

Passage 6, Questions 53-64. In September of 1952, headlines around the country announced that vice-presidential candidate Richard Nixon had amassed a “secret fund” with which he had paid for items unrelated to the campaign. Before making a decision about whether to drop Nixon from the ticket, Republican presidential candidate Dwight David Eisenhower agreed to give Nixon the chance to defend himself on national television, which Nixon did on September 23, 1952. Read the speech carefully before you choose your answers.

I come before you tonight as a candidate for the vice presidency and as a man whose honesty and integrity have been questioned.

(5) The usual political thing to do when charges are made against you is to either ignore them or to deny them without giving details. I believe we’ve had enough of that in the United States, particularly with the present administration in Washington, D.C. To me the office of the vice presidency of the United States is a great office, and I feel that the people have got to have confidence in the integrity of the men who run for that office and who might obtain it. I have a theory, too, that the best and only answer to a smear or to an honest misunderstanding of the facts is to tell the truth. And that’s why I’m here tonight. I want to tell you my side of the case.

(10) I am sure that you have read the charge and you’ve heard that I, Senator Nixon, took \$18,000 from a group of my supporters. Now, was that wrong? And let me say that it was wrong—I’m saying, incidentally, that it was *wrong* and not just illegal. Because it isn’t a question of whether it was legal or illegal—that isn’t enough. The question is, was it morally wrong?

(15) I say that it was morally wrong if any of that \$18,000 went to Senator Nixon for my personal use. I say that it was morally wrong if it was secretly given and secretly handled. And I say that it was morally wrong if any of the contributors got special favors for the contributions that they made.

(20) And now, to answer those questions, let me say this: Not one cent of the \$18,000 or any other money of that type ever went to me for my personal use. Every penny of it was used to pay for political expenses that I did not think should be charged to the taxpayers of the United States.

(25) It was not a secret fund. As a matter of fact, when I was on *Meet the Press*—some of you may have seen it last Sunday, Peter Edson came up to me after the program and he said, “Dick, what about this fund we hear about?” And I said, “Well, there’s no secret about it. Go out and see Dana Smith, who is the administrator of the fund.” And I gave him his address, and I said that you will find that the purpose of the fund simply was to defray political expenses that I did not feel should be charged to the government.

(30) And third, let me point out—and I want to make this particularly clear—that no contributor to this fund, no contributor to any of my campaigns, has ever received any consideration that he would not have received as an ordinary constituent.

(35) But then some of you will say and rightly, “Well, what did you use the fund for, Senator? Why did you have to have it?” Let me tell you in just a word how a Senate office operates. First of all, a Senator gets \$15,000 a year in salary. He gets enough money to pay for one trip a year, a round trip that is, for himself and his family between his home and Washington, D.C. And then he gets an allowance to handle the people that work in his office, to handle his mail. And the allowance for my state of California is enough to hire thirteen people. But there are other expenses which are not covered by the government. And I think I can best discuss those expenses by asking you some questions.

(40) Do you think that when I or any other senator makes a political speech, has it printed, should charge the printing of that speech and the mailing of that speech to the taxpayers? Do you think, for example, when I or any other senator makes a trip to his home state to make a purely political speech, that the cost of that trip should

be charged to the taxpayers? Do you think when a senator makes political broadcasts or political television broadcasts, radio or television, that the expense of those broadcasts should be charged to the taxpayers?

(50) Well, I know what your answer is. It is the same answer that audiences give me whenever I discuss this particular problem. The answer is, "No." The taxpayers shouldn't be required to finance items which are not official business but which are primarily political business.

(55) And so I felt that the best way to handle these necessary political expenses of getting my message to the American people and the speeches I made—the speeches that I had printed, for the most part, concerned this one message: of exposing this administration, the communism in it, the corruption in it—the only way that I could do that was to accept the aid which people in my home state of California who contributed to my campaign and who continued to make these contributions after I

(60) was elected were glad to make.

And let me say I am proud of the fact that not one of them has ever asked me for a special favor. I'm proud of the fact that not one of them has ever asked me to vote on a bill other than as my own conscience would dictate. And I am proud of the fact that the taxpayers by subterfuge or otherwise have never paid one dime for expenses which I thought were political and shouldn't be charged to the taxpayers.

(65) I realize that there are still some who may say, and rightly so—and let me say that I recognize that some will continue to smear regardless of what the truth may be—but that there has been understandably some honest misunderstanding on this matter. And there's some that will say, "Well, maybe you were able, Senator, to fake this thing. How can we believe what you say? After all, is there a possibility that maybe you got some sums in cash? Is there a possibility that you may have feathered your own nest?" And so now what I am going to do—and incidentally this is unprecedented in the history of American politics—I am going at this time to give this television and radio audience a complete financial history: everything I've earned, everything I've spent, everything I owe. And I want you to know the facts. I'll have to start early.

(70) I was born in 1913. Our family was of modest circumstances, and most of my early life was spent in a store out in East Whittier. It was a grocery store, one of those family enterprises. The only reason we were able to make it go was because my mother and dad had five boys and we all worked in the store.

(80) I worked my way through college and to a great extent through law school. And then, in 1940, probably the best thing that ever happened to me happened: I married Pat, who is sitting over here. We had a rather difficult time after we were married, like so many of the young couples who may be listening to us. I practiced law. She continued to teach school. Then in 1942 I went into the service.

(85) Let me say that my service record was not a particularly unusual one. I went to the South Pacific. I guess I'm entitled to a couple of battle stars. I got a couple of letters of commendation, but I was just there when the bombs were falling and then I returned. I returned to the United States, and in 1946 I ran for Congress.

(90) When we came out of the war, Pat and I—Pat during the war worked as a stenographer, and in a bank, and as an economist for a government agency—and when we came out the total of our saving from both my law practice, her teaching, and all the time that I was in the war—the total for that entire period—was just a little less than \$10,000. Every cent of that, incidentally, was in government bonds.

(95) [Here, Nixon presents a detailed accounting of his personal assets and debts]

(100) Well, that's about it. That's what we have and that's what we owe. It isn't very much, but Pat and I have the satisfaction that every dime that we've got is honestly ours. I should say this: that Pat doesn't have a mink coat, but she does have a respectable Republican cloth coat. And I always tell her that she'd look good in anything.

One other thing I probably should tell you, because if we don't they'll probably be saying this about me too: We did get something, a gift, after the election. A man down in Texas heard Pat on the radio mention the fact that our two youngsters would love to have a dog. And, believe it or not, the day before we left on this
(105) campaign trip we got a message from Union Station in Baltimore saying they had a package for us. We went down to get it. You know what it was? It was a little cocker spaniel dog in a crate that he'd sent all the way from Texas. Black and white spotted. And our little girl—Tricia, the six-year-old—named it Checkers. And you know, the kids, like all kids, love the dog, and I just want to say this right now that
(110) regardless of what they say about it, we're gonna keep it.

It isn't easy to come before a nationwide audience and air your life as I've done. But I want to say some things before I conclude that I think most of you will agree on. Mr. Mitchell, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee, made the statement that if a man couldn't afford to be in the United States Senate, he
(115) shouldn't run for the Senate. And I just want to make my position clear. I don't agree with Mr. Mitchell when he says that only a rich man should serve his government in the United States Senate or in Congress. I don't believe that represents the thinking of the Democratic Party, and I know it doesn't represent the thinking of the Republican Party. I believe that it's fine that a man like Governor
(120) Stevenson, who inherited a fortune from his father, can run for president. But I also feel that it's essential in this country of ours that a man of modest means can also run for president.

And now, finally, I know that you wonder whether or not I am going to stay on the Republican ticket or resign. Let me say this: I don't believe that I ought to quit,
(125) because I'm not a quitter. And, incidentally, Pat's not a quitter. After all, her name was Patricia Ryan and she was born on St. Patrick's Day, and you know the Irish never quit.

But the decision, my friends, is not mine. I would do nothing that would harm the possibilities of Dwight Eisenhower to become president of the United States.
(130) And for that reason I am submitting to the Republican National Committee tonight through this television broadcast the decision which it is theirs to make. Let them decide whether my position on the ticket will help or hurt. And I am going to ask you to help them decide. Wire and write the Republican National Committee whether you think I should stay or whether I should get off. And whatever the
(135) decision is, I will abide by it.

But just let me say this last word. Regardless of what happens I'm going to continue this fight. I'm going to campaign up and down America until we drive the crooks and the communists and those that defend them out of Washington. And remember, folks, Eisenhower is a great man. Believe me, he's a great a man. And a
(140) vote for Eisenhower is a vote for what's good for America.

53. The second sentence of the second paragraph serves to

- (A) highlight Nixon's knowledge of history
- (B) shift the focus away from himself
- (C) imply that dishonesty is rampant throughout the U.S.
- (D) emphasize that Nixon is a Washington "insider"
- (E) protest that these charges have unfairly singled out Nixon

54. The sentence in lines 12-13 which begins "And let me say" is contradictory to the next two paragraphs by virtue of its
- (A) lack of specifics
 - (B) lack of grammatical coherence
 - (C) use of first person only, with no third person references
 - (D) omission of conditional clauses
 - (E) level of hyperbole
55. The primary purpose of the three paragraphs beginning in line 20 and ending in line 33 is to
- (A) present Nixon's refutations of the charges
 - (B) show Nixon's outrage at the charges
 - (C) suggest that the questions which have been raised are absurd
 - (D) hint that Peter Edson and Dana Smith have betrayed Nixon
 - (E) try to explain why the \$18,000 fund was necessary
56. The two paragraphs from lines 34-49 contain all of the following EXCEPT
- (A) parallelism
 - (B) bandwagon appeal
 - (C) anticipating an objection
 - (D) rhetorical questions
 - (E) concrete examples
57. Nixon's meaning would be made more precise if the word "rightly" (line 66) were restated as
- (A) correctly
 - (B) conservatively
 - (C) necessarily
 - (D) truthfully
 - (E) understandably
58. In light of the end of the paragraph that precedes it, the effect of the sentence "I was born in 1913" (line 77) is
- (A) touching
 - (B) ludicrous
 - (C) perplexing
 - (D) incongruous
 - (E) mollifying
59. In the four paragraphs from lines 77-94, Nixon appeals to all of the following EXCEPT
- (A) patriotic sentiment
 - (B) the respect for hard work
 - (C) sympathy for underpaid teachers
 - (D) a sense of the importance of family
 - (E) romantic sentimentality

60. As a part of Nixon's overall argument that he is not dishonest, the details about Pat's coat (lines 98-100) could best be described as a(n)
- (A) *non sequitur*
 - (B) *ad hominem* argument
 - (C) *post hoc ergo propter hoc* argument
 - (D) *reductio ad absurdum*
 - (E) *sine qua non*
61. In the paragraph about Checkers (lines 101-110), Nixon
- I. appeals to the emotions of his audience
 - II. attempts to make his accusers look bad
 - III. makes clear that he will withdraw from the race rather than give up Checkers
- (A) I only
 - (B) II only
 - (C) I and II only
 - (D) I and III only
 - (E) I, II, and III
62. In lines 115-117, Nixon's restatement of Mr. Mitchell's words as reported in lines 113-115 could best be described as
- (A) an exaggerated alteration of the original statement
 - (B) an understatement of what Mr. Mitchell apparently said
 - (C) a reasonable paraphrase of the original statement
 - (D) an attempt to persuade his audience that wealth is not necessary for competence
 - (E) a reminder that, in general, the Democrats were wealthier than the Republicans
63. The sentence in lines 124-125 is an example of
- (A) syllogistic reasoning
 - (B) inductive reasoning
 - (C) cause and effect reasoning
 - (D) deductive reasoning
 - (E) circular reasoning
64. In this speech, Nixon implies that his accusers are all of the following EXCEPT
- (A) heartless
 - (B) communist
 - (C) naive
 - (D) elitist
 - (E) unethical

65. The tone of the speech could best be described as

- (A) apologetic
- (B) defiant
- (C) belligerent
- (D) incredulous
- (E) matter-of-fact