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ABSTRACT

Political Silence, the Feminine Style, and AIDS: The Role Of Surrogate Speakers at the 1992 Presidential Nominating Conventions

by

Rebecca Ruth Moldenhauer

Dr. Thomas R. Burkholder, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of Communication
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

By the 1992 presidential campaign, AIDS had become a national health crisis and a highly publicized political issue that each party knew had to be addressed. Until this point, presidential candidates had remained relatively silent on the issue without consequence. Due to the nature of the subjects relating to AIDS (i.e. sex, homosexuality, drug use, etc.), the candidates, Bill Clinton and George Bush, felt it an unwise political decision to openly discuss it. Surrogate speakers, therefore, were chosen to address the AIDS issue at the 1992 national nominating conventions. Bob Hattoy, Elizabeth Glaser, and Mary Fisher delivered speeches about AIDS to replace the silence by Clinton and Bush.

Through analysis of their speeches, this project illustrates the use of the feminine style of communication in political discourse. It also demonstrates the advantage of using this style in a campaign setting. Finally, it concludes that the feminine style may offer political candidates a more desirable technique of appealing to voters and voters a superior approach to making political decisions.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

From the beginning of the epidemic in America, AIDS has been not only a health issue but also a political one. In spite of this, presidential candidates have remained relatively silent on the issue of AIDS during campaigns, with the exception of speeches delivered by Jesse Jackson in 1988 and Bill Clinton in late 1992, and have completely ignored it at the national party nominating conventions. The AIDS issue has been left to surrogates to discuss at the national conventions.

The silence of the presidential candidates regarding the issue of AIDS during the campaign is not surprising. That strategy was implemented throughout the Reagan administration. In fact, President Reagan remained silent about AIDS until 1987 (Perez & Dionisopoulos 18) and AIDS was not a major issue in the 1988 presidential election. However, by 1992, activists were becoming more vocal and each party knew that the issue of AIDS had to be addressed.

This study focuses on speeches delivered by surrogates for presidential candidates at the national party nominating conventions in 1992. This year was chosen because it was the only presidential election year in which AIDS was made a central issue at the national conventions. Speeches delivered by surrogate speakers were chosen because the presidential candidates did not discuss AIDS at the nominating conventions. Speeches
delivered at the nominating conventions were chosen because of the significance of the
conventions in the electoral process.

Judith S. Trent and Robert V. Friedenberg suggest that the purpose and function
of the national party nominating conventions have changed from merely making the
presidential nominations official to more "symbolic or ritualistic" functions (43). They
suggest that since the television coverage of the conventions, "the convention proceedings
have] become ritual with little or no pragmatic value" (45). However, in seeming
contradiction, they also say that "television coverage of the conventions boosted voter
interest and attention to the campaign, especially among those who were not strong
political partisans" (45).

Larry David Smith agrees, saying that the nominating conventions are more
important "than a series of group-oriented rituals for party faithful" (259) and that they
"may provide the basis for victory or defeat in the November election" (260). In a later
article Smith further argues for the importance of the nominating conventions stating,
"The presidential nominating conventions provide transitions from the primary campaigns
to the general election" (30).

The national party nominating conventions play a significant role in the process of
electing a president. Therefore, what occurs during these conventions plays a role in how
voters choose the candidate for whom they will vote. Not only are the speeches delivered
by the nominees significant, but other speeches delivered during the conventions are also
significant. This study focuses on those speeches delivered by surrogates on an issue that
the candidates and/or nominees thought unwise to speak about themselves: AIDS.
The Speeches

At the 1992 Democratic National Convention in New York, Bob Hattoy, a Bill Clinton aide, and Elizabeth Glaser, co-founder of the Pediatric AIDS Foundation, both delivered speeches about AIDS on July 14. They were the first speakers at a national political convention who were open about their HIV-positive status (German & Courtright 69). Glaser’s speech focuses on children, America, and on the economic impact of AIDS. Hattoy begins his speech by emphasizing that AIDS can affect anyone without regard to race, gender, sexual orientation, etc., but then moves on to focus his speech on the gay and lesbian community, his part in that community, and how it has been affected by AIDS. Hattoy’s speech also includes praise of his boss, Bill Clinton, throughout.

About a month after the Democratic National Convention, on August 19, 1992, Mary Fisher, an AIDS activist and lifelong Republican, delivered her speech, “A Whisper of AIDS,” at the Republican National Convention in Houston, Texas. One theme of Fisher’s speech was to increase AIDS awareness, to convince her audience that AIDS is a problem that everybody should and needs to be concerned about. She also tried to put to rest the stereotypical view of a person with HIV. Another strong theme throughout this speech was praise of the Republican party and pride in being a Republican herself.

The Fear of AIDS

Due to the nature of the AIDS issue and of the presidential nominating conventions, candidates from the two major political parties, Republican and Democratic, have thus far relegated the discussion of AIDS to surrogate speakers. AIDS was not even
an issue in a presidential campaign until 1992, eleven years and three elections after the
CDC had first documented cases that later came to be known as AIDS. There is a stigma
connected with AIDS and STD's in general because they are taboo subjects that involve
sex. The sexual issue is magnified by the link between AIDS and homosexuality as well as
IV drug use. It has been difficult to overcome this stigma, “Since the first public
awareness, AIDS has been a delicate political issue because of its early and continuing
association with stigmatized individuals” (German & Courtwright 67). Presidential
candidates are confronted with a significant rhetorical problem in the AIDS issue and
choose to respond to that problem through silence combined with surrogate speakers.

Strategic Silence

Tina L. Perez and George N. Dionisopoulos explain that “silence has been used
strategically to replace the discourse usually associated with presidential leadership.
Sympathetic discourse generated by presidential surrogates and the media define and
contextualize this silence” (19). Barry Brummett defines strategic silence as “the refusal
of a public figure to communicate verbally when that refusal (1) violates expectations, (2)
draws public attribution of fairly predictable meanings, and (3) seems intentional and
directed at an audience” (289). Brummett adds more characteristics to his definition of
political strategic silence by saying it is “a type of nonverbal behavior,” that silence only
becomes strategic “when talk is expected,” and “is strategic when someone has pressing
reason to speak, but does not” (289). When the public expects the political figure to
speak and she/he does not, the silence is strategic.
Keith V. Erickson and Wallace V. Schmidt conclude that “Presidential political silence is contextual, announced, strategic, and rhetorically potent” (420). They also suggest that a president “may fall victim to ineloquent surrogate rhetoric, ill-advised dramatistic acts, lessened credibility, rhetorical distance, and inadvertently harm fellow party candidates” (421). If this is true for presidential political silence, it also must be true for the political strategic silence explained by Brummett as “silence by public figures.”

When discussing surrogate rhetoric, Erickson and Schmidt state that surrogates must be carefully selected and “must refine and coordinate their rhetoric in order to avoid contradictions and conflicts of opinion between themselves and the White House” (413). Clearly, preventing similar contradictions between surrogates and presidential candidates is essential as well.

Previous research by Perez and Dionisopoulos focused on President Reagan’s silence concerning AIDS. They suggest that this silence was sanctioned by the public and “facilitated by surrogate discourse which depicts the president as actively involved in addressing the situation at hand” (29). Further, Perez and Dionisopoulos suggest that Reagan made a decision concerning AIDS “to treat the crisis as more of a political problem than a health issue” (30). They come to an evaluation of the use of presidential silence in the case of President Reagan on the AIDS issue. They say that Presidential silence has been used to fulfill the public expectations of leadership, “silence has been used strategically to replace the discourse...usually associated with Presidential leadership” (20). They also explain the role of surrogates in this strategy of silence, “Sympathetic discourse generated by presidential surrogates and the media define and contextualize this
discourse generated by presidential surrogates and the media define and contextualize this silence" (20).

**The Campaign Speech and Surrogate Speakers**

Michael C. Leff and Gerald P. Mohrmann discuss the unique characteristics of campaign speeches in their article, “Lincoln at Cooper Union: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Text. They say, “the ultimate goal of the campaign orator is to promote himself as a candidate” (348). They also explain that the audience judges the person, as in epideictic rhetoric, not the policy, as in deliberative rhetoric (464). The primary purpose of a political convention is to rally support for a candidate. Leff and Mohrmann say that the promotion of “oneself” as a candidate is the main aim of campaign orators and that their primary objective is “ingratiation” but this could also pertain to those people who are not candidates but who are part of the campaign. As surrogates, the speakers promote the candidates for President. The listeners know that they are speaking at the conventions to promote the candidates for president and to enhance the candidates’ ethos, not their own.

Thomas D. Clark expands on Leff and Mohrmann’s ideas and argues for a separate genre of campaign discourse. He found that campaign speeches, including those delivered by “non-candidates speaking on behalf of candidates," shared two characteristics, “1) they were specific in form, but ambiguous in content, and 2) they attempted to project images of a competent, active, friendly, and independent candidate” (124). Clark explains that speakers engage in different rhetorical strategies to meet their audiences’ expectations.

Martha Stout Kessler discusses the advantages of using surrogates. One of those
advantages is especially noteworthy for the purposes of this study: "Surrogates...perform a service to the candidate by saying things the candidate wants said, but considers, for reasons of strategy, unwise to say himself" (148). Trent and Friedenberg suggest that surrogates make statements that are not "politically expedient for the candidate to make," including "the harshest criticism of the foe" (201). Although Trent and Friedenberg say that surrogates deliver the message for the candidate, Leff and Mohrmann’s research suggests that the rhetors are not only delivering their candidates’ message but are also speaking to enhance the candidates’ credibility.

The Feminine Style

As Clark states, campaign speakers use different types of rhetorical strategies to accomplish ingratiating. Various scholars, among them Bonnie J. Dow, Mari Boor Tonn, Jane Blankenship, and Deborah C. Robson, have explored the function of the feminine style in political discourse. They suggest that the feminine style creates an "alternative approach to decision-making" that focuses on how policies affect "real" people. In their analysis of Ann Richards' political rhetoric, Dow and Tonn demonstrated the usefulness of analyzing the feminine style within the general political landscape instead of only within feminist rhetoric.

Dow and Tonn identify personal disclosure, anecdotes, tone, attitude, and examples as characteristics of the feminine style. Blankenship and Robson explain more specific characteristics of feminine style: basing political judgments on concrete, lived experience; valuing inclusivity and the relational nature of being; conceptualizing the
power of public office as a capacity to 'get things done' and to empower others; approaching policy formation holistically; and, moving women's issues to the forefront of the public arena (353). They also stress the importance of audience identification in the feminine style.

Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher use elements of the feminine style in their speeches in an effort to ingratiate Clinton and Bush with voters. By personalizing the AIDS issue, they attempt to create an identification with the audience that can be transferred to the candidate. This study examines the use of the feminine style by the surrogate speakers at the 1992 Democratic and Republican national conventions. It is significant because research on AIDS rhetoric in a political context is lacking as is research that supports the exploration of the feminine style in political discourse initiated by Dow and Tonn.

Literature Review

Previous communication research on AIDS rhetoric has mentioned the political aspects of the issue but has not focused on it. Much of this research concentrates on the rhetoric of AIDS from a homosexual perspective. There is also a growing body of health communication research that discusses the rhetoric of AIDS researchers and health workers.

Valeria Fabj and Matthew J. Sobnosky focus on the public and private realms of AIDS and how AIDS activism in the public sphere has impacted AIDS research, which, in turn, affects people in the private sphere. They conclude that AIDS, once a solely private
issue, has been made a public issue through the workings of AIDS activism. Fabj and Sobnosky state that people with AIDS have “become conscious of the relationship between AIDS, politics, and science” (181). Although their article mentions the political aspect of the AIDS issue, it is in terms of the rhetoric of AIDS activists and research, not in terms of presidential campaigns or surrogate speeches.

James Darsey discusses the issue of AIDS in terms of the gay liberation movement in his article “From ‘Gay is Good’ to the Scourge of AIDS: The Evolution of Gay Liberation Rhetoric, 1977-1990.” This article is written as a rhetorical history of the gay liberation movement and AIDS is a part of that history. Darsey does not focus on the rhetoric of politicians about AIDS but, rather, on the AIDS rhetoric of homosexuals. It is a worthwhile chronicle of the rhetoric of the gay liberation movement and the gay response to AIDS but does not explain the government response to AIDS, let alone the responses of presidential candidates or their surrogates.

The rhetorical strategies of ACT UP, an AIDS activist organization, were discussed in “Comedy As Cure for Tragedy: ACT UP and the Rhetoric of AIDS” by Adrienne E. Christiansen and Jeremy J. Hanson. Like other articles about AIDS, this one mentions the political aspects of AIDS. It also discusses Presidents Reagan and Bush but focuses on the rhetoric of ACT UP in trying to influence the two Presidents rather than on the rhetoric of the Presidents themselves.

Carol Reeves discusses the rhetoric of scientists and physicians involved with the treatment and study of AIDS in her article “Language, Rhetoric, and AIDS: The Attitudes and Strategies of Key AIDS Medical Scientists and Physicians.” She states, “Cultural
studies of AIDS have largely ignored rhetorical action as a necessary creative force in
science that negotiates between ‘old’ practices and ‘new’ problems that require changes in
practice and attitudes” (130). She also wrote another article regarding the AIDS issue
called “Rhetoric and the AIDS Virus Hunt.” In this article, Reeves discusses the
controversy surrounding the discovery of the HIV virus. Both of these articles are useful
in terms of health communication research but not in terms of the political rhetoric about
AIDS.

The idea that the United States’ AIDS policy has created so-called “innocent” and
“guilty” victims of AIDS is discussed in an article written by Mark C. Donovan called
of Innocence.” Donovan suggests that in trying to urge the government to act and the
public to accept people with AIDS, the mass media, AIDS activists, and lawmakers
promoted the minority of “sympathetic sufferers” of AIDS and left the “less sympathetic
majority out of sight” (138). These ideas will be important for the purposes of this thesis
because some of the surrogate speakers mention the distinction between the innocent and
guilty victims of AIDS. Donovan concludes that “What is needed in the United States is
political leadership which unflinchingly confronts the AIDS epidemic as a crisis which
confronts citizens” (139). This thesis expands on that idea and explains how presidential
candidates entrust surrogates to confront the AIDS issue.

Thomas L. Long explains the rhetoric of AIDS “victims” in “Plague of Pariahs:
AIDS ‘Zines and the Rhetoric of Transgression.” He explains how AIDS ‘Zines adopted
the rhetoric of punk culture and “a continuous crisis of self-representation evident even in
the format and technology of the 'zines print publication and circulation' (401). AIDS 'Zines were the products of HIV-positive gay men and, therefore, mainly consisted of their rhetoric. Long does not elaborate on political issues surrounding AIDS and does not discuss other sources of rhetoric about AIDS, such as the rhetoric from presidential candidates and/or their surrogates.

The research on AIDS rhetoric is incomplete. Many researchers recognize, understand, and even call attention to the significance of the politics surrounding AIDS but most have failed to comprehensively examine the rhetoric or lack of rhetoric about AIDS in a political context. This study does both. It examines the strategic silence concerning AIDS from candidates running for president as well as the consequent surrogate rhetoric at the national party nominating conventions. This study does not attempt to evaluate the silence of Clinton and Bush during the 1992 presidential campaign but, rather, will illustrate the use of surrogate rhetoric as a substitute for that silence at the 1992 nominating conventions. Chapter 2 contextualizes the speech texts including an overview of the AIDS issue, the 1992 presidential campaign, and specific contextual information surrounding the individual circumstances of each text. Chapter 3 establishes a theoretical framework involving campaign speaking and the feminine style that is used and applied to the speech texts in Chapter 4. Chapter 5 includes a summary, conclusions, and implications for further study.
CHAPTER 2

THE 1992 NATIONAL NOMINATING CONVENTIONS

The Campaign

It was clear from the outset that the 1992 presidential campaign was going to be an unusual one. People began commenting on the peculiar aspects of the campaign even before the primaries, calling it "the most bizarre in recent memory" (Trent 43). The first indication that it was going to be an atypical campaign was that it started later than any other campaign since 1972 (Trent 43). For example, according to Judith S. Trent, "two years before the general election some of the most likely Democratic presidential contenders called press conferences, not to announce that they would be candidates for president but to explain that they would not be entering the race" (43). According to Anthony J. Corrado, "The uncertainty surrounding the outcome of the Gulf War and the president's popularity combined to discourage potential democratic challengers from launching a bid for the presidency even though the New Hampshire primary was less than a year away" (197). President Bush had a job approval rating close to ninety percent, the highest ever recorded in public opinion polls at the time (Corrado 197).

Another indication that it would be an odd campaign was the candidates that did eventually decide to enter the race. The Democratic front-runner, Bill Clinton, "sidestepped allegations of marital infidelity, pot smoking, and draft dodging—and
remained solidly in the race" (Trent 43). Bush answered controversial questions on MTV from young voters, something never seen before in a campaign. To add to all of this, an Independent party candidate, Texas billionaire Ross Perot, entered the race then withdrew, then joined and then withdrew again. Perot had no prior political experience; in fact he had never held or even run for public office before, and even though his popularity was increasing, neither Bush or Clinton thought that Perot had a chance to win (Corrado 221). Bush and Clinton had reason, though, for not taking Perot seriously: “He had no party affiliation, no particular social or geographic constituency, no clear ideology, and no sharply defined policy views other than his call for a reduction in the federal budget deficit” (Corrado 211). He was a single issue candidate in a race with multiple issues.

AIDS In the 1992 Campaign

Most of the issues that dominated the 1992 presidential campaign were not new. Unemployment, healthcare, the national debt, and the economy, perhaps the single most dominant, were the issues on the minds of Americans (Trent 53). But one issue was new. AIDS had become, for the first time, an issue in the campaign for the presidency. In a Gallup poll, the top three problems cited as becoming worse during the Bush administration were crime, healthcare, and AIDS (Klein & McDaniel 22).

However, although AIDS was becoming an increasingly important political issue, there were political risks associated with discussing it. According to a July 14, 1992 Reuters article by Lyndsay Griffiths, “politicians have been wary of addressing a disease that has claimed gays and drug-users as its main victims.” A discussion of AIDS would
inevitably lead to a discussion of sex, homosexuality, and drug use, issues that if openly discussed could be offensive to more conservative voters and, possibly more important, to Independent voters who were looking for a candidate to support once Perot had dropped out of the race.

The AIDS issue was important in the 1992 presidential election. Although the epidemic was more than ten years old, the number of people who had died from AIDS passed 100,000 before President Reagan said the word ‘AIDS’ in public (Fisher 198). None of the three candidates in the 1992 campaign, however, had spoken about AIDS before the national conventions and neither Bush or Clinton spoke about AIDS at their respective conventions.

According to CNN Medical News Correspondent Andrew Holtz, “Ever since the beginning of the epidemic, politics and morality have been intertwined with the health debate on AIDS” (Holtz & Randall 2). Further complicating the issue was the association of AIDS with stigmatized groups beginning in the early days of the epidemic. As a result, say Kathleen German and Jeffrey Courtright, “few political leaders have risked taking action regarding the disease” (67). A poll taken by the Roper Organization before the Democratic convention found that eight out of ten Americans wanted a President who would take a leading role in the fight against AIDS. As Holtz explained, “A candidate who is for doing more about AIDS, who is concerned about AIDS, who showed compassion about it, who wanted to spend more research money to find a cure, would be benefited” (Holtz & Randall 2). However, a poll taken by the Gay Men’s Health Crisis Group around the same time found that no candidate had satisfied voters with his AIDS
Group around the same time found that no candidate had satisfied voters with his AIDS policies (Holtz & Randall 2).

The AIDS issue was obviously going to be an important one at the 1992 national party nominating conventions and possibly a deciding factor for many voters on election day. This put Clinton and Bush in a precarious position. Although AIDS had to be addressed, the candidates and the two parties had to decide how it should be handled at the conventions in front of a national audience. They needed a strategy.

Both the Democrats and the Republicans settled on a strategy that involved silence on the part of the candidates coupled with surrogate speakers to address the AIDS issue. Bush had already tested a similar strategy during the primaries. Surrogates were used to attack his Republican opponent in the primary campaign, Pat Buchanan, so Bush could remain “presidential” (Cease & Busch 38). According to James Cease and Andrew Busch, the use of surrogates was the initial step in the Bush campaign’s attack on Buchanan: “The strategy of attacking Buchanan went through several phases, starting first with the use of surrogates...coupled with milder criticism from the chief executive himself” (44-45). For example, John Sununu, Newt Gingrich, Jack Kemp, and Vice President Dan Quayle acted as surrogates for Bush following the success of an attack by actor Arnold Schwartzzeneggar in New Hampshire in which he said “Hasta la vista, Buchanan!” (Cease & Busch 38).

It is apparent that both Clinton and Bush implemented the strategy of silence coupled with surrogates because of the nature of the AIDS issue during the 1992 campaign up until the time of the conventions as well as the general politicization of the
disease. The politicization and publicity of AIDS leading up to the 1992 national party nominating conventions became a rhetorical problem for the candidates.

National Party Nominating Conventions

National party nominating conventions play a significant role in the process of electing a president. All major candidates have been nominated at national conventions since 1932 (Parris 1). Trent and Friedenberg suggest that the purpose and function of the national party nominating conventions have changed from merely making the presidential nominations official to more "symbolic or ritualistic" functions (43). The four ritualistic or symbolic functions they note are: the legitimization of the "American Dream;" to legitimize the party nominee; to show party unity; and to introduce the nominee's agenda for the general election campaign" (49-54).

The first function of the national party nominating conventions, the legitimization of the "American Dream," serves to reaffirm the correctness of the American way both in tradition and future (Trent & Friedenberg 49). Trent and Friedenberg say that the second function of the conventions is to legitimize the party nominee: "A person may have won primary after primary, but not until the convention delegates affirm selection through their voters at the convention can the candidate become the nominee" (50). The third function of the national party nominating conventions, showing party unity, is important because it is a chance to repair any damage to party unity incurred during the primary campaign (51). According to Judith H. Parris, "When the convention works well, it is, as its name would imply, a 'coming together'" (2). Finally, the fourth function is significant because the
public is introduced to the issues that will dominate the general election campaign and the
nominees stand on those issues (54). All of the functions of the national party nominating
conventions mentioned by Trent and Friedenberg contributed to the rhetorical problems of
Clinton and Bush regarding the AIDS issue and their decision to remain silent on that
issue as well as to the rhetorical problems of the surrogate speakers.

In his analysis of Barbara Jordan's 1976 keynote address, Wayne N. Thompson
describes the two audiences present at a national nominating convention, "the cheering,
partisan, highly emotional delegates, alternates, and political friends in the auditorium; and
the silent, heterogeneous, separated citizens, including television viewers" (272). He
explains that the simultaneous presence of these two audiences becomes a rhetorical
problem for the keynote speakers and candidates. It could also be considered a rhetorical
problem of surrogate speakers because they speak to the same audiences at the
conventions. It causes specific problems for the surrogate AIDS speakers at the 1992
national conventions that will be discussed further in this chapter. Thomas D. Clark
expands on this argument stating, "It seems that to meet the dual responsibilities of
appearing to speak out decisively and intelligently on issues, while also focusing their
speeches around images to which most of the voting members of their primary and
secondary audiences will respond favorably, campaign orators must write speeches
ambiguous in content, yet containing rhetorical correlates of specificity and decisiveness"
(133).

The importance of the nominating conventions and the significance of the
audiences of the conventions poses a problem for the candidates, or nominees, as well as
for the speakers. Not only does the party nominee have to bring his party together, he also has to reach out to two different audiences. The nominations are often guaranteed by the time of the convention and, according to Trent and Friedenberg, the nominee looks to specialists and consultants with an aim to “put on the best show possible” (48). They say that the nominee, not party leaders, “determines the platform, the issues to be debated, the songs to be played, the identity of those who will speak from the podium during prime time, the name of the keynote speaker or speakers, and the content and length of the ‘spontaneous’ demonstration” (48). Trent and Friedenberg say “the presence of television has restructured convention programming so that the party’s ‘important’ events occur during ‘prime time’” (45). Therefore, each nominee makes the decision when to speak and what to speak about and also chooses who will take his place to speak on what issue and when. The importance of the conventions, the dual and opposing audiences, and the four ritualistic functions of the convention cause problems for the speakers.

The Democratic National Convention

After trailing George Bush in earlier polls, Bill Clinton had improved his standing among voters going into the convention. A CBS News/New York Times poll showed that the race had become closer with Bush at 33%, Clinton at 30%, and Perot falling to 25% (Corrado 214). Corrado argues that because Clinton’s message of change seemed to be popular among voters, he was able to use the convention to “highlight his message of change and establish his leadership with the party” (214).

Clinton had been an underdog throughout the entire campaign and through the
primaries. As late as February, 1992, people were saying that Clinton should quit the race and push for support of his closest competitor in the Democratic party, Paul Tsongas. Los Angeles Times political reporter Ted Van Dyk argued that the Democrats should support Tsongas, whom he called “the most substantive and courageous of the remaining candidates” (B11). He also suggested that one more scandal or controversy involving Clinton would make it impossible for the Democrats to win in the November election (B11). However, by the end of the primaries Clinton was being called the “Come-Back Kid” and “boasted of his ability to take a punch” (Ceaser & Busch 56).

Another Los Angeles Times reporter, Robert S. McElvaine, suggested that the only hope for the democrats to win the election was for Clinton to call for an open convention. McElvaine said, “any candidate—Bill Clinton or someone else—chosen by a free, open convention is likely to be stronger in November than Clinton will be if he appears to be a candidate chosen without enthusiasm, by default, through a process that simply has not worked this year” (B7). There was skepticism in the media and among Democrats about Clinton’s ability to be a leader of the Democratic party and to win the election. As George Church asked: “Is it possible for a candidate to win a presidential nomination while convincing even many of his own party’s strongest partisans that he has the honesty and integrity to lead the nation?” (38).

Although many Gay Rights groups supported Clinton, he had run-ins during the campaign with AIDS activists (Griffiths). Rene Sanchez, a staff writer for the Washington Post, wrote about one particular incident that caused AIDS activists to criticize Clinton. Clinton canceled an appearance at a Washington, D.C. AIDS clinic “prompting AIDS
activists to complain that his presidential campaign is avoiding the issue” (a19). Jim Graham, clinic administrator, told Sanchez, “Apparently they wanted to shy away, for now, from the AIDS issue, and they were worried about a protest being staged” (a19). The Clinton campaign used a schedule conflict and time constraints as excuses for the cancellation. However, some aides admitted that the rumor of a protest by the AIDS activist group ACT-UP played a role in the decision to cancel the visit. Graham was disappointed at these events and said, “We need a candidate who’s very forthright on AIDS issues” (Sanchez a19).

The theme of Clinton’s campaign was “change.” Throughout the campaign, he worked his way from being an underdog in his own party to closing in on President Bush in the polls. This theme of “change” would continue at the convention. Ceaser and Busch stated, “Appealing directly to the Perot voters who had just been cut adrift, Clinton offered himself up as the true heir and nominee of the outside party” (72).

The Surrogates

The first openly HIV-infected speakers to address a national political convention were Bob Hattoy and Elizabeth Glaser at the 1992 Democratic National Convention in New York (German & Courtright 69). Hattoy, an openly gay man, had been working on Bill Clinton’s campaign up until a few weeks before the Convention. He resigned after being diagnosed with AIDS (Gallagher & Bull 86). Hattoy had been a lobbyist for the Sierra Club, an environmental organization, before joining Clinton’s campaign. His speech at the convention was his first experience as an AIDS activist.
Hattoy was diagnosed with the AIDS virus in May, 1992 (Berke 28). He had been working as an environmental advisor for Bill Clinton since the beginning of the primary season. Clinton personally asked Hattoy to address the convention to which Hattoy answered, “I’m not sure I should do it. Maybe it should be a black or a woman” (Schmalz A10). However, Clinton convinced him to do it and Hattoy felt it was his obligation to do it, not as a gay rights or AIDS activist but as a friend.

Glaser was a scheduled speaker at the Democratic National Convention before Hattoy was invited. She had confronted Clinton’s campaign chairman, Mickey Kantor, and convinced him that she had something to say (Levy 4D). Glaser was well-known, both as a person and an AIDS activist. People knew her name because of her marriage to actor-director Paul Michael Glaser and were aware of her AIDS activism because of her non-profit organization, the Pediatric AIDS Foundation. Glaser’s first speech involving AIDS came in late 1989 when she successfully encouraged Congress and the Bush Administration to increase funding for pediatric AIDS research (Glaser & Palmer 49). Glaser blamed Republicans for the epidemic, as she states in her book, In the Absence of Angels: “What could have stopped the fear and hysteria was strong leadership from the Reagan administration. But in those early years of the epidemic, that leadership was absent” (60).

Glaser contracted the AIDS virus from a blood transfusion she received in 1981 due to complications after giving birth to her first child, a daughter named Ariel (Ellis & Sheff 46). She passed the virus to Ariel through her breast milk and to her second child, a
son named Jake, in utero. The three were not diagnosed until 1986 when Ariel began having health problems.

Glaser did not become an AIDS activist or begin speaking about AIDS when she and her children were diagnosed. She did not speak out when they experienced discrimination and ignorance with health care providers, in school, and from their friends. Elizabeth Glaser did not become an AIDS activist until the death of Ariel in 1988 (Glaser & Palmer 47).

The Glaser’s faced many barriers in trying to get the latest treatments for their daughter and found that there was little research being done on AIDS and children. So, she started the Pediatric AIDS Foundation. At first, Glaser kept her involvement secret to protect her family’s privacy as they had still not made a public announcement. Only after the National Enquirer informed them that they were going to run a story about Ariel’s death and Elizabeth and Jake’s illness did the Glasers come out publicly with their story in the Los Angeles Times.

So, although Glaser and Hattoy were eager to speak at the Convention, there was a debate among the press, the Republicans, and the Democrats about whether or not they accurately represented the AIDS community. According to Kathleen German and Jeffrey L. Courtright, Hattoy was almost immediately dismissed because he had been a member of Clinton’s campaign staff (69). Glaser was a white woman married to a TV star who got AIDS “innocently” and represented the less stigmatized faction of the AIDS community (German & Courtright 69).

Although Hattoy and Glaser had not been AIDS activists for long, they would be
well-known at the Convention. Hattoy would be recognized by many within the Democratic party and Glaser would be a recognized face on television.

Audience

The immediate audience at the Convention consisted of thousands of delegates, dignitaries, and guests (German & Courtright). Even with all of the media coverage of the AIDS issue, the disagreement within the party as to how large a priority AIDS should be, and the argument about whether or not Glaser and Hattoy represented the “average” person with AIDS, Glaser and Hattoy were still considered to be speaking to a “converted audience.” A majority of the audience wore red ribbons that symbolize support and sympathy for people with AIDS. The differences on the AIDS issue and controversy about the speakers were forgotten and replaced with a general atmosphere of sympathy for the speakers and AIDS sufferers in general.

Aside from the usual audience at the Convention, the 1992 Democratic National Convention audience consisted of groups of political activists. According to John H. Fund, the activists prevalent at the convention belonged to one of three groups: public employee unions, gay rights caucuses, or feminists (A16). A San Diego Clinton delegate, Victor Castillo, noted proudly that 104 of the delegates at the convention were gay or lesbian (Fund A16).

The television audience was also important. Because Independent party candidate Ross Perot had withdrawn from the race shortly before the Democratic Convention, there was speculation that his supporters would be paying close attention to the Convention to...
find another candidate (Apple 1). The planners of the convention also scheduled events that would be attractive to television viewers (German & Courtright 68).

Rhetorical Problems

There was debate about whether AIDS should even be addressed at the Democratic National Convention. Gays and lesbians within the Democratic party had different views on which issues should take top priority (German & Courtright 69). Gays in the military, equal job opportunities, and gay marriage and adoption were all important and relevant issues affecting the gay and lesbian community. Some felt that AIDS should be of the highest priority, however, because people were dying.

There were protests from people who argued that diseases such as cancer, heart disease, and diabetes were being ignored and poorly funded because of AIDS. The conservative "family values" theme at the center of the Republican campaign challenged many of the Democratic views on many issues, including AIDS (Hartman 387).

Bob Hattoy himself had some issues that were competing with his own message at the convention. In an interview with New York Times reporter Jeffrey Schmalz, Hattoy was asked what he hoped to accomplish with his speech. He replied, "None of what I dream about is going to happen as a result of my speech...George Bush will be fishing. Most of America will get up and get a beer. And I'll still have AIDS" (A10).

One of the major competing forces was the argument by the Republicans and the press that Hattoy and Glaser did not accurately represent the AIDS community. Not only were the Republicans commenting about this but some Democrats were as well. Thomas
B. Stoddard, a New York gay rights leader said, “She’s a celebrity and he’s a campaign worker. It’s a false image of AIDS” (German & Courtright 69).

The Republican National Convention

President Bush’s main opponent within the Republican party during the 1992 primary season was Patrick J. Buchanan, a conservative television commentator and columnist who had held communication positions in the Reagan and Nixon administrations (Cease & Busch 38). Buchanan gained the support of the right-wing, conservative Republicans at the start of the campaign (Rollins M2). The conservative Republicans had been alienated by Bush and he needed to gain their support. One way he did this, according to Ann Devroy, was by opposing gay rights laws: “President Bush told a group of evangelical Christian leaders that he opposes special laws to protect the rights of homosexuals” (a14). However, Bush also had to appeal to the Independents who had supported Perot. This became a rhetorical problem for him in terms of speaking about AIDS.

Although Bush had often tried to defend himself and his administration by stating their efforts to combat AIDS, the opinion was that Republicans did not care. As Mary Fisher states in her autobiography, “President Bush and, even more routinely, some of his Cabinet members were seen as not merely anti-gay or anti-AIDS but as indifferent to the plight of those who were now dying” (250).

The impact of the speeches by Glaser and Hattoy, which were called “poignant” and moved some delegates to tears, led Bill Clinton to make AIDS central to his campaign
for the presidency after the Democratic Convention (Schmalz 1). He promised to spend more on AIDS research, he said he would implement recommendations from the National Commission on AIDS, and he said he would also support safe sex programs and condom distribution in schools, all of which contradicted what the Bush administration had done during the last four years (Holtz & Randall 2). The AIDS community, even more so than before the Democratic Convention, was asking what the Republicans, specifically President Bush, were going to do about AIDS (Dority 28). Mary Fisher was the answer to that question.

Activist groups, like ACT UP, were planning protests of the Republican National Convention months in advance. One of these protests included shipping coffins to Houston that marchers would carry on their shoulders as the President passed (Fisher 229). On the day of her speech, Fisher said, “The midday news from Houston was all about President Bush’s fundraising appearance which had been interrupted by local AIDS activists waving condoms in the air and shouting ‘What about AIDS?’” (Fisher 235).

The theme of the evening of August 19 at the Convention was “family values” a common theme throughout the campaign (Schwartz A33). This is significant because many of the Republicans had been targeting homosexuals and their stereotypical lifestyles. They were unsympathetic to gay issues and suggested that there were innocent and guilty victims of AIDS. Schwartz said, “It is the lack of tolerance for AIDS patients that Fisher said she wanted to change with her presence” (A33).
The Surrogate

Mary Fisher was highly motivated to speak at the Republican National Convention in 1992. She had already been speaking out about the fight against AIDS and the Convention would provide her with a nationwide audience. As she states in her book, My Name is Mary, “The more I learned, the more I wanted to do something useful, to make a difference” (198).

Jeffrey Schmalz, a reporter for the New York Times, had been covering the AIDS issue since AIDS was still known as a gay cancer in 1981. He interviewed Fisher about a week before her speech at the convention to find out what she would say. In his article from August 16, 1992, Schmalz discussed AIDS advocates who were cynical of Fisher: “a few say she is allowing herself to be used as the AIDS poster girl by a party that they believed has done little to fight the disease” (10).

In July 1991, Mary Fisher discovered that she was HIV-positive (Fisher 181). As soon as she began telling people of her status, they started telling her that she was in a position to do something about the problem of AIDS in America. In her book, My Name is Mary, Fisher recalls a conversation with Sally Fisher, no relation, who said, “You’re not a gay man. You’re not a Santa Fe liberal. You’re in the All-American Republican Power Family, a sweet blonde mom with two kids. You’re just what we’ve needed” (194).

Although Fisher began speaking at AIDS events there were certain facets of the AIDS community who were skeptical of Fisher, but more so of the Republican party. As she states in her book, “The American AIDS community was, in 1991, nearly unanimous in its judgment that Republicans in the White House—first President Reagan, then
President Bush—had done more to fan the spread of AIDS than to fight it. Research was too little. Compassion was a scarce commodity” (198).

It was not just by coincidence that Fisher was invited to speak at the Convention. Her adoptive father, Max Fisher, was a major Republican fundraiser and contributor (Schmalz 1). Fisher was also a well-known member of the Republican party. With the help of her father, she got a job in the White House working for President Ford.

Fisher began to write the speech that she would deliver at the convention with the help of a speechwriter who had assisted her in writing previous speeches about AIDS. She wanted to point out that if AIDS could happen to her, it could happen to anybody. She wanted to reach as many people as possible. Through negotiations, she was able to move her scheduled time to speak to prime-time which would allow her to reach a larger television audience (Fisher 225).

Audience

The immediate audience of the Convention consisted of Republicans, delegates, and media from all over the world and with numerous agendas. However, the delegates at National Conventions are not “average” party members. They are those people who have done something extraordinary for the Party that has gotten them noticed enough to be invited to the Convention. For example, Mary Fisher’s father was a delegate at the 1992 Convention and had been a delegate on eight previous occasions (Schmalz 1). He was a major fund-raiser for and a top contributor to the Republican party.

In her speech, however, Fisher did not target this audience alone. Her speech was
delivered on national television during prime-time. She targeted a national television audience. It was an election year and the only reason for people to speak at the Convention was to help get President Bush re-elected. Therefore, Fisher also targeted undecided voters.

Rhetorical Problems

Fisher faced challenges from several key competing persuasive forces. There were those members of the AIDS community who felt that she was abandoning them by "siding" with the Republicans. There were protestors at the Convention and gay activists who were trying to disrupt the Convention. There were members of the Republican party who blamed homosexuals and their lifestyles for the AIDS epidemic. Because it was an election year and her speech was delivered in a political context, the Democrats and the Democratic National Convention was also a force.

The AIDS community and gay activists wanted to know what Bush would do about AIDS if he were to be re-elected. Clinton had already managed to make AIDS policy a large part of his campaign after the Democratic convention. These two forces were working together. Elizabeth Glaser and Bob Hattoy had spoken at the Democratic National Convention in July. According to Barbara Dority, they both accused the Republicans and President Bush of not doing enough in the fight against AIDS (27). The AIDS community believed the promises made by Clinton following the convention that he would continue the fight against AIDS if he was elected.

A New Republic article by Norman Mailer explained some of the protests. There
were arrests, clashes with police, flaming effigies of George Bush, chants, such as "We’re also innocent and we’re going to die" (23). This chant was inspired by a comment made by a Republican who said that AIDS was a tragedy when it took the lives of "innocent" children (24). These protests competed with Fisher because she would be seen as an "innocent victim." She had contracted HIV in marriage and some members of the AIDS community thought that she would be sending the wrong message.

Fisher wrote about some Republicans at the Convention who were competing with her message. For example, in her book she mentions that Marilyn Quayle, the Vice President’s wife, and a television actor were talking and joking so loudly during the beginning of her speech that she could barely concentrate until someone told them to be quiet (240). Mailer wrote about Republicans who said AIDS stood for "Anal Injection-Dirty Sex" (26). He also mentioned "the forces of the right, equally inflamed by the more and more vivid presence of the gay nation, were out to extirpate all human flesh that carried the virus" (26).

Fisher and her speechwriter also had concerns that the speech would be changed, that what she read on the TelePrompTer on the night she was speaking would be different from what they had written (233). So, to combat this, she memorized her speech. They also gave a copy of her speech to the Los Angeles Times that night as insurance, knowing that the newspaper would print the original speech the next day.

In his New York Times article from August 16, 1992, Jeffrey Schmalz described the difficulty Fisher faced, "Party officials were more or less forced into letting her speak" (1). He explained how some felt that they had to counter the speeches given by Glaser
and Hattoy at the Democratic Convention and others who recognized the influence of her father. Even though she was invited to speak, many Republicans didn’t want to address the AIDS issue.

Conclusion

The presidential candidates faced similar and different rhetorical problems involving the AIDS issue in the 1992 campaign. Their were political risks associated with discussing AIDS but also with ignoring it. Bush and Clinton had sidestepped the issue throughout the primary campaign, focusing rather on healthcare, the economy, the environment, and other less controversial issues. However, with the national nominating conventions approaching, AIDS and the lack of discussion from the candidates about AIDS had become an important publicized issue. It had to be addressed. Instead of facing these rhetorical problems directly, both Bush and Clinton remained silent in regard to the AIDS issue at the conventions and decided to address it indirectly through the use of surrogate speakers.

The surrogates, too, faced similar and different rhetorical problems. They confronted the same rhetorical problem of the candidates in that AIDS was associated with stigmatized groups, drug use, and homosexual behavior. However, the rhetorical problems that Clinton’s surrogates faced were different than those that Bush’s surrogate faced.

Although the surrogates faced different challenges at the two conventions, their purposes were basically the same. They were there to increase the credibility of their
party's candidate on an issue that had become an important one in the election: AIDS. Elizabeth Glaser and Bob Hattoy spoke in support of Bill Clinton and Mary Fisher in support of George Bush. How each speaker attempted to achieve their purpose will be more thoroughly examined in the following chapters.
CHAPTER 3

THE FEMININE STYLE OF COMMUNICATION IN CAMPAIGN ORATORY

This theoretical perspective is based on careful examination of the texts of the speeches as well as of the context and rhetorical problems of the speakers, Bob Hattoy, Elizabeth Glaser, and Mary Fisher. Because these three speakers acted as surrogates for presidential candidates Bill Clinton and George Bush, their speeches are best characterized as a group as being campaign speeches. Therefore, the theoretical perspective that frames the analysis of their speeches combines elements of epideictic and deliberative rhetoric, campaign speeches, and the feminine style of communication in political discourse.

The Campaign Speech and Surrogate Speakers

Martha Stout Kessler explains the role of surrogates for presidential candidates stating, "surrogates served important needs of three groups - the candidates for whom they spoke, the audiences they addressed, and the surrogates themselves" (148). Kessler also discusses the advantages of using surrogates. One of those advantages is especially noteworthy for the purposes of this study: "Surrogates....perform a service to the candidate by saying things the candidate wants said, but considers, for reasons of strategy, unwise to say himself" (148). Due to the nature of the AIDS issue in the 1992 campaign
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and the association of AIDS with sex, homosexuality, and drug use, surrogate speakers were considered an advantage.

Judith S. Trent and Robert V. Friedenberg suggest that surrogates make statements that are not “politically expedient for the candidate to make,” including “the harshest criticism of the foe” (201). Although Trent and Friedenberg say that surrogates deliver the message for the candidate, Michael C. Leff and Gerald P. Mohrmann’s research suggests that the rhetors are not only delivering their candidates’ message but are also speaking to enhance the candidates’ credibility.

Surrogates speak when presidents—or presidential candidates—choose to remain silent. Keith V. Erickson and Wallace V. Schmidt conclude that “Presidential political silence is contextual, announced, strategic, and rhetorically potent” (420). They also suggest that a president “may fall victim to ineloquent surrogate rhetoric, ill-advised dramatistic acts, lessened credibility, rhetorical distance, and inadvertently harm fellow party candidates” (421). For example, Robert Dole acted as a surrogate for Gerald Ford during his campaign for the presidency. Erickson and Schmidt say that Dole was perceived to be “caustic and arrogant” and Ford’s “nice guy” image was damaged by Dole’s sarcasm (413).

When discussing surrogate rhetoric, Erickson and Schmidt state that surrogates must be carefully selected and “must refine and coordinate their rhetoric in order to avoid contradictions and conflicts of opinion between themselves and the White House” (413). Clearly, preventing similar contradictions between surrogates and presidential candidates is essential as well.
Previous research by Tina L. Perez and George N. Dionisopoulos focused on President Reagan’s silence concerning AIDS. They suggest that this silence was sanctioned by the public and “facilitated by surrogate discourse which depicts the president as actively involved in addressing the situation at hand” (29). Further, Perez and Dionisopoulos suggest that Reagan made a decision concerning AIDS “to treat the crisis as more of a political problem than a health issue” (30). The authors claim that presidential silence “has been used strategically to replace the discourse...usually associated with Presidential leadership” (20). They also explain the role of surrogates in this strategy of silence, “Sympathetic discourse generated by presidential surrogates and the media define and contextualize this silence” (20).

Leff and Mohrmann discuss the unique characteristics of campaign speeches in their article, “Lincoln at Cooper Union: A Rhetorical Analysis of the Text.” They incorporate ideas about personal and non-personal persuasion set forth by Paul I. Rosenthal. In his article, “The Concept of Ethos and the Structure of Persuasion,” Rosenthal makes a distinction between these two types of persuasion. The relationship between the speaker, the message, and the environment determines the type of persuasion used by the speaker (126).

Leff and Mohrmann explain that in non-personal persuasion, “the speaker attempts to influence audience attitudes about a particular issue” and in personal persuasion, “The focal point is the speaker, and the message becomes a vehicle for enhancing ethos” (348). They characterize campaign orations as examples of personal persuasion. A campaign orator uses their message to enhance ethos. Leff and Mohrmann say, “the ultimate goal of
the campaign orator is to promote himself as a candidate" (348). They also explain that
the audience judges the person, as in epideictic rhetoric, not the policy, as in deliberative
rhetoric (464).

To evaluate a campaign discourse, Leff and Mohrmann examine whether the
orator meets the primary objective. They call this objective “ingratiation,” and say, “Both
policies and character are in question, but the treatment of issues is subsidiary to the
purpose of creating a general identification between the speaker and the audience” (348).
Leff and Mohrmann conclude that Lincoln’s speech was created to meet the “immediate
problems” of the campaign to get elected (358). They suggest that “The object of
judgment, however, is not a policy, as it is in deliberative speaking, but a person, as it is in
epideictic” (464). The ideas about personal persuasion and the campaign speech, a hybrid
of two classical genres (epideictic and deliberative), may be able to suggest a similar
argument regarding the speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher.

Although Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher were surrogates when they delivered their
speeches, their aim was to rally support for the candidates. The candidate at the 1992
Democratic National Convention was Bill Clinton and, as speakers at the convention,
Hattoy and Glaser spoke for him and his candidacy. The candidate at the 1992 Republican
National Convention was George Bush and, as a speaker at that Convention, Fisher was
an intermediary, or surrogate, between Bush and the audience. Thus, their speeches were
clearly campaign orations as explained by Leff and Mohrmann. In his discussion of
rhetorical genres, Aristotle says that the listener “determines the speech’s end and object”
(1335). If that is true of the separate genres, it should also be true of a hybrid of two
genres, epideictic and deliberative, that Leff and Mohrmann argue a campaign speech is. As surrogates, Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher promote Clinton and Bush as candidates for President. The listeners of these speeches know that the speakers are there to promote their candidate for President. They know that they are there to enhance his ethos, not their own.

Celeste Michelle Condit identifies a speech as being epideictic “if a message’s content consisted primarily of praise or blame of an object, event or person” (285). Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Thomas R. Burkholder describe deliberative rhetoric as being political and explain that it “is characterized by audience members who function as judges of future events—that is, of proposed policies or courses of action” (99). The speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher reveal both epideictic and deliberative qualities.

The characteristics of epideictic and deliberative rhetoric function together in these speeches. The deliberative qualities seem to be more pronounced. However, these speeches do not behave the way deliberative rhetoric is supposed to. Deliberative rhetoric usually relies heavily on supporting materials and an argument that is deductive. The three speeches do not contain these elements. They are speeches that use deliberative means to reach an epideictic end. They are hybrids.

The rhetors analyzed in this thesis were not candidates when the speeches were delivered. However, the speeches were delivered at national party nominating conventions. Although Trent and Friedenberg explain four purposes of political conventions, as noted in the previous chapter, they conclude that the primary purpose is to rally support for the candidate. Therefore, the rhetors to be analyzed acted as
intermediaries, or surrogates, between the candidates and the audience. Leff and Mohrmann say that the promotion of “oneself” as a candidate is the main aim of campaign orators. However, for those people who are not candidates but who are part of the campaign, like Bob Hattoy, Elizabeth Glaser, and Mary Fisher, the promotion of the candidate is their main aim.

Thomas D. Clark supports the idea of a establishing a separate genre of campaign discourse in his article, “An exploration of Generic Aspects of Contemporary American Campaign Orations.” He found that campaign speeches, including those delivered by “non-candidates speaking on behalf of candidates,” attempted to convey the candidate as being competent, active, friendly, and independent (124). He also said that campaign speeches are ambiguous in content which benefits candidates because the vagueness allows them to reach out to more voters. Clark explains that campaign speakers engage in different rhetorical strategies to meet their audiences’ expectations in regard to competence, action, friendliness, and independence.

According to Clark, the campaign speaker cites nonspecific solutions, uses substantive and personal authority to justify her/his arguments, and uses collective nouns to create an image of candidate competence. Clark suggests that portraying the candidate as being “active” is also an important element of the campaign speech: “use of self references focuses the speech on the candidate and adds to the image of the candidate being an active person, one who makes things happen, an image consistent with the American ideal of a political representative” (132). For surrogates, like Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher, “self references,” became “candidate references.” Audience pronouns are used
in campaign speeches to enhance informality and friendliness. The image of independence is created by using few to no quotations and/or authoritative citations. In terms of surrogate campaign speeches, these quotations and citations would be limited to those from the candidate.

It is useful to examine the speeches from this perspective because they are both deliberative and epideictic in nature and act like campaign speeches with Hattoy, Glaser, or Fisher as a surrogate. The concepts of personal persuasion and campaign oration shed new light on the analysis of these speeches. However, Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher fulfill the expectations of campaign oratory in a distinctive fashion that is best characterized as feminine style.

The Feminine Style

Various scholars, among them Bonnie J. Dow, Mari Boor Tonn, Jane Blankenship, and Deborah C. Robson, have explored the function of "feminine style" in political discourse. Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher employed elements of feminine style to fulfill the expectations for campaign orations.

In their article about the rhetoric of a female political figure, Ann Richards, Dow and Tonn suggest that the rhetoric of female political speakers has traditionally been unsuitably evaluated because the standards of "good" public communication are based on characteristics of male communication which is "abstract, hierarchical, dominating, and oriented toward problem-solving" (288). They argue that female communication patterns develop from the socialization of women into social roles that require "emotional support,
nurturance, empathy, and concrete reasoning” and that this “feminine style” of communication is characterized as “concrete, participatory, cooperative, and oriented toward relationship maintenance” (288).

Dow and Tonn analyze Richards’s rhetoric that would traditionally be characterized as deliberative. They conclude that the “analysis of rhetoric such as Richards’ demonstrates the declining usefulness of distinctions between public and private modes of discourse and thought, a distinction that has devalued women’s rhetorical and political contributions” (299). Dow and Tonn advocate the usefulness of applying the feminine style, which had since been applied only to feminist rhetors within feminist movements, to rhetoric within the broader political landscape. This can provide useful insight into the Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher speeches which may also help to reinforce this argument.

Building on an earlier work by Karlyn Kohrs Campbell, Dow and Tonn say:

Campbell notes that the use of these types of evidence [personal anecdotes, concrete examples, and brief narratives] can function to empower audiences because the generalizations reached from validation of personal experiences lead to the realization that ‘the personal is political,’ a process which produces group cohesion and transforms audience members into ‘agents of change’ (289).

The speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher demonstrate this process. Their speeches, although about AIDS, are political speeches delivered at nominating conventions. The purpose of the speeches is to persuade the audience to vote for a candidate for President. By making AIDS a personal issue and associating it with a
candidate, they hope to get the audience to vote for that person. Dow and Tonn argue that audience identification, a goal of feminine style, can also be achieved through the telling of personal experience (292). Getting the audience to identify with the candidate will also help to achieve the purpose.

The characteristics of feminine style discussed by Dow and Tonn have since been expanded. In their article, “A ‘Feminine Style’ in Women’s Political Discourse: An Exploratory Essay,” Jane Blankenship and Deborah C. Robson identify five characteristics of the feminine style of communication that are used by both women and men in political rhetoric: basing political judgments on concrete, lived experience; valuing inclusivity and the relational nature of being; conceptualizing the power of public office as a capacity to ‘get things done’ and to empower others; approaching policy formation holistically; and, moving women’s issues to the forefront of the public arena (353).

The first characteristic of feminine style, “basing political judgments on concrete, lived experience,” is included as a characteristic of the feminine style because of how women acquire it (359). They discuss how social practices of women develop characteristics of caregiving and nurturing in the private sphere and that women bring these characteristics into the public sphere, unlike men, who are socialized to only use a communication style “appropriate” to the public sphere. It would be useful to subject the Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher speeches to this approach because Blankenship and Robson argue that, “Basing political judgment on lived experiences personalizes issues in powerful and compelling ways” (359).

The second characteristic of feminine style, “valuing inclusivity and the relational
nature of being,” involves the importance of relationships. Blankenship and Robson suggest that “women enter politics framing government more in terms of public service than career opportunity” (360). They also explain the relational nature of being, “the central organizing feature of women’s development of a sense of self and self worth is an inner sense of connection to others, the ability to create and maintain relationships” (360).

The third characteristic of feminine style mentioned by Blankenship and Robson, “conceptualizing the power of public office fundamentally as the capacity to ‘get things done’ and empower others,” is attributed to gender socialization (361). This conceptualization of power as the “power to” rather than “power over” is related to the first characteristic because it has developed due to women’s traditional social roles that remain part of them in the public sphere (361). While the more traditional “male” political discourse express having power themselves, the “feminine style” of power conceptualization is an alternative.

Blankenship and Robson explain how, in the feminine style, policy formation is approached holistically, the fourth characteristic (362). The relational nature of being in the feminine style leads to the characteristic of approaching policy formation holistically because the wanting of relationships creates an interdependence of the system. As Blankenship and Robson argue, “It is within the context of this fuller system that effective policy formation occurs” (362).

The final characteristic of the feminine style discussed by Blankenship and Robson relates not to how women communicate in the public arena but rather to what they communicate about, “specific kinds of legislation with which women identify, but which
have been traditionally neglected in legislative bodies” (362). They argue that this is a characteristic of feminine style because women in public office have realized that if they don’t bring “women’s issues” to the agenda, nobody will. It is a “shared need and shared lived experience that pushes women to try to bring women’s issues to the fore” (363).

Although Blankenship and Robson say that their conclusions may not be generalizable to settings other than governance settings, they say that the “likelihood is strong” (363). This is an important realization toward using this approach to evaluate the speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher. None of the speakers were serving in any state or city government and their speeches were not given in a governance setting. However, chapter two revealed the significance of the political setting surrounding their speeches and they are characterized as campaign speeches. Blankenship and Robson also emphasize that the feminine style is not exclusive to females stating, “there is, a feminine style that is spoken, in part, by men and, more fully, by women” (363). Therefore, using this approach to identify specific elements of the characteristics of the feminine style is not only appropriate but enlightening.

Conclusion

This chapter has explained a theory of feminine style in campaign oratory and how it might be used by surrogates. Leff and Mohrmann characterize campaign speeches as examples of personal persuasion, the goal of which is to promote the candidate. The audience judges the person, not the policy. Therefore, the message about AIDS is secondary to the speakers’ messages about their candidate.
Elements of the feminine style are used to meet the primary aim of a campaign speech: ingratiation. One element of the feminine style is that it is used to personalize issues. This is accomplished through the use of personal tone and attitude and through the telling of personal experience. Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher use the feminine style hoping to get an emotional reaction from the voters which they hope will be transferred to the candidate and increase the candidates ethos. They hope to ingratiate the candidate with the voters by personalizing AIDS. Dow and Tonn suggest that there is an emerging trend in political theory integrating feminine values and, “Such a feminine political theory might include valuation of the ethic of care, of enhanced emotional capacity, and of empathy in relationships” (298). The following chapter will include an analysis of each speech text as well as a discussion of their impact on this trend in political theory.
CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS

The theoretical perspective explained in the previous chapter was based on the feminine style of communication and how it might be used by surrogates in campaign discourse. This perspective lends insight to the speeches delivered by Bob Hattoy, Elizabeth Glaser, and Mary Fisher at the national nominating conventions in 1992. Elements of the feminine style are used to meet the primary aim of a campaign speech: ingratiation. This perspective shows how these elements of the feminine style are used by surrogate speakers in an attempt to ingratiate the candidate with voters by producing an emotional reaction and transferring that feeling to the candidate. This chapter will first review the characteristics of campaign orations and the feminine style. It will then illustrate how Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher use the feminine style in campaign speeches in an attempt to ingratiate their candidates with voters on the subject of AIDS.

Deliberative Means, Epideictic End

The speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser and Fisher are examples of campaign orations as explained by Michael C. Leff and Gerald P. Mohrmann. They are speeches that use deliberative means to reach an epideictic end. Leff and Mohrmann argue, “One who listens to a campaign speech is a judge of a future event, and he is urged to do
something... The object of judgment, however, is not a policy, as it is in deliberative speaking, but a person, as it is in epideictic” (464). In his discussion of rhetorical genres, Aristotle says that the listener “determines the speech’s end and object” (1335). If that is true of the separate genres, it should also be true of a hybrid of two genres, epideictic and deliberative, that Leff and Mohrmann argue a campaign speech is. Although they say that the purpose of a campaign oration is to create “a general identification between the speaker and the audience,” the suggestion is that the purpose is to create identification between the candidate and the audience (348). They refer to this objective as ingratiation.

As surrogates, Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher promote Clinton and Bush as candidates for President. The listeners of these speeches know that the speakers are there to promote their candidate for President. They know that the speakers are there to enhance his credibility, not their own.

Both Hattoy and Glaser advise listeners to vote for Bill Clinton instead of George Bush. Hattoy says, “It’s time to move George Bush out of the White House” [9]. Glaser says “Take America back” [16] and, “The people in this hall—this week, the Democratic party—all of us... in November we can all bring it home” [17]. Fisher urges her listeners to adopt a personal policy with regard to AIDS and people who have AIDS, saying, “My call to the nation is a plea for awareness” [11]. These statements reveal deliberative elements of their speeches.

The speeches by Hattoy and Glaser include epideictic qualities that blame the

---

1. Bracketed numbers [ ] indicate paragraph numbers within the text of the speech. See Appendix.
Republican party and former President Reagan and President Bush. Hattoy states, “AIDS is a disease of the Reagan-Bush years” [4]. Glaser practically blames former President Reagan for the death of her daughter, saying: “Exactly four years ago my daughter died of AIDS—she did not survive the Reagan administration” [3]. Fisher praises President Bush and the Republican Party for their efforts regarding AIDS, an epideictic quality of her speech: “With the President’s leadership, much good has been done” [9]. As surrogates, Hattoy and Glaser tried to promote Clinton as a presidential candidate and Fisher attempted the same with Bush. Thomas D. Clark, in arguing for a separate genre for campaign discourse, explains that campaign speakers engage in different rhetorical strategies. The speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher are campaign speeches that use the feminine style to ingratiate the candidate with the voters.

The Feminine Style

Bonnie J. Dow and Mari Boor Tonn say that the feminine style of communication is “concrete, participatory, cooperative, and oriented toward relationship maintenance” (288). They suggest that personal anecdotes, concrete examples, personal tone, attitude and the use of personal experience as evidence, are characteristics of the feminine style. As explained in the previous chapter, the goal of campaign speeches is to promote the candidate. Speakers can do this in several ways. The surrogate speakers analyzed in this thesis use the feminine style in an attempt to ingratiate their candidate with voters by personalizing the AIDS issue and triggering an emotional reaction.

Building on the works of Dow and Tonn, Jane Blankenship and Deborah C.
Robson identify five characteristics of the feminine style of communication that are used by both women and men in political discourse:

- basing political judgments on concrete, lived experience; valuing inclusivity and the relational nature of being; conceptualizing the power of public office as a capacity to 'get things done' and to empower others; approaching policy formation holistically; and, moving women's issues to the forefront of the public arena (353).

Through their use of the feminine style Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher personalize the AIDS issue and associate it with their respective candidates in order to ingratiate these candidates with voters.

Bob Hattoy

The purpose of Bob Hattoy's "Presentation on AIDS" was to persuade the audience that Bill Clinton was a more compassionate, kind, courageous, and worthy candidate for President than was George Bush. He says, "I am here tonight because of one man's courage and conviction, one man's dedication and daring and yes, one man's true kindness" [2]. He follows this with several examples of why Clinton is a more honorable candidate for President than Bush. He says, "AIDS does not discriminate but George Bush's White House does," [3] and, "AIDS is a disease of the Reagan-Bush years" [4].

Hattoy personalizes the AIDS issue through self disclosure and a personal tone that ranges from proud to angry and bitter. He reveals to the audience that he is a gay man with AIDS and a proud member of the Gay and Lesbian community in America: "I'm
a Gay man with AIDS and if there’s any honor in having this disease it’s because it’s an honor being part of the Gay and Lesbian community in America” [6] and “The Gay and Lesbian community is an American family in the best sense of the word” [8]. This gives Hattoy the credibility to speak on AIDS and to speak to Clinton’s credibility on AIDS: “And although I am a person with AIDS, I am a person with hope, because I know how different my life and all our lives could be if I could call my boss Mr. President” [13]. Hattoy also aligns himself with Democrats and Clinton supporters, saying, “So I stand here tonight in support of Bill Clinton,” [12] and, “All of you came here tonight...I think it’s really important to understand that this year, more than any other year, we must vote as if our life depends upon it” [15].

Although the tone of Hattoy’s speech varies from pride to anger and bitterness, it is a personal tone. He is proud of Clinton, proud to be working for Clinton and a proud Clinton supporter. On two occasions Hattoy mentions that he works for Clinton and that Clinton is the reason why he is speaking. He is angry at George Bush and blames him for doing nothing to help slow the spread of AIDS in paragraph four, “AIDS is a disease of the Reagan-Bush years” and “George Bush doesn’t talk about AIDS, much less do anything about it.” This use of personal tone are evidence of Hattoy’s use of the feminine style.

An important paragraph in Hattoy’s speech links the philosophy of Martin Luther King to the AIDS issue. He says, “Martin Luther King once said that our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter. Fifty thousand people took to the streets in New York today because they will no longer be silent about AIDS” [14]. King
invokes powerful images in the minds of listeners and linking him with the fight against AIDS and AIDS-related discrimination was valuable.

Feminine style pervades Hattoy’s speech. He uses the personal examples and disclosure to, as Dow and Tonn suggest, invite the audience to take a personal attitude toward the subject and to identify with him on some level, “You see, I have AIDS” [3]. He also says, “I’m a Gay man with AIDS” [6].

Consistent with the elements of the feminine style as explained by Blankenship and Robson, Hattoy bases his political judgments on lived experiences. For example, in the seventh paragraph of his speech he says, “We have watched our friends and lovers die, but we have not given up hope.” He also states, “So I stand here tonight in support of Bill Clinton, a man who sees the value in each and every member of the American family. And, although I am a person with AIDS, I am a person with hope, because I know how different my life and all our lives could be if I could call my boss Mr. President” [13]. The basic structure of Hattoy’s speech is based on his lived experiences. Hattoy suggests that Bush, not AIDS, is the problem and that the solution to the problem is to elect Clinton [9, 10, 11, 12 & 13].

Hattoy mentions his pride in being a member of the Gay and Lesbian community several times. These instances reveal the second characteristic of feminine style, “valuing inclusivity and the relational nature of being.” He says, “I’m a Gay man with AIDS and if there’s any honor in having this disease it’s because it’s an honor being part of the Gay and Lesbian community in America” [6]. He also equates the Gay and Lesbian community to a family, clearly illustrating the value of his relationship with members of that
community, "Gay men and Lesbians created community health clinics, provided educational materials, opened food kitchens, and held the hands of the dying in hospices. The Gay and Lesbian community is an American family in the best sense of the word" [8]. He targets two groups that he feels a strong connection to, the Gay and Lesbian community and the Democrats, conveying the importance of relationships.

In the third characteristic of the feminine style, the power of public office is conceptualized as the "power to" rather than the "power over." Hattoy attributes that power to Clinton. For example, in paragraph thirteen he says, "So, I stand here tonight in support of Bill Clinton, a man who sees the value in each and every member of the American family."

Bob Hattoy expresses the holistic approach to policy formation, the fourth characteristic of the feminine style, in the purpose of his speech. He says, "I am a person with hope, because I know how different my life and all our lives could be if I could call my boss Mr. President" [13]. After discussing the AIDS demonstration that occurred earlier in the day in New York in which fifty thousand people participated Hattoy says, "we must vote as if our life depends on it. Mine does; yours could—and we all have so much to live for" [15].

Hattoy emphasizes how women, children and families are affected by AIDS, a disease often thought to primarily affect gay men. This is the fifth characteristic of the feminine style, moving women's issues to the forefront of the public arena. He says in the third paragraph, "I could be an African American woman...a 10 year old boy or girl." Hattoy also discusses the impact of AIDS on families, a historically female issue, "Every
single person with AIDS is someone worthy of caring for. After all, we are your sons and daughters, fathers and mothers” [11]. He uses the repetition of “We need a President” in the tenth paragraph to stress his point that Bush is not concerned about the issues that affect families with AIDS.

Hattoy uses the feminine style in an attempt to ingratiate Clinton with his audience. He first personalizes the AIDS issue and emphasizes its importance through the use of personal testimony. He creates an identification with the audience through personal tone and by revealing his connection to Democrats and the Gay and Lesbian community and how he values these connections. He bases his speech on lived experiences to suggest to the audience that Bush, not AIDS, is the problem and Clinton is the solution. Hattoy puts the audience in a position to judge each candidate and by praising Clinton and blaming Bush in reference to AIDS, they are likely to deem Clinton the more worthy candidate for President.

Glaser

The key purpose of Elizabeth Glaser’s “Speech to the Democratic National Convention” was to persuade the audience to vote for Bill Clinton. She was attempting to persuade her audience to vote for Clinton and that Democrats are the more worthy party but, more significantly, that Republicans are harmful to the country. Glaser uses the strategy of repetition to enforce this purpose. She repeats the phrase “We need a leader,” in reference to Clinton, throughout the speech. This is used in conjunction with her purpose of informing the audience why Bush should not be re-elected as President. For
example, in the tenth paragraph of her speech Glaser says, “I believe in America, but not with a leadership that talks about problems but is incapable of solving them...We need a leader who will not only listen to these recommendations, but will implement them.”

Clearly Glaser’s purpose is to persuade the audience to vote for Clinton because Bush cannot or will not do what is needed about AIDS. More importantly, then, her purpose is to persuade the audience not to vote for Bush. This purpose is especially clear in the “We need a leader” paragraphs. She is trying to persuade the audience that the Republicans have let people down and by saying “We need a leader” Glaser suggests that a Democrat is needed in the White House. She says, “The people in the hall–this week, the Democratic party–all of us can begin to deliver that partnership, and in November we can bring it home” [17]. It is clear that Glaser targets her speech to her immediate audience, the Democratic National Convention and Democrats. She says, “In this hall is the future” [16] and “The people in this hall” [17]. Although she uses “we” and “America,” she is not speaking to Republicans.

Personal examples and personal tone are prevalent throughout Glaser’s speech. The speech begins with Glaser telling the audience how she contracted AIDS and passed it on to her two children. She also explains how she became an AIDS activist, “I started out just a mom–fighting for the life of her child” [4]. Glaser makes several important disclosures about her daughter who died of AIDS, “Exactly four years ago my daughter died of AIDS” [3], “My daughter lived seven years, and in her last year, when she couldn’t walk or talk, her wisdom shone through” [18], and “My daughter and I loved each other with simplicity” [19].
Glaser's tone is one of frustration and anger but it is based on her personal experiences and, therefore, is personal. In the sixth paragraph she says, "I began to lose faith in America. I felt my own country was letting me down—and it was." In the next paragraph Glaser adds, "This is not the America I was raised to be proud of" [7]. This tone is also reflected in the repetition of the phrase "I believe in America" [9-13]. Through this repetition Glaser expresses her anger, frustration, and alienation with the current and past Republican administrations but also her hope and optimism for the future if Clinton is elected. Ryan White is mentioned in Glaser's speech to put a well-known face on the disease and the discrimination people with AIDS face. She says, "We need a visionary to guide us—to say it wasn't all right for Ryan White to be banned from school...We need a leader who is truly committed to educating us" [8]. This, coupled with her own personal examples, is very compelling and creates strong audience identification, a purpose of the feminine style.

Glaser personalizes the AIDS issue by establishing herself as a mother in the first paragraph, explaining how she got AIDS and passed it to her two children. This is influential because it allows her to use personal examples of her experiences involving health care, education, and research to convince the audience not to vote for Bush. She says, "I went to Washington to tell Presidents Reagan and Bush we needed to do much, much more for AIDS research and care, and that children couldn't be forgotten" [5]. She adds, "The first time, when nothing happened, I thought, oh, they just didn't hear. The second time, I thought, Maybe I didn't shout loud enough. But now I realize that they don't hear because they don't want to listen" [5].
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Glaser’s speech contains the first element of the feminine style, basing political judgments on lived experiences. She became an AIDS activist because when she tried to get help for her daughter who was dying of AIDS she found that there wasn’t anything being done or even researched in terms of children with AIDS. In the fifth paragraph Glaser states, “I understand the sense of frustration and despair in our country, because I know firsthand about screaming for help and getting no answer.” In the same paragraph she says, “I went to Washington to tell Presidents Reagan and Bush we needed to do much, much more for AIDS research and care, and that children couldn’t be forgotten” [5].

As previously mentioned, Glaser discusses her family on several occasions in her speech and obviously maintains the importance of creating and maintaining relationships, the second characteristic of the feminine style of communication. She says, “I am here because my son and I may not survive four more years of leaders who say they care, but do nothing” [3].

Glaser discusses a “partnership” and explains how we need a President who can work with Congress to get things done, the holistic approach to policy formation. She says, “We must have ACTION: a President and Congress who can work together so we can get out of this gridlock and move ahead. Because I don’t win my war if the Congress cares and the President doesn’t—or if the President cares and the Congress doesn’t support his ideas” [16]. Here, Glaser is not only suggesting that her audience vote for Clinton but that a vote for Clinton is not enough, they also need to vote Democrats into Congress. In the seventh paragraph she emphasizes that AIDS is not only her problem or the problem
of other people with AIDS, she says, “it’s everyone’s problem.” Her repetition of “I believe in America” from paragraphs nine through thirteen is also evidence of this characteristic.

Like Hattoy, Glaser’s speech emphasizes the impact of AIDS on women and children. In the fourth and fifth paragraphs she explains how, before she became involved, there was nobody doing anything for children with AIDS, stating, “I started out just a mom—fighting for the life of her child” and “I went to Washington to tell Presidents Reagan and Bush we needed to do much, much more for AIDS research and care, and that children couldn’t be forgotten.” Glaser also says, “We need a visionary to guide us—to say it wasn’t alright for Ryan White to be banned from school because he had HIV or a man or a woman denied a job because they were infected with the virus” [8].

Through her emotional and compelling personal account of coping with AIDS and watching her daughter die of AIDS, Glaser attempts to ingratiate Clinton with her audience. Her use of elements of the feminine style like personal disclosure creates strong audience identification and gives her the credibility to tell the audience not to vote for Bush. She bases her political judgments on her experiences and is able to argue that Clinton will do better in handling the AIDS issue than Bush has done. Her use of the feminine style is a means of ingratiating Clinton with the voters.

Fisher

One purpose of Fisher’s speech “A Whisper of AIDS” is to increase AIDS awareness, to convince her audience that AIDS is a problem everyone should be
concerned about. She does this by using personal experience as examples to help her audience identify with the problem. This purpose is deliberative in nature. She pleads with the audience throughout her speech to think and act in a new way with regard to AIDS and AIDS sufferers. She says, “Set aside prejudice and politics to make room for compassion and sound policy” [21].

Fisher uses a personal example involving President Bush and his wife to align him with the policy she is advocating, saying, “They have embraced me and my family in memorable ways. In the place of judgment, they have shown affection” [8]. The quote from President Bush is especially important because it helps Fisher with her purpose, “Much remains to be done” [9]. This uncovers the epideictic quality of her speech. Because Bush has adopted this policy, he is worthy of praise. As Leff and Mohrmann argue, “the end of campaign oratory is to make the candidate appear worthy and honorable” (464). Fisher accomplishes this. Acting as a surrogate for Bush, Fisher enhances his ethos and promotes him as a desirable candidate for President, the other purpose of her speech.

Fisher follows statistics used to explain the pervasiveness of AIDS and how it can affect anybody, not only the groups previously thought of as typical victims, with brief examples of AIDS policies that have failed, “But despite science and research, White House meetings and Congressional hearings, despite good intentions and bold initiatives, campaign slogans and hopeful promises—despite it all, it’s the epidemic which is winning tonight” [3]. This is a strategic use of supporting materials because it sets up the need for
a new proposed solution. It allows Fisher to urge listeners to adopt her policy of compassion for AIDS sufferers.

Fisher uses a profound example of her family's support of her as an example for her listeners to follow. She says, "My family has been a rock of support" [15]. Fisher also mentions the compassion of President and Mrs. Bush, which helps to enhance Bush's ethos, "They have embraced me and my family in memorable ways. In the place of judgment, they have shown affection" [8]. She goes on to tell of those who have no support, "You weep silently; you grieve alone" [16].

Fisher takes on many different roles throughout the speech to help her achieve her purposes. Fisher addresses several audiences during her speech. To successfully appeal to those groups, she must assume roles that can influence them. A very important role taken on by Fisher in her speech is that of a Republican. She takes on this role to target her immediate audience, the Republican National Convention. She says, "My call to you, my Party" [8]. Fisher does not say this simply to alert the Republicans that she is specifically addressing them but also to emphasize her membership in the Republican party. This allows her to create an identification with that audience that will help her achieve her purposes, a goal of the feminine style.

Fisher gives both general and specific examples of people who are HIV-positive, including herself. These examples help Fisher relate the topic to her different audiences by demonstrating the unbiased nature of the AIDS virus, "It does not care whether you are Democrat or Republican. It does not ask whether you are black or white, male or female, gay or straight, young or old" [4]. Here, Fisher is speaking to her Republican audience.
She also gives more specific examples, “a black infant struggling with tubes in a Philadelphia hospital” [5] and “the lonely gay man sheltering a flickering candle from the cold wind of his family’s rejection” [5]. This helps her show the AIDS community that she is trying to send their message about people who suffer from AIDS. Their message that there is no distinction between so-called “innocent” and “guilty” victims of AIDS.

Fisher uses examples and vivid descriptions in the speech to help the audience experience the problem. In the fifth paragraph she describes “a black infant struggling with tubes in a Philadelphia hospital” and “the lonely gay man sheltering a flickering candle from the cold wind of his family’s rejection.” These powerful images allow the audience to see the baby struggle and to watch the lonely man. This helps her achieve her purpose of increasing sympathy and compassion for AIDS sufferers which is deliberative.

In the fourth paragraph of her speech, Fisher begins her *a fortiori* argument. An *a fortiori* argument, according to Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Thomas R. Burkholder, is “a strategy of arguing that if something is true in one particular and unlikely case, it is much more likely to be true in other cases” (27). This illustrates the feminine style because she bases it on lived experience. Through her personal testimony, Fisher is attempting to convince the audience that because she, a conservative, heterosexual, white, married female got infected with the HIV virus, anybody else can also get infected. She says, “the AIDS virus is not a political creature” and “It does not care whether you are Democrat or Republican...black or white, male or female, gay or straight, young or old” [4]. More evidence of this argument occurs in the seventh paragraph, “HIV asks only one thing of those it attacks: Are you human?” This strategy continues in the eleventh paragraph with
her telling of personal experience, a characteristic of the feminine style, "If you believe you are safe, you are in danger. Because I was not hemophiliac I was not at risk. Because I was not gay, I was not at risk. Because I did not inject drugs, I was not at risk."

Fisher combines her a fortiori argument with strategies to create a sense of responsibility in her audience. In the twelfth paragraph she continues the argument, "If you believe you are safe, you are at risk. If you do not see this killer stalking your children, look again. There is no family or community, no race or religion, no place left in America that is safe. Until we genuinely embrace this message, we are a nation at risk."

This is evidence of the fifth characteristic of the feminine style because she is bringing family issues, which are traditionally female, to the forefront. She combines this element of her a fortiori argument with a fear appeal in the thirteenth paragraph:

HIV marches resolutely towards AIDS in more than a million American homes, littering its pathway with the bodies of the young. Young men. Young women. Young parents. Young children. One of the families is mine. If it is true that HIV inevitably turns into AIDS, then my children will inevitably turn to orphans.

This is a great example of the personalization that is characteristic of the feminine style.

Fisher personalizes the AIDS issue by speaking as a person with HIV and a member of the AIDS community. Here, she is trying to put the stereotypical view of a person with HIV to rest. Fisher says, "I represent an AIDS community whose members have been drafted from every segment of American society" [5]. Fisher also makes a point to emphasize those personal characteristics that are not stereotypical, "I am white and a mother...I am female and contracted this disease in marriage, and enjoy the warm
support of my family” [5]. The use of these personal examples is an obvious characteristic of the feminine style but a hidden characteristic is that of moving women’s issues to the forefront. She stresses the fact that she is a woman and a mother to highlight an ignored facet of the AIDS community.

The topic of Fisher’s speech, AIDS, is one that the Republican Party previously had been unwilling to discuss, as she notes in the first paragraph, “I have come tonight to bring our silence to an end” [1]. This reveals an element of the second characteristic, valuing inclusivity and the relational nature of being, because Fisher is alluding to one of her purposes, to promote AIDS awareness and compassion for AIDS sufferers. It also illustrates Blankenship and Robson’s third characteristic of feminine style, conceptualizing the power of public office as a capacity to get things done. Although Fisher is not in public office, her speech is delivered in a political setting and has political purposes.

One of the first roles Fisher takes on is that of a messenger. There are two passages that suggest this messenger persona, “I have come tonight to bring our silence to an end” [1] and “I bear a message of challenge” [2]. This role signifies characteristics of the feminine style. Unlike the traditional male style of communication in which the rhetor expresses having power, Fisher employs the feminine style. By “challenging” the audience, she is articulating the alternative notion of power, the “power to” rather than the “power over.”

Fisher strategically uses pronouns throughout her speech. Although she uses “I” when describing her personal experiences with HIV and her family, she often uses “we” to invite the audience in. The emphasis of “we” is one way that Fisher is able to target
several audiences. It is also part of her use of the feminine style because she is approaching policy formation holistically. She is telling the audience that "we" have to work together to solve this problem.

Although Fisher’s purpose, on the surface, is to increase AIDS awareness it is obvious that there is another purpose to persuade her audience to re-elect Bush. She combines the two purposes by suggesting that Bush also believes that more needs to be done in regard to the issue of AIDS and people with AIDS. She uses personal examples of President and Mrs. Bush to enhance his credibility. Her use of personal disclosure allows her to target several different audiences helping her have the ability to influence them. Fisher uses the feminine style to suggest that Bush will be better able to deal with AIDS if “we,” meaning Republicans, change “our” attitudes and beliefs towards AIDS and people with AIDS and give him another chance by re-electing him as President.

Conclusion

This analysis has illustrated how Hattoy and Glaser acted as surrogates in an attempt to enhance the credibility of Bill Clinton and how Fisher acted as a surrogate to enhance George Bush’s credibility. It has also revealed the characteristics of the feminine style present in their three speeches delivered at the 1992 national nominating conventions. While Hattoy and Glaser are clearly trying to persuade the audience to vote for Clinton, Fisher’s “Vote for Bush” message is much more ambiguous. The analysis has revealed how the surrogate speakers use feminine style in effort to ingratiate the candidates with
the voters by portraying them as being concerned about individual people. The final chapter will further explain these conclusions and their implications.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

Summary

Bill Clinton and George Bush faced political risks by discussing AIDS during the 1992 campaign but there were also risks involved with ignoring it. They had both sidestepped the issue throughout the primaries but with the national nominating conventions approaching, AIDS had become an important, publicized issue. Both Clinton and Bush decided to face the issue indirectly through the use of surrogate speakers.

Martha Stout Kessler discussed the advantage of presidential candidates using surrogates: "Surrogates.....perform a service to the candidate by saying things the candidate wants said, but considers, for reasons of strategy, unwise to say himself" (148). Michael C. Leff and Gerald P. Mohrmann’s research suggests that the surrogates are not only speaking to deliver their candidate’s message but also to enhance the candidate’s credibility.

Bob Hattoy and Elizabeth Glaser faced considerable rhetorical problems as surrogate AIDS speakers for Bill Clinton at the 1992 Democratic National Convention in New York. There was an internal debate within the Democratic Party about how much of the convention’s focus should be on the AIDS issue. They also faced a competing message from the Republican Party that argued Hattoy and Glaser did not accurately reflect the AIDS community. Mary Fisher also faced significant rhetorical problems as a
surrogate AIDS speaker for George Bush at the 1992 Republican National Convention in Houston. There were members of the AIDS community who viewed Fisher as a traitor for “siding” with the Republicans and feared that she would be seen as an “innocent” victim of AIDS. She also had to compete with members of her own party that blamed homosexuals for the AIDS epidemic and, therefore, didn’t consider it an important issue in the campaign.

Hattoy and Glaser faced an immediate audience presumably more sympathetic to the AIDS issue and to people with AIDS than were the Republicans addressed by Fisher. They were also able to argue that because Bush and the Republicans had failed on the AIDS issue, people should vote for Clinton. Fisher, on the other hand, was forced to argue that even though Bush’s past efforts had been less than fully successful, people should still vote for him. She tried to do that, at least in part, by shifting blame from Bush to the Republican party in general—a strategy that seems unlikely to be well received, at least by her immediate audience. It is less damaging to attack the party in power than the party not in power. This could be why Fisher does not engage in attacks on Democrats similar to those on Republicans by Hattoy and Glaser.

The surrogates also faced many of the same rhetorical problems as the candidates because of the nature of the AIDS issue. AIDS was still a disease associated with stigmatized groups, drug use, and homosexual behavior. They had to overcome their rhetorical problems to increase the credibility of their candidate on the AIDS issue. Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher relied on the feminine style in effort to ingratiate Clinton and Bush with the voters. By using the feminine style, the surrogates were able to personalize
the AIDS issue, thus overcoming many of their rhetorical problems as well as portraying the candidates as being concerned about how AIDS affects "real" people.

Leff and Mohrmann characterize campaign speeches as examples of personal persuasion, the goal of which is to promote the candidate. The audience judges the person, not the policy. Therefore, the message about AIDS is secondary to the surrogate speakers' messages about their candidate. Thomas D. Clark explains that campaign speakers engage in different rhetorical strategies to meet their audiences' expectations. Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher attempted to ingratiate the candidates with the voters, the purpose of a campaign speech, using characteristics of the feminine style.

Conclusions

This thesis has examined feminine style in political discourse. However, a conclusion regarding the advantage of its use cannot be completely understood without an examination of and comparison to the traditional or masculine style of communication. Julia T. Wood, a gender communication expert, concluded that the masculine style of communication is used "to exert control, preserve independence, and enhance status" (126). She also says that masculine language is more authoritative, direct, and forceful (128).

Bonnie J. Dow and Mari Boor Tonn suggest that the standards of "good" public communication are based on characteristics of male communication which is "abstract, hierarchical, dominating, and oriented toward problem-solving" (288). They call the masculine style "socially approved" and identify additional characteristics as including
“formal evidence, deductive structure, and linear modes of reasoning” (288). Conversely, the feminine style is characterized as “concrete, participatory, cooperative, and oriented toward relationship maintenance” (Dow and Tonn 288). Dow and Tonn argue that the feminine style is based on female communication patterns that develop from the socialization of women into social roles that require “emotional support, nurturance, empathy, and concrete reasoning” (288).

Jane Blankenship and Deborah C. Robson argue that the basis of the characteristics of feminine and masculine styles of communication is found in the traditional conceptualizations of power of women and men and can be attributed to gender socialization (361). They call the conceptualization of power in the feminine style “power to rather than power over” and defend it as an alternative notion of power.

Elements of the feminine style are used to meet the primary aim of a campaign speech: ingratiation. One element of the feminine style is that it is used to personalize issues. This is accomplished through the use of personal tone and attitude and through the telling of personal experience. Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher use the feminine style hoping to get an emotional reaction from the voters which they hope will be transferred to the candidate and increase the candidates ethos. They hope to ingratiate the candidate with the voters by personalizing AIDS.

Dow and Tonn suggest that there is an emerging trend in political theory integrating feminine values and, “Such a feminine political theory might include valuation of the ethic of care, of enhanced emotional capacity, and of empathy in relationships” (298). They argue that their analysis of the rhetoric of Ann Richards moved consideration
of the feminine style away from feminist rhetoric and into the broader political landscape. Dow and Tonn state that it will be useful to examine the feminine style beyond the traditional focus on female rhetors within feminist movements (300). The examination of the speeches delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher reinforces this view and broadens it to the study of surrogate rhetoric. It also demonstrates the value of revealing the use of the feminine style within the broader political landscape.

Dow and Tonn conclude that the feminine style can be used in political discourse “for the purpose of creating alternative grounds for political judgment” (298). The basis of political judgment would shift to how it would affect us and those around us. Thus, the feminine style may offer a more desirable approach to making policy decisions such as deciding who should be President because it focuses on how these decisions affect “real” people and families. That is, as Blankenship and Robson suggest, feminine style stresses a candidates “power to” help voters and their families rather than “power over” them and their families.

Although Blankenship and Robson state that their conclusions regarding the feminine style may not be “generalizable” to the campaign setting, they do suggest that it is a strong likelihood that they may be. This project has identified characteristics of the feminine style in three speeches delivered in a campaign setting. It has found that the use of the feminine style in this setting is beneficial because it offers voters a “personal” reason to vote for a candidate.

The surrogate speakers demonstrate an attempt to ingratiate the candidates with the voters using the feminine style to personalize the AIDS issue while at the same time
fostering decision-making that focuses on how policies affect "real" people. By personalizing the AIDS issue, Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher create an identification with the audience. They then associate their personal experience with the candidate in effort to foster audience identification with him.

Clinton and Bush did not approach the AIDS issue during the 1992 presidential campaign or at the national nominating conventions (with the exception of a speech delivered by Clinton after the 1992 Democratic National Convention). It was a controversial issue that involved taboo subjects. The speeches on AIDS delivered by Hattoy, Glaser, and Fisher at the conventions replaced the silence of Clinton and Bush. Through the use of feminine style in their political discourse, these surrogate speakers spoke for the candidates on AIDS in effort to foster the belief that each candidate was concerned about the AIDS issue and about people with AIDS.

These conclusions reveal reasons why the use of the feminine style may have an advantage over the masculine style in campaign discourse. The feminine style offers an alternative method for making decisions that focuses on how they affect "real" people. When policies are discussed in the masculine style, the focus is on statistics and abstract examples and it loses sight of how the policies affect real individuals. The preceding analysis demonstrated how the feminine style was used by surrogate speakers to express how the candidates would affect people personally. As Dow and Tonn contend, "reliance on concrete examples and anecdotes in feminine style...reflects a philosophy stressing the utility of practical wisdom in judging truth" (298). It would be difficult to disagree with such a philosophy.
Recommendations for Future Study

This thesis has examined the use of the feminine style by surrogate speakers in a campaign setting and has concluded that it is preferable to the masculine style because of the personal kind of decision making it can foster. In light of these conclusions, future research should continue to analyze campaign speeches delivered by candidates for evidence of feminine style. Due to the nature of the AIDS issue and the context surrounding the 1992 campaign, it would also be wise to examine more campaign speeches delivered by surrogates on a variety of topics. It would be useful to examine these speeches for evidence of attempted ingratiating through the use of personal attitude, tone, and disclosure. Such efforts could provide additional evidence that feminine style offers a more desirable approach to making policy decisions, such as who we should elect as President.
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APPENDIX

SPEECH TEXTS

Bob Hattoy’s speech to The Democratic National Convention
"Presentation on AIDS"

1. Thank you. I Love you. Thank you, California. Thank you, Gay and Lesbian community. Thank you, Congresswoman Pat Schroeder. Thank you, Aretha Franklin, God.

2. I am here tonight because of one man’s courage and conviction, one man’s dedication and daring and yes, one man’s true kindness. He’s my boss, Bill Clinton.

3. You see, I have AIDS. I could be an African American woman, a Latino man, a 10-year old boy or girl. AIDS has many faces. And AIDS knows no class or gender, race or religion, or sexual orientation. AIDS does not discriminate, but George Bush’s White House does.

4. AIDS is a disease of the Reagan-Bush years. The first case was detected in 1981, but it took 40,000 deaths and seven years for Ronald Reagan to say the word “AIDS.” It’s five years later, 70,000 more are dead and George Bush doesn’t talk about AIDS, much less do anything about it.

5. Eight years from now there will be 2 million cases in America. If George Bush wins, we’re all at risk in America. It’s that simple. It’s that serious. It’s that terrible.

6. This is hard. I’m a Gay man with AIDS and if there’s any honor in having this disease it’s because it’s an honor being part of the Gay and Lesbian community in America.

7. We have watched our friends and lovers die, but we have not given up hope. Gay men

and Lesbians created community health clinics, provided educational materials, opened food kitchens, and held the hands of the dying in hospices.

8. The Gay and Lesbian community in America is an American family in the best sense of the word.

9. President Bush, we are a million points of light; you are just too morally bound to see us. Mr. President, you don’t see AIDS for what it is—it’s a crisis in public health that demands medical experts, not moral judges—and it’s time to move beyond your politics of denial, division and death. It’s time to move George Bush out of the White House.

10. We need a President who will take action, a President strong enough to take on the insurance companies that drop people with the HIV virus, a President courageous enough to take on the drug companies who drive AIDS patients into poverty and deny them lifesaving medicine. And we need a President who isn’t terrified of the word “condom.”

11. Every single person with AIDS is someone worthy of caring for. After all, we are your sons and daughters, fathers and mothers. We are doctors and lawyers, folks in the military, ministers and priests and rabbis. We are Democrats and, yes, Mr. President, Republicans. We are part of the American family and, Mr. President, your family has AIDS and we’re dying and you’re doing nothing about it.

12. Listen. I don’t want to die. I don’t want to die. But I don’t want to live in an America where the President sees me as the enemy. I can face dying because of a disease, but not because of politics.

13. So I stand here in support of Bill Clinton, a man who sees the value in each and every member of the American family. And although I am a person with AIDS, I am a person with hope, because I know how different my life and all our lives could be if I could call my boss Mr. President.

14. Martin Luther King once said that our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter. Fifty thousand people took to the streets in New York today because they will no longer be silent about AIDS.

15. Their actions give me hope. All of you came here tonight; millions more are watching in America. Obviously, we have hope and hope gives me the chance of life. I think it’s really important to understand that this year, more than any other year, we must vote as if our life depends upon it. Mine does; yours could—and we all have so much to live for. Thank you.


17. Now I am honored to introduce a woman who has been an inspiration to millions, who
has been living with HIV for 11 years: the co-founder of the Pediatric AIDS Foundation, Elizabeth Glaser. Thank you.
Elizabeth Glaser's Speech to The Democratic National Convention  

1. "I'm Elizabeth Glaser. Eleven years ago, while giving birth to my first child, I hemorrhaged and was transfused with seven pints of blood. Four years later, I found out that I had been infected with the AIDS virus and had unknowingly passed it on to my daughter, Ariel, through my breast milk, and my son, Jake, in utero. Twenty years ago I wanted to be at the Democratic Convention because it was a way to participate in our country.

2. Today I am here because it's a matter of life and death.

3. Exactly four years my daughter died of AIDS - she did not survive the Reagan administration. I am here because my son and I may not survive four more years of leaders who say they care, but do nothing. I am in a race with the clock. This is not about being a Republican or an Independent or a Democrat - it's about the future ... for each and every one of us.

4. I started out just a mom - fighting for the life of her child. But along the way I learned how unfair America can be. Not just for the people who have HIV, but for many, many people - gay people, people of color, children. A strange spokesperson for such a group - a well-to-do white woman - but I have learned my lessons the hard way, and I know that America has lost her path and is at risk of losing her soul. America wake up - we are all in a struggle between life and death.

5. I understand the sense of frustration and despair in our country, because I know firsthand about screaming for help and getting no answer. I went to Washington to tell Presidents Reagan and Bush we needed to do much, much more for AIDS research and care, and that children couldn't be forgotten. The first time, when nothing happened, I thought, Oh, they just didn't hear. The second time, when nothing happened, I thought, Maybe I didn't shout loud enough. But now I realize that they don't hear because they don't want to listen. When you cry for help and no one listens you start to lose hope.

6. I began to lose faith in America. I felt my own country was letting me down - and it was.

7. This is not the America I was raised to be proud of. I was raised to believe that other's problems were my problems as well. But when I tell most people about HIV, hoping they will care and try to help, I see the look in their eyes - it's not my problem they're thinking - well, it's everyone's problem and we need a leader who will tell us that.

8. We need a visionary to guide us - to say it wasn't all right for Ryan White to be banned from school because he had HIV or a man or woman denied a job because they were infected with this virus. We need a leader who is truly committed to educating us.

9. I believe in America - but not with a leadership of selfishness and greed where the wealthy get health care and insurance and the poor don't. Do you know how much my AIDS care costs? More than $40,000 a year. Someone without insurance can't afford this. Even the drugs that I hope will keep me alive are out of reach for others. Is their life any less valuable? Of course not. This is not the America I was raised to be proud of - where the rich people get care and drugs that poor people can't. We need health care for all. We need a leader to say this, and do something about it.

10. I believe in America, but not with a leadership that talks about problems but is incapable of solving them. Two HIV commission reports with recommendations about what to do to solve this crisis are sitting on shelves, gathering dust. We need a leader who will not only listen to these recommendations, but will implement them.

11. I believe in America - but not with a leadership that doesn't hold government accountable. I go to Washington to the National Institutes of Health and say, "Show me what you're doing on HIV." They hate it when I come because I try to tell them how to do it better. But that's why I love being a taxpayer - because it's my money and they must become accountable.

12. I believe in an America where our leaders talk straight. When anyone tells President Bush that the battle against AIDS is seriously under funded, he juggles the numbers to mislead the public into thinking we're spending twice as much as we really are. While they play games with numbers, people are dying.

13. I believe in America - but an America where there is light in every home. One thousand points of light just wasn't enough - my house has been dark for too long.

14. Once every generation, history brings us to an important crossroads. Sometimes in life there is that moment when it's possible to make a change for the better. This is one of those moments.

15. For me, this is not politics. It's a crisis of caring.

16. In this hall is the future: women, men of all colors saying, Take America back. We are just real people wanting a more hopeful life. But words and ideas are not enough. Good thoughts won't save my family. What's the point of caring if we don't do something about it? We must have ACTION: a President and a Congress who can work together so we can get out of this gridlock and move ahead. Because I don't win my war if the Congress cares and the President doesn't - or if the President cares and the Congress doesn't support his ideas.
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17. The people in this hall - this week, the Democratic party - all of us can begin to deliver that partnership, and in November we can all bring it home.

18. My daughter lived seven years, and in her last year, when she couldn't walk or talk, her wisdom shone through. She taught me to help others, when all I wanted to do was hate. She taught me to help others, when all I wanted to do was help myself. She taught me to be brave, when all I felt was fear.

19. My daughter and I loved each other with simplicity. America, we can do the same.

20. This was the country that offered hope. This was the place where dreams could come true. Not just economic dreams, but dreams of freedom, justice and equality. We all need to hope that our dreams can come true. I challenge you to make it happen, because all our lives, not just mine, depend on it.
Mary Fisher’s speech to The Republican National Convention
August 19, 1992–Houston, Texas
“A Whisper of AIDS”

1. Less than three months ago, at platform hearings in Salt Lake City, I asked the Republican Party to lift the shroud of silence which has been draped over the issue of HIV/AIDS. I have come tonight to bring our silence to an end.

2. I bear a message of challenge, not self-congratulation. I want your attention, not your applause. I would never have asked to be HIV-positive. But I believe that in all things there is a good purpose, and so I stand before you and before the nation, gladly.

3. The reality of AIDS is brutally clear. Two hundred thousand Americans are dead or dying; a million more are infected. Worldwide forty million, or sixty million or a hundred million infections will be counted in the coming few years. But despite science and research, White House meetings and congressional hearings, despite good intentions and bold initiatives, campaign slogans and hopeful promises—despite it all, it’s the epidemic which is winning tonight.

4. In the context of an election year, I ask you—here, in this great hall, or listening in the quiet of your home—to recognize that the AIDS virus is not apolitical creature. It does not care whether you are Democrat or Republican. It does not ask whether you are black or white, male or female, gay or straight, young or old.

5. Tonight, I represent an AIDS community whose members have been reluctantly drafted from every segment of American society. Though I am white and a mother, I am one with a black infant struggling with tubes in a Philadelphia hospital. Though I am female and contracted this disease in marriage, and enjoy the warm support of my family, I am one with the lonely gay man sheltering a flickering candle from the cold wind of his family’s rejection.

6. This is not a distant threat; it is a present danger. The rate of infection is increasing fastest among women and children. Largely unknown a decade ago, AIDS is the third leading killer of young-adult Americans today—but it won’t be third for long. Because, unlike other diseases, this one travels. Adolescents don’t give each other cancer or heart disease because they believe they are in love. But HIV is different And we have helped it along. We have killed each other—with our ignorance, our prejudice, and our silence.

7. We may take refuge in our stereotypes but we cannot hide there long. Because HIV asks only one thing of those it attacks: Are you human? And this is the right question:
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Are you human? Because people with HIV have not entered some alien state of being. They are human. They have not earned cruelty and they do not deserve meanness. They don't benefit from being isolated or treated as outcasts. Each of them is exactly what God made: a person. Not evil, deserving of our judgment; not victims, longing for our pity. People. Ready for support and worthy of compassion.

8. My call to you, my Party, is to take a public stand no less compassionate than that of the President and Mrs. Bush. They have embraced me and my family in memorable ways. In the place of judgment, they have shown affection. In difficult moments, they have raised our spirits. In the darkest hours, I have seen them reaching not only to me, but also to my parents, armed with that stunning grief and special grace that comes only to parents who have themselves leaned too long over the bedside of a dying child.

9. With the President's leadership, much good has been done; much of the good has gone unheralded; as the President has insisted, "Much remains to be done."

10. But we do the President's cause no good if we praise the American family but ignore a virus that destroys it. We must be consistent if we are to be believed. We cannot love justice and ignore prejudice, love our children and fear to teach them. Whatever our role, as parent or policy maker, we must act as eloquently as we speak—else we have no integrity.

11. My call to the nation is a plea for awareness. If you believe you are safe, you are in danger. Because I was not hemophiliac, I was not at risk. Because I was not gay, I was not at risk. Because I did not inject drugs, I was not at risk.

12. My father has devoted much of his lifetime to guarding against another holocaust. He is part of the generation who heard Pastor Niemoeller come out of the Nazi death camps to say, "They came after the Jews and I was not a Jew, so I did not protest. They came after the Trade Unionists, and I was not a Trade Unionist, so I did not protest. They came after the Roman Catholics, and I was not a Roman Catholic, so I did not protest. Then they came after me, and there was no one left to protest."

13. The lesson history teaches is this: If you believe you are safe, you are at risk. If you do not see this killer stalking your children, look again. There is no family or community, no race or religion, no place left in America that is safe. Until we genuinely embrace this message, we are a nation at risk.

14. Tonight, HIV marches resolutely towards AIDS in more than a million American homes, littering its pathway with the bodies of the young. Young men. Young women. Young parents. Young children. One of the families is mine. If it is true that HIV inevitably turns to AIDS, then my children will inevitably turn to orphans.

15. My family has been a rock of support. My 84-year-old father, who has pursued the healing of the nations, will not accept the premise that he cannot heal his daughter. My
mother has refused to be broken; she still calls at mid-night to tell wonderful jokes that make me laugh. Sisters and friends, and my brother Phillip (whose birthday is today)—all have helped carry me over the hardest places. I am blessed, richly and deeply blessed, to have such a family.

16. But not all of you have been so blessed. You are HIV-positive but dare not say it. You have lost loved ones, but you dared not whisper the word AIDS. You weep silently; you grieve alone.

17. I have a message for you: It is not you who should feel shame, it is we. We who tolerate ignorance and practice prejudice, we who have taught you to fear. We must lift our shroud of silence, making it safe for you to reach out for compassion. It is our task to seek safety for our children, not in quiet denial but in effective action.

18. Some day our children will be grown. My son Max, now four, will take the measure of his mother; my son Zachary, now two, will sort through his memories. I may not be here to hear their judgments, but I know already what I hope they are.

19. I want my children to know that their mother was not a victim. She was a messenger. I do not want them to think, as I once did, that courage is the absence of fear; I want them to know that courage is the strength to act wisely when most we are afraid. I want them to have the courage to step forward when called by their nation, or their Party, and give leadership—no matter what the personal cost. I ask no more of you than I ask of myself, or of my children.

20. To the millions of you who are grieving, who are frightened, who have suffered the ravages of AIDS firsthand: Have courage and you will find comfort.

21. To the millions who are strong, I issue this plea: Set aside prejudice and politics to make room for compassion and sound policy.

22. To my children, I make this pledge: I will not give in, Zachary, because I draw my courage from you. Your silly giggle gives me hope. Your gentle prayers give me strength. And you, my child, give me reason to say to America, "You are at risk." And I will not rest, Max, until I have done all I can to make your world safe. I will seek a place where intimacy is not the prelude to suffering.

23. I will not hurry to leave you, my children. But when I go, I pray that you will not suffer shame on my account.

24. To all within sound of my voice, I appeal: Learn with me the lessons of history and of grace, so my children will not be afraid to say the word AIDS when I am gone. Then their children, and yours, may not need to whisper it at all.

25. God bless the children, and bless us all.
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