



A Study on How Presidential Rhetoric Reflects the Drastic Change of Course of the Democrats and Republicans

Aklilu Haile

First supervisor: Professor Tony Foster

Second supervisor: Professor Lettie Dorst

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	2
The History of The Democratic Party.....	3
The History of The Republican Party	8
The Science of Rhetoric	13
The Canons of Rhetoric	15
Methodology.....	22
The Speeches on Role of Government.....	23
Andrew Jackson on January 6, 1828.....	23
Franklin D. Roosevelt Inaugural Address on March 4, 1933.....	26
Theodore Roosevelt on August 22, 1902	29
Ronald Reagan’s Inaugural Address on January 20, 1981.....	32
The Speeches on Segregation	35
Andrew Jackson’s Speech to the Congress on December 6, 1830.....	35
John F. Kennedy’s Civil Rights Address on June 11, 1963	37
Abraham Lincoln’s Cooper Union Address on February 27, 1860	40
Donald Trump’s Presidential Announcement Speech on June 16, 2015	42
Discussion Results of Role of Government	46
Discussion Results of Segregation.....	48
Conclusion	50
Works Cited	51

Introduction

This thesis deals with the change of course of the Democratic and Republican Party in the United States through the past two centuries. Both the Democratic and Republican Party have had presidents in the past who seemed to have viewpoints concerning key party notions which differ greatly from the viewpoints presented by the presidents of both parties in modern times. This study will demonstrate this change of course through the analysis of speeches by presidents of both parties in past and present. For the purpose of keeping the thesis brief, I have chosen to focus on only two key party notions during this analysis: the role of the government and segregation. Through this analysis, I will show how the changes in Democratic and Republican ideology are reflected in speeches of prominent representatives of these parties.

This study consists of three main chapters. The first chapter gives a brief overview of the history of the Democratic party and an overview of the history of the Republican party. Through these overviews it will become clear that both parties have changed course through time. Then in the second chapter I have laid out the context for understanding the analysis of speeches later on in terms of the science of rhetoric. In this chapter I have provided a brief overview of the science of rhetoric and key notions within this field. This overview will act as a framework for my analysis of the speeches. The third and final chapter analyses four speeches by Democratic presidents and four speeches by Republican presidents; in these speeches, the presidents use several rhetorical tools to convince their audience of certain key notions. In discussion of the results found in the speeches, I will indicate how these persuasive appeals show the dramatic change of course in both the Democratic and Republican Party. Finally, I will briefly conclude this paper. A paper which shows how presidential rhetoric reflects the drastic change of course of the Democratic and Republican party.

The History of The Democratic Party

Today's Democratic Party is considered a party in which government plays an important role in society; the government should fight against economic inequality. Kendra King describes the Democratic Party as being "rooted in a longstanding belief in government intervention and involvement in the economic and social well-being of its citizens" (114). Furthermore, the Democratic Party is the first and only party that has ever had a black president. However, the party used to be very different. The Democratic Party was once a party of white supremacy; supporting slavery and the Ku Klux Klan. Moreover, the party used to promote limited government and the notion of more power to the people. To understand the huge shift the party has made in terms of their racial policies as well as their government policies we need to go back to the nineteenth century.

Role of government

In the 1828 presidential election, the popular former general Andrew Jackson took part on behalf of the Democratic Party and won in a landslide victory. Jackson challenged the political establishment and elite of his day. He believed that "to eliminate privilege from society political leaders must strictly limit the role of the national government" (Milkis and Nelson 122).

As the twentieth century began, the country had been going through major changes: the population doubled between 1870 and 1900, and urbanization and immigration "increased at extraordinary rates" (Milkis and Nelson 208). Moreover, there was a shift in business activity "from local, small-scale manufacturing and commerce to large-scale factory production and mammoth national corporations" (Milkis and Nelson 208). These developments caused an unprecedented economic growth; this aroused the fear that the growing corporate influence might demolish "the equal opportunity of individuals to climb the economic ladder" (Milkis and

Nelson 208). As a reaction to this, reformers began pushing an agenda of progressivism, promoting the idea that the government should play an active role in big businesses and strive to improve the lives of the ordinary people. The Democrat Woodrow Wilson won the presidency in 1912 and put much of this agenda in to action over Republican resistance.

The great depression of 1930 sealed this new identity of the Democratic Party as the party of government intervention. In an effort to combat the Great Depression, president Franklin Roosevelt signed a program of reform; calling it the New Deal. This program contained the expansion of the power of the federal government. Furthermore, their power was “deployed in a sustained and concerted fashion to address dramatic failures of the market economy” (Smith 2). As FDR stated, “the day of enlightened administration has come” (Heale 80). In the coming years, several acts were enacted such as the Emergency Banking Act of 1933, the National Labor Relations Act of 1935 and the Social Security Act of 1935. Although FDR’s administration greatly expanded the size of government in the process of the New Deal; the party remained split over race.

In the sixties, the Lyndon Johnson presidency marked an important role of the national government in domestic affairs. In his speech at the University of Michigan in 1964, he proclaimed that the nation should “move not only toward the rich society and the powerful society, but upward to the Great Society” (Patterson 562). This Great Society has been described as “a vision of an America in which there was no poverty, squalor, ignorance, fear or hatred, and where the quality of life opened the door for all Americans to fulfil their human potential” (Davies and McKeever 54).

Both Clinton and Obama seemed to have adopted the same approach as FDR in terms of their degree of involvement. Among the policies which show this active role of the government

during Clinton's first presidency was the raise of taxes in 1993. Later on, during his second presidency, he extended tax credits "for renewable energy production to encourage development" (Lindstrom 75). Obama pursued the same course: this can be seen in his tax plans which "includes an \$80 billion tax cut for poor and middle-class families and repeal the tax cuts for the richest one percent of taxpayers" (Paddock 81).

Segregation

One year after his first inauguration, Jackson's administration began expelling native Americans living east of the Mississippi river. This Indian Removal Act was passed by the Congress on May 28, 1830. Five large Indian tribes were forcedly marched in to territories and camps further west. These series of forced removals of Native Americans became known as the Trail of Tears. The ambitions of the Democrats did not stop there. In the 1840s the party adopted the doctrine of manifest destiny; the doctrine advocated the idea that white Americans were divinely entitled to the whole north American continent. It was Democratic president James K. Polk who put this idea in to action. Soon afterwards, there was political controversy over whether new states entering the union should be permitted to allow slavery. The southern slave holding states were a Democratic stronghold and therefore the Democrats voted in favor. The Republicans, however, opposed the expansion of slavery any further. When Republican candidate Lincoln won the presidency in 1860, several Democratic slave holding states protested and formed the Confederacy; this eventually lead to the civil war.

After the civil war, the Republican Party and their Reconstruction was extremely unpopular among white southerners who wanted to maintain supremacy over former slaves. By passing laws which became known as the Black Codes, Democratic southerners tried to block the Reconstruction. Dinesh D'Souza claims that "the Democrats started numerous terror groups,

but the most notorious of these was the Ku Klux Klan” (107). The KKK was initially led by former Confederate army officer Nathan Bedford Forrest, who, according to D’Souza, “served two years later as a Democratic delegate to the party’s 1868 national convention” (107). At the end of the 19th century, the Democratic Party was effectively the only political party in the South, supported by physical intimidation and suppression of black voters.

The first Democratic president in the twentieth century, Woodrow Wilson, was known for his racial attitudes and policies. Professor William Keylor explains how Wilson opposed policies of racial integration in the federal civil service by authorizing members of his cabinet to reverse these policies. One of these member was his son-in-law, Secretary of the Treasury William McAdoo of Tennessee, who “re-segregated facilities such as restrooms and cafeterias in their buildings” (Keylor). Furthermore, screens were set up in federal offices “to separate white and black workers” (Keylor). When a delegation of black professionals opposed these new policies, Wilson declared that “segregation is not a humiliation but a benefit, and ought to be so regarded by you gentlemen” (De Leon 33). Despite his racial attitude and policies, Woodrow Wilson did pave the way for the Democrats’ new identity as a party of government activism.

By the mid twentieth century, the Democratic Party contained southerners who supported segregation on one side and liberal reformers trying to end it on the other side. The progressive reformers seemed to had gained the upper hand in 1964, when the Senate voted on the anti-segregation Civil Rights Act. The Democrats in the south voted against the civil rights act, remaining staunch opponents of segregation. In the 1960s, black voters would begin overwhelmingly supporting the Democratic Party from then on. Meanwhile, white southerners moved away from the Democratic Party. Democrats went from dominating the south to losing almost all influence in the region. Because of this drop in popularity among white voters, the

Democrats started losing elections. Demographically, however, the US increasingly became a non-white country, and partly through minority voters the Democrats made a comeback. These demographic shifts helped the Democrats, once the advocates of white supremacy and slavery, to elect Barack Obama in 2008. During his presidency, the first black president has pushed anti-segregation policies and staunchly supported government intervention; this shows how much the party has changed in the past 200 years.

The History of The Republican Party

Today's Republican Party is culturally conservative, it opposes big government and its support is strongest among white voters and in the south. Kenneth Hill explains that the Republican Party advocates principles such as "limited government, fiscal conservatism, low taxes and a strong national defense" (172). Furthermore, the party's president in 2017 has been heavily criticized for inciting racial tensions. Like the Democratic Party, in the past 200 years the GOP has gone through a remarkable transformation in terms of their racial policies as well as their government policies: it changed from being the party of Abraham Lincoln to the party of Donald Trump.

Role of government

The first Republican president in history, Abraham Lincoln, favored a strong federal government. According to Donald Phillips, during his presidency Lincoln "did indeed preside over the largest expansion of federal power in American history (up to that point in time)" (154). Lincoln initiated the national banking system and stated that this would furnish to the people "a currency as safe as their own government" (Karpie 176). Moreover, Lincoln promoted economic development and growth by constructing a transcontinental railroad and telegraph with federal subsidies. Lincoln's expansion of the federal government "helped finance the Civil War, reduce the national debt, strengthen the economy and set the stage for future development" (Phillips 154).

On September 6, 1901, president William McKinley was shot during a Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo, New York. Vice president Theodore Roosevelt becomes president. Roosevelt was also a progressive reformer, responding to the major changes that affected the country. However, "TR was no enemy to business or party interests" (Milkis and Nelson 210). Rather, Roosevelt "accepted the new industrial order, wanting only to curb its worst excess

through government regulation” (Milkis and Nelson 210). Like other progressive reformers, TR seemed to advocate more government activism. In 1913, Roosevelt seems to anticipate the welfare state that later would be associated with his cousin’s New Deal. TR wrote, “within the range of fair play and a just administration of the law, must inevitably sympathize with the men who have nothing but their wages, with the men who are struggling for a decent life, as opposed to men, however honorable, who are merely fighting for larger profits and autocratic control of big business” (Roosevelt 113) His Republican successor William Taft seemed to follow the same road when he signed the bill into law that created the U.S. Department of Labor. Moreover, Taft stated that “a government is for the benefit of all the people” (Schaeffer 104).

In the 1920s, the Republican Party had become essentially the party of big business and limited government. Milkis en Nelson explain that the Harding-College economic program had “its emphasis on unregulated domestic markets and protection from foreign competition (268). However, due to economic crashes and the Great Depression, FDR and other Democrats were later on swept into power. The Democrats began to dramatically expand the size and role of the government. Republicans opposed this quick expansion; defining themselves as opposition to big government.

In the second half of the century, the Republicans seem to seal their new identity when they select Ronald Reagan for presidency. Reagan promises to fight for business interests, lower taxes and traditional family values. He is clearly an opponent of government interference. In his inaugural address he states, “in this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem: government is the problem” (Harris and Bailey 142) Reagan’s desire for less government activism was evident. Milkis and Nelson explain that “Reagan’s rhetoric challenged the fundamental principles of the New Deal” (367) and that his emphasis on presidential politics was

“a logical response to the New Deal and its consolidation of the modern presidency” (379). Reagan’s vice president George Bush did not deviate from his predecessor when he became president in 1981. According to Milkis and Nelson, “in his 1988 presidential campaign, Bush had portrayed himself as the true heir to Reagan in domestic policy” (390). Likewise, his son generally treads the same conservative path when he becomes president in 2001. The future will show to what extent Trump will adhere to this conservative notion.

Segregation

The Republican Party came into existence in 1854, seven years before the civil war. At that point, there were two main parties: the Democrats and the Whigs. America was rapidly expanding westward; this led to the abovementioned debate on whether new states entering the union such as Kansas and Nebraska should be permitted to allow slavery. The Whigs were divided on the issue; eventually they could not agree and the party ended up collapsing. The former Whigs in the North formed a new party that would fight against the expansion of slavery: the Republican Party.

By 1860, the Republican Party has become increasingly powerful in the North. In that year Abraham Lincoln wins the presidency. Even though Lincoln was no abolitionist, he “believed that the extension of slavery into the western territories should not be permitted” (Milkis and Nelson 154). Therefore Lincoln and his party were still too anti-slavery for the south to tolerate; Lincoln’s words “fell on deaf southern ears” (Milkis and Nelson 157) and eleven southern states seceded from the union, forming the Confederate States of America. The northern states decided to fight to keep the union together; this led to the civil war. The civil war resulted in a northern victory and the abolition of slavery nationwide. After the war, Republicans fought to ensure that recently freed slaves have their rights in the south. One year after Lincoln’s

assassination, the party passes the Civil Rights Act of 1866; making sure that black men have the same right to vote with new laws and constitutional amendments.

In the first half of the twentieth century, the Republicans seemed to have maintained this identity when president Harding and Coolidge supported the Dyer Anti-Lynching Bill. Furthermore, Coolidge urged his cabinet secretaries to give black employees a fair chance: he says that, “to me it seems a terrible thing for persons of intelligence, of education, of real character—as we know many colored people are—to be deprived of a chance to work because they happen to be born with a different colored skin. I think you ought to find a way to give them an even chance” (Sobel 320).

In the fifties and sixties, race and the south were at the forefront of national politics, with the civil right movement attempting to end segregation. Then, in 1964 Democratic president Lyndon Johnson signs the Civil Rights Act into law. Consequently, black voters converted almost entirely to their new advocates: the Democrats. The white voters in the south that had been staunch Democrats resent the new developments. Over the next decades, white voters in the south switch to the GOP. The new white voters can identify themselves with the conservative presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush.

In the twenty-first century, America is going through a major demographic shift in the form of Hispanic immigration. Democrats support reforming immigration laws, while the Republicans remain tough on immigration policies. According to John Jackson, “the Republican swing to the hard right was exacerbated by Mitt Romney’s campaign in 2012” (77). This ended up costing the Republicans, and in 2012 Mick Romney lost his bid for the presidency with only 27 percent of the Hispanic vote in the general election 2012 (Stanley and Niemi 116). The GOP seems to be a party for white voters in an increasingly non-white country. During these

demographic trends, Republican leaders became strongly aware of the importance of Hispanic voters. In 2013, key Republicans in the Senate collaborated with Democrats on an immigration reform bill that would give unauthorized immigrants a route to US citizenship. This elicited “a fierce backlash from the base of the party” (Tichenor 266). The immigration reform bill exacerbated the mistrust of GOP voters in their own party leaders. These developments made the political landscape of 2015 fertile ground for a figure like Donald Trump: an outsider business man who wants to build a wall on the border of Mexico. Even though he was loathed by party leaders, Trump won enough support in the primaries to become the GOP nominee for president. In November 2016, Donald Trump won the presidency thanks in part to massive support from the south after a campaign marked by racist rhetoric; showing how much the Republican Party has changed since Abraham Lincoln.

The Science of Rhetoric

Rhetoric is a universal and timeless tool used to persuade or convince someone. Aristotle claims that “the use of rational speech is more distinctive of a human being than the use of his limbs” (6). Rhetoric and persuasion cover a wide range of different fields: children who desperately want something use persuasion. Jehovah witnesses in their door-to-door ministry use persuasion. A boxing trainer uses persuasion. According to O’Keefe, persuasion is “a successful intentional effort at influencing another’s mental state through communication in a circumstance in which the persuadee has some measure of freedom” (5). Different methods and techniques are employed to make this intentional effort successful. I will briefly mention a few methods and techniques which are relevant to this study.

Two Routes of Persuasion

The intentional effort previously mentioned can be successful through two different routes: the central route and the peripheral route. O’ Keefe explains that “the central route to persuasion represents the persuasion processes involved when elaboration is relatively high” (139). The degree of elaboration can be measured through the elaboration likelihood model by Petty, Cacioppo et al. This model illustrates the importance of the degree of elaboration in deciding the type of persuasion. O’Keefe explains how the target audience will “attend closely to a presented message” and “carefully scrutinize the arguments it contains” (138). It is therefore important for the persuader to ascertain the degree of elaboration. The central route involves thoughtful consideration by the audience of the content presented. It is thus important for the persuader to present strong arguments.

By contrast, the peripheral route involves a low degree of elaboration. Other cognitive shortcuts are employed to make the intentional effort successful. Heuristics are applied in the

peripheral route. According to Novak and Gowin, an heuristic is “something employed as an aid to solving a problem or understanding a procedure“ (55). In the peripheral route, heuristics entail methods and techniques which help the target to evaluate the viewpoints of the orator. O’ Keefe explains that persuasion is achieved after “the receiver employs some simple decision rule (some heuristic principle) to evaluate the advocated position” (139). These heuristics are activated through peripheral cues. These cues involve “extrinsic features of the communication situation such as the characteristics of the communicator” (O’Keefe 148). There are a number of heuristics: among them is the credibility heuristic. The credibility heuristic entails that the viewpoints of the persuader will be accepted by the audience due to the credibility of the persuader, without careful consideration of the content of the message. Another heuristic is the outer appearance of the persuader: “What you look like will be a major part of your total message” (Turk 150). There are more examples of the peripheral route mentioned in the sections below on ‘ethos’ and ‘pathos’. After the degree of elaboration is measured, the orator will construct a persuasive appeal; at that stage, the canons of rhetoric will be vital.

The Canons of Rhetoric

The art of rhetoric embodies five basic parts. These parts are known as ‘the five canons of rhetoric’. According to Cicero, rhetoric “is divided into five “parts”: Invention, Arrangement, Style, Memory and Delivery” (Murphy 42). Quintilian states that this division is what “the most and greatest writers have taught” (qtd. in Leith 43). The division is a framework that shows how any persuasive appeal is structured. It provides guidelines, structure and an outline which will help to fulfil the objective of the persuasive appeal. I will briefly go through these different parts.

Invention

Despite its name, this part does not refer to creating content. It is about preparing a persuasive appeal whilst bearing in mind the different factors which could influence the outcome of the argument. Cicero explains that “invention is the devising of matter, true or plausible, that would make the case convincing” (7). Invention is therefore more than only the arguments of the case. Invention is also about presenting the case and bearing mind other external factors which will result in a successful outcome. Aristotle has divided invention into three different appeals: ethos, logos and pathos.

Appeal to Ethos

Ethos represents the portrayal of character. According to Shabo, in an appeal to ethos “the speaker emphasizes the strength of his or her own moral character and experience in order to establish personal credibility” (8). The way the persuader is presented is crucial in convincing the audience of the bona fide of the speaker and creating a connection. Aristotle stated that “we believe good men more fully and more readily than others” (7). In an ethical appeal, the persuader convinces the audience of his credibility, character and competence. Mortensen argues that scientific research has shown the power of ethos. He explains that “a study by Hovland and

Weiss gave students messages that were identical in all respects except for their source. High-credibility sources yielded large opinion changes in the students while low-credibility sources produced small opinion changes” (10). In his argument against legalized abortion, presidential candidate Ron Paul gives a clear example of an ethical appeal: “As an O.B. doctor of thirty years, and having delivered 4000 babies, I can assure you life begins at conception” (Shabo 10). Paul prefaces his arguments by emphasizing the fact he is an obstetrician who has delivered 4000 babies. The audience has to be made amenable: among the strategies that help make the audience amenable is giving them the feeling they share the same viewpoints and interests. This is closely connect to commonplaces: a commonplace is a shared assumption by a group of people. Heinrichs defines a commonplace as being “a viewpoint your audience holds in common” (107). As Leith argues, “any form of reasoning has to start from a set of premises, and in rhetoric those premises are very often commonplaces” (64-65). It is important for the speaker to address commonplaces in order to enhance his or her ethos: “Rhetoric is about connecting with an audience, which means finding shared assumptions” (Leith 95). Commonplaces range from political beliefs to rules of thumb. An example of a commonplace is religion. Once this ethos has been established, the foundation has been built for the rest of the persuasive appeal. So the persuader creates by way of ethos a ground on which the arguments stand.

Appeal to Logos

The appeal to logos is the logical appeal in which the main focus is argumentation and reason. The logos of the speakers consists of rational arguments. Shabo argues that “the logical mode is the most essential – it is the base upon which the other appeals must rest” (17). The audience is influenced by way of arguments which seem rational. An argument is defined as a “a set of propositions, or statements, that are designed to convince a reader or listener of a

conclusion and that contain at least one reason (premise) for accepting that conclusion” (Dwyer 383). However, an argument may be perceived as irrational; Leith claims that a proof in rhetoric differs from a mathematical proof: “Anywhere outside pure maths, we’re in the territory of inductive reasoning” (59). Rhetorical reasoning takes place through different routes. Steinberg has listed a few types of reasoning that are often employed by persuaders. One of them is “reasoning from cause to effect” (34). Steinberg explains that this type of reasoning is employed when “the reasoner infers that when A occurs, B will most probably follow” (34). So the link between the cause and the effect is highlighted. Freeley and Steinberg illustrate this with the following example; “Students may go to college because they see a college education as a cause that they hope will produce a desirable effects in later life” (79). This type of reasoning can also be turned around: in reasoning from effect to cause “the reasoner observes a known effect and tries to determine the cause” (34). Steinberg also mentions “[r]easoning from example” (34). In this type the speaker moves “from one or more specific cases to a generalization” (34). The persuader tries to convince the people through examples. The persuader, however, must be wary of avoiding logical fallacies. A logical fallacy is a flaw in reasoning which occurs “when an argument contains a mistake that makes it invalid (for a deductive argument) or weak (for an inductive argument)” (Shabo 57). There are two main fallacies: *cum hoc, ergo propter hoc* and *post hoc, ergo propter hoc*. In the first fallacy the misapprehension is made that “because an event statistically occurs in conjunction with some other event, one of those events occurs because of the other” (Hall 40). The second fallacy is the assumption that “a particular event, B, is caused by another event, A, simply because B follows A in time” (Damer 180). Both fallacies seem to be arguments, but they are in fact errors in reasoning. As long as these fallacies are avoided, the persuader can successfully employ an appeal to logos.

Appeal to Pathos

Pathos is the appeal to the audience's feelings. It is a rhetorical tool which is often used "to incite the audience to take a specific course of action, from donating to a charitable cause to initiating a war" (Shabo 13). An appeal to pathos might be employed through provocative language or imagery and focuses on influencing a wide range of emotions such as anger, sadness and humour. The following excerpt from an open letter by Martin Luther King Jr. in which he fights to put an end to segregation is a clear and straightforward example of an appeal to pathos: "Perhaps it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say, 'Wait.' But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick and even kill your black brothers and sisters" until his words "... when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of 'nobodiness' – then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait" (Jasinski 303). This excerpt shows an effective use of an appeal to pathos. By extensively describing painful situations, King is able to stir his audience into action. Emotions such as guilt and fear can also be used as rhetorical techniques. Morris argues that "negative emotions such as guilt or fear can serve as a guide for future action if they are coupled with a thoughtful examination of the conditions of our actions" (137). All these appeals to emotions are part of the peripheral route to persuasion. According to Verderber et al., the peripheral route relies partly on "a gut check about what we feel about the message" (263).

Arrangement

In order to ensure a successful persuasive effort, the persuasive appeal needs to be well structured. Howells argues that the audience will not be persuaded "if the structure of your presentation is illogical and hard to follow" (11). In *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero provides

with a general outline for a speech. He sums up the six parts of a discourse: “Introduction, Statement of Facts, Division, Proof, Refutation and Conclusion” (8). I shall briefly elaborate on these six parts.

The speech begins with the introduction. The introduction is crucial and will lay the foundation for the rest of the discourse. In this introduction, the orator informs the audience of the subject and he renders the people tractable. Cicero explains that in this part “the hearer’s mind is prepared for attention” (8). In the introduction commonplaces will be mentioned and an appeal to ethos and pathos will be employed.

After the introduction, the persuasive will provide with the statement of facts. The intent behind this statement of facts is informing the audience of important events that occurred preceding the speech. The target audience is persuaded into believing “that the speaker’s version and interpretation of events are credible” (MacBride 108). The persuader will frame the situation to his advantage. Entman describes framing as “select[ing] some aspects of a perceived reality and mak[ing] them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation” (52). This framing is crucial for the persuader. Leith claims “framing the terms of the debate is half the battle won” (88).

The third part is the division. In this division, the orator will present the agreements and disagreements between both parties. According to MacBride, this overview will help to provide “clarity and thus memorability to the speech” (115).

This is followed by ‘Proof’: here the arguments which support the orator’s viewpoints will be set out. According to Cicero, it involves “the presentation of our arguments, together with their corroboration” (8). Refer back to the section on ‘logos’ for more on ‘proof’.

After these supporting arguments, the “destruction of our adversaries’ arguments” (Cicero 8-9) will occur in the ‘Refutation’. The opponents can be refuted through different methods and techniques. Long explains that the orator could “attack the opponents by generally painting a bleak portrait of them politically and ethically” (Long 89). Furthermore, he could also “anticipate any opposition to one’s own arguments” or “answer related criticism or personal attacks” (Long 89).

The final stage is the conclusion. In the conclusion, facts and arguments might be mentioned again. Furthermore, the orator might make a final appeal to ethos and pathos.

Style

The intent behind style is the sort of language used in the persuasive appeal. The persuader may apply different rhetorical tools when presenting the content. There are different methods and techniques which help a persuader to produce a rhetorically effective style. Metaphors, for example, may help the persuader in boosting the content. Other rhetorical tools may also include the use of anaphora’s. An anaphora is the “repetition of the same word or group of words at the beginning of successive clauses” (Murphy 65). This is, for example, demonstrated by Churchill when he stated that “we shall fight on the beaches, we shall fight on the landing grounds, we shall fight in the fields and in the streets, we shall fight in the hills” (Abbott 180).

Memory

This canon may be part of the appeal to ethos. The audience is impressed when the persuader is able to speak from memory. There are two reasons why speaking from memory will help increase the ethos. Firstly, if the speaker seems dependent upon notes, this might diminish the authority and credibility of the persuader. Moreover, a dependence upon notes might make it

difficult for the persuader to reach the *sprezzatura* which could be vital during the persuasive appeal. This *sprezzatura* is described as a “quality of life and spontaneity in a speech” (Leith 144). It makes the orator more dynamic. In this way, the speech will be more convincing and more memorable.

Delivery

Delivery is concerned with the presentation of the speech. According to Leith, delivery is “traditionally subdivided into control of the voice and control of physical gesture” (174). The mentioning of physical gesture may suggest that persuasion does not only occur through spoken language: non-verbal features are also vital. In his *Effective Speaking: Communicating in Speech*, Christopher Turk describes these non-verbal features as “all the hints, indications, and suggestions we communicate not by what we say, but by what we do” (145). The target audience will judge the persuader through different non-verbal features. Among these features is the appearance of the persuader. According to Turk, immediately after seeing the orator the audience “start the process of assessment” (149). It is therefore of crucial importance for the speaker to give much importance to his or her appearance. Turk claims the appearance “underlines the credibility of the message” (151).

Methodology

As explained earlier, both the Republican and Democratic Party have drastically changed their course in terms of their government intervention policies and their segregation policies. I have looked at different speeches of Republican and Democratic presidents in different time periods in order to highlight this change of course. For this study, I have analysed eight speeches by eight presidents: four speeches by four Democratic presidents and four speeches by four Republican presidents. These four speeches were divided in two speeches for each topic. So there are two speeches by Democratic presidents on the role of government and two speeches on segregation. I did the same for the Republican presidents. I have chosen speeches from different time periods; in this way, I was able to discern the big differences in the policies. For the role of government, I have chosen for speeches by Andrew Jackson and Theodore Roosevelt as the first speeches and speeches by Franklin D. Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan as the second speeches. For segregation, I have chosen for speeches by again Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln for the first speeches and speeches by John F. Kennedy and Donald Trump as the second speeches.

In my analysis, I have focused on several rhetorical tools and techniques. Firstly, I focused on the persuader's use of ethos, pathos and logos. Then I focused briefly on the arrangement of the speeches and how that might have helped them in persuading the target audience. Since the study cannot be bigger than 17.000 words, I have chosen to only focus on the Invention and the Arrangement of the speeches. Furthermore, not every speech has been recorded so it is therefore impossible to draw comparisons between all speeches. I have first given the results of all speeches. Then I concluded my analysis with a discussion on the results.

The Speeches on Role of Government

Andrew Jackson on January 6, 1828

Invention

There are different moments during Jackson's speech in which he tries to convince the target audience through appeals to ethos. In the beginning of his speech, he stresses that he was actually the people's first choice in the previous elections. However, his rival president Adams was the culprit who deprived the people from their first choice. Jackson states that "as you all know, three years ago I won the popular vote for President, but was denied the office because of a "corrupt bargain" between the dishonorable Henry Clay and President Adams" (database University of California, see works cited). Jackson argues that "the people's choice was disregarded by the elite in power". However, Jackson promises that he will "take back the people's power to choose their own leaders." Through this preface, Jackson is able to portray himself as a competent president. Later on in his speech, Jackson does another appeal to ethos when he mentions his military achievements. Jackson claims that "one of the most important qualifications a President should have is a military background." Even though his opponent president Adams dismisses him as a 'military chieftain'; Jackson quickly shows him wrong by reminding the people that "I have fought two wars for this country, and I am proud of it." After claiming that military background is crucial, he stresses that "I think we were invaded by the British only 15 years ago" and "that enemy is still in the Canadas agitating Indians to attack us, and waiting for another chance to invade." He also mentions the threatening danger of Spanish forces and the Indians. By emphasizing that "we have foreign enemies at our every border", Jackson shows the people why it is crucial for a president to have a military background. Jackson

has a military background. Jackson is a competent president. According to Jackson, “these foreign threats are many and dire, and we need a President who has the experience to defend our nation against them.” Towards the end of his speech, Jackson tries to portray himself as one of the people. This appeal to ethos is illustrated when he remarks that “I trust the common people of this nation, because I am one of the common people.” Jackson stresses how “I am not yet another wealthy land owner from Virginia, nor am I an aristocratic lawyer from Massachusetts. I am a just an old Indian fighter from Tennessee.” He uses this portrayal of himself to convince the people to vote for him; Jackson concludes with stating that “I believe “we the people” who have sacrificed the most for this great nation have earned the right to govern it. But I need your help to make this happen.” He also makes an appeal to pathos when he scares the people by claiming that “already, the new states are entering the union with few restrictions on the vote. This has caused many the old states to change their ways as well.” However, Jackson believes the solution to this problem is simple. He urges the people “ to go to the polls on Election Day. With this election we can finally take back power from the old aristocracy.”

Arrangement

Jackson begins his speech by reminding the audience that they are facing “a very important choice” and that they are able to “forge a “true” representative democracy for the first time in history, and be led by our directly elected leaders” instead of “continue to live in an aristocratic republic run by over-educated elitists who are not beholden to the will of the people, but only to themselves.” So from the outset Jackson stresses the importance of the election and the importance of the people’s choice. He then proceeds to employ several appeals to ethos as mentioned above. After he scares the people with the threats from outside the country, Jackson mentions “there are threats to our nation from within as well.” From now on, Jackson seems to

be a proponent of a limited role for the government. He claims “the Second National Bank is a threat to our economic well-being.” He then uses the second part of his speech to explain why the people should have more power. According to Jackson, “it does great harm to the average American. It is a financial monopoly controlled by a few wealthy easterners. It controls the credit for the entire country, prints paper money of dubious worth, and it is just plain unconstitutional.” He does not only describe the problem; he also presents what he believes to be the solution. Jackson claims “we should also rely on our local and state banks, run by the people who live in and understand our communities, to control the currency needed for commerce, not some faceless, monopolistic national bank.” He then finishes his speech with a few final appeals to pathos in which he tries to stir the people’s emotions. He asks his audience, “how will southern families feed and clothe themselves without their labor force? I say let the people and their states decide this issue for themselves.” He stresses that “we have marched across the continent, scratching out a living, and burying our children along the way to do it.” He also argues that the people are competent enough to have more power: “I say “we the people” understand better than anyone what it takes to make this nation grow and prosper.” During his appeals to pathos he also does not shy away from rebuking current president and opponent John Adams. Jackson remarks that “president Adams is afraid of internal threats as well. His biggest fear is YOU! The people of this nation, the ordinary citizens of the United States are the gravest threat he faces.” He finishes with a few last encouraging words: “This is the dawn of a new day for democracy and modern American politics. Please vote on Election Day. Thank you.”

Franklin D. Roosevelt Inaugural Address on March 4, 1933

Invention

Roosevelt makes several appeals to ethos in his speech; for example, he uses the country as a common ground to strengthen his appeal to ethos. He begins his speech by mentioning that the “great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper” (Daley 64). It is all about the country. It is all about “the warm courage of national unity” (Daley 68). He addresses and stresses the difficulties the country is going through and presents himself as the saviour. He mentions how “in every dark hour of our national life a leadership of frankness and vigor has met with that understanding and support of the people themselves which is essential to victory” (Daley 64). Roosevelt believes “that you will again give that support to leadership in these critical days” (Daley 64). FDR uses appeals to pathos when he describes the difficulties that the nation is dealing with. He extensively describes how “Values have shrunk to fantastic levels; taxes have risen; our ability to pay has fallen; government of all kinds is faced by serious curtailment of income; the means of exchange are frozen in the currents of trade; the withered leaves of industrial enterprise lie on every side; farmers find no markets for their produce; the savings of many years in thousands of families are gone” (Daley 65). According to Roosevelt, “Only a foolish optimist can deny the dark realities of the moment” (Daley 65) and “this Nation asks for action, and action now” (Daley 66).

Besides his appeals to ethos and pathos, Roosevelt also makes an appeal to logos. In order to justify the new course of action, Roosevelt stresses the perceived evil of his opponents and predecessors. He mentions “rulers of the exchange of mankind's goods” (Daley 65) who have failed and he rebukes the “practices of the unscrupulous money changers” (Daley 65). The government must change. The course of action must change. According to Roosevelt, “the joy

and moral stimulation of work no longer must be forgotten in the mad chase of evanescent profits” (Daley 65). He claims that “the money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization” (Daley 65). The solution is simple: the solution “can be accomplished in part by direct recruiting by the Government itself” (Daley 66). Not only should the government be recruited; Roosevelt also states that “there must be a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments, so that there will be an end to speculation with other people's money; and there must be provision for an adequate but sound currency” (Daley 66).

Arrangement

From the outset, Roosevelt makes clear to his audience in the first few minutes that “this is pre-eminently the time to speak the truth, the whole truth, frankly and boldly” and that “first of all, let me assert my firm belief that the only thing we have to fear is fear itself” (Daley 64). He aims at starting his speech powerfully and mixes that with several appeals to ethos: Roosevelt attempts to connect with his audience by addressing them in the beginning of his speech with “my fellow American” (Daley 64). He then moves on to elaborate on “the dark realities of the moment” (Daley 65). He frames the situation in a way that will enable him to convince his audience of his pro government intervention views. In this middle part, he complains about the situation and “how a host of unemployed citizens face the grim problem of existence” (Daley 65). Roosevelt is especially unhappy about banks. He claims “they have resorted to exhortations, pleading tearfully for restored confidence” (Daley 65) and “they know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers” (Daley 65). This leads him to the conclusion that they have no vision; and “when there is no vision the people perish” (Daley 65). He then mentions how he will try to solve these problems. Roosevelt pleads for more government intervention: he claims the problems can be helped by “national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and of

communications and other utilities which have a definitely public character” (Daley 65).

Furthermore, Roosevelt pleads for “a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments, so that there will be an end to speculation with other people's money” (Daley 65).

He finishes his speech by reminding the people of the “dedication of a Nation” (Daley 68) and he asks God for help and that “He guide me in the days to come” (Daley 68).

Theodore Roosevelt on August 22, 1902

Invention

In this speech, Theodore Roosevelt boasts about the American accomplishments in countries outside the United States. His accounts of the situations in other countries could be considered as subtle appeals to ethos. Through these accounts he is able to portray himself and the administration as capable leaders and capable men in charge. He first begins his speech by addressing the fact there were “some of the external problems which we have had to face during the last four years” (Roosevelt 86). He shows the people he has a strong sense of responsibility when he stresses that he is aware of the importance of solving these problems. Roosevelt stresses that “you never can meet any duty, and after you have met it say that your action only affected that duty. If you meet it well you face the next duty a stronger man, and if you meet it ill you face your next duty a weaker man” (Roosevelt 87). By showing this awareness and this feeling of responsibility, Roosevelt portrays himself as a compassionate and competent president. He then proceeds to describe accomplishments and achievements in different countries. He mentions that “Porto Rico, it is a pleasure to say, may, now serve as an example of the best methods of administering our insular possessions (Roosevelt 87)”. Interestingly, the way these accomplishments have been achieved is through policies which would not be considered

Republic in 2017: Roosevelt explains that “first and foremost, in Porto Rico we have consistently striven to get the very best men to administer the affairs of the island” (Roosevelt 88). Roosevelt displays a strong sense of government intervention. He even supports this active government policy by claiming that it is “in their own interests to keep the power of shaping their destiny” (Roosevelt 89). Roosevelt applies the same policy in Cuba which “we refused to turn it loose

offhand” (Roosevelt 89). By and large, Roosevelt seems to apply a more progressive way of structuring the countries.

Arrangement

In the first few minutes, Roosevelt repeatedly refers to different ‘duties’ that must be done and need special attention. In this appeal to ethos he gives the impression that he is a leader with a strong sense of responsibility. He emphasizes that he does not only have duties in the United States: “A nation must first take care to do well its duties within its own borders, but must not make of that fact an excuse for failing to do those of its duties the performance of which lies without its own borders” (Roosevelt 86). After stressing the fact that there are both problems within the orders as well as outside the orders that need to be solved; Roosevelt continues with mentioning different countries which have flourished through his help. He gives extensive accounts of countries such as Porto Rico and Cuba in which he explains how he and his team has helped the countries to develop. He claims that “so excellent has been the administration of the island, so excellent the effect of the legislation concerning it, that their very excellence has caused most of us to forget all about it. There is no opportunity for head-lines about Porto Rico. You don't need to use large letters in order to say that Porto Rico continues quiet and prosperous” (Roosevelt 88). Roosevelt and his helpers have acted “in good faith” (Roosevelt 89) and they have “acted with good sense” (Roosevelt 89). The rest of the speech seems to be an ode to himself for helping many countries and many people outside the United States. However, it should not “be forgotten that while we have thus acted in the interest of the islanders themselves, we have also helped our own people” (Roosevelt 97). Roosevelt claims that “our interests are as great in the Pacific as in the Atlantic. The welfare of California, Oregon, and Washington is as vital to the nation as the welfare of New England, New York, and the South-Atlantic States”

(Roosevelt 97). In this way, Roosevelt is able to convince his target audience that is a competent and compassionate president.

Ronald Reagan's Inaugural Address on January 20, 1981

Invention

Reagan has a couple of instances in which he employs an appeal to ethos. Firstly, he emphasizes the feeling of unity between the citizens. After he has established this bond of unity, he proceeds on to showing how the union is threatened by several problems which he will fight to solve.

Reagan begins by stressing “how unique we really are” (Reagan 1) and that “we are a united people pledged to maintaining a political system which guarantees individual liberty to a greater degree than any other” (Reagan 1). After Reagan mentions the fact that special interest groups get much attention, he reminds his listeners to “a special interest group that has been too long neglected” (Reagan 1). Reagan explains that this is “a group which consists of men and women who raise our food, patrol our streets, man our mines and factories, teach our children, keep our homes, and heal us when we're sick—professionals, industrialists, shopkeepers, clerks, cabbies, and truck drivers. They are, in short, "We the people," this breed called Americans” (Reagan 2). Reagan reminds the people of the monument of George Washington in front of him; the “father of our country” (Reagan 3). Once the connection is established through these common grounds and people have a high sense of union, Reagan continues to state that they suffer from a terrible inflation: according to Reagan, it is “the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history” (Reagan 1). An inflation which affects “the lives of millions of our people” (Reagan 1).

Reagan uses the same inflation in his appeal to logos. He stresses the fact that the “economic ills we suffer have come upon us over several decades” (Reagan 1). According to Reagan, the economic ills are due to the great tax burden which does not keep pace with the public spending. He complains that “for decades we have piled deficit upon deficit, mortgaging

our future and our children's future for the temporary convenience of the present” (Reagan 1). Reagan believes that “to continue this long trend is to guarantee tremendous social, cultural, political, and economic upheavals” (Reagan 1). After mentioning the several negative consequences of the inflation and economic ills, Reagan explicitly states that “in this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem” (Reagan 1). Reagan claims he will solve the problems by curbing “the size and influence of the Federal establishment and to demand recognition of the distinction between the powers granted to the Federal Government and those reserved to the States or to the people” (Reagan 2). He emphasizes that “the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government” (Reagan 2).

There are also several instances in which he employs an appeal to pathos in which Reagan tries to stir the emotions of his audience. He reminds the people to “renew our determination, our courage, and our strength” and “renew our faith and our hope” (Reagan 2). Reagan believes the people should fight for “your dreams, your hopes, your goals are going to be the dreams, the hopes, and the goals of this administration, so help me God” (Reagan 2). Reagan finished his speech by reminding the people of different men who have paid prices “for our freedom” (Reagan 3). He mentions George Washington and he mentions the men whose lives ended in Belleau Wood, The Argonne, Vietnam and other places. The last hero he mentions is Martin Treptow, who left his job in a small town barbershop to fight in the first World War. Reagan mentions that a diary was found on his body in which Treptow stated: “America must win this war. Therefore I will work, I will save, I will sacrifice, I will endure, I will fight cheerfully and do my utmost, as if the issue of the whole struggle depended on me alone”

(Reagan 4). This tragedy combined with the anaphora helps Reagan to strengthen his appeal to pathos.

Arrangement

Reagan begins his speech by remembering his audience “how unique we really are” (Reagan 1). He quickly address one of the most burning issue the nation is dealing with: “ the longest and one of the worst sustained inflations in our national history” (Reagan 1). Through an appeal to pathos he stresses this bad situation. Reagan explains that the inflation “distorts our economic decisions, penalizes thrift, and crushes the struggling young and the fixed-income elderly alike. It threatens to shatter the lives of millions of our people” (Reagan 1). The rest of the speech is a plead in which he repeatedly stresses that the size and influence of the government should be curbed. He does not strictly adhere to the order of division, proof and refutation. Without providing a classical division in which he delves into the agreements and disagreements, Reagan immediately states what is the reason behind the problem: “In this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem” (Reagan 1). Reagan stresses that the nation is more important than the government; the president argues “we are a nation that has a government—not the other way around” (Reagan 2) and “all of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government” (Reagan 2). After his plead, Reagan reminds his audience again of the greatness of the nation; he concludes his speech by stating that they should bring forth their “best effort and our willingness to believe in ourselves and to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds” (Reagan 4) and that they should believe “that together with God's help we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us. And after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans” (Reagan 4).

The Speeches on Segregation

Andrew Jackson's Speech to the Congress on December 6, 1830

Invention

In this speech Andrew Jackson does an effort to sugar-coat the Indian removal act and to portray it as a noble and necessary deed. Straight from the beginning he refers to the removal act as “the benevolent policy of the Government” (Jackson 112). A benevolent policy which is on its way to “a happy consummation” (Jackson 112). He strengthens this appeal to ethos by claiming both parties profit from the removal act: he mentions that two important tribes have accepted to move and he expresses his hope that this will “induce the remaining tribes also to seek the same obvious advantages” (Jackson 112). He stresses his views that both parties benefit by arguing that “the consequences of a speedy removal will be important to the United States, to individual States, and to the Indians themselves” (Jackson 112). Thereafter, he tries to convince the people that the removal act is indeed a noble deed through appeals to pathos in which he paints a black picture of the Indians. According to Jackson, the removal act “puts an end to all possible danger of collision between the authorities of the General and State Governments on account of the Indian” (Jackson 112). Moreover, this removal act will help to “cast off their savage habits” (Jackson 113). When the Indians are gone, this will pave the way for “an interesting, civilized, and Christian community” (Jackson 113). Jackson underlines his view by asking the people a rhetorical question: “What good man would prefer a country covered with forests and ranged by a few thousand savages to our extensive Republic?” (Jackson 114). Towards the end of his speech, Jackson even claims that the removal act is a sign of generosity and kindness. According to Jackson, the Indian Removal Act shows that “the policy of the General Government toward

the red man is not only liberal, but generous” (Jackson 115). He informs the people that “the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement” (Jackson 115).

Arrangement

Jackson begins his speech by stressing that the Indian Removal Act is “a benevolent policy of the Government” (Jackson 112) which consists of “obvious advantages” (Jackson 112). In this way he is able to combine the introduction with an appeal to ethos with a statement of facts which consists of several remarks which help to frame the situation to his advantage. He moves on to mention how important this act is; according to Jackson, “the pecuniary advantages which it promises to the Government are the least of its recommendations” (Jackson 112). He keeps on framing the situation to his advantage when he portrays the Indians as “a few savage hunters” (Jackson 112) and “savages” (Jackson); this differs from his portrayal of the white population as “an interesting, civilized, and Christian community” (Jackson 114) and “the settled, civilized Christian” (Jackson 115). Through these portrayals, Jackson is able to convince the audience that the Indian Removal Act is actually a noble act on his behalf. Jackson is doing the country a favour. He is helping the country. He is cleansing the country. The Indian Removal Act will “relieve the whole State of Mississippi and the western part of Alabama of Indian occupancy, and enable those States to advance rapidly in population, wealth, and power” (Jackson 113). Jackson concludes with reminding the Indians that he is not only doing the white population a favour: Jackson claims that “the General Government kindly offers him a new home, and proposes to pay the whole expense of his removal and settlement” (Jackson 115).

John F. Kennedy's Civil Rights Address on June 11, 1963

Invention

In this speech, Kennedy does not seem to make much appeals to ethos. This might be due to the nature of the speech: this speech is not an inaugural speech nor a presidential announcement speech. Kennedy mainly seems to rely on appeals to pathos to support his stance. Within the first minutes of his speech he reminds the listeners that he hopes that “every American, regardless of where he lives, will stop and examine his conscience about this and other related incidents” (Hutchins 1). By addressing the conscience of his listeners, Kennedy seems to indicate his speech will be directed towards the emotions of his target audience. He repeatedly forces his listeners to put themselves in the shoes of the black citizens: firstly, Kennedy states that “every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated” (Hutchins 1). Later on he asks whether “we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated” (Hutchins 1). Then, after he summed up several constraints black citizens have to suffer, he asks his audience if they would like to stand in their shoes: “Who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place?” (Hutchins 1-2). Kennedy explicitly rebukes the people who do not act against the situation. He explicitly tries to give them a feeling of shame when he states that “those who do nothing are inviting shame, as well as violence” (Hutchins 2). He repeatedly stresses the bad circumstances black citizens have to deal with. He speaks of the fact “there are Negroes unemployed, two or three times as many compared to whites, inadequate education, moving into the large cities, unable to find work” and he mentions how black citizens are “denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or a lunch counter or go to a movie theatre, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university

even though qualified” (Hutchins 3).

Kennedy makes several appeals to the reason of his audience. In the beginning of his speech he reminds the people that all citizens are equal by mentioning the fact that “this Nation was founded by men of many nations and backgrounds” (Hutchins 1). Thereafter, Kennedy stresses that the United States is “founded on the principle that all men are created equal” and he illustrates this with the fact that when Americans are sent to Vietnam or West Berlin, we do not ask for whites only” (Hutchins 1). Kennedy even reminds the people of the abolition of slavery and claims that black citizens still experience a lack of freedom: “One hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free” (Hutchins 2). He stresses this point even more when he argues that “we preach freedom around the world, and we mean it, and we cherish our freedom here at home, but are we to say to the world, and much more importantly, to each other that this is the land of the free except for the Negroes” (Hutchins 2). In this way, Kennedy seems to sway the audience through an appeal to their reason.

Arrangement

Kennedy sets the tone in the beginning of his speech by directly stating what his speech will be about. He mentions the order from the United States District Court of the Northern District of Alabama that is carry out and calls for the admission of “two clearly qualified young Alabama residents who happened to have been born negro” (Hutchins 1). He stresses the fact that these residents are clearly qualified and that they are solely disadvantaged because of the colour of their skin. He directly starts framing the situation in the following part of his speech. By making his audience get into the minds of the black citizens he is able to frame the situation to his advantage. Kennedy believes that “every American ought to have the right to be treated as he

would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated” (Hutchins 1).

Furthermore, he asks the people “whether we are going to treat our fellow Americans as we want to be treated” (Hutchins). Through this focus on the problems in terms of segregation and this focus on how “wrongs are inflicted on Negro citizens and there are no remedies at law”

(Hutchins 2) Kennedy is able to pave the way for his requests: in the middle part of his speech he asks the Congress to enact legislation which will give Americans “the right to be served in facilities which are open to the public” (Hutchins 2). Moreover, he asks the Congress “to authorize the Federal Government to participate more fully in lawsuits designed to end segregation in public education” (Hutchins 3). Thereafter, he stresses once again the weak positions of black citizens and that they are “denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or a lunch counter or go to a movie theater, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university even though qualified” (Hutchins 3). He concludes his speech by requesting one last time for a law that is fair and a constitution that is “color blind” (Hutchins 3).

Abraham Lincoln's Cooper Union Address on February 27, 1860

Invention

Lincoln builds a frame in this speech: he stresses the position of the government and the constitution. In this way he is able to support his viewpoints towards slavery. He seems to support his viewpoints mainly through logos. Lincoln builds a frame in which the constitution is the main source everything is referred back to. By doing this, he is able to justify for the people his negative stance towards slavery. If he is able to convince the people that they should refer everything back to "our fathers who framed the government under which we live" (Lamon 426) and he can consequently show that they were against slavery; Lincoln might be able to convince the people of his thoughts on slavery. For example, after he states that the people should take the thirty-nine fathers who framed the government as the point of reference, Lincoln mentions that in 1784 the congress of the confederation had the question of prohibiting slavery in the north-western territory. According to Lincoln, "four of the "thirty-nine" who afterward framed the Constitution, were in that Congress, and voted on that question" (Lamon 427). This shows that "in their understanding, no line dividing local from federal authority, nor anything else, properly forbade the Federal Government to control as to slavery in federal territory" (Lamon 428). He mentions more examples which shows that these fathers and the other fathers seemed to agree with Lincoln that slavery should be banned. In this way, Lincoln is able to support his own negative viewpoints on slavery. After mentioning examples which show the support of the fathers, he tries to convince his audience of the evil of slavery. He mentions that "you consider yourselves a reasonable and a just people; and I consider that in the general qualities of reason and justice you are not inferior to any other people" (Lamon 433). He supports his viewpoints with an appeal to pathos in which he mentions the circumstances the slaves have to cope with:

“The slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary freemen, black or white, supply it” (Lamon 435).

Arrangement

In the beginning of his speech, Lincoln asks the people “what is the frame of government under which we live?” (Lamon 426) He provides with an answer himself, hereby enabling himself to frame the situation to his advantage: he explains that it is the Constitution of the United States which was framed by thirty-nine ‘fathers’. He then proceeds to ask the people “what was the understanding those fathers had of the question mentioned?” (Lamon 426) As explained above, Lincoln then proceeds to mention different instances in which the bulk of the fathers seem to indicate that they are no advocates of slavery. After mentioning the four fathers who voted for prohibiting slavery, he mentions that in 1787 “two more of the "thirty-nine" who afterward signed the Constitution, were in that Congress, and voted on the question” (Lamon 428). The examples Lincoln brings forth are the statements of facts which help him frame the situation. Before even starting to refute the idea of slavery, Lincoln is able to convince the audience of the evil of slavery by making them believe that the fathers to whom everything should be referred back to were against slavery. After his statement of facts, Lincoln immediately refutes the concept of slavery without mentioning any arguments which could support slavery. Lincoln claims that “if slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it, are themselves wrong, and should be silenced, and swept away” (Lamon 440). He reminds the people that “all true men do care” (Lamon 440) and they should “stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively” (Lamon 440). He concludes his speech with encouraging words: “Let us have faith that right makes might, and in that faith, let us, to the end, dare to do our duty as we understand it” (Lamon 440).

Donald Trump's Presidential Announcement Speech on June 16, 2015

Invention

Trump immediately begins with an appeal to ethos. He stresses the incompetence of his opponents by telling the audience they did not know how the air-conditioner works. Trump jokes and says that “they sweated like dogs. They didn't know the room was too big, because they didn't have anybody there. How are they going to beat ISIS? I don't think it's gonna happen.” His opponents are incompetent and Trump is the competent leader the people should vote for. Trump proudly states that he is capable of defeating China: “When was the last time anybody saw us beating, let's say, China in a trade deal? They kill us. I beat China all the time. All the time” (Beahm 21). The commonplace Trump repeatedly addresses in his speech is the country itself. He stresses that “our enemies are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker” (Beahm 25) and that “we have to stop doing things for some people, but for this country” (Beahm 25). After repeatedly stating that the honour and power of the country should be restored, Trump argues that the country needs him. Trump will save the country. He promises that “I'll bring back our jobs from China, from Mexico, from Japan, from so many places. I'll bring back our jobs, and I'll bring back our money” (Beahm 26). In his appeal to logos, Trump extensively makes use of reasoning from example. Trump takes a few examples of certain problems and consequently generalizes the issue. Trump claims the Mexicans “are not sending their best” (Beahm 22); he accuses the Mexicans of “bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume are good people” (Beahm 22). He argues that “it only makes common sense” (Beahm 22); thereby stressing that he seems to believe he is using rational arguments. He is also suggesting that his successful business career indicates that he will be a successful president. This is illustrated by his choice to announce that he will be running for

president directly after reminding the public that “all of my life, I've heard that a truly successful person, a really, really successful person” (Beahm 26). There are several instances in which Trump makes an appeal to pathos. For example, after stressing how the United States have become weak in Trump’s eyes, he mentions how America has “lost thousands of lives, thousands in Iraq” (Beahm 22) and he mentions the “thousands and thousands” of “wounded soldiers, who I love, I love” (Beahm 22). He stresses how America has become weaker by claiming that they are the laughing stock of other countries; after mentioning that the nuclear arsenal is malfunctioning and that this was unknown for a while, Trump stresses what kind of bad signals this sends to “Putin and all of the other people that look at us and they say, "That is a group of people, and that is a nation that truly has no clue. They don't know what they're doing. They don't know what they're doing” (Beahm 23). He stresses again their position of laughing stock when he reminds the people how “we owe China \$1.3 trillion. We owe Japan more than that. So they come in, they take our jobs, they take our money, and then they loan us back the money, and we pay them in interest, and then the dollar goes up so their deal's even better” (Beahm 26). Thereafter, Trump asks the audience a rhetorical question: “How stupid are our leaders? How stupid are these politicians to allow this to happen? How stupid are they?” (Beahm 26).

Arrangement

Trump seems to be aware of the importance of the introduction when he immediately makes an appeal to ethos and pathos. He stresses the incompetence of his rivals by claiming they did not know the air-conditioner did not work. Quickly after ridiculing his opponents, Trump lays down the facts to his advantage. He sums up different reasons why according to him “our country is in serious trouble” (Beahm 21). He proposes several rhetorical questions to his audience to stress his view that America has become a weak country. He asks the people if they remember when

was the last time they saw America beat China in a trade deal and he whether they remember “when did we beat Japan at anything?” (Beahm 21) In addition, he asks his audience if they know when they will beat Mexico at the border and he stresses that “ISIS has the oil, and what they don't have, Iran has” (Beahm 22). He finishes his statement of facts with a clear conclusion: according to Trump, the enemies “are getting stronger and stronger by the way, and we as a country are getting weaker” (Beahm 19). In the rest of his speech, Trump continuous to complain about the weak status of America and how other countries are stronger. He also briefly mentions Obamacare, but does not go in to any arguments for Obamacare; he only states why he believes Obamacare is “a disaster” (Beahm 23) and that “we have to repeal Obamacare” (Beahm 25). Trump does not strictly adhere to the different parts of arrangement laid down by Cicero; he skips ‘division’ and only applies ‘proof’ and ‘refutation’. For his proof, Trump solely seems to rely on statements in which he stresses the success he has achieved. He stresses his successes in trade deals; he informs the audience that “I beat China all the time. All the time” (Beahm 21) and that “I don't need anybody's money. It's nice. I don't need anybody's money” (Beahm 30). Further on in his speech, Trump explicitly states “this is going to be an election that's based on competence, because people are tired of these nice people” (Beahm 32); thereby implying that he would be the most competent leader. For his refutation, Trump stresses throughout his speech how America has become weak and how other countries are stronger. This rebuke serves as fertile ground for the supporting proofs Trump uses to convince the audience that he should be the next president. In his conclusion, Trump rebukes the American situation again. He states that “sadly, the American dream is dead” (Beahm 37). He makes a final appeal to ethos and claims that he will make the American dream alive again; he promises that “if I get elected president, I

will bring it back bigger and better and stronger than ever before, and we will make America great again” (Beahm 37).

Discussion Results of Role of Government

Andrew Jackson vs. Franklin D. Roosevelt

The change of course that is portrayed after looking at the speeches by Jackson and Roosevelt is evident. Although both presidents use the same persuasive appeals and both seem aware of several rhetorical devices, they seem to fight for different causes. Jackson explicitly describes the National Bank as a serious threat and believes the people are entitled to more power. He complains about the expansive role of the government and how the bank “is a financial monopoly controlled by a few wealthy easterners.” He even claims that the whole notion is unconstitutional. Jackson does not shun away from challenging their power. He stresses that the people “understand better than anyone what it takes to make this nation grow and prosper” and he hopes that “with this election we can finally take back power from the old aristocracy.” Roosevelt, on the other hand, is a proponent of an active government and government intervention. Like Jackson, he is unhappy about the bank and their policies. However, this does not mean Roosevelt feels the people are entitled to more power at the expense of the banks. He believes the government should play a more important role and the banks should be supervised more actively. According to Roosevelt, the problems will be solved if they employ “national planning for and supervision of all forms of transportation and of communications and other utilities which have a definitely public character” (Daley 65). Furthermore, Roosevelt wants to help the problems through “a strict supervision of all banking and credits and investments, so that there will be an end to speculation with other people's money” (Daley 65). After a hundred years, the Democratic Party seems to have changed from a party which advocates limited government to a party which advocates government intervention.

Theodore Roosevelt vs. Ronald Reagan

Theodore Roosevelt may only be distantly related to FDR; their policies in terms of the role of the government seem closely related. Roosevelt seems to support a more important and active role for the government. He describes how he and his administration have helped structuring countries such as Porto Rico and Cuba. He argues that government intervention is “in their own interests to keep the power of shaping their destiny” (Roosevelt 89). He seems afraid to hand over too much power to the people; he remarks that “we refused to turn it loose offhand” (Roosevelt 89). This is contrary to Reagan’s policies. Reagan prefers limited government and even claims that “in this present crisis, government is not the solution to our problem; government is the problem” (Reagan 1). He does not advocate a more important and active role for the government. Reagan believes that “we are a nation that has a government—not the other way around” (Reagan 2) and “all of us need to be reminded that the Federal Government did not create the States; the States created the Federal Government” (Reagan 2). He believes the people are entitled to more power and encourages them to believe and employ this notion. He reassures the people that “together with God's help we can and will resolve the problems which now confront us” (Reagan 4) and urges them to bring forth their “best effort and our willingness to believe in ourselves and to believe in our capacity to perform great deeds” (Reagan 4). Reagan’s viewpoints concerning the role of government seem to differ greatly from Roosevelt’s policies in Porto Rico and Cuba. Roosevelt would later on become more and more progressive; something which seems to heavily contradict the Republican notion of today. The notion which Ronald Reagan staunchly supported in his speech. Reagan believed that the people should be the ones who resolve the problem: “And after all, why shouldn't we believe that? We are Americans” (Reagan 4).

Discussion Results of Segregation

Andrew Jackson vs. John F. Kennedy

The Indian Removal Act seems to be the epitome of segregation. Jackson pushed this legislation to move southern Native tribes to west of the Mississippi River. After displacing the natives from their tribal lands, Jackson would pave the way for “an interesting, civilized, and Christian community” (Jackson 113) to inhabit the pieces of land. In this speech, Jackson persuades the Congress in to believing this Indian Removal Act is not unconstitutional and is actually a good deed. He stresses that the act is a sign of “the benevolent policy of the Government” (Jackson 112) and that it helps the Union to be relieved of “a few savage hunters” (Jackson 112). Jackson seems afraid for any bad influences which the natives might have on the white Christian community. Through the act, Jackson is able to protect “the settled, civilized Christian” (Jackson 115) from the “savage habits” (Jackson 113) of the Native Americans. Kennedy does not seem to share the same racial policies. In his speech, he complains about different disadvantages the black citizens have to deal with in America 130 years later. He claims that black citizens are “denied equal rights, denied the opportunity to eat at a restaurant or a lunch counter or go to a movie theater, denied the right to a decent education, denied almost today the right to attend a State university even though qualified” (Hutchins 3). Whereas Jackson believed it would be better to have Native Americans relocated; Kennedy explicitly states that he hopes “every American, regardless of where he lives, will stop and examine his conscience about this and other related incidents” (Hutchins 1). Furthermore, Kennedy wants his people to try to put themselves in their shoes and get into the mind of black citizens. Jackson portrayed the Native Americans as savage uncivilized hunters who differ greatly from the settled and civilized

Christian community; Kennedy reminds his listeners that the United States is “founded on the principle that all men are created equal” and states that “every American ought to have the right to be treated as he would wish to be treated, as one would wish his children to be treated” (Hutchins 1). Kennedy’s speech demonstrates how the Democratic Party seems to have drastically changed their course in terms of racial policies.

Abraham Lincoln vs. Donald Trump

One of the achievements Abraham Lincoln is most famous for is the abolition of slavery. Lincoln staunchly opposed slavery and clearly stated his grievances in his speech. He complains that “the slaves have no means of rapid communication; nor can incendiary freemen, black or white, supply it (Lamon 435) and that “if slavery is right, all words, acts, laws, and constitutions against it, are themselves wrong, and should be silenced, and swept away” (Lamon 440). He expresses his discontent with slavery and reminds the audience that “all true men do care” (Lamon 440). Lincoln believes that he and the people should “stand by our duty, fearlessly and effectively” (Lamon 440). This speech stands in stark contrast to Trump’s speech. Especially Trump’s remarks on Mexicans. Trump claims the Mexicans are bringing drugs and crime and that they are rapists. Trump believes other countries are getting stronger and the United States is getting weaker; the United States should beat China and Japan. The United States should also beat ISIS. The Republican Party seems to have changed from a party that is responsible for the abolition of slavery to the party that has brought forth a president which “all media stream criticize” for being “a Mexican hater racist” (Aviles 156).

Conclusion

This study has shed light on a hitherto understudied topic: the change of course both the Democratic and Republican Party underwent in the past 200 years. The Democratic Party used to be a conservative party which advocated limited government while the Republican Party was known for being the party that is responsible for the abolition of slavery and a party which has a progressive past of government intervention. Times and parties have changed. This study showed how Democratic and Republican presidents from the twentieth and twenty-first century have not adhered to notions which might be perceived as key notions of each party. They brought change. The parties brought change. Would anyone in the nineteenth century believe that a Democratic president a hundred years later will take a Republican president as an example and mention how “one hundred years of delay have passed since President Lincoln freed the slaves, yet their heirs, their grandsons, are not fully free” (Hutchins 2)? It shows that both parties in actuality are not rigidly linked to certain notions and that they are able to change. We will have to wait and see whether in a hundred years from now the Democratic Party and the Republican Party will be the parties they are today.

Works Cited

Abbott, Chris. *21 Speeches That Shaped Our World: The People and Ideas That Changed the*

Way We Think. London: Rider, 2010. Print.

Aristotle. *Rhetoric*. Trans. W. Rhys Roberts. New York: Dover Publications, 2004. Print.

Aviles, Luis. *Sunrise for U.S. Ghettos throughout Immigration Reform*. N.p.: Lulu Com, 2016.

Print.

Beahm, George. *Trump Talk: Donald Trump in His Own Words*. Avon, MA: Adams

Media, 2016. Print.

Cicero. *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*. Trans. Harry Caplan. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1954. Print.

D'Souza, Dinesh. *Hillary's America: The Secret History of the Democratic Party*.

Washington, DC: Regnery, a Division of Salem Media Group, 2016. Print.

Damer, T. Edward. *Attacking Faulty Reasoning: A Practical Guide to Fallacy-free*

Arguments. 6th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub., 2009. Print.

Dwyer, Judith. *Communication for Business and the Professions: Strategies and Skills*.

Melbourne, Vic.: Pearson Australia, 2016. Print.

Entman, Robert M. "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm." *J*

Communication Journal of Communication 43.4 (1993): 51-58. Web.

Freeley, Austin J., and David L. Steinberg. *Argumentation and Debate: Critical Thinking for Reasoned Decision Making*. 13th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Pub., 2014. Print.

Hall, Gary McLean. *Adaptive Code: Agile Coding with Design Patterns and SOLID Principles*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft, 2017. Print.

Harris, Douglas B., and Lonce H. Bailey. *The Republican Party: Documents Decoded*. Santa Barbara, Calif.: ABC-CLIO, 2014. Print.

Heale, Michael J. *The United States in the Long Twentieth Century: Politics and Society since 1900*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015. Print.

Heinrichs, Jay. *Thank You for Arguing, Revised and Updated Edition: What Aristotle, Lincoln, and Homer Simpson Can Teach Us about the Art of Persuasion*. New York: Three Rivers, 2007. Print.

Hill, Kenneth L. *An Essential Guide to American Politics and the American Political System*. Bloomington, IN: AuthorHouse, 2012. Print.

Howells, Sian. *Complete Guide to Speaking in Public*. Place of Publication Not Identified: Lulu Com, 2008. Print.

Jackson, Andrew. *Messages of Gen. Andrew Jackson: With a Short Sketch of His Life*. Place of Publication Not Identified: Nabu, 2010. Print.

Jackson, John S. *The American Political Party System: Continuity and Change over Ten*

Presidential Elections. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 2015. Print.

Jasinski, James. *Sourcebook on Rhetoric: Key Concepts in Contemporary Rhetorical Studies*.

Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2010. Print.

Karpie, Robert James. *Social Security: Immaculate Deception - A National Disgrace*. Denver,

Colorado: Outskirts, 2009. Print.

King, Kendra A. *African American Politics*. Cambridge: Polity, 2010. Print.

Lamon, Ward Hill. *Life of Abraham Lincoln: From His Birth to His Inauguration As*

President. S.l.: Applewood, 1872. Print.

Leith, Sam. *You Talkin' to Me?: Rhetoric from Aristotle to Obama*. London, England: Profile,

2011. Print.

Leon, Lionel De. *United States Facts and Dates*. Place of Publication Not Identified: Lulu

Com, 2012. Print.

Lindstrom, Matthew J. *Encyclopedia of the U.S. Government and the Environment: History,*

Policy, and Politics. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-CLIO, 2011. Print.

Long, Fredrick J. *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: The Compositional Unity of 2*

Corinthians. Cambridge: Cambridge U, 2004. Print.

MacBride, Tim. *Preaching the New Testament as Rhetoric: The Promise of Rhetorical Criticism for Expository Preaching*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2014. Print.

McKeever, Robert J., and Philip Davies. *Politics USA*. Madison: Taylor and Francis, 2014. Print.

Milkis, Sidney M., and Michael Nelson. *The American Presidency Origins and Development, 1776-2007*. Washington, D.C.: CQ, 2008. Print.

Morris, Theresa. *Hans Jonas's Ethic of Responsibility: From Ontology to Ecology*. Albany: State U of New York, 2013. Print.

Mortensen, Kurt W. *Maximum Influence: The 12 Universal Laws of Power Persuasion*. New York: AMACOM - American Management Association, 2013. Print.

Murphy, James Jerome. *A Short History of Writing Instruction: From Ancient Greece to Contemporary America*. New York: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Novak, Joseph Donald., and D. B. Gowin. *Learning How to Learn*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2010. Print.

O'Keefe, Daniel J. *Persuasion: Theory and Research*. 2nd ed. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 2002. Print.

Paddock, Carl. *Obama, Creator of History*. New Delhi: Epitome, 2009. Print.

Patterson, James T. *Grand Expectations: The United States, 1945-1974*. New York, NY:

Oxford University Press, 1996. Print.

Phillips, Donald T. *Lincoln On Leadership For Today: Abraham Lincoln's Approach to*

Twenty-First-Century Issues. S.l.: Mariner, 2017. Print.

Reagan, Ronald. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Ronald Reagan,*

1981: January 20 to December 31, 1981. Place of Publication Not Identified:

GPO, 1982. Print.

Roosevelt, Theodore. *Presidential Addresses and State Papers*. New York: Review of

Reviews, 1910. Print.

Schaeffer, Ron. *What the Hell Happened to America?: Obama's Economic Zone*. Place of

Publication Not Identified: Wwww.lulu.com, 2012. Print.

Shabo, Magedah. *Rhetoric, Logic, & Argumentation: A Guide for Student Writers*. Clayton,

DE: Prestwick House, 2010. Print.

Smith, Jason Scott. *A Concise History of the New Deal*. New York: Cambridge University

Press, 2014. Print.

Steinberg, Sheila. *Persuasive Communication Skills*. Kenwyn: Juta, 1999. Print.

Turk, Christopher. *Effective Speaking: Communicating in Speech*. London: E. & F.N. Spon,

1985. Print.

Verderber, Rudolph F., Deanna D. Sellnow, and Kathleen S. Verderber. *The Challenge of*

Effective Speaking: In a Digital Age. 16th ed. Stamford: Cengage Learning, 2015. Print.

Andrew Jackson Campaign Speech 1828: <https://studymoose.com/andrew-jackson-campaign-speech-of-1828-essay>

John F. Kennedy Speech 1963: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7BEhKgoA86U&t=508s>
<http://dubois.fas.harvard.edu/sites/all/files/JFK%20Civil%20Rights%20Speech%20June%202011,%201963.pdf>