefully crafted for them. For example, when Nixon referenced the "mushroom rain" that greeted him upon his arrival, he used that reference as rhetorical device to appeal to his listeners who believe in "good omens." This strategy represented a clear departure from the style of address Nixon typically delivered to American audiences. Another clear oratorical departure is the president's reference to the proverb: "Make peace with man and quarrel with your sin" [52]. Nixon's speechwriters were well aware of rhetorical strategies like proverbs that would resonate with Soviet audiences. In addition, this proverb acted as a quasi *ask and answer* strategy as it allowed Nixon to respond to the proverb and then follow up with the statements he desired to impart. A third departure also caters to his Soviet listeners, namely philosophizing. In the West, and particularly in the early 1970s, the Soviets were characterized as intellectuals and deep thinkers. As such, employing a philosophical strategy would resonate with a wide range of Soviet citizens, and work to close the distance between "East" and "West."

The most notable rhetorical strategy employed by Nixon was the aforementioned story of Tanya Savicheva at the end of his address. As mentioned earlier, the president considered an oration's conclusion to be the most important of a public speech. Nixon was particularly moved by Savicheva's story and mentioned her in the speech's conclusion as a means of appealing one last time to the Soviet citizenry about global peace. This rhetorical technique also served as a "bookend" for his address. The bookend technique is often used in public oratory to initially introduce a theme that is discussed in more depth in the body of the speech. The theme is then referenced again in the speech's conclusion as a means of creating a circular approach for the whole address and return the listeners to the speech's introduction. Psychologically, the bookend approach returns listeners to the introduction's theme, after the speech itself has provided them with additional information that makes the theme more appealing. In effect, it is a technique to inform listeners about various subjects as a means of convincing them to believe and support the president's words and ideas.

As Jamieson (1996) noted, the story of Tanya Savicheva became a favorite rhetorical technique for Nixon as he used it in three other speeches after initially introducing it during his address to the Soviet citizens. Because of its *appeal to remembering*, it served as effect device for the president to recycle and reuse as part of his 1972 presidential re-election attempt [53]. Nixon's awareness of the strong, emotive power generating by Savicheva's tale is evident in an August 14, 1972 memo from the president to Haldeman. In it, Nixon requested his chief of staff to work with other White House personnel to find a letter from a US citizen who had lost a father or brother in the Vietnam War. The president indicated that this letter would provide a brilliant segue to his "Tanya" story for his presidential party nomination acceptance speech [54]. While Nixon eventually did not use the Vietnam letter approach, he did use the Savicheva story in his August 24 acceptance. The Nixon White House knew how powerful the story was, and used it to their advantage during the election season. The video of Nixon visiting Savicheva's grave in Leningrad during the Moscow Summit was aired on American television the night before the nomination, with the president followed up with a modified version of his Soviet people address's conclusion for his acceptance speech [55]. It is obvious that Nixon and his handlers were exploiting the Summit and the story to ensure his reelection bid would be successful. An informed rhetorical scholar employing the close textual analysis approach would also be successful in fleshing out

themes and techniques that casual readings may miss, and interpret and explain those strategies to reveal the motives and intentions of the orator.

4. The Connection between Close Textual Analysis and Archival Research

The aforementioned Nixon August 14, 1972 memorandum also illustrates an important reason for rhetorical scholars to conduct thorough research. One of the criticisms lodged toward the close textual analysis approach is its *subjective* nature. Consequently, this and other interpretive forms of rhetorical criticism are not as highly favored as are those relying on concrete, statistical data that populates the work of communication social scientists. While philosophers would argue that all interpretive information is inherently *subjective*, including the interpretation of *objective* data, the position communication scholars take is that interpretations based on substantive, *objective* information are more valid than interpretation and conjecture alone. Rhetorical criticism is based on interpreting artifacts based on available external information as well as evaluative theories that generate informed interpretations. Often our field utilizes external (e.g. widely available) *secondary* research materials like memoirs and third party or journalist-based accounts to provide information to support an author's claims [56]. But archival research, in its *internal* form as *primary* research materials, can be viewed as more *objective* forms of data sets that better explain options, choices, arguments, and decisions. As such, archival research can better inform scholarly interpretations and make them less *subjective*.

Various documents discovered in the Nixon Archives illustrate the above position. For example, in mid-April 1972, Nixon's staff began thinking about the President's public statements during the Summit. In his April 19 memo to Price, U.S. National Security Council staff member A. Denis Clift raised several points about various "themes" that could anchor Nixon's public Summit oratory that eventually materialized in Nixon's May 28 speech to the Soviet citizenry. One such theme referenced Nixon's previous Russia trip thirteen years prior, and argued for its placement in a public Nixon communicative form:

In his 1959 radio-television address Mr. Nixon quoted and then answered questions he had been asked during his trip by various Soviet citizens. Fortunately or unfortunately, Soviets are asking the same questions of us today. They are still passionately interested in the American standard of living, puzzled by our social problems, and unsure about our peaceful intentions in the world. Perhaps the President could in his television address to the Soviet people (or other public statement if he is not granted television time) refer to this continuity of interest and describe the progress made over the past decade in the United States and abroad. This would provide the framework for an upbeat tone on Soviet-American relations and the international environment in general and at the same time provide a rationale for dealing candidly with the sensitive subjects raised in 1959 [57].

Clift's advice was partially heeded and Nixon's rhetorical theme of peace was utilized in his address. The president often referenced his desire for global peace, for individual autonomy of countries, and his desire for cordial relations between the Soviet and American citizens [58].

In addition, Nixon originally intended to reference his meetings in Moscow in the first paragraph of his speech, but was subsequently replaced with the line "to bring you a message of friendship from all the people of the United States" [59] In other words, Nixon replaced his intention to demonstrate serious, concerted, and dedicated work with a ceremonial theme employing pathos. Also, in the same April 19th memorandum, Clift stated that the US and the U.S.S.R had not fought each other in wars or other military events, and that both countries remembered the Elbe meeting that is a "well known and cherished symbol of our cooperation in WW II" [60]. This suggestion was subsequently incorporated into the second paragraph of Nixon's address as a means of strategically reminding listeners of the longstanding cooperation between the two nations.

These shifts in content, strategy, and effect suggest that Nixon and his aides decided against a policy-oriented, informative speech (that may have resulted in the appearance of competition and divisiveness between the two countries) in favor of a speech that was primarily ceremonial in nature and intentionally enacted emotional appeals of friendship, safety, and collaboration to persuasively appeal to his listeners.

Notes in Nixon Speechwriter Raymond Price's archival documents indicate the Nixon address went through at least 3 drafts and was reviewed and commented on by Nixon advisor Henry Kissinger [61]. This approach of multiple drafts and multiple eyes was typical for the Nixon wordsmithing process. During Nixon's first presidential term, the president would create groups or sets of speech writers to work on the same topic and create what they thought a Nixon speech should address, what themes they should employ, and the rhetorical strategies they should utilize. Nixon, then, would take the best from each group's version to craft his final address. In addition, topics that involved certain subjects or branches of government were vetted by associated individuals ahead of time, in terms of content and form, and prior

to the final oration iteration. For example, any passage referencing foreign affairs would first be reviewed by the Department of State.

In an undated "Draft Communique" located in White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler's files is a passage that resembles a paragraph from the middle of Nixon's speech. The communiqué's paragraph stated that "They affirmed that every country, without exception, has the sovereign right to live out its national destiny without any interference of any sort from any other country" [62]. The Soviet citizenry speech paragraph stated: "We believe in the right of each nation to chart its own course, to choose its own system, to go its own way, without interference from other nations" [63]. The closeness in subjects and wording suggests that this portion of Nixon's address was planned out well in advance of the Summit, and not written as a response to the activities created or generating during the Summit. It also indicates that other White House individuals beyond the primary speech writers had input on the content and wording of Nixon's address. As an example, Nixon was advised to refer to the Soviets as "Peoples" by William Safire, one of his speechwriters [64].

Price's archival documents also contains several "speech inserts" by various administration personnel designed for potential inclusion into Nixon's address. Those inserts that did not make the final speech version include references to high praise for the American President [65], Nixon's achievements in China and the U.S.S.R. [66], nuclear weapons statistics [67], and comparisons of Nixon to Woodrow Wilson [68]. These additions most likely did not fit with Nixon's intentions of *pathos* (emotional appeals) over *ethos* (credibility) and were excluded due its content as well as any potential adverse mediated effects they could have generated in the minds of the listeners (not only Soviet and American audiences, but also the audiences of allies and foes).

These documents suggest that Nixon favored illuminating a celebratory approach of peace and unification in his address over employing a direct, policy approach of that would highlight differences. In addition, these documents reveal information that might otherwise be left unknown: the originators of ideas, the choices of topics and words that are available or omitted, the rationales behind choosing one linguistic option over another, and the decisions that were made to favor/disfavor and include/omit specific topics and wordings. Scholars who elect to use *primary* documents over *secondary* sources can thus be assured they are generating better interpretations and conclusions because the former were contextually generated at that moment in time, instead of the latter that often relies on an author's notes and/or memories, or post-presidential reflections by various former employees.

5. Conclusion

As with other Nixon addresses through his one and a half presidential terms, many individuals offered suggestions for content and wording of various presidential addresses. These individuals included various White House staff members in addition to other personnel from other government agencies and non-government individuals like business, religious, and labor leaders. Archival research unearths these nuances and strategies that serves to strengthen a close textual analysis of former American president Richard M. Nixon's radio and television address to the Soviet people of the Soviet Union on May 28, 1972 as part of the Moscow summit. This case study illuminates the rhetorical strategies and techniques the US leader took deliver an oration that would resonate with his Soviet listeners.

While traditional rhetorical criticism focuses on public orations, modern approaches have widen the scope of artifacts that can by studied. For example, close textual analysis can be applied to a television anchor's commentary or a journalist's published opinion, or a feminist critique can be made of the Motherland Monument in Kyiv or a public figure's social media postings. Awareness of American critical approaches based on the fields of history, political science, philosophy, logic, argumentation, persuasion, psychology and sociology can broaden the approaches of our Eastern European colleagues who often approach criticism from similar fields as well as ones that are predominant in Western communication scholarship, like literature, linguistics, philology, and world languages. It is imperative for global scholars to continue to close intellectual gaps and share their knowledge and practices so that we can learn from each other and open new avenues to communication's and communications' analysis and criticism. We welcome and look forward to our Eastern European counterparts' discussions of their specific methodologies and approaches to criticism as part of a symbiotic process to draw us closer together.

References
1. Hazen, M. D. (2008). 'Thoughts on the development of the communication discipline in the United States and Russia', *Russian Journal of Communication, 1,* p455-475. dx.doi.org/10.1080/19409419.2008.10756730.
2. Price, R. (1977). *With Nixon*. New York, NY: Viking Press.
3. Haldeman, H. R. (1994). *The Haldeman diaries: Inside the Nixon White* House. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

4.   Heberer, Patricia (2011). *Children during the Holocaust*. Lanham, MD: Alta Mira Press;

5.   Tuchinskaya, Irina. "Дневник Тани Савичевой покажут впервые за 35 лет (Diary of Tanya Savicheva will be displayed for the first time in 35 years)". *Komsomolskaya Pravda*. Retrieved from https://www.kp.ru/online /news/536548/.

6.   Nixon, R. N. (1972). 'Radio and television address to the people of the Soviet Union', *Public Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, 1972*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, pp. 629-632. Haldeman, 467.

7.   See Cicero Sattler, W.M. (1949). 'Some platonic influences in the rhetorical works of Cicero, *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 35(2), p164-169; Murphy, J.J. (1967). 'Cicero's rhetoric in the middle ages', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 53(4), p334-341; Kennedy, G. (1968). 'Antony's speech at Caesar's funeral. *Quarterly Journal of Speech, 54*(2), 99-106; Brinton, A. (1988).

8.   Cicero's use of historical examples in moral argument', *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 21(3), p169-184;

9.   Goodwin, J. (2001). 'Cicero's authority'. *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 34(1), p.38-60;

10.   O'Rourke, S.P. (2007). 'The rhetorical dynamics of judicial situations: Joseph Story, Ciceronian rhetoric, and the judicial response to American slavery', *Advances in the History of Rhetoric, 10*, College Park, MD: American Society for the History of Rhetoric, pp. 43-71.

11.   See Riley, F.K. (1936). 'St. Augustine, public speaker and rhetorician', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 22(4), p572-578; Murphy, J.J. (1960). 'Saint Augustine and the debate about a Christian rhetoric', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 46(4), p400-410; Johnson, W.R. (1976).

12.   'Isocrates flowering: The rhetoric of Augustine', *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 9(4), p.217-231;

13.   Detwiler, T. (1988). 'Viewing Robertson's rhetoric in an Augustinan mirror', *Journal of Communication & Religion,* 11(1), p22-31; Troup, C.L. (2001). 'Rhetoric interpretation in Augustine's confessions', *Journal of Communication & Religion,* 24(1), p43-67;

14.   Lauer, I. (2007). 'Augustan rhetoric: The declining orator', *Advances in the History of Rhetoric: The First Six Years*. R.L. Enos & D.E. Beard (eds.) West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, pp. 351-367.

15.   See Pence, O.L. (1953). 'The concept and function of logical proof in the rhetorical system of Richard Whately', *Speech Monographs,* 20(1), p23-38;

16.   Pomeroy, R.S. (1963). 'Whately's Historic doubts: Argument and origin', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 49(1), p62-74;

17.   Anderson, F.D., & Hayes, M. (1967). 'Presumption and burden of proof in Whately's speech on the Jewish civil disabilities repeal bill', *Speech Monographs,* 34(2), p133-136;

18.   Leathers, D.G. (1969). 'Whately's logically derived "rhetoric": A stranger in its time', *Western Speech,* 33(1), p.48-58;

19.   McKerrow, R. E. (1976). 'Campbell and Whately on the utility of syllogistic Logic', *Western Speech Communication,* 40(1), p3-13;

20.   Sproule, J.M. (1976). 'The psychological burden of proof: On the evolutionary development of Richard Whately's theory of presumption', *Communication Monographs,* 43(2), p115-129;

21.   Whedbee, K. (1998). 'Authority, freedom, and liberal judgment: The presumptions and presumptuousness of Whately, Mill, and Tocqueville', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 84(2), p171-189;

22.   See Golden, J.L. (1952). 'Hugh Blair: Minister of St. Giles', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 38(2), p155-160;

23.   Cohen, H. (1958). 'Hugh Blair's theory of taste', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 44(3), p265-274;

24.   Bevilacqua, V.M. (1967). 'Philosophical assumptions underlying Hugh Blair's lectures on Rhetoric and Belle Lettres', *Western Speech,* 31(3), p150-171;

25.   Friedenberg, R.V. (1984). 'Rabbi Isaac Mayer Wise and American's Judaism's rhetorical indebtedness to Reverend Hugh Blair', *Religious Communication Today,* 7, p12-18;

26.   Longaker, M.G. (2008). 'The political economy of rhetorical style: Hugh Blair's response to civic-commercial dilemma', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 94(2), p179-199;

27.   Smith, C.R. (2016). 'Constructing a neo-romantic rhetorical theory', *Western Journal of Communication,* 80(2), p. 220-237;

28.   O'Rourke, S.P. (2007). 'Sentimental journey: The place and status of the emotions in Hugh Blair's rhetoric', *Advances in the History of Rhetoric: The First Six Years*. R.L. Enos & D.E. Beard (eds.) West Lafayette, IN: Parlor Press, pp. 308-325.

29.   See Pomeroy, R.S. (1962). 'Hume on the testimony for miracles', *Speech Monographs,* 29(1), p. 1-12;

30.   Bitzer, L.F. (1969). 'Hume's philosophy in George Campbell's Philosophy of Rhetoric', *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* 2(3), p139-166;

31.   Golden, J.L. (1970). 'The influence of rhetoric on the social science theories of Giambattista Vico and David Hume', *Western Speech,* 34(3), p.170-180;

32.   Bormann, D.R. (1985). 'Some "common sense" about Campbell, Hume, and Reid: The extrinsic evidence', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 71(4), p.395-421.

33.   Bryant, D.G. (1933). 'Edmund Burke on oratory', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 19(1), p1-18;

34.   Bryant, D.G. (1934). 'Edmund Burke's opinions of some orators of his day', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 20(2), p241-254;

35.   Bryant, D.G. (1956). 'Burke's present discontents: The rhetorical genesis of a party testament', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 42(2), p115-126;

36.   Snow, V.F. (1956). 'Robert C. Johnsons' appraisal of Edmund Burke's eloquence', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 42(3), p243-249;

37.   Browne, S.H. (1989). 'Burke's speech on conciliation: The pragmatic basis of rhetorical judgement', M.C. Leff and F.J. Kauffeld (eds.) Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, pp. 55-80;

38.   Lucaites, J.L. (1989). 'Burke's speech on conciliation as oppositional discourse', M.C. Leff and F.J. Kauffeld (eds.. Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, pp.81-89.

39.   See Fisher, W. R. (1984). "Narration as human communication paradigm: The case of public moral argument." *Communication Monographs*, 51, 1–22. dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637758409390180;

40.   Fisher, W. R. (1985a). "The narrative paradigm: An elaboration." *Communication Monographs*, 52, 347–367. dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637758509376117;

41.   Fisher, W. R. (1985b). "The narrative paradigm: In the beginning." *Journal of Communication*, 35, 74–89. doi: 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1985.tb02974.x;

42.   Fisher, W. R. (1988). "The narrative paradigm and the assessment of historical texts." *Argumentation and Advocacy*, 25, 49–53;

43.   Fisher, W. R. (1989). "Clarifying the narrative paradigm." *Communication Monographs*, 56, 55–58. dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637758909390249

44.   Ivie, R. L. (1982). 'The metaphor of force in prowar discourse: The case of 1812', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68, p240-253;

45.   Ivie, R. L. (1985). 'Literalizing the metaphor of Soviet savagery: President Truman's plain style', *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 51, p.91-105;

46.   Ivie, R. L. (1987). 'Metaphor and the rhetorical invention of cold war 'idealists'', *Communication Monographs,* 54, p165-182.

47.   Harrell, J. and Linkugel, W. A. (1978). 'On rhetorical genre: An organizing principle', *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 11, p262-281;

48.   Jamieson, K. H. and Campbell, K. K. (eds.) (1978). *Form and genre: Shaping rhetorical action*. Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association;

49.   Fisher, W. R. (1980). 'Genre: Concepts and applications in rhetorical criticism', *Western Journal of Communication*, 44, p288-299;

50.   Campbell, K. K. and Jamieson, K. H. (1990). *Deeds done in words: Presidential rhetoric and the genres of governance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

51.   McGee, M. C. (1975). 'In Search of 'the people': A rhetorical alternative', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 61, p235-249;

52.   McGee, M. C. (1978). ''Not men, but measures': The origins and import of an ideological principle', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 64, p141-154;

53.   McGee, M. C. (1980). 'The 'ideograph:' A link between rhetoric and ideology', *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 66, p1-16;

54.   McGee, M. C. (1984). 'Another Philippic: Notes on the ideological turn in Criticism', *Central States Speech Journal*, 35, p43-50.

55.   Bormann, E.G. (1972). 'Fantasy and rhetorical vision: The rhetorical criticism of social Reality', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 58, p396-407;

56.   Bormann, E.G. (1973). 'The Eagleton affair: A fantasy theme analysis', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 58, p143-159;

57.   Bormann, E.G. (1982). 'Fantasy and rhetorical vision: Ten years later', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 68, p.288-305;

58.   Bormann, E.G. (1983). 'The symbolic convergence theory of communication and creation, raising, and sustaining public consciousness', In J.I. Sisco (ed.) *The Jensen Lectures: Contemporary Communication Studies*, pp. 71-90;

59.   Bormann, E.G. (1985). *The force of fantasy: Restoring the American dream*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.

60.   Campbell, K.K. (1989). *Man cannot speak for her: A critical study of early feminist rhetoric.* New York: Greenwood Press;

61.   Campbell, K.K. (1993). 'Stanton's "Solitude of Self": A Rationale for Feminism', In T. W. Benson (ed.) *Landmark Essays on Rhetorical Criticism* Davis, CA: Hermagoras Press, pp. 189-199;

62.   Condit, C.M. (1997). 'In praise of eloquent diversity: Gender and rhetoric as a public persuasion', *Women's Studies in Communication,* 20, p91-116;

63.   Campbell, K.K. (2001). 'Rhetorical feminism', *Rhetoric Review,* 20, p9-12.

64.   Bitzer, L.F. (1968). 'The rhetorical situation', *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* 1, p1-14;

65.   Bitzer, L.F. (1978). 'Rhetoric and public knowledge', In D. Burks (ed.) *Rhetoric, Philosophy, and Literature: An Exploration*, pp. 67-94;

66.   Bitzer, L.F. (1980). 'Functional communication: A situational perspective', In E.E. White (ed.) *Rhetoric in Transition: Studies in the Natureand Uses of Rhetoric*, pp. 21-38;

67.   Bitzer, L.F. (1987). 'Rhetorical public communication', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* 4, p.425-428.

68.   Clinton, H. (2016, July 28). Transcript: Hillary Clinton's Speech at the Democratic Convention. *New York Times*. Retrieved November 23, 2018 from https://www.nytimes.com/2016/07/29/us/politics/hillary-clinton-dnc-transcript.html

69.   Burke, K. (1950). *A Rhetoric of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

70.   Burke, K. (1945). *A Rhetoric of Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

71.   See Arendt, H. (1998). *The Human Condition*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original Work published 1958);

72.   See Bakhtin, M.M., and Holquist, M. (1981). 'Discourse in the Novel', *The Dialogic Imagination*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 269-422;

73.   Schuster, C.I. (1985). 'Mikhail Bakhtin as rhetorical theorist', *College English,* 47(6), p.594-607;

74.   Bakhtin, M.M., Holquist, M., McGee, V., and Emerson, C. (1986). 'The Problem with Speech Genres', *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, pp. 60-102;

75.   Newcomb, H.M. (1984). On the dialogic aspects of mass communication. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* 1(1), p.34-50;

76.   Hoy, M. (1994). 'Joyful mayhem: Bakhtin, Football songs, and the carnivalesque', *Text & Performance Quarterly,* 14(4), p.289-304;

77.   Rogers, R.A. (1998). 'A dialogics of rhythm: Dance and the performance of cultural conflict', *Howard Journal of Communication,* 9(1), p.5-27.

78.   Foss, S.A., Foss, K.A., & R. Trapp. (1991). 'Michel Foucault', *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric, 2nd ed.* Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, pp. 209-239.

79.   Foss, K.A., & R. Trapp. (1991). 'Jürgen Habermas', *Contemporary   Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 2nd ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, pp. 241-272;

80.   Conley, T.M. (1990). 'Jürgen Habermas', *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. New York: Longman, pp. 299-303.

81.   Perelman, C. (1968). 'Rhetoric and philosophy', Trans. Henry W. Johnstone, Jr., *Philosophy and Rhetoric,* 1(1), p15-24;

82.   Perelman, C. (1990). *The Realm of Rhetoric*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press;

83.   Foss, S.A., Foss, K.A., & R. Trapp. (1991). 'Chaim Perelman', *Contemporary Perspectives on Rhetoric*, 2nd ed. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, pp. 119-141;

84.   Conley, T.M. (1990). 'Chaim Perelman', *Rhetoric in the European Tradition*. New York: Longman, pp. 296-299.

85.   Morris, C.E., and Sloop, J.M. (2006). ''What Lips These Have Kissed?' Refiguring the Politics of Queer Public Kissing', *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies,* 3(1): p.1-26;

86.   King, C.S. (2016). 'American queerer: Norman Rockwell and the art of queer feminist Critique', *Women's Studies in Communication,* 39(2), p.157-176;

87.   LeMaster, B. (2015). 'Discontents of being and becoming fabulous on RuPaul's Drag U: Queer criticism in neoliberal times', *Women's Studies in Communication,* 38(2), p.167-186;

88.   Hahn, D.F., and Gonchar, R.M. (1971). 'Studying social movements: A rhetorical Methodology', *Speech Teacher,* 20(1), p44-52;

89.   Miller, E.C. (2015). 'Phyllis Schlafy's 'Positive' Freedom: Liberty Liberation, and the Equal Rights Amendment', *Rhetoric & Public ffairs,*8(2): p.277-300;

90.   Blair, C., Jeppeson, M.S., and Pucci Jr, E. (1991). 'Public memorializing in postmodernity: The Vietnam Veterans Memorial as Protoype', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 77, p.263-288;

91.   Browne, S. H. (1993). 'Reading public memory in Daniel Webster's Plymouth Rock Oration', *Western Journal of Communication,* 57(4), p.464-477;

92.   Maurantonio, N. (2015). 'Material Rhetoric: Public Memory and the Post-It Note', *Southern Journal of Communication,* 80(2): p83-101;

93.   Kavoori, A.P., and Condit, C.M. (1998). 'Getting past the latest 'post': Assessing the term 'post-colonial'', *Critical Studies in Mass Communication,* 15(2), p195-203;

94.   Shome, R., and Condit, C.M. (1998). 'Caught in the term "post-colonial": Why the "post-colonial" still matters. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 15(2), p.203-212;

95.   Diaz, A.R. (2003). 'Postcolonial theory and the third wave agenda', *Women & Language,* 26(1), p.10-17;

96.   Cramer. J.M. (2003). 'White womanhood and religion: Colonial discourse in the U.S. women's missionary press, 1869-1904', *Howard Journal of Communication,* 14(4), p.209-224, doi: 10.1080/10646170390248955;

97.   Hasain, M., & Bialowas, A. (2009). 'Gendered nationalism, the colonial narrative, and the rhetorical significance of the Mother India controversy', *Communication Quarterly,* 57(40, p.489-486;

98.   Black, J.E. (2012). 'Rhetorical Circulation, Native Authenticity, and Neocolonial Decay: The Case of Chief Seattle's Controversial Elegy', *Rhetoric & Public Affairs,* 15 (4), p.635-646.

99.   Stanton, J.L., and Lowenhar, J.A. (1977). Perceptual mapping of consumer products and television shows. *Journal of Advertising,* 6(20, p16-22;

100.   Meyerowitz, B.E., and Chaiken, S. (1987). 'The effect of message framing on breast self-examination attitudes, intentions, and Behaviors', *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology,* 52(3), p500-510;

101. Cherwitz, R.A., and Darwin, R.A. (1994). 'Beyond reductionism in rhetorical theories of meaning', *Philosophy & Rhetoric,* 27(4), p. 313-329;

102. Jasperson, A.E., Shah, D., Watts, M., Faber, R., and Fan, D.P. 'Framing and the public agenda: Media effects on the importance of the federal budget deficit', *Political Communication,* 15(2), p.205-224;

103. Sounders, M.C., and Dillard, K.N. (2014). 'Framing connections: An essay on improving the relationship between rhetorical and social scientific frames, including a study of G. W. Bush's framing of immigration', *International Journal of Communication,* 8, p.1008-1028.

104. See Fulkerson, R.P. (1979). 'The public letter as rhetorical form: Structure, logic, and style in King's 'Letter from Birmingham Jail'', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 65, p121-136;

105. Benson, T.W. (1980). 'The rhetorical structure of Frederick Wiseman's *High School*', *Communication Monographs,* 47, p233-261; Campbell, K.K. (1980). 'Stanton's "Solitude of Self": A rationale for feminism', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 66, p304-312;

106. Leff, M. (1986). 'Textual criticism: The legacy of G.P. Mohrmann', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 72, p377-389;

107. Slagell, A. R. (1991). 'Anatomy of a masterpiece: A close textual analysis of Abraham Lincoln's second inaugural address', *Communication Studies*, 42, p155-171;

108. Black, E. (1994). 'Gettysburg and silence', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 80, 21-36;

109. Browne, S.H. (1996). 'Encountering Angelina Grimke: Violence, identity, and the creation of radical Community', *Quarterly Journal of Speech,* 82, p55-73.

110. Browne, S.H. (2016). 'Close textual analysis: Approaches and applications', In J.A. Kuypers (ed.) *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*, 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 91-104.

111. Masterson, L. (1985). *Teaching the Media*. New York: Routledge.

112. Bischof, K. (2018). 'Australian postwar democratic consensus and ant-Semitism: Rhetorical strategies, exclusionary patterns and constructions of the "demos" in parliamentary debates', *Journal of Language & Politics*, 17(5), p.676-695.

113. Kayam, O. (2018). 'Donald Trump's rhetoric', *Language & Dialogue,* 8(2), p183-208.

114. Pal, J., et.al., (2017). 'Innuendo as outreach: @narendramodi and the use of political irony on Twitter', *International Journal of Communication,* 11, p4197-4218.

115. Kuypers, J.A. 2016). 'An eclectic approach to criticism', In J.A. Kuypers (ed.) *Rhetorical Criticism: Perspectives in Action*, 2nd ed., Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 239-252.

116. Memorandum for Ron Ziegler from J. Bruce Whelihan. May 3, 1972. [Soviet Summit, May 1972] III, U.S.S.R. Plans/Memoranda. Ronald Ziegler. Box 39. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA.

117. Nixon, *Public Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, 1972*, 632.

118. Shabad, T. (1972). 'Nixon talks on TV to Soviet people and hails accord', *New York Times*, May 29, pp. 1.

119. Greer, W. L. (1997). *The 1972 mining of Haiphong Harbor: A case study in naval mining and diplomacy*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Defense Analyses. Haldeman, 458.

120. Minielli, M. C. and Hazen, M. D. (2013). 'Richard M. Nixon's cold war rhetoric, crisis definitions, and the hidden motive of the 1972 presidential election', *Topical Problems of Communication and Culture,* 15, p.58-77.

121. Soviet Objectives at the Summit. n.d. [Soviet Summit, May 1972]. Soviet Views of Objectives. Ronald Ziegler. Box 36. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA.

122. China. n.d. Visit of Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, May 1972, [1 of 4].

123. Ronald Ziegler. Box 36. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA; Southeast Asia. n.d. Visit of Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, May 1972, [1 of 4].

124. Ronald Ziegler. Box 36. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA; Briefing Book. Visit of Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, May 1972, [1 of 4].

125. Memorandum for H. R. Haldeman. May 18, 1972. Memos – May 1972. Box 4. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA.

126. Safire, W. (1998). *Before the fall: An inside view of the pre-Watergate White House*. New York: Da Capo Press. Price, 107; see also Nixon, R. N. (1978). *RN: The memoirs of Richard Nixon*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 617; Haldeman, 466-477.

127. Minielli, M.C. (2015). 'The role of 'ethos' in presidential argument by definition', Proceedings of the 8th Conference on Argumentation of the International Society of the Study of Argumentation, Amsterdam, NL. Also available online at http://rozenbergquarterly.com/issa-proceedings-2014-the-role-of-ethos-in-presidential-argument-by-definition/

128. Nixon, *Public Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, 1972*, p.629-630.

129. Hall Jamieson, K. (1996). *Packaging the Presidency*. London: Oxford University Press. Memorandum for Bob Haldeman from the President, August 14, 1972, Box 4, Memos – August 1972; White House Special Files: Staff Member and Office Files: President's Personal Files; Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum, Yorba Linda, CA.

130. Nixon, R. N. (1972). Remarks on accepting the presidential nomination of the Republican National Convention. *Public Papers of the Presidents: Richard Nixon, 1972*. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office, pp. 787-795.

131. Rzpecka, M. (2008). 'Nixon's rhetorical confrontation with communism', In L. Dam, L. Holmgreen & J. Strunk (eds.) *Rhetorical Aspects of Discourses in Present-Day Society*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Printing, pp. 49-61.

132. The Moscow Summit – Themes for Public Statements. April 19, 1972. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8]. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 8. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon's Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. "The Moscow Summit – Themes for Public Statements." Moscow TV Address. May 19, 1972. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8]. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 8. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. "The Moscow Summit – Themes for Public Statements." "Moscow TV Address." Draft communiqué. Department of State briefing paper. n.d. Visit of Richard Nixon, President of the United States, to the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, May 1972, [1 of 4].

133. Ronald Ziegler. Box 36. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. Nixon, 631. Memorandum for the President from Bill Safire. May 17, 1972. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8].

134. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 8. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. Moscow Summit – A. n.d. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8].

135. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 8. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. Moscow Summit – B. n.d. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8].

136. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 8. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. 67. Arms control agreements. n.d. Moscow Summit – A. n.d. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8]. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 8. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers;

137. Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA. 68. Moscow Summit – C. n.d. Russian Trip 1974 – Background. [1 of 8]. Raymond Price Speech File. Box 105. Folder 9. President's Personal File. Staff Members and Office Files. White House Special Files; Richard M. Nixon Papers; Richard M. Nixon Library, Yorba Linda, CA.