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ABSTRACT

“The Most Powerful Woman in the World”: The Rhetorical Image Construction of Condoleezza Rice

by

Karin Dawn Tidgewell

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

Condoleezza Rice is recognized as one of President George W. Bush’s closest advisors and one of America’s most influential officials. During her tenure as Bush’s National Security Advisor and then as America’s first African American female Secretary of State, Rice faced situations in which her image was challenged, undermined, or questioned by other individuals. This project explores how she addressed her image through examination of her rhetorical strategies in her opening statement before the 9/11 Commission in April of 2004, her first address as Secretary of State to State Department staff in January of 2005, and her first public speech as Secretary in France in February of 2005. Using Walter R. Fisher’s communicative motives as a framework for analysis, this paper also examines how Fisher’s motives appeared in contemporary discourse, describes which motives dominated Rice’s remarks, and evaluates her success in enacting the dominant motive in each rhetorical act. Ultimately, the examination of these three artifacts revealed that Rice’s rhetoric better suited the introduction of new ideas and a new image than repairing damaged images.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"Warrior princess" (Wolffe 28). "A kind of intellectual agility mixed with velvet-glove forcefulness" (Coit Blacker as quoted in Robinson par. 11). "Eloquent and charming" (Kessler A1). "Direct and blunt" (Kessler A1). "Fiercely loyal" (Gearan A4). "A creature of meticulous self-discipline" (Wolffe 28). "Rising star" (Hughes 9). "The most powerful woman in the world" (Wilkerson 114). Considering the many adjectives and monikers used to describe Condoleezza Rice throughout her career, asserting which ones accurately represent the woman behind the name and her historic roles remains challenging because many aspects of Rice herself remain under-studied and under-examined. However, as Rice’s prominence and influence continues to increase in domestic and international politics, so, too, does the need to understand this woman better.

When Condoleezza Rice was sworn in as America’s 66th Secretary of State on January 26, 2005, she assumed yet another place in history: only the second woman ever to hold the post; the second African-American; and the first African-American woman. However, making history was not new to Rice. She was the first female, first African American, and youngest individual to serve as Stanford University’s Provost, and she vacated her previous position as President George W. Bush’s National Security Adviser, the first woman to hold the position, to serve as Bush’s second Secretary of State,
replacing the retiring Colin Powell. Rice likewise was among the few in American history to advise both a father and son serving as president on foreign policy issues.

These accomplishments alone, and particularly her governmental roles, distinguish Rice as an increasingly prominent figure in American politics who merits study. However, the extraordinary circumstances in which she has found herself in these roles, the decision-making power she actually possessed, and the influence others speculated she wielded likewise emphasize the need for closer examination of Rice. Throughout three presidential terms, Rice has served in positions that allowed her to shape America’s foreign policy and, as a result, America’s history and future. Because there is limited scholarship examining Rice and her rhetorical strategies, this project provides an opportunity to gain further insight into Condoleezza Rice as an individual through the examination of three speeches she presented either as Bush’s National Security Adviser or as Secretary of State.

Although biographies provide clues about a speaker’s characteristics, rhetors also reveal insights about themselves through rhetorical acts, both intentionally and unintentionally. Edwin Black describes the connection between a rhetor and the rhetorical act by writing, “Discourses contain tokens of their authors. Discourses are, directly or in a transmuted form, the external signs of internal states” (191). Within a speech, a rhetor provides explicit information that comprises the content of the message, and this content can reveal explicitly the speaker’s opinions on, or attitudes toward, the topic being discussed. However, through choices such as language, inclusion or omission of topics, or evidentiary support of claims, rhetors also reveal their opinions, attitudes, and motivations. Rhetorical criticism seeks to illuminate and analyze not only the
obvious characteristics speakers share in rhetorical acts, but also the more subtle cues evident through close examination of rhetorical strategies. This project looks to Rice’s own words to gain insight into her both as an individual and as a rhetor.

The first speech to be examined is Rice’s testimony to the 9/11 Commission on April 8, 2004. At the time of her remarks, she had declined the Commission’s invitation to testify publicly, choosing instead to invoke “executive privilege” (Elliott et al. par. 3). However, Rice proceeded to appear in numerous media to counter allegations made against her and the Bush Administration by former counterterrorism expert Richard Clarke, who claimed that the Bush Administration did not take terrorism seriously prior to 9/11 (Smiley par. 17). When the White House eventually reversed its decision and allowed Rice to testify, she faced accusations of misconduct, obstructionism, and hypocrisy. In response to these accusations, Rice’s remarks needed to address, and presumably repair, her image that had been undermined through both Clarke’s accusations and her own behavior.

The second speech in this project is Rice’s first Town Hall Meeting with State Department staff on January 31, 2005, just days after her swearing-in ceremony. Rice had just endured a “contentious” confirmation hearing in the Senate during which senators criticized her failure to admit mistakes in planning and executing the War in Iraq (Gearan A4). Additionally, she replaced the popular outgoing secretary Colin Powell, and some staff feared mass firings at the State Department following her confirmation as Secretary (Wolffe 28). In this speech, Rice faced the challenge of not only repairing the image potentially damaged during the Senate confirmation hearings but also constructing a new image as Secretary within her new State Department.
Rice delivered the final speech to be examined in this study on February 8, 2005, and it represented her first public speech as Secretary of State. Rice chose to give her speech in Paris, and she faced an audience skeptical of her both personally and professionally. After all, she had played a significant role in mobilizing America’s activities in Iraq as Bush’s National Security Adviser, and she criticized France for its disagreement with America over this military action (LaFranchi, “Ambitious First” 2). The opinion of Rice was that she was only a “George W. Bush proxy” (Sennott A1) who was unable to think independently of Bush and his advocacy of military activities in Afghanistan and Iraq. In this situation, Rice similarly needed to address the less favorable image her audience held of her while cementing her new image as Secretary of State.

Public figures routinely use rhetorical strategies to create favorable images of themselves, sometimes with success and other times with failure. Rice delivered each speech in this study during occasions when the rhetorical situation called for image control, and she was motivated to address her image. The images rhetors seek to project, as well as their ultimate success or failure in doing so, can be studied through the examination of a rhetor’s situation and strategies. Accordingly, this project examines the ways Rice projected her image, as well as the specific images she constructs, in each of the three speeches.

In addition to examining Rice’s image construction and projection, this study draws on Walter R. Fisher’s “motive view of communication,” in which he argues that rhetors choose strategies that reflect their motives and are designed to help them attain their goals (131). Because a goal of this project is to illuminate characteristics of Rice as an individual speaker, analysis of her remarks using Fisher’s motives as analytical criteria
allows for evaluation of her success or failure at achieving her goals through the examination of which motives dominate her rhetorical acts and the strategies she uses that reflect these motives. These conclusions also allow for discussion about how Fisher’s conceptualizations of his motives manifest themselves in contemporary discourse.

As a presidential confidant and adviser and now America’s chief diplomat, Rice’s influence on America and the world continues to grow. Indeed, some speculate that Rice’s work and favorable public approval ratings may position her for a presidential run in 2008 (Gearan A4; Stone, “Rice Sets” A7). Despite these observations, however, few academic examinations of Rice and her work exist. This project seeks to begin rectifying that gap.

Rice’s Rise in Prominence

There are numerous reasons for selecting Rice as a subject for study: the historic nature of the roles she has held; the controversial situations she has faced; and the work with which she has been tasked throughout her governmental positions, such as being an adviser assisting with decisions on going to war. However, in addition to these rationales, Rice is worthy of examination because of her increasing prominence and power both domestically and internationally. This increase is the result not only of the governmental positions she has held, but of her close personal and professional relationship with President George W. Bush.

Rice’s power did not begin with her swearing in as Secretary of State. Although her academic career included numerous accolades and accomplishments, Rice skyrocketed to
the forefront of America’s consciousness during the 2000 presidential campaign between Bush and Al Gore. Long considered the heir-apparent to succeed Powell, she commanded attention and speculation about her political future even before her appointment as Bush’s National Security Adviser. Already during the 2000 campaign when she served as Bush’s foreign policy adviser, Rice fielded questions about her future in a Bush Administration (Kralev 87-88). Reporter Nicholas Kralev noted to her, “Your name has been circulating as a likely national security adviser or secretary of state in a possible Bush administration” (88). However, Rice was hesitant to speculate on her personal achievements, a trait that would surface again in her career, and avoided this part of Kralev’s question. Instead, she opted to answer the second part of his question regarding the changes in press cycles since her time as an adviser to President George H. W. Bush. Although Rice’s name was mentioned as a possible Secretary of State during the election, following Bush’s election, Rice assumed the position of National Security Adviser, and Powell assumed the post as Secretary of State.

Public interest in Rice continued to increase throughout her tenure as Bush’s National Security Adviser, particularly during the 9/11 Commission’s hearings and following her nomination and subsequent confirmation as Secretary of State in January of 2005. However, the tone of the attention Rice received from the media during this time changed from predominantly positive to more questioning and skeptical. Some of the attention emerged out of questions about whether American intelligence agencies possessed information that could have prevented the events of September 11, 2001, and from allegations by Clarke that Rice and Bush actually had ignored critical intelligence (Clarke, Against All 226). Rice’s delayed appearance before the 9/11 Commission (Stein
10) and failure to identify mistakes made in Iraq during her Secretary of State confirmation hearings (Babington A3) placed her under the scrutiny of media and government officials. However, despite the negative attention she received, the Senate ultimately confirmed Rice as Secretary of State following a “contentious Senate confirmation hearing” (Gearan A4). Rice’s star was once again on the rise.

In her early days as Secretary of State, members of the media followed Rice’s transition to her new position, and their descriptions reflected an increasingly powerful Rice, an individual with the ear of the president who was responsible for influencing America’s policies worldwide. Reporter John Hughes argued, “Condi is the rising star of the Bush second term, unleashed to manage with dignified but bare-knuckled diplomacy the president’s international agenda” (9). Similarly, Daniel Schorr of The Christian Science Monitor described Rice’s influence by writing, “Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice has been in office hardly three weeks, but already there are signs of a shift in the balance of power between the State and Defense Departments” (9). Speculation about this shift in power indicated that Rice wielded greater influence with Bush than either her predecessor Powell or Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld (Schorr 9).

In addition to the media portrayals of Rice and her influence in the Bush Administration, supporters began relaying their confidence in and respect for Rice. In tribute to her, Rice’s supporters created a website on her behalf, without her endorsement, proposing a presidential run in 2008 (Stone, “Rice Sets” A7). As USA Today reporter Andrea Stone noted, “From the start of her whirlwind tour [the first as Secretary of State], it’s been clear that some people have specific hopes for Rice’s future. In London, TV interviewer David Frost told her about Internet Web sites that tout ‘Condi for 2008.’
‘I think no one should count on such things,’ she laughed” (“Rice Sets” A7). Despite her dismissals, these actions and statements signify the importance others placed on Rice and her role in American society.

The perceptions of Rice shared by reporters and commentators likewise emphasize the need to examine further her and her rhetoric. In 2002, Essence magazine devoted an article to Rice when she served as America’s first female National Security Adviser, entitled “The Most Powerful Woman in the World” (Wilkerson 114). This moniker followed Rice when she assumed the post of Secretary of State. Within the first two weeks of taking office, Italian reporter Luca Rigoni asked Rice, “How does it feel to be considered, or to be, the most powerful woman on Earth?” (Rice, “Interview with Luca Rigoni” par. 15). Rice again deflected this attention, but the basic underlying point remained: Rice had achieved success as a significant political appointee and diplomat.

In August of 2005 when Forbes magazine published its list of the world’s “100 Most Powerful Women,” Rice topped the list. She outranked numerous prime ministers, corporate heads, royals, Supreme Court Justices, Nobel Prize winners, and politicians, including the presidents of the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Finland, and Ireland (Fitch et al. 46-47). In November of 2005, Barbara Walters named Rice one of her ten “Most Fascinating People of 2005” noting that, “Some say she may have a shot at becoming the first female president” (par. 1). These perceptions of Rice’s power, not only in America but internationally, highlight the importance of studying Rice with the goal of better understanding her and her influence in the world.

While these public and media perceptions distinguish Rice as an important subject for study, her close relationship with President George W. Bush adds yet another dimension
of relevance. At Rice’s ceremonial swearing in, Bush described his family’s feelings toward Rice by stating, “We love her – I don’t know if you’re supposed to say that about the Secretary of State” (Bush and Rice par. 1). Reporter Bob Deans of The Atlanta Journal-Constitution compiled a biography of Rice in anticipation of her appearance before the 9/11 Commission and described her as “something of a third daughter to Bush and his wife” (1A). Newsweek reporter Richard Wolffe noted, “There’s no question they’re [Bush and Rice] close – Condi often weekends with the Bushes in Camp David” (28). These descriptions of Rice reflected a close, familial relationship with Bush and could be interpreted as a contradictory image to the powerful Rice. From one perspective, by describing Rice as a daughter, this close relationship placed Rice in the sphere of subordinate who takes orders rather than an intellectual equal who advises. By saying that his family loves Rice and then questioning whether that is appropriate to say about a Secretary of State, Bush described Rice in more endearing rather than respectful ways. However, from another perspective, this personal relationship appeared not to detract from her power, instead providing Rice with extraordinary access to Bush and with opportunities to ensure her opinions are heard. This dichotomy highlighted an additional element to the need to study Rice.

Further illustrating the relationship between Bush and Rice, Deans quoted a former National Security Council staff member, Ivo Daalder, as stating, “No other national security adviser in the history of that office has been this close to the president….You can’t get any closer” (1A). Senators asserted that the close relationship between Rice and Bush emphasized the importance of confirming Rice as Secretary of State. During the floor debate over her nomination, Senate Majority Leader Bill Frist called Rice “a steady
and a trusted confidant of two Presidents" (Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S529), referencing not only Rice’s service to George W. Bush but also her beginnings in government service working on Soviet issues for President George H. W. Bush.

Following her confirmation, Wolffe argued that Rice’s close ties with George W. Bush might make her a more effective Secretary of State than Powell. He wrote, “Those tight ties should free Rice from Powell’s burden. Powell admitted to reporters that he rarely traveled abroad because he felt the need to stay in Washington to watch his back. Rice, in contrast, will be far more assured that her advice will reach the president” (28). Rice’s close relationship with both presidents accounted for the role she has played, however large or small, in shaping not only George W. Bush’s presidency but also the world’s history.

Numerous avenues and perspectives exist from which to examine Rice, her influence, and her rhetoric. However, because of Rice’s increasing prominence as a public figure, she continues to face situations that motivate attention to the concept of image. As a result, this project examines how Rice rhetorically addressed issues pertaining to her image in three distinct rhetorical situations. Each situation included circumstances that motivated Rice to construct or repair her personal image, and important to the understanding of Rice’s efforts on behalf of her own image is the understanding of the importance of image and image construction to public figures.

Image and Public Figures

Rhetorical scholars have examined the concept of image from numerous perspectives. B. L. Ware and Wil A. Linkugel describe the dominant strategies rhetors use in self-
defense when an image has been attacked, and William L. Benoit and Shirley Drew propose that rhetors use specific strategies to “restore face, image, or reputation” (153). Halford Ross Ryan proposes that equally important to understanding efforts to restore image are the accusations that gave rise to the defense, and Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles examine the stylistic characteristics of presidential image construction through mediated channels. Central to each of these examinations has been the construction or repair of an individual’s image through discourse.

The image projected by a speaker often contributes to or represents the public’s perception and interpretation of that person, and because of this relationship, images are of vital importance to public figures. Political elections hinge on the images of the candidates; an official’s ability to negotiate outcomes, enact policies, or persuade others can rely on an image of honesty and trustworthiness. However, the image being projected through a rhetorical act must be distinguished as independent from the speaker. An image may reflect accurately the individual, but just as likely is that rhetors seek to project an alternate interpretation of themselves. Black observes this distinction by writing, “we are more conscious that there may be a disparity between the man [sic] and his image” in that there can be a “distinction between the real author of a work and the author implied by the work” (192). Black describes this as a distinction “between reality and illusion,” with the image comprising the illusionary element (192). Because the public relies on images for its decisions, examining the images public officials project and how they accomplish this task becomes an important part of communicative study.

Public figures build images not only through interpersonal contact but on a much larger scale, often relying on large forums and mediated channels to shape their images.
Ronald L. Jackson argues that individuals reveal insight into themselves and influence images each time they communicate (364), and Fisher writes that "rhetorical discourse creates an 'image,' a value-oriented interpretation, of some part of the world" (131). Addressing specifically how rhetorical acts function with regard to this "image," Fisher states, "[D]iscourse functions to affect the life of an image which may be expressed as a proposition, proposal, or cause. The image may be of a man, a set of ideas, a circumstance, a time, or a place" (132). Thus, Rice shapes her image, deliberately or subconsciously, each time she speaks.

Similar to Fisher’s conclusions, Kenneth Boulding emphasizes the power of messages in shaping images. He writes,

> Messages, therefore, may have the effect not only of adding to or of reorganizing the image. They may also have the effect of clarifying it, that is, of making something which previously was regarded as less certain more certain, or something which was previously seen in a vague way, clearer. Messages may also have the contrary effect. They may introduce doubt or uncertainty into the image. (Boulding 10)

For public figures, rhetoric represents their primary messages and primary tools with which to build, mold, or repair their images. As a result, examinations of rhetorical discourse are vital for understanding a public figure’s image construction.

Inherently linked with speakers’ images are their ethos, or the rhetors’ perceived credibility and character. Aristotle emphasizes the importance of ethos in Book I of Rhetoric by writing, “Persuasion is achieved by the speaker’s personal character when the speech is so spoken as to make us think him [sic] credible. We believe good men
more fully and more readily than others” (1356a). Ellen Reid Gold argues that maintaining *ethos* is of critical importance to public officials. She notes, “Aristotelian theory and modern communication theory agree that one’s ethos, or credibility, is an extremely important source of effectiveness. Any attack casting suspicion upon one’s moral character may hinder one’s ability to achieve goals and, unless deflected, may destroy the ability to function as a public leader” (307). *Ethos* represents a part of an individual’s image and can contribute to the believability of an image being projected. Similarly, an individual whose *ethos* has been attacked or challenged likely works to rectify that situation by projecting a more favorable image. These conclusions highlight the necessity of paying close attention to the image being projected by a speaker.

In addition to *ethos*, Boulding writes that individuals must be mindful that their images are linked with their responsibilities. He states, “Part of the image of a man [sic] is a more or less public image of the organizations in which he plays a role or which comprise his environments” (28). Specifically for public figures, Boulding cautions that, “The political image is essentially an image of roles” (103), including both specific and symbolic expectations (109-110). However, Boulding notes, “These images are constantly being changed by the messages received” (105). Considering the role expectations and the power of messages in altering images, rhetors must be concerned with more than the image they desire to project. They must recognize the expectations of their audiences and the power of their own and others’ messages for shaping their images.

The awareness of the influence of others’ messages and role expectations on shaping images reflects a similar awareness of and sensitivity to the potentially changing
circumstances surrounding a rhetor’s discourse. This sensitivity to context speaks to Scott Consigny’s assertions about rhetorical situations. He writes, “The rhetor discloses issues and brings them to resolution by interacting with the situation, revealing and working through the phenomena, selecting appropriate material and arranging it into a coherent form” (179). Rhetorical situations present rhetors with unique circumstances and choices about which topics, individuals, and circumstances merit comment, and through these choices, speakers construct and project images. Because of the influence of rhetorical situations, central to the examination of Rice’s image will be analysis of the situations she faced and her responses to them, all of which will be explored in later chapters.

Although a rhetor may communicate for any number of reasons, Fisher argues that individuals are motivated to communicate by four primary motives: “affirmation, concerned with giving birth to an image; reaffirmation, concerned with revitalizing an image; purification, concerned with correcting an image; and subversion, concerned with undermining an image” (132). While these four motives represent distinct rhetorical goals, Fisher recognizes their interconnectivity by writing, “to affirm an image is, in effect, to subvert an old one; to subvert an old one is, in effect, to affirm a new one” (138). An individual concerned with building a specific image likely may have an interest in all four of Fisher’s motives, desiring to create a new image while modifying or ending a pre-existing one. However, Fisher asserts that one of the four motives will dominate the rhetorical act.

Rhetors use numerous strategies ranging from physical appearance to language choice when creating images; this project focuses on specifically the rhetorical strategies Rice
uses. Because each speech emerged out of a distinct rhetorical situation and included specific challenges that Rice needed to address and overcome, this project likewise includes analysis of the various situations Rice faced in order to contextualize her statements and provide clues to her rhetorical choices. Ultimately, each of these analyses are designed to answer several questions about Rice and her image.

Among the most basic questions are what images did Rice construct and project in her remarks, and how did she accomplish this? Were the images responsive to the rhetorical situations, and did they reflect the expectations of media accounts prior to the speeches? This paper examines the contexts surrounding her remarks and assesses the images she projects in conjunction with the analysis of her rhetorical situations. Through close textual analysis, this project seeks to examine the rhetorical strategies Rice used and to what extent her strategies were responsive to her rhetorical situations. Additionally, this project seeks to illuminate which of Fisher’s motives dominates Rice’s rhetoric in each speech in order to understand how these motives appear in contemporary rhetoric and to assess Rice’s success in enacting the motives. The culmination of these analyses will be the evaluation of Rice’s remarks for their responsiveness to and appropriateness for their rhetorical situations and internal credibility. These discussions have as their goal revealing further insight into Rice the rhetor.

Following Chapters

This project examines three distinct speeches linked with one another in that Rice presented them all and the rhetorical situations surrounding each motivated Rice to address her image within her remarks. In order to understand more fully the remarks
themselves and their respective rhetorical situations, this project devotes a chapter to each speech for developing the context of the situation, analysis of the remarks, and evaluation of Rice’s choices. The chapters are organized chronologically.

Chapter Two examines Rice’s opening statement before the 9/11 Commission on April 8, 2004. Presented during a hearing specifically created for her testimony following the White House reversal of “executive privilege,” Rice speaks in a situation that calls for purification of her undermined image. During this speech, Rice begins revealing patterns, including her strong organizational skills and a willingness to address the many elements comprising her rhetorical situation. Rice anticipates and refutes attacks to her credibility while refraining from leveling extensive counterattacks. However, in addition to these strengths, she also reveals her propensity for avoiding accepting personal responsibility for errors or mistakes, one of the key weaknesses that emerges during this analysis. Rice acknowledges the possibility of human error, but she stops short of apologizing or accepting personal responsibility for the decisions leading up to, during, or following 9/11. Ultimately, Rice fails to purify her image fully in these remarks.

Chapter Three addresses her remarks at the State Department during her first Town Hall Meeting on January 31, 2005. As the new Secretary and considered by many to be an ouster of Powell, Rice begins her term by speaking first to her new staff, during which she seeks to affirm her new image. Although the rhetorical situation appears to call for purification again, Rice focuses instead on building a new image in which she is now the leader of the State Department. She also uses these remarks to begin advocating diplomatic efforts around the world, introduce her philosophy of transformational
diplomacy, and pay tribute to Powell to bridge the gap between her audience and her. Rice’s organization again stands out in that she builds rapport with her audience and establishes herself as a part of the team before asserting herself as their leader. Because she focuses on affirmation rather than purification, she avoids needing to account fully for her past decisions, and ultimately, Rice is able to subvert her undermined image by affirming a new one as Secretary.

Chapter Four is devoted to Rice’s remarks at the Institut d’Etudes Politiques de Paris on February 8, 2005. The most anticipated speech during her first trip as Secretary, Rice faces both an immediate audience skeptical of her both personally and professionally because of her criticism of France and an audience at home that remembers the attacks to her credibility from her confirmation hearing. The same strengths in organization and addressing her rhetorical situation appear in this speech, but the same weaknesses appear as well. Rice again acknowledges the possibility of human error, but she does not include herself or the Bush Administration in that possibility. After spending considerable time building rapport with her audience, Rice inserts American-centered biases that detract from her efforts, and she likewise inserts contradictions that undermine her credibility. Once again, Rice seeks to purify her image during her speech in Paris, but she falters and leaves the purification unaccomplished.

Each of the above three chapters begins with a discussion of the factors, events, characteristics, and players that comprised Rice’s rhetorical situation for the speech. This background provides the context and framework for the analysis of her remarks, and included in the examination of her statements are discussions of the specific strategies Rice used, both successfully and unsuccessfully. Finally, Chapters Two, Three, and Four
conclude with detailed evaluations of Rice’s remarks and conclusions about her image construction in each speech. Beyond discussing the specific images she projects, the evaluations also examine which of Fisher’s motives dominate the rhetorical act and whether Rice successfully enacts the motive her remarks embody.

Chapter Five provides the final and unifying analysis of the project by illuminating and discussing patterns revealed across the examination of all three speeches. This chapter evaluates Rice’s performance as a rhetor across the series of speeches and highlights both her strengths and weaknesses. Two of Rice’s most dominant strengths involve her responses to her rhetorical situations and the organization of her remarks. Rice addresses the many concerns surrounding her remarks, and she refutes the many attacks to her credibility both explicitly and implicitly. Additionally, Rice organizes her remarks so that she builds a sense of unity with her audience before delving into discussions of more divisive issues. Rice’s main weakness, however, and a distinct flaw in these speeches involves failing to address or admit personal mistakes. Rice is quick to acknowledge the possibility of human error and humans being flawed creatures, but these observations seemingly do not include Rice or the Bush Administration. The chapter concludes with proposing avenues for future studies on Rice.
CHAPTER 2

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE 9/11 COMMISSION

ON APRIL 8, 2004

When Condoleezza Rice appeared before the 9/11 Commission on April 8, 2004, the event signified far more than the mere progression of the Commission's investigation into the government's activities and knowledge leading up to September 11, 2001. To some, her testimony represented a victory over the White House; Bush and Rice apparently had conceded to the pressure from the Commission, family members of victims of 9/11, and the media to reverse the White House's invocation of "executive privilege." Others tuned in to see whether Commissioners would be as critical of Rice in person as they had been about her in her absence. Still others hoped for revelations from Rice to help make sense of the myriad of questions concerning America's intelligence successes and failures. However, for Rice, her opening remarks served as a mechanism to defend herself against the accusations she faced from a variety of sources.

The Historical Context and Rice's Rhetorical Situation

Although Lloyd Bitzer argues that one exigence will dominate a rhetorical situation, several challenges comprise the context for Rice's remarks on April 8, 2004: the events of September 11, 2001; the White House's invocation of "executive privilege;" and accusations from Richard Clarke that Rice and the Bush Administration failed to take
terrorism seriously prior to 9/11. Each of these challenges contributes to the overall situation Rice faced when she spoke on April 8, 2004.

_**September 11, 2001, and Forming the 9/11 Commission**_

When al-Qaida hijackers commandeered four commercial airliners and flew them into the World Trade Center towers in New York City, the Pentagon just outside of Washington, DC, and into a field in Pennsylvania, the loss of nearly 3,000 Americans prompted numerous questions and demands for answers. Family members of 9/11 victims and citizens throughout America questioned whether the United States government could have prevented these events and what the government knew about al-Qaida prior to 9/11 (Family Steering Committee, “Our Goals”). Investigations conducted by both the United States Congress and the National Commission for Investigation of Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (also known as the 9/11 Commission) revealed that various levels of the government possessed information indicating the potential for terrorist attacks before September 11, 2001 (National Commission, _The 9/11 Commission_). These revelations led the media and citizens to accuse various individuals within the government, including Rice in her role as Bush’s National Security Adviser, of failing to protect America (Family Steering Committee, “Our Goals”).

The events of September 11, 2001, represented the worst act of terrorism within the United States since the attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941 and resulted in the greatest loss of life. On September 11, 2001, few Americans knew of the organization known as al-Qaida (also referred to as al Qaeda and al-Qida), increasing the surprise, concern, and confusion following 9/11 (National Commission, _The 9/11 Commission_ 341). However,
the events of 9/11 propelled al-Qaida and the subject of terrorism into the forefront of Americans’ concerns and awareness.

Following 9/11, news organizations began uncovering what information the United States government possessed and did not possess about potential terrorist plots. Individuals speculated that the events of 9/11 could have been prevented, and friends and family members of victims began pushing the government for an investigation (Family Steering Committee, “Our Goals”). Although the Senate and House Intelligence Committees began a joint inquiry to investigate the events of 9/11, significant portions of the proceedings were closed to the public; the final report of the inquiry remained classified long after the conclusion of the investigation (Graham 1). Family members of victims asserted that an investigation should be non-partisan and public, and they “demanded that Congress create legislation for an independent investigation into the September 11th terrorist attacks” (Family Steering Committee, “Our Goals” par. 1). After months of advocacy by victims’ friends and family members, Congress passed Public Law 107-306, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2003, creating the 9/11 Commission.

The actions of the hijackers that led to the deaths of nearly 3,000 people prompted accusations by family members of misconduct within the government, and the government’s delays in creating the 9/11 Commission only reinforced these concerns. The accusations against the Bush Administration transcended simply attacking policies and turned to questioning ethos, including Rice’s. Citizens blamed the government for failing to protect America, and Rice’s affiliation with the Bush Administration forced her to defend herself from attacks against her character because of the 9/11 attacks. If
government inaction led to the deaths on 9/11, the government was to blame, including Rice. Additionally, because individuals blamed many of the delays in creating the 9/11 Commission on the Bush Administration, Rice shared that blame as well.

_The White House’s Invocation of “Executive Privilege”_

A second challenge contributing to Rice’s rhetorical situation resulted from the White House’s invocation of “executive privilege,” which attempted to preclude Rice from testifying in public before the 9/11 Commission. In preparation for its two-day hearing on intelligence scheduled for March 23-24, 2004, the Commission invited “former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright; current Secretary of State Colin Powell; former Secretary of Defense William Cohen; current Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld; the director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet; former National Security Advisor Samuel Berger and former National Counterterrorism Coordinator Richard Clarke” to testify (National Commission, “23 Mar. 2004” 1). In addition to these individuals, the Commission invited Rice to appear, but 9/11 Commission Chair Kean noted, “the Administration has declined that invitation” (National Commission, “23 Mar. 2004” 1). Rice was the only one invited to attend the hearings who declined to testify in public.

For weeks prior to her appearance before the Commission, Rice and White House spokespersons stated that she would not appear before the Commission publicly because of “executive privilege” and the need for a separation of powers among different branches of government (Elliott et al. par. 3). In explanation of the refusal, Bush stated, “A President and his advisers, including his Adviser for National Security Affairs, must be able to communicate freely and privately without being compelled to reveal those
communications to the legislative branch” (Bush 508). The invocation of executive privilege perhaps could have been defended had she refused to speak publicly about her conversations with Bush to anyone, but Rice undermined that defense when she began talking to the media.

At the same time she declined to testify publicly at the 9/11 Commission’s hearings, Rice appeared on numerous television programs to address criticism of the Bush Administration, particularly criticism by Richard Clarke in his book, *Against All Enemies: Inside America’s War on Terror* (Smiley; Elliott et al.; National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004”). William Martel of the Naval War College characterized Rice’s media appearances as a “very aggressive media campaign outlining her position” (Smiley par. 17), and during an interview airing on the CBS program *60 Minutes*, Rice stated, “Nothing would be better, from my point of view, than to be able to testify. I would really like to do that. But there’s an important principle involved here. It is a long-standing principle that sitting national security advisers do not testify before the Congress” (Smiley par. 3). Yet, critics pointed to Rice’s appearances on national television and in national print media as contradictory to the claim that she could not answer questions publicly and under oath about her interactions with Bush (Elliott et al.). Several of the topics Rice addressed on the media paralleled what she would be asked by the 9/11 Commission.

The depth of Clarke’s criticism will be explored in the following section, but Rice’s media appearances (designed to counteract the allegations by Clarke) only increased the criticism of her and the invocation of executive privilege. Two Senators, Edward Kennedy (D-MA) and Charles Schumer (D-NY), introduced a resolution “calling upon
Dr. Rice to testify under oath” (Smiley par. 26), and the controversy surrounding Rice’s refusal to appear before the 9/11 Commission carried over into the March hearings. In his questioning of former National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, Commissioner Richard Ben-Veniste began by stating, “Our hearings today will be asymmetrical in the sense that your counterpart, National Security Adviser Dr. Condoleezza Rice, will not appear because the White House has refused to allow her to testify here” (National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004” 72). Later, Ben-Veniste, in conjunction with comments made by Clarke and Commissioner Tim Roemer, made Rice the focus of a joke:

MR. BEN-VENISTE: …I’ll cede my time to Congressman Roemer, if he’ll give me his time with Condoleezza Rice. (Laughter.)

MR. CLARKE: That may not be a good deal.

MR. ROEMER: Submit those questions for the record, Mr. Commissioner. (National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004” 149)

The criticism of Rice only intensified as she continued to be absent from the proceedings.

Upon the appearance of Assistant Secretary of State Richard Armitage before the Commission in Rice’s allocated time, Ben-Veniste engaged in an exchange with Armitage, asking specific questions that Rice likely would have been the only individual able to answer comprehensively. Armitage’s inability to comment on the scenarios led to the following exchange between the two men during the hearing:

MR. BEN-VENISTE: ….Are you familiar with the fact that Dr. Rice took that position?

MR. ARMITAGE: No, I’m not.

MR. BEN-VENISTE: I believe she’s expressed it publicly in recent days.
MR. ARMITAGE: I'm not aware of it.

MR. BEN-VENISTE: Have you paid attention to at least some of the appearances Dr. Rice has made on the airwaves?

MR. ARMITAGE: No, actually I haven’t.

MR. BEN-VENISTE: You own a television?

MR. ARMITAGE: Yeah, and it’s generally on, and I won’t tell you what it’s on. (Laughter.)

MR. BEN-VENISTE: (Laughs.)

MR. ARMITAGE: But --

MR. BEN-VENISTE: I guess it -- (chuckles) -- wasn’t on any of the talk shows --

MR. ARMITAGE: Look, I --

MR. BEN-VENISTE: -- because she’s been on about every one of them -

MR. ARMITAGE: You know what --

MR. BEN-VENISTE: -- but not before the Commission.


Members of the audience (many of whom were family members of 9/11 victims) left the hearing during Armitage’s appearance in Rice’s place and called for the replacement of the executive director of the 9/11 Commission due to his professional relationship with Rice (National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004” 190).

On March 27, 2004, the Family Steering Committee for the 9/11 Independent Commission, comprised of family members of victims who lobbied Congress for the creation of the Commission, released a statement that said:
The Family Steering Committee demands the appearance of National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice under oath in a public hearing immediately. We believe that testifying before the Commission in a public forum is Ms. Rice’s moral obligation given her responsibility as National Security Advisor to protect our nation. The death of nearly 3000 innocent people warrants such a moral precedent. (par. 1)

After claiming executive privilege for weeks, the White House reversed its position. On March 30, 2004, Bush announced that Rice would testify publicly during a special hearing of the 9/11 Commission because Congress had assured him that Rice’s appearance before the Commission would “not be used as precedent in the conduct of future inquiries” (Bush 508). The change in status of Rice’s public testimony allowed her the opportunity to speak before the Commission, but at the same time, this appearance opened her to further criticism.

*Clarke Challenges Rice’s Credibility*

As noted previously, one of the challenges Rice faced resulted from her media appearances to counteract the allegations made by Richard Clarke against the Bush Administration as a whole and against Rice individually. Clarke issued these attacks in *Against All Enemies: Inside the War on Terror* and during his testimony before the 9/11 Commission on March 24, 2004. The allegations not only encompassed criticism of policies but also specific and direct criticism of Bush’s and Rice’s *ethos*.

In his own appearance before the 9/11 Commission, Clarke began by stating:

> I welcome these hearings because of the opportunity that they provide to the American people to better understand why the tragedy of 9/11
happened, and what we must do to prevent a reoccurrence. I also welcome the hearings because it is finally a forum where I can apologize to the loved ones of the victims of 9/11, to them who are here in the room, to those who are watching on television, your government failed you. Those entrusted with protecting you failed you. And I failed you. We tried hard, but that doesn’t matter because we failed. And for that failure, I would ask, once all the facts are out, for your understanding and for your forgiveness. (National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004” 103)

Through this statement, Clarke asserted that the Bush Administration, including Rice, had failed the American public. However, he accepted responsibility for his role in failing to prevent 9/11, leaving Rice and Bush in the predicament of either likewise admitting culpability or continuing to focus blame solely on the al-Qaida hijackers and Osama bin Laden.

Later in his testimony, when asked about his opinions of the Bush and Clinton Administrations’ perceptions of terrorism, Clarke stated, “My impression was that fighting terrorism in general, and fighting al Qaeda in particular, were an extraordinarily high priority in the Clinton administration, certainly no higher a priority” (National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004” 104). However, when asked about the Bush Administration, Clarke replied, “I believe the Bush administration in the first eight months considered terrorism an important issue but not an urgent issue” (National Commission, “24 Mar. 2004” 104). Many of these same sentiments also surfaced in Clarke’s book, and they contrasted the Bush and Clinton Administrations. For Clarke, the Clinton Administration pursued terrorism ruthlessly, whereas the Bush
Administration did not. As a result, Clarke implied that the events of September 11, 2001, ultimately resulted from a lack of importance placed on fighting terrorism by the Bush Administration.

Similarly, Clarke’s book outlined his experiences with the events of 9/11 and his criticism of the Bush Administration. The book became available the week Clarke appeared before the 9/11 Commission (The Frontrunner), and in its first week sold enough copies to be classified as the top non-fiction seller on both Amazon.com and Barnesandnoble.com (The Frontrunner par. 36). Roemer characterized the book as a “blistering attack on the Bush administration” (National Commission, “23 Mar. 2004” 23), and used it as a reason for Rice to appear before the Commission as a means to clear up the discrepancies between Clarke’s and Rice’s assertions.

Within the book itself, Clarke characterized Rice as being unfamiliar with al-Qaida, writing, “As I briefed Rice on al Qaeda, her facial expression gave me the impression that she had never heard the term before” (Clarke, Against All 229). In a similar description of the Bush Administration’s views of terrorism, Clarke stated, “In January 2001, the new administration really thought Clinton’s recommendation that eliminating al Qaeda be one of their highest priorities, well, rather odd, like so many of the Clinton administrations’ actions, from their perspective” (Clarke, Against All 226). As with Clarke’s testimony, these allegations leveled specific criticism toward Rice, motivated a response and defense by the Bush Administration, and laid the foundation for her media appearances and ultimately her appearance before the 9/11 Commission.

Journalists recognized that Rice needed to address Clarke’s allegations in her opening remarks. Demonstrating the competition between Rice’s testimony and that by Clarke,
Lisa Stein wrote, “The testimony [by Rice] will cap a mad tear by the White House to refute damning testimony by former counterterrorism czar Richard Clarke” (10). Clarke’s specific and direct accusations comprised the final element of Rice’s rhetorical situation by providing detailed points that needed to be addressed and refuted if Rice and the Bush Administration were to protect their credibility.

The accusations and challenges to her image and *ethos* that resulted from all three of these exigencies that Rice faced were an uncommon experience for her. Although Rice had served as Bush’s National Security Adviser since January of 2001, she was not widely criticized until the weeks prior to her appearance before the 9/11 Commission. Tavis Smiley noted, “while Dr. Rice is accustomed to the spotlight in her role as the first female NSC adviser, she is now in the unfamiliar role of being heavily criticized” (par. 3). Michael Elliott, Massimo Calabresi, and John F. Dickerson highlighted the change in attitude toward Rice, writing, “For the first time in more than three years, during which she has usually been the subject of coverage so flattering that it would make Donald Trump blush, the first woman to ever be National Security Adviser was on the spot” (par. 4). Rice’s favorable image had been challenged, attacked, and undermined. Left unaddressed, this unfavorable image would be what the public would hold of Rice and potentially jeopardize her believability in the future. Her remarks needed to address these concerns in order to restore a favorable image.

**Rice’s Remarks**

Rice relies on numerous strategies to address the different components of her rhetorical situation, incorporating both overt and subtle elements into her defense. When
necessary, Rice addresses and refutes information explicitly, but she also relies on strategies to function enthymematically so that she avoids directly expressing divisive sentiments. Rice likewise addresses the many elements comprising her rhetorical situation.

*Depicting the Events of 9/11*

One of the exigencies Rice faces involves citizens coming to terms with the events of September 11th and the questioning of the Bush Administration’s conduct before and after that day. Rather than assume camaraderie with her fellow citizens, Rice takes steps to build a sense of unity with her audience. She establishes a clear distinction between the hijackers and their sponsors who were responsible for the events of September 11 and the United States (members of the government and U. S. citizens) by using both nouns and verbs as labels and to create antithesis.

In describing the events of 9/11, Rice states, “The terrorist threat to our Nation did not emerge on September 11th, 2001. Long before that day, radical, freedom-hating terrorists declared war on America and on the civilized world” (par. 3). Through this statement, Rice draws the distinction between “radical, freedom-hating terrorists” and “America” and “the civilized world” (par. 3). Through these descriptions, Rice indicates her belief that individuals belong to one group or the other, not both. She takes an additional opportunity to distinguish among the different parties by stating, “A band of vicious terrorists tried to decapitate our government, destroy our financial system, and break the spirit of America” (par. 40). By distinguishing between the “band of vicious terrorists” and “our government” (par. 40), Rice creates an “us versus them” and “good versus evil” divide. Categorizing individuals and whole populations in this way
challenges the audience to choose with whom they associate themselves, to take sides. Rice associates herself and the United States government with “good.” By implication, those who do not want to be classified as terrorists on the side of evil must choose to be classified similarly to Rice and the United States government. Presenting audience members with this “choice,” Rice reframes the depiction of the United States government and completes the differentiation by making the alternative “them” appear vile.

Having outlined this specific, current, common enemy, Rice turns her attention to building her case for the seriousness she and others place on the enemy. To do this, Rice first connects the modern enemy with enemies of the past. After recounting terrorist activity of the past 20 years directed toward U. S. interests, Rice describes the activities, saying, “these and other atrocities were part of a sustained, systematic campaign to spread devastation and chaos and to murder innocent Americans” (par. 3). These descriptions connect multiple, seemingly unrelated activities together into a consistent effort by others against the United States. The events of 9/11 did not occur in isolation; Rice explains how the events fit within a broader context of terrorist attacks against U. S. interests worldwide. Rice also names past aggressors against America as “Nazi Germany’s” and “Imperial Japan” (par. 4), which functions as an enthymeme. Listeners can recognize the seriousness with which government officials treated these threats and America’s success in World War II and attribute those actions to the Global War on Terror. Similarly, these references contribute to the construction of the “evil” enemies of the United States by naming two groups responsible for the deaths of thousands of people.
In addition to her use of nouns in building the common enemy, Rice uses verbs to
delineate clearly between the actions of the United States government and those of the
9/11 hijackers. She accomplishes this by using proactive verbs when discussing the
actions of the Bush Administration and violent verbs when discussing the actions of
terrorists. For example, Rice states, “Because of these briefings and because we had
watched the rise of al-Qaida over the years, we understood that the network posed a
serious threat to the United States. We wanted to ensure there was no respite in the fight
against al-Qaida” (par. 7). Rice’s use of the verb “understood” demonstrates the Bush
Administration’s awareness of issues, and the use of the verb “ensure” illustrates a level
of commitment from the Bush Administration, directly contradictory to assertions that the
Bush Administration did not take terrorism seriously.

Rice uses the verb “understood” three additional times, as well as other proactive
verbs such as “revived” (par. 8), “confront” (par. 9), “ordered” (par. 12), “seize” (par.
14), “freeze” (par. 14), “eliminate” (par. 17), “sever” (par. 19), “increased” (par. 23),
“detect” (par. 31), “protect” (par. 31), “disrupt” (par. 31), “launched” (par. 36), “unified”
(par. 42), “secure” (par. 42), “stop” (par. 42), “fight” (par. 46), “hunting down” (par. 47),
“confronting” (par. 48), “removed” (par. 49), “build” (par. 49), and “defeat” (par. 49).
Many of these verbs appear multiple times throughout Rice’s remarks. By labeling the
Bush Administration’s actions in this way, Rice creates the picture of a busy, committed,
proactive organization working to protect America. These depictions help Rice
differentiate the Bush Administration’s actions from those of the 9/11 terrorists.

Rice also uses proactive verbs to describe the hijackers, but this time the verbs
possess negative connotations. For example, Rice states, “these and other atrocities were
part of a sustained, systematic campaign to spread devastation and chaos and to murder innocent Americans” (par. 3). Rice uses the word “murder” to describe terrorists’ actions rather than an alternative such as “kill” or “hurt.” Additionally, Rice states, “A band of vicious terrorists tried to decapitate our government, destroy our financial system, and break the spirit of America” (par. 40). The verbs “decapitate,” “destroy,” and “break” (par. 40) depict the terrorists’ activities in a vivid, savage way and clearly detach them from the actions of the Bush Administration. This strategy supports Robert L. Ivie’s argument that central to rhetoric justifying war is the depiction of the enemy as “coercive, irrational, and aggressive” (284). Framing the terrorists’ activities in this way helps Rice reassert who is to blame for the deaths on 9/11: the hijackers who flew the planes into the buildings, not the Bush Administration.

Because individuals blamed the Bush Administration for delaying the creation of the 9/11 Commission, Rice also addresses this concern later in her remarks. She states, “We [the Bush Administration] are eager to do whatever is necessary to protect the American people. And we look forward to receiving the recommendations of this Commission” (par. 43). Through these words, Rice connects the Bush Administration with the recommendations and work of the 9/11 Commission, projecting the assumption that the Bush Administration is receptive to and willing to incorporate the Commission’s recommendations. Because of the delays in the creation of the Commission, the connection of these concepts is something members of the audience likely did not do on their own.

The differentiation of the Bush Administration’s actions from the actions of those she labeled as terrorists addresses three issues. First, some individuals blamed the Bush
Administration for failing to prevent 9/11. Rice reframes the Bush Administration’s actions by using positive, proactive verbs to present a contrary image to that of a lackadaisical organization that did not place a priority on stopping terrorism. Second, some individuals likened the Bush Administration with terrorists because of ongoing military operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. Rice’s strategies seek to reframe the image individuals held of the Bush Administration. Finally, all of these strategies help build the collaborative identity of enemies of the United States against whom she and her audience can unite.

Through these strategies, Rice projects an image of herself as a fellow citizen, one of many united against a common enemy. She identifies with whom she classifies herself, and she presents herself as a historian by recounting past terrorist events. As the exigencies become more personal for Rice, her strategies also shift to speak more specifically to her own image. All of these efforts combine to portray Rice and the Bush Administration more favorably and to clearly identify who ultimately is to blame for the events of 9/11.

Reframing Executive Privilege

During the debate over the invocation of executive privilege, Commissioners and members of the media depicted Rice as an obstructionist. To defend herself against these charges, Rice relies heavily on strategies that characterize her as a willing participant in the 9/11 investigation, a protector of the Constitution, and a fellow American.

At the beginning of her remarks, Rice projects an image of a willing participant in the process. She states, “I thank the Commission for arranging this special session. Thank you for helping to find a way to meet the Nation’s need to learn all we can about the
September 11th attacks…” (par. 1). However, as Rice finishes this sentence, she assumes the role of protector of the Constitution by concluding, “…while preserving important Constitutional principles” (par. 1). Rice revisits both of these themes again later in her remarks. She resumes her role of willing participant in the process three additional times, stating: “Although this National Security Presidential Directive was originally a highly classified document, we arranged for portions to be declassified to help the Commission in its work, and I will describe some of those today” (par. 12); “As you know from the Pakistan and Afghanistan strategy documents that we made available to the Commission” (par. 18); and “Let me clear up any confusion about the relationship between the development of our new strategy and the many actions we took to respond to threats that summer” (par. 24). In each instance, Rice crafts an image that shows her willingness to contribute to the Commission’s work. She likens herself to previous individuals who testified before the Commission, helped the investigation, and of whom the audience held a favorable view.

In shaping her persona as a fellow American, Rice identifies with her audience and uses inclusive language. Instead of referring to America solely by name, Rice repeatedly describes it as the “homeland” (par. 30, 42), “the” or “our Nation” (par. 3, 5, 49, 50), or “our country” (par. 2). Rice also repeatedly uses the word “we” to identify with her audience. These labels contribute to Rice’s image of a fellow American, and they also project a more affective reference to the country than simply referring to it as the United States. Similarly, these references identify Rice with a favorable image of the nation likely held by members of her audience.
Rice resumes the role of a fellow American by stating, “The world has changed so much that it is hard to remember what our lives were like before that day” (par. 5), and during her discussion of the events of 9/11, Rice states, “As an officer of government on duty that day, I will never forget the sorrow and the anger I felt. Nor will I forget the courage and resilience shown by the American people and the leadership of the President that day” (par. 40). Shaping her image of a fellow American in this way enables Rice to highlight the similarities among herself, the family members of 9/11 victims, and members of the 9/11 Commission, and these similarities include their reactions toward the events of September 11th. In this way, Rice responds to attacks on her *ethos* by using *pathos* appeals; she appeals to her audience’s emotions.

Rice pointedly identifies herself with the 9/11 Commissioners and the 9/11 victims’ family members by stating, “This Commission, and those who appear before it, have a vital charge. We owe it to those we lost, and to their loved ones, and to our country, to learn all we can about that tragic day, and the events that led to it” (par. 2). Rice identifies herself with others who appeared before the 9/11 Commission and the commissioners themselves by expressing appreciation toward family members of 9/11 victims. She states, “Many families of the victims are here today, and I thank them for their contributions to the Commission’s work” (par. 2). These strategies acknowledge members of Rice’s audience, express a favorable opinion toward them, and identify Rice as a supporter of both the 9/11 Commission and the family members, thereby flattering them so that they will accept and believe Rice’s statements.

In her second foray as a defender of the Constitution, Rice describes Bush’s post-9/11 activities and then states, “And he has done all of this in a way that is consistent with
protecting America’s cherished civil liberties and with preserving our character as a free and open society” (par. 42). Rice connects her failure to appear before the 9/11 Commission publicly with the greater issue of protecting “cherished civil liberties” (par. 42). This portrays Rice as looking out for the greater good of America and its citizens.

Many people viewed Rice’s unwillingness to appear before the Commission as a personal selfishness designed either to avoid responsibility, hide information, or belittle the investigation. To counteract these accusations, Rice presents information that reflects a contrary image. She points out her compliance with the Commission to present the image of a willing participant, she relies on identification strategies to depict herself as a fellow American, and she provides alternate explanations for her behavior through projecting the image of a defender of the Constitution. After addressing this exigence, Rice faces her most personal and direct challenge to her image: the allegations from Clarke.

Defending from Clarke’s Allegations

Clarke leveled specific and direct accusations against Rice that undermined the favorable image she previously enjoyed. In response, Rice defends herself both explicitly and implicitly by directly refuting information Clarke stated and by relying on enthymemes to make her arguments.

The first strategy Rice uses to defend herself involves reducing the perceived animosity between herself and Clarke and the Bush Administration and the Clinton Administration. For instance, she states, “I took the unusual step of retaining Dick Clarke and the entire Clinton Administration’s counterterrorism team on the NSC staff” (par. 7). Through this statement, Rice aligns herself with Clarke, her accuser and favored
by members of the 9/11 Commission. Rice also refrains from editorializing about Clarke. She notes that her action was “unusual” (par. 7), presenting herself as an individual above petty bickering. However, she never explicitly attacks Clarke or demeans his appearance before the Commission, which allows her to protect herself from allegations of using her testimony to get even with or disparage Clarke.

Building on this strategy, Rice also uses an informal tone when speaking of members of the Clinton Administration. She refers to Clarke by his informal first name, and she also used a collegial tone when referring to her predecessor, Samuel Berger. Rice states, “Sandy and I personally discussed a variety of other topics, including North Korea, Iraq, the Middle East, and the Balkans” (par. 6). Similar to her references to Clarke, the use of Berger’s first name identifies an affiliation of Rice with Berger, another individual about whom the audience had expressed a favorable opinion.

For those unfamiliar with Clarke’s accusations, Rice’s remarks could be viewed simply as an articulation of activities. However, considered within the context of Clarke’s book and testimony, Rice repeatedly uses the negative when making an argument to deny Clarke’s accusations. For example, Rice states, “It was the very first major national security policy directive of the Bush Administration -- not Russia, not missile defense, not Iraq, but the elimination of al-Qaida” (par. 11). Structuring her argument in the pattern of making the declarative statement followed by repeated negatives solidifies and emphasizes her point, and she uses this strategy three additional times. She asserts, “America’s al-Qaida policy wasn’t working because our Afghanistan policy wasn’t working. And our Afghanistan policy wasn’t working because our Pakistan policy wasn’t working” (par. 21). Rice inserts this repetition a third time,
stating, “The threat reporting we received in the Spring and Summer of 2001 was not specific as to time, nor place, nor manner of attack” (par. 26), and her fourth use of this type of repetition occurs when Rice states, “Troubling, yes. But they don’t tell us when; they don’t tell us where; they don’t tell us who; and they don’t tell us how” (par. 28). Each of these repetitions denies facts, and these denials refute Clarke’s accusations. These denials present an alternate explanation for why the Bush Administration was unable to prevent 9/11.

Clarke undermined Rice’s image of an informed and educated government official by alleging that she appeared to be unfamiliar with the al-Qaida organization. To deny this accusation, Rice repeats the words “al-Qaida” 32 times, the second most prevalent word in her remarks (second only to some derivative of the word “terror”). These usages directly challenge Clarke’s assertions, but do so subtly and repeatedly. Rice is able to project herself as knowledgeable without presenting herself as combative or confrontational.

Additionally, at several points in her statement, Rice requires the audience to provide the missing details to make her points, or enthymemes. Her most prevalent use of this strategy involves dates, which provide enough information to place the activity Rice describes into context but little enough information for her to avoid directly blaming an individual or administration. For example, only on one occasion does Rice connect a date with a previous presidential administration. Rice states, “While we were developing this new strategy to deal with al-Qaida, we also made decisions on a number of specific anti-al-Qaida initiatives that had been proposed by Dick Clarke. Many of these ideas had been deferred by the last Administration, and some had been on the table since 1998”
In this statement, Rice illustrates the Bush Administration’s proactive actions (deciding to enact specific initiatives), but she also indicates that the Bush Administration took action on items that a previous administration had not. Additionally, Rice mentions the year “1998,” attaching the references to the Clinton Administration. Audience members hearing this date observe Rice’s correlation of inactivity charged to that specific administration, but the audience determined on its own to whom Rice refers. These statements counter Clarke’s assertion that she, and members of the Bush administration, did not take terrorism seriously prior to 9/11 but that other presidential administrations had. Rice brings the Clinton Administration into her argument to share the blame for 9/11 with the Bush Administration.

These strategies depict Rice as an educated individual who had been accommodating to her accuser when others may not have been. By using colleagues’ informal names, Rice aligns herself with them and projects herself as a part of a greater team rather than an individual outside of the loop. The creation of this team allows for the entire U. S. government, across multiple administrations, to share the blame for the events of 9/11, rather than allow for the Bush Administration to be the sole target of accusations. These strategies help deflect criticism of Rice.

Evaluation of Rice’s Response to Her Rhetorical Situation

Rice covers significant ground in her remarks. Beyond the variety of topics, events, and individuals she discusses, Rice also addresses all three exigencies comprising her rhetorical situation. This acknowledgement and action bodes well for Rice by revealing an awareness of and sensitivity to the complexity of the situation she faces. Rather than
ignore, belittle, or lump multiple exigencies together. Rice addresses each individually and tailors her strategies to address the different demands and needs of each.

The events of September 11th had been a unifying event in America, and Rice revisits this theme through her strategies. She builds a common enemy for her audience and then provides them with the choice of either aligning themselves with her or the enemy. In response to the allegations that she was trying to undermine the work of the 9/11 Commission through claiming executive privilege, Rice rallies her audience around a symbol of national unity and pride: the Constitution. She portrays her decisions as grounded in revered constitutional principles. She praises the 9/11 Commission, presents herself as a supporter of their work, and outlines her cooperation with them. She refrains from counterattacking Clarke and instead seeks to diminish his allegations through denial and providing contrary information. All of these strategies support the argument that Rice’s primary motive in her remarks is Fisher’s concept of “purification.”

Fisher argues that a speaker motivated by purification will attempt to “refine” an image, and using Richard M. Nixon and John F. Kennedy as examples, Fisher states, “The strategy of their efforts was definition” (136). In order to alter an image, rhetors define concepts, terms, or ideology in a way that favors the image they seek to project. Rice, too, exemplifies this motive of purification. Central throughout the majority of her speech is defining the concept of American unity. Whether this unity stems from action against a common enemy, cherished symbols of national history and pride, or respect for government officials across administrations, Rice seeks to define for her audience what it means to be a fellow American.
Fisher also highlights a part of Nixon and Kennedy’s successful purification: “It is notable that both Nixon and Kennedy communicated a sense of the unfairness of the charge against them, aroused thereby some degree of pity for their plight, and probably excited respect, if not admiration, for their courage to face their problems forthrightly” (136-137). Rice chooses a slightly alternate route. She addresses the many accusations against her and the Bush Administration, particularly the direct accusations from Clarke. However, she refrains from using strategies to arouse pity or draw attention to her defense. Instead, she remains factual and implicit, denying Clarke’s assertions through alternate facts and strategies functioning much like enthymemes where the audience must insert the remaining pieces of her argument. When discussing her emotional response to the events of 9/11, she seeks not to distinguish herself from the emotions others felt that day. She remains focused on defining American unity rather than fully purifying her own image.

Ivie argues that American wartime rhetoric must distinguish the actions of America from those of the enemy, and he writes, “This image of the enemy [as an aggressor] is intensified by a contrasting image of the United States as a representative of civilization who is rational, tolerant of diversity, and pacific” (281). Rice epitomizes this strategy in her remarks to a fault. Instead of fully purifying her personal image, she chooses to focus instead on delineating between “good” and “evil” to build a clear, common enemy. However, the image of the common enemy at the time of her remarks is not in question. Rice’s personal image is, and she falls short of fully purifying it, in part, because her focus is elsewhere.
Rice is to be commended for her dedication to using subtlety and a variety of strategies to address all of the exigencies of her rhetorical situation. She likewise is to be commended for her apparent efforts to remain “above the fray.” However, her failure to express direct and explicit outrage or indignation toward her accusers and the specific accusations against her diminishes the strength and completeness of the purification of her image. Clarke accepts responsibility for failures and asks for forgiveness both in his testimony and in his book. Rice does not answer in kind, leaving the impression that she believes her critics are wrong.

However, her rhetoric does not assert this point strongly, and as a result, Rice never fully eliminates the image of an individual asleep at the wheel prior to September 11th. She seeks to share the blame with others, but this does not reduce the responsibility and liability others already attached to her. Rice’s unwillingness to admit to any personal culpability (or even the possibility of her own or the Bush Administration’s error) for 9/11 stands out in these remarks. Even without apologizing, asking for forgiveness, or accepting full responsibility, Rice could acknowledge making decisions that in hindsight appear wrong, misguided, or ineffective. Instead, she blames terrorists throughout history and other presidential administrations. Numerous individuals share blame and responsibility for what ultimately occurred on 9/11, but certainly the presidential administration that had been in office for the nine months prior to that day also shares that blame.

Rice’s reliance on providing dates for the shift in blame also may have failed her. She places the responsibility for making the connection of who deserves blame nearly entirely on her audience. Considering the credibility and image issues Rice faced from
her audience, this strategy proves risky. Using enthymemes and innuendo, Rice appears to be uncomfortable directly stating her views. This observation raises questions of the accuracy of her assertions and the strength of her convictions.

Although difficult to directly link Rice’s opening remarks to her future success in the Bush Administration, her appearance before the 9/11 Commission resurfaced during her confirmation hearing to become Bush’s Secretary of State following the resignation of Colin Powell. Rice’s remarks and her appearance before the 9/11 Commission ultimately did not detract from her ethos because she was confirmed to her new position within ten months of her testimony before the 9/11 Commission. Her confirmation indicated a degree of confidence in her credibility and character by the senators who assessed her ability to represent the United States and its interests to the world. However, some Senators used Rice’s 9/11 Commission testimony against her during her confirmation hearing. This indicates that Rice did not purify her image fully. Artistically and stylistically, Rice excels in her remarks, but strategically, she falls short of the full purification of her image.
CHAPTER 3

TOWN HALL MEETING FOR STATE DEPARTMENT STAFF

ON JANUARY 31, 2005

On January 31, 2005, staff at the State Department gathered in their Dean Acheson Auditorium to hear from their newly sworn in Secretary of State. She had appeared on several Sunday morning news shows for one-on-one interviews immediately after taking office, and had offered a brief address to the staff who welcomed her in the lobby of the State Department on January 27, 2005. However, the appearance at the Town Hall Meeting represented the first time Condoleezza Rice spoke, uninterrupted and at length, about her priorities and goals for her tenure as Secretary of State. Rice’s choice to discuss these issues first with her State Department staff highlighted the importance she placed on them in several ways. Not only had Rice prepared remarks outlining her thoughts about her new role as their leader, but she also orchestrated the event to be more interactive, setting aside time to open the floor to questions from those in attendance. The State Department later made Rice’s remarks at the Town Hall Meeting available to the public, but the speech was tailored for and delivered specifically to State Department staff – now her staff – and the individuals responsible for executing her foreign policies.
The Historical Context and Rice’s Rhetorical Situation

When Rice took the stage on January 31, 2005, she faced numerous challenges. Still fresh in the minds of many was the Senate debate over Rice’s nomination, as well as the challenges to Rice’s credibility that surfaced during that debate. Rice likewise contended with the fact that she was replacing a wildly popular Secretary within the Department, Colin Powell. In fact, his departure had raised questions about the circumstances of his resignation and Rice’s own priorities as the new Secretary. Rumors circulated that Powell resigned due to frustration over his disagreements with other Bush Administration officials regarding military action in Iraq, and naming Rice as Powell’s replacement appeared designed so that Bush could rein in the State Department. As a staunch supporter of Bush’s military initiatives as National Security Adviser, would Rice advocate diplomacy as America’s chief diplomat or would she look to military force as her key tool? These questions comprised Rice’s rhetorical situation at the Town Hall Meeting.

*Senate Expresses Concerns about Rice’s Credibility*

Speculation about Rice as a potential Secretary of State began during the 2000 campaign. Bush’s appointment of Rice as his National Security Adviser only solidified the assumption that Rice would replace Powell should he resign, a possibility made more likely as divisions in ideology over the war in Iraq began surfacing between Powell and Rumsfeld, Rice, and Bush during their first term in office. Although few were surprised when Bush nominated Rice as America’s 66th Secretary of State, Rice’s past decisions and statements haunted her Senate confirmation hearings.
Although Rice and the White House reversed their assertions of executive privilege and allowed Rice to testify before the 9/11 Commission, family members of victims of 9/11, many of whom had vocalized their displeasure with Rice’s initial failure to appear before the Commission, did not consider Rice’s eventual testimony a resolution. Following Rice’s public appearance before the Commission, CNN reported that a daughter of a 9/11 victim, Carie Lemack, stated, “We’re glad that she [Rice] came forward and spoke. We’re glad that it was in public, under oath, and we were able to get that information. But there is a lot more truth to be told” (Xinhua par. 5). Months later, as Rice’s nomination progressed through the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, her role in the events leading up to September 11, 2001, her perceived lack of cooperation with the 9/11 Commission, and her perceived unwillingness to answer questions resurfaced. Some senators questioned her honesty, leading to contentious exchanges between Rice and members of the Committee (CBS).

When Rice’s nomination passed out of the Committee for a vote before the full Senate, the floor debate included numerous senators rising to speak against or to express concern about her nomination (Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S516-S528). Even some who chose to vote in favor of Rice’s confirmation took the opportunity to express concerns about Rice’s policies and past behavior. Floor debate in the Senate regarding Rice’s nomination had been scheduled so that Rice could make her first trip as Secretary of State immediately following Bush’s State of the Union and the announcement of his international initiatives (Congressional Record, “20 Jan. 2005” S78). Rice would face an international audience immediately after others questioned her ethos.
The accusations Rice faced again went beyond her support of specific policies and included specific attacks on her credibility. Senator Barbara Boxer (D-CA), one of Rice’s leading critics, stated during the floor debate, “The reason I am going to be voting no is clear to anyone who has followed this debate. I asked Condoleezza Rice a series of questions about five different areas. I gave her every opportunity to correct the record…. She refused to budge” \textit{(Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S519)}. Boxer also argued that Rice “continues to put out these misstatements,” eventually arguing that, “Responsibility matters. Accountability matters. It matters when you give someone a chance to correct the record that is replete with half-truths and misstatements, and they don’t take that opportunity” \textit{(Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S519)}. Similar to the criticism made on the floor of the Senate, \textit{The Atlanta Journal-Constitution’s Scott Shepard} quoted Senator Mark Dayton (D-MN) as saying, “I don’t like to impugn anyone’s integrity, but I really don’t like being lied to, repeatedly, flagrantly, intentionally” \textit{(A3)}. The accusations directly challenged Rice’s \textit{ethos} and raised larger questions of honesty within the Bush Administration.

Ultimately, the Senate confirmed Rice by a vote of 85 to 13, with two members not present to vote \textit{(Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S529)}. While this tally demonstrated that an overwhelming majority of senators voted to confirm Rice, the numbers must be put into perspective. The Senate confirmed Rice’s predecessor Powell unanimously \textit{(Powell, “Biography”)}, and his vote occurred immediately after the divisive presidential election of 2000 between former Vice President Al Gore and Bush. Additionally, no other nominee for Secretary of State had received as many votes against his or her nomination since the confirmation of Henry Clay to the post in 1825 \textit{(CBS;
Rice, “Interview on Fox”; Rice, “Interview with ABC’s”). Critics likewise were quick to point out that even Henry Kissinger received fewer votes against his nomination during his confirmation in the midst of the Vietnam War than did Rice. The Senate confirmed Kissinger by a vote of 78 to 7 (CBS). In short, in comparison to her predecessors, Rice was an unpopular, divisive candidate.

Emphasizing the significance of the debate Rice faced over her nomination, USA Today reporter Barbara Slavin noted, “The heat of Rice’s hearing was in sharp contrast to the Senate’s much gentler treatment of then-nominee Colin Powell four years ago and was a sign of a potentially rough ride ahead for the lame duck president and his new top diplomat” (A6). Because Rice ultimately would rely on the Senate and Congress for funding and support for her policies, the criticism she faced could complicate future dealings with the legislative branch. Should journalists, politicians, world leaders, or the public continue to question her ethos, Rice could experience extreme difficulty in carrying out her job both domestically and abroad.

Considering the public debate about her integrity, her honesty, her policies, and her motives, individuals within the State Department likely were very familiar with these concerns, and she did not have the luxury of anonymity, obscurity, or time for the wounds to her credibility to heal. Instead, Rice faced her audience at the State Department who not only had heard this public commentary questioning her credibility, but also had strong positive feelings about the individual she was replacing.

Replacing Powell as Secretary

Along with the description of the Secretary of State’s duties regarding the negotiation of treaties, advising the sitting president on foreign policy, and serving as America’s
chief diplomat, the U. S. State Department notes that the Secretary of State “[a]dministers the Department of State” and also “[s]upervises the Foreign Service of the United States” (U. S. Department of State par. 3). In this role, the Secretary of State ultimately serves as the chief executive officer of the State Department and can affect tremendously the work of all State Department employees. Because of this relationship and responsibility, the new Secretary of State is faced with the task of developing rapport with many non-political staff who remain in service regardless of the political appointee named to lead them.

When Rice assumed her new job, she replaced a highly respected and, for many staff members, beloved Secretary of State Colin Powell. In a column for The Washington Post, former U. S. Ambassador to the United Nations Richard Holbrooke stated that Powell was considered a “savior” by State Department staff (A17), and Howard LaFranchi wrote in The Christian Science Monitor that, “Colin Powell returned a certain sense of self-respect to the professionals [of the State Department] and came to be well-loved by them” (“What Makes” 1). The transcript of Powell’s farewell remarks at the State Department indicates that those present greeted Powell at the start of his remarks with, “Applause and cheers” (Powell, “Farewell Remarks” par. 1). Transcripts of other secretaries’ remarks note the occurrence of “applause” (Rice, “Remarks at Town” par. 1), making the notation of “cheers” in response to Powell even more noteworthy.

Supporting LaFranchi’s observation, Powell placed great emphasis on the staff during his farewell. He recounted a story from when he first assumed office and expressed how his staff became very much his own. He complimented and praised not only their work, but them as individuals. He stated,
I remember the first day that I came into this lobby and was greeted with warmth and affection by all of you. That morning before I left to come down here, Alma said to me, “Remember now, you’re not in the Army anymore.... And don’t go down there and start acting as if it’s an infantry battalion.” (Laughter.) And I said, “Yes, dear.” (Laughter.) Then I immediately came down here and saw the crowd and started treating you like you were an infantry battalion.... Because you were my troops. You were America’s troops. You are wonderful individuals. You are wonderful families. You are wonderful patriots.... And I want to thank President Bush for giving me the opportunity to serve as the 65th Secretary of State and the opportunity not only to be his foreign policy advisor, but to be the leader of this magnificent Department. (“Farewell Remarks” par. 2-3)

Powell filled his remarks with accolades to his staff, noting, “We are one big family” (“Farewell Remarks” par. 9), and minimizing his role as Secretary in comparison to their jobs in the Department.

Powell expressed his gratitude toward the staff and described his job as secondary to theirs. He noted, “[W]e have the privilege of being your leaders, but we know how it gets done. It doesn’t get done because I give a speech or I go here or I go there. It gets done because you do it every single day” (“Farewell Remarks” par. 17). He characterized his work at the State Department by saying, “It has been my privilege to serve you” (“Farewell Remarks” par. 22), and throughout his remarks, Powell emphasized the connection he felt with the staff he was leaving. The same audience
response of “Applause and cheers” occurred at the conclusion of his farewell address after Powell said, “But I want to say to you today that after four years of being with you, serving this Department, the relationship is the same. And even though I step down as your Secretary, I will never leave you. I will always be a part of this wonderful family” (Powell, “Farewell Remarks” par. 23). This statement reflected the strong bond Powell shared with his staff and alluded to the fact that the memory of Powell would remain with the staff long after his departure. He and the relationship he shared with the State Department workers would be references against which Rice would be compared by her new staff.

Praise for Powell continued after Rice assumed her new post. At her ceremonial swearing in on January 28, 2005, Bush honored Powell and described him, saying, “For over four decades, millions at home and abroad have benefited from his bravery, his dignity and his integrity.... [A]ll of us admire and appreciate the service of Colin Powell” (Bush and Rice par. 3). *Newsweek* reporters Michael Hirsh, Eve Conant, and Christopher Dickey described Powell as “the most moderate (and popular) member” of the Bush Administration (24). Replacing a prominent and respected figure such as Powell reinforced the necessity for Rice to build her own credibility and manage her image with the State Department staff. Also complicating Rice’s assumption of office and these remarks were the circumstances surrounding Powell’s resignation, questions about the security of staff members’ jobs and quality of life within the State Department, and uncertainty about Rice’s priorities as the new Secretary of State, which comprised the final elements of her rhetorical situation.
Rice’s Style and Priorities Uncertain

When Colin Powell announced his resignation prior to Bush’s second term, individuals characterized the announcement in several ways. Some assumed Powell was tired of disagreements with other Bush officials over the War on Terror and military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan (Hirsh et al. 24). However, others argued that the change was less voluntary. Hirsh et al. asked, “Was Colin Powell angry? He’s so smooth and politic it’s hard to tell. But only a week before, the man President George W. Bush once likened to George C. Marshall had been, in effect, fired” (24). Hirsh et al. noted that, “Bush simply did not ask him to stay [on for the second term]” (24), and this action raised questions of Bush’s strategy in placing Rice in the State position.

Because of the close relationship Rice shared with Bush and her loyalty to him, the question emerged asking whether Rice was nominated as Secretary to rein in the State Department for Bush’s second term, or whether she would be able to build her own image and priorities as Secretary. Even more specifically, was her nomination designed to clear the path for further American military actions in the world, to provide a more direct line to Bush for world leaders through her close relationship with him, or to restructure the department to be more in line with Bush’s thinking? As Rice assumed office, various reports surfaced giving credence to these concerns.

Of immediate concern to the State Department staff was job security. Reporter Mark Hosenball noted that some staff worried that Rice would restructure the State Department similarly to the changes at the CIA occurring after the appointment and confirmation of its new director. He wrote, “A popular parlor game in Washington is figuring out who Secretary of State designate Condoleezza Rice’s top deputies will be. The diplomatic
community is speculating that Rice and her transition team...will do the same type of
housecleaning that President George W. Bush’s new Central Intelligence director, Porter
Goss, has done at the CIA” (8). Although Hosenball conceded that, “[T]he rumor mill
regarding the State Department transition may be overheated” (8), the staff looked to
Rice for clues about what she would do as the new Secretary.

During a question and answer session immediately following Rice’s remarks at the
Town Meeting, a member of the State Department’s human resources staff questioned
Rice’s priorities regarding taking care of the staff. Rice replied, “I’ll have good people
around me who also pay attention to what’s happening to the people. I know very well
how important this set of issues was to Colin Powell and his team. You can be certain
that we’re not going to have any drop off in that regard” (Rice, “Remarks at Town Hall”
par. 76). Statements such as this sought to quell the concerns about job stability and
satisfaction, but Rice also faced concerns about her priorities as Secretary of State.

Whether he resigned or was fired, journalists argued that Powell’s opinions were out
of sync with Bush’s and ultimately caused his departure. Indeed, as Hirch et al. asserted,
 “[T]he instant reaction in Washington last week was that his ouster was part of a purge of
the dissenters who had so roiled Bush’s first term, in particular, questioning his invasion
of Iraq” (23). If true, nominating Rice to head the State Department raised questions
about whether she would advocate more aggressive actions in dealing with world leaders
and issues, or whether she would transition to diplomacy. Richard Wolffe noted, “For
nervous State Department officials, the critical question is whether Rice will lean toward
Donald Rumsfeld’s Pentagon (as she did in the White House despite their differences in
style and age) or reflect Powell’s instincts for compromise” (28). With numerous
Rice’s Remarks

Rice projects three key images during her remarks, which address in different ways the exigencies she faced prior to presenting these remarks. To accomplish these different tasks, Rice relies on numerous strategies ranging from using an informal tone to flattering her audience and Powell, which portray her as a team player, leader, and diplomat.

Building Her New Team and Taking the Reins

The first image Rice constructs in her remarks is that of a humbled, collegial, and team player, and this image emerges from the beginning of her remarks. After thanking her audience four times during the applause following her introduction, Rice mentions that she began as an intern in the State Department in 1977 and states, “The lesson of the day is to be good to your interns, you never know what’s going to happen” (par. 2). Rice likens herself to her employees by referring to “our role together” (par. 3) and repeatedly referring to “we” throughout her remarks. Consistent with speeches presented during times of transition, Rice recognizes the need to connect herself with her staff. In this
specific context, Rice harkens the relationship Powell enjoyed with the staff, uses these choices to start to build a team, and establishes herself as a member of that team.

Continuing along the line of being a member of the team, Rice takes the opportunity to present a humble image of herself, much as Powell did in his farewell. Although the State Department staff likely knew Rice’s biography of accomplishments, she refers to her success in terms of luck rather than talent. Referencing her previous work in the State Department at the end of the Cold War, Rice characterizes her participation by stating, “It was an extraordinary time to be lucky enough to be the White House Soviet specialist. The end of the Cold War. I was lucky enough to participate in the liberation of Eastern Europe, the unification of Germany, and to see shortly after the collapse, the peaceful collapse, of the Soviet Union” (par. 6). Through this statement, Rice not only appears humble, but she also begins taking steps to establish her credibility as Secretary of State. Rice avoids appearing arrogant by crediting “luck” for her opportunities, and by referencing her work during the Cold War, Rice identifies herself as having worked successfully on profound international issues.

Rice provides ample evidence to demonstrate her personal knowledge of international issues, her awareness of the current work at the State Department, and the importance of both to those in the audience. Rice references former U. S. diplomatic leaders such as George Marshal and Dean Acheson (par. 7), traces the diplomatic history of the United States following World War II (par. 8-11), and discusses the significance of the Georgian and Ukrainian revolutions and voting in Afghanistan, Palestine, and Iraq (par. 13). Later, Rice asks three groups of staff members to stand in the audience representing those working on “tsunami relief” (par. 23), “HIV/AIDS” (par. 26), and “PSI -- the
Proliferation Security Initiative” (par. 28). For each of these groups, Rice explains to the audience on what each group worked. By referencing all of these elements, Rice demonstrates her understanding of State Department history and contemporary issues that the staff had been handling. She validates their work, builds her credibility by demonstrating her knowledge, and flatters the staff, all of which contribute to building a favorable image of Rice.

In addition to citing facts, Rice also expresses a level of understanding of what the work entails through reassurances such as, “You see before you an example of people who worked enormously long hours and very, very hard over the last few weeks -- some are down here -- to respond to the tsunami. And I can tell you. I’ve been briefed on what we did” (par. 23). This statement represents one of the most personal assertions she makes in assuring the audience members of her awareness and understanding of their operations. Proactively discussing these elements contributes to Rice’s credibility as being a knowledgeable individual and being in tune with the inner workings of the State Department. These strategies also contribute to establishing that she, too, is a part of the State Department team through her knowledge.

In a departure from other speeches, Rice incorporates a more informal style in this speech through her use of powerless language throughout the text, specifically a use of qualifiers, intensifiers, and hesitations. Throughout her remarks, Rice incorporates qualifiers and intensifiers to stress her points. She speaks at length about the historic times in which she and members of the State Department staff find themselves. Indeed, for her, these are not just “times” but “extraordinary time[s]” (par. 3, par. 17, par. 20), “special time[s]” (par. 5), “rare time[s]” (par. 5), “heady times” (par. 7), or “great and
exciting time[s]" (par. 32). Individuals working for diplomacy did not face mere setbacks but “dizzying setbacks” (par. 8) or a “dizzying array of setbacks” (par. 10). Similarly, Rice repeatedly characterizes elements as “tremendous” including “tremendous accomplishment” (par. 11), “tremendous steps forward” (par. 13), and “tremendous challenges” (par. 13, par. 29). The use of these adjectives emphasizes and illustrates her points, but they also project an informal and collegial tone from Rice. Her language does not represent the formal Rice with whom many in the audience were familiar. This tone supports the image of Rice as a member of the State Department team and one of them by showing a less formal version of herself.

Rice also emphasizes elements by using the words “really” and “very” throughout her remarks. Rice states that post-World War II decisions were “really just a matter of harvesting good decisions” (par. 7), that the post-World War II “world that really lay asunder” (par. 8), that State Department staff “have to be able to really engage” (par. 18), that tsunami relief workers worked “very, very hard” (par. 23), and that there were elements of tsunami relief that were “done very, very well” (par. 24). As before, Rice’s use of these words for emphasis contributes to a more informal and personal tone with her audience, helping build the idea that Rice is one of “them.” Having been considered an outsider or a spoiler in replacing Powell, making this connection is important for the believability of Rice’s image as a part of the State Department.

These elements of projecting herself as a peer and a member of the team become increasingly important when Rice begins to distinguish herself as the leader of the team. Already having established her knowledge of issues facing the State Department, Rice assumes the role of a leader and cheerleader rallying her new troops. Rice’s discussion of
the purpose of this speech indicates, “I just wanted to have a few minutes to talk to you about how I see the Department and our role together in promoting the interests and values of the United States at this extraordinary time” (par. 3). Through this statement, Rice declares she will be working with the State Department staff, but she makes clear that she is their leader. Later, Rice asserts,

Before I speak about these three efforts that are examples of transformational diplomacy, though, I want to say one other thing to each and every person in this room. There is no such thing as an insignificant or unimportant task or an insignificant or unimportant job. Not in the State Department. Every single task is important. Every single job must be done well. It does not matter what job you have, it doesn’t matter if you’re administration, all the way up to the Secretary, there is no unimportant or insignificant task. (par. 19)

Rice seeks to bolster her audience by recognizing and amplifying the importance of their work. While this statement reflects the idea that Rice is simply a member of the State Department team, her insertion of the specific reference of her own position within the Department likewise serves as a distinguishing factor to represent her leadership role in the team, as does her change in tone. In this statement, Rice uses more concise language and refrains from using the qualifiers she used previously. This change also contributes to establishing Rice as the leader.

In her most specific reference to being the new leader of the State Department, Rice declares, “So I’m counting on all of you, every person in this room and every person beyond listening, to take on the challenge that we have, because if we do what we do
well, we, too, will be part of a legacy that leaves to people 30 or 40 or 50 years from now
a transformed world” (par. 21). This statement represents Rice’s call to action for her
new employees and serves as a transitional statement to emphasize a second element
emerging from her rhetorical situation that Rice addresses: an acknowledgement that her
decisions can include positive and negative consequences.

Unclear from the shift in roles from “one of the team” to the leader of the team is
whether Rice feels a need to assert her authority or merely acknowledges the reality of
her new position as Secretary. She predominantly keeps her tone informal, casual, and
collegial, indicating an emphasis on the latter. Creating this collegial image allows for
greater believability as she begins addressing her priorities as Secretary.

Establishing Her Focus
Because some people questioned whether she would advocate military force or
diplomacy as Secretary of State, Rice clearly articulates how she sees her new role.
Throughout her remarks, Rice speaks in terms of “time” (par. 5), “history” (par. 5), and
“legacy” (par. 21). While these references serve as rallying points to the staff hearing her
statements, they also signal Rice’s personal recognition that decisions of the past
transcend their contemporary times and contexts. This becomes important because it
serves as recognition that Rice’s decisions as Secretary could impact the world for
generations to come. The use of these terms suggests that Rice would approach decisions
with this awareness in mind.

The topical theme Rice employs in her remarks includes her advocacy of
“diplomacy” (par. 4), specifically “transformational diplomacy” (par. 18). Rice argues
“that the time for diplomacy is now and that the State Department will have a key role in
that diplomacy” (par. 4). Rice appears determined to alleviate concerns about whether she would support military action over diplomacy in her role as Secretary. Additionally, Rice clarifies that transformational diplomacy means “that we are doers. We’re activists in this effort to change the world. Yes, we’ll analyze. And yes, we will report. And yes, we will come up with great ideas. But we also have to be able to really engage and get it done” (par. 18). Rice thus announces her commitment to actively pursuing solutions to the world’s challenges, and she reiterates her commitment to diplomacy.

While Rice uses numerous strategies to vilify terrorists in her 9/11 Commission testimony, divisive language rarely appears in her Town Hall speech. Instead of focusing on the War on Terror or the War in Iraq, Rice highlights some of the humanitarian efforts coming out of the State Department. Her references to the work on tsunami relief (par. 23) and HIV/AIDS (par. 26) mark clear distinctions between Rice’s other speeches. When referring to Afghanistan and Iraq, she predominantly characterizes these nations in terms of the successful voting occurring within their borders (par. 13). She makes few references to war or terrorism in her remarks, and when she does, they are framed in terms of democracy and freedom. For example,

We have fought two wars in the greater Middle East, in Afghanistan and Iraq. We face a world in which we recognize after September 11th that we have to change in the Middle East, change based on democratic values, change based on the spread of liberty, because without the dignity and the hope that liberty and freedom bring, we’re going to see nothing but the kind of hopelessness that terrorism brings. (par. 12)
She glazes over the two wars in a single sentence, focusing instead on contrasting the ideas of freedom and human dignity with the “hopelessness that terrorism brings” (par. 12). Similarly, Rice notes that recent voting in Iraq occurred “despite the efforts of the terrorists to intimidate them, to sow fear” (par. 13). In a final reference to terrorism, Rice states, “As Zarqawi said, democracy is something for infidels, he said. A vote for democracy is something that we [al Qaida in Iraq] will oppose. Well, the Iraqi people answered that and answered it resoundingly” (par. 14). By framing these references in terms of democracy and freedom, Rice again emphasizes diplomacy over military force. Based on these references, the audience can infer that Rice, too, will focus on diplomacy instead of military action as their new Secretary.

Rice provides subtle clues to her past diplomatic efforts through references to her work in the administration of George H. W. Bush. Rice’s specification of working toward “the collapse, the peaceful collapse” of the Soviet Union bolsters her resume, which was dominated more by military actions than diplomatic activities in the administration of George W. Bush. Once again, Rice places diplomacy in the forefront of the minds of her audience. She focuses on her past diplomatic efforts to indicate where her priorities as Secretary would be.

As Rice presents herself as a part of her new team, prepared to lead and prepared to focus on diplomacy, she faces one final obstacle: the staff’s loyalty to the revered Colin Powell. Rice faces the choice of rejecting the significance of Powell to her audience and forcing them to move on, or she can embrace him in her remarks. Rice chooses the latter.
Acknowledging Powell

For those in the audience loyal to Powell and perhaps skeptical of a new Secretary, Rice reaches to address their concerns in a variety of ways. In a key bolstering strategy early in her remarks, Rice praises the work done under Powell’s leadership at the State Department. She states, “[W]e have seen some tremendous steps forward in the last three-and-a-half years” (par. 13). An even more specific bolstering strategy involving Powell includes Rice’s description of Powell as “my dear friend and our dear immediate past Secretary, Colin Powell” (par. 30). While Rice and Powell indeed were close, Rice’s reference to their friendship in this speech and at this time appears strategically designed to acknowledge the devotion of many staff members to Powell.

Perhaps Rice’s most strategic reference to Powell comes when she announces a new program named in his honor, the Colin Powell Fellows Program (par. 30). Rice advises her audience that the program will involve a forum in which participants can “provide ideas and insights to me and to others on the leadership team and to have a chance to be recognized for their potential” (par. 30), and she notes that those selected for the program “will represent the best of what the Department of State is and what it must be in the future” (par. 31). These descriptions are consistent with the sentiments Powell expressed about the State Department and its staff, and they reflect that his influence will continue within the Department. However, Rice provides no specific details about the program and acknowledges that it had not yet been established. Her choice to announce the program at this time, with no details, emphasizes that the announcement seeks to acknowledge Powell more than launch the program.
Evaluation of Rice’s Response to Her Rhetorical Situation

Rice presents herself as a part of her new team who is ready to lead the Department and enact America’s diplomatic strategies. She once again demonstrates a sensitivity to her rhetorical situation by acknowledging and addressing the many exigencies she faces, and her strategies reveal several insights into her goals.

Rice’s immediate audience contended with numerous images of her from both within and outside of the Department prior to her remarks: usurper, stooge, aggressor, liar. Rice also needed to acknowledge the work of Powell and to identify whether she would be more militarily- or diplomatically-minded. She needed to address whether she was little more than Bush’s new mouthpiece or possessed her own opinions, and she needed to be mindful of the potential influence of public commentary on the opinions of her new staff. Based on examination of Rice’s rhetorical situation, Fisher’s “purification” once again appears to be Rice’s most obvious motivation. However, her strategies and remarks reveal otherwise. While Rice does appear determined to correct the alternate images of her in existence through her remarks, this speech is dominated instead by Fisher’s notion of “affirmation.”

Fisher writes, “[A] rhetoric of affirmation (or genesis) [appears] in situations when a communicator addresses potential believers in an effort to get them to adopt a ‘new’ concept” (132). Within affirmation, rhetors can speak in three different types of situations, each stemming from differing circumstances: “autocratic,” “democratic,” or “academic” (Fisher 133). Rice’s situation is clearly the “democratic” where, “Determination of policy is made through rhetorical transactions; the people judge; and decision is compromise” (Fisher 133). This democratic affirmation can include large-
scale contexts, such as a president addressing the electorate, or much smaller contexts like the situation applicable to Rice. In the Town Hall meeting, Rice’s “people” are the State Department staff, and they are responsible for judging her message and arriving at the compromise. Her success as Secretary depends largely on their compliance and support. As Rice speaks before her audience, she introduces her diplomatic philosophy in the State Department under her leadership: transformational diplomacy. Each of Rice’s strategies is aimed toward building credence to and acceptance of this idea. Concerning her own image, Rice’s strategies for gaining acceptance of transformational diplomacy contribute to persuading her audience to accept the image of Rice as the enactor of this new philosophy and their new leader.

Rice is methodical and relies on each argument to build into the next. She works to gain credibility with her audience by portraying herself as one of them. Only after having established this relationship and rapport does Rice begin to assert herself as the leader. When she distinguishes herself as the leader of the team, Rice then begins laying the foundation for the introduction of her diplomatic philosophy. By unfolding her plans in this way, Rice increases the likelihood of receptivity of her audience to her message. The ultimate image Rice projects is that of the individual leading the State Department into the future through innovative ideas like transformational diplomacy. Rice cannot project this image believably without walking her audience through the steps outlined above, and the organization of her remarks greatly assists in this endeavor.

An important element of affirmation in a democratic situation involves “recogniz[ing] that human beings are fallible and that political decisions are not absolute” (Fisher 133). Rice incorporates this element into her remarks by crediting luck for her success and
talking about the many challenges the State Department has faced at different times in history. The eventual success of some actions did not secure the world indefinitely, and Rice acknowledges that America continues to face challenges in the world, despite past success. However, Rice frames this element positively, choosing to focus instead on past successes providing hope for future ones.

As Fisher notes, a rhetor motivated by affirmation in a democratic situation relies on the audience to judge the message, and decisions arrive as a result of compromise (133). Although Rice is the leader of the State Department, she relies on the compliance and assistance of others to enact her policies, and she acknowledges this relationship in her remarks. She relies on her audience to accept her willingness to work with them, her awareness and understanding of their work, and the sincerity of her message. Rice succeeds in enacting transformational diplomacy only if her audience arrives at a compromise: although Powell is gone and will be missed, Rice is now in charge, determined to lead the Department in a positive direction, and deserves support.

Rice provides a strong example of Fisher’s affirmation. Although her strategies do not stand out as extraordinarily artistic, her fidelity to her ultimate goal and her organization are masterful. What Rice sacrifices in style she makes up for with pragmatism. By avoiding overly ornate language and keeping her message focused on positive elements of State Department operations, Rice ultimately possesses a better chance of gaining acceptance of her new image and ideas from her audience.

The most significant implication of Rice’s rhetoric at the Town Hall Meeting is her choice to focus on affirmation rather than purification. The numerous elements comprising her rhetorical situation present Rice with that choice: she can answer her
critics and purify her image, or she can focus instead on creating a new image as Secretary. Because purification of her image would necessitate that she introduce an element of negativity into her remarks by addressing and giving a voice to her critics, Rice effectively focuses on affirmation by keeping her messages upbeat and positive. Because her goal is to create a favorable image, focusing on positive elements assists in that endeavor. Fisher notes that creating a new image ultimately assists in subverting a previous image, and by channeling her efforts into creating her new image as America’s chief diplomat, Rice is able to begin the process of subverting her previous, less favorable images.
CHAPTER 4

REMARKS AT THE INSTITUT D'ETUDES POLITIQUES DE PARIS
ON FEBRUARY 8, 2005

Just under two weeks into her term as Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice delivered her first major public speech while in the middle of a tour of Europe and the Middle East, and this speech in Paris constituted her first extended public remarks as Secretary of State, either in the United States or abroad. Although she appeared publicly and offered remarks with world leaders at each of her stops throughout her travels in the early days of her tenure, Rice limited her remarks to the customary recitations of goals for upcoming meetings, the issues discussed during meetings that already had occurred, and answering questions from the press. She passed over the opportunity to give this first speech while in locations such as London, Berlin, Warsaw, Ankara (Turkey), Jerusalem, Tel Aviv, Ramallah, and Rome, opting instead to address a group of students, instructors, and French and European leaders at a political science school in Paris. At home, critics still questioned whether Rice would advocate military force over diplomacy and whether her past criticism of European allies, specifically France, over the War in Iraq would taint her efficacy as Secretary of State. Overseas, Rice's close relationship with Bush, her involvement with the advocacy and planning of U.S. military actions in Afghanistan and Iraq, and her criticism of those who disagreed with America's military actions remained controversial to many citizens and government officials. The appearance in Paris
allowed Rice the opportunity to engage and assuage both her international and domestic critics. Not only did Rice flatter her French hosts by choosing them to hear her first speech as Secretary of State, but she also demonstrated to her critics at home that she would face even her fiercest critics on their own soil.

The Historical Context and Rice’s Rhetorical Situation

When Rice spoke in Paris, she faced a rich and complex situation. Personally, she contended with the concerns revealed during her Senate confirmation process regarding her ability to promote and engage in diplomacy rather than advocate military action. Professionally, she possessed her first opportunity as Secretary of State to share her goals and vision for the future. In many ways, Rice would reveal who she was and, more specifically, what kind of Secretary of State she would be through her remarks at the Institut d’Etudes. Rice chose to speak before an immediate audience that could have been either receptive or hostile towards her, and ultimately, this speech provided Rice an opportunity on an international stage to bolster both her personal and professional image at home and abroad.

Questioning Rice’s Diplomatic Abilities

While Rice’s time as Bush’s National Security Adviser led directly to her nomination and confirmation as Secretary of State, her actions and statements during that time complicated her image both domestically and internationally during her first weeks as Secretary of State. Government officials and journalists portrayed Rice as a key figure in planning America’s military action in Afghanistan and Iraq, something many held against her. Senator Jim Jeffords (I-VT) characterized Rice as “a lead architect of our Nation’s
failed foreign policy and of the war in Iraq” (Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S521). Jeffords argued that Rice’s tarnished image would jeopardize her efficacy as Secretary of State, and emphasizing the importance of the image of the person serving in that role, he stated,

The Secretary of State is America’s second most visible face to the world. If he or she is to be effective, the Secretary must be seen as truthful, forthright, and respectful of other nations. The hallmark of this administration’s foreign policy has been its willingness to distort information in the service of political objectives, and its failure to tell the truth. It has viewed other nations as either naïve or cowardly if they have disagreed with our policy. Ms. Rice has been the public face of this policy and this “modus operandi”. Nothing could be more detrimental to her ability to be a successful Secretary of State. (Congressional Record, “26 Jan. 2005” S520)

Although he presented his criticism as against “this administration” of which Rice was a member, Jeffords’ message was clear: in his opinion, Rice was untruthful, disrespectful, and would not be a positive representative of the United States to the world. He directly challenged Rice’s personal credibility and character, or ethos, with this comment. Unfortunately for Rice, his portrayal was not the only one of its kind.

Senator Daniel Akaka (D-HI) also explained his vote against Rice’s confirmation by writing, “As Secretary of State, one of the Secretary’s main responsibilities is to implement our diplomatic efforts which include addressing regional and civil conflicts. I do not believe, given her past decisions and comments on the reasons to go to war in Iraq,
that Dr. Rice will be able to represent the United States without a predetermined bias from the war” (par. 2). In a statement released following Rice’s confirmation, Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA) described Rice as “the marketer of the inflated evidence leading up to what was called a pre-emptive war in Iraq” (par. 2). Both senators represented Rice as an individual who favored military action over diplomacy, a counterproductive and problematic tendency for the person who would be America’s chief diplomat. These criticisms represented the thoughts of members of an opposing political party, but Rice suffered image problems internationally, as well.

Going in to her speech in Paris, pundits reported that Rice’s image in Europe was not favorable because of her past criticisms of other nations and due to comparisons to Powell. As National Security Adviser, Rice expressed unfavorable opinions about other nations in response to their lack of support for the war in Iraq (LaFranchi, “Ambitious First” 2). Reporters Robin Wright and Keith B. Richburg explained, “As Bush’s national security adviser, Rice reportedly called for a policy in early 2003 to ‘forgive Russia, ignore Germany and punish France’ after those three countries blocked a U. N. resolution allowing the use of force in Iraq” (Al). This statement portrayed Rice as fiercely loyal to and supportive of Bush’s military ambitions, as well as a vengeful individual determined to get even with those who dared to disagree with Bush and his policies. Reports such as this emphasized the significance of Rice’s choice of France for her first speech as Secretary of State in that she not only would be addressing and taking questions from those she reportedly said to punish, but also doing so in their land, on their terms.
Another element contributing to the questions surrounding whether Rice would advocate diplomacy or military action stemmed from comparisons regularly drawn by members of the media and government officials worldwide between Powell and her. These comparisons often painted an unflattering image of Rice. People viewed Powell as being his own man in the Bush Administration; Rice appeared to be Bush’s mouthpiece. Charles M. Sennott quoted Jonathon Stevenson, a London think-tank researcher, as stating, “They [Rice’s comments in London about Iran just prior to her Paris speech] show that she is very much a George W. Bush proxy and that she will not even lean toward having an independent identity the way Colin Powell did, and not necessarily use the niceties of diplomatic language in doing so” (A1). Similarly, Andrea Stone reported that according to European media, “Rice’s image in Europe is not a good as Powell’s; Powell was seen as a moderate” (“Rice Sets” A7). H. D. S. Greenway noted, “Europeans may find her a bit tiresome with her Bush-speak about promoting liberty” (A15), and Stone noted that Europeans agreed more with Powell’s policies and views than Rice’s (“Rice Sets” A7). All of these sentiments combined to present Rice the challenge of articulating who she would be and what would be her primary tools as Secretary of State. To her advantage, many media reported that Europeans were willing to give Rice an opportunity to prove herself (Greenway A15; Stone, “Rice Sets” A7), but she clearly still faced image and credibility challenges going into the speech.

Choosing France as a Venue

The same day that Rice addressed staff at the Town Hall Meeting, State Department spokesman Richard Boucher fielded questions about her choice to present her first major public speech in Paris. In response, Boucher stated, “[S]he wanted to do it in Paris
because she felt Paris was one of the places where there’s a lot of debate and discussion about the U.S., about Europe, about common goals, about how we achieve our agenda, and that she wanted to be part of that discussion” (par. 44). However, most journalists speculated that Rice was trying to reconcile disagreements with European nations (particularly France and Germany) about America’s military action in Iraq. Depending on the reporter covering the story, this decision represented Rice’s desperation in mending the damaged relationship or demonstrated gutsy courage in her willingness to engage these critics.

For example, among the variety of ways reporters characterized Rice’s choice of Paris for her speech, LaFranchi said Rice was, “Testing the waters” (“Ambitious First” 2), and Wright and Richburg called the speech “a major overture to end two years of tension with key U.S. allies over the Iraq war” (A1). In an article outlining Rice’s first trip as Secretary of State, Stone noted, “Rice will give her first major speech as Secretary of State in the country whose animosity to Bush and the Iraq War prompted some angry Americans to turn French fries into ‘freedom fries’” (“Rice Begins” A5). An editorial in the Boston Globe described Rice’s speech and her visit to Europe in the first several weeks of her tenure as “an indispensable effort to begin repairing what never should have been fractured” (“Rice’s Grand” A14). Regardless of the specific description, Rice’s speech was considered an olive branch with great expectations for reconciling America’s relationship with Europe and France attached to it.

Because of these significant expectations, curiosity about Rice’s speech intensified as it approached. Once her travels as Secretary of State were underway, an unidentified reporter stated to Rice following her meeting with Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rotfeld
on February 5, 2005, “As I understand, your journey to Europe now is also aimed at
remedying the relations with main European powers that have been strained, especially
with France and Germany” (Rice, “Remarks With Polish Foreign” par. 22). Rice kept the
focus on choosing France as a center of debate, but members of the media continued to
speculate about Rice’s choice of Paris. Most wanted to know what Rice would say in the
speech so that they could better determine what U.S. policy toward France and Europe
would be now that Bush had a similarly-minded figure as Secretary. The question
became whether France would continue to be viewed negatively and as an obstructionist
country or whether Rice would make overtures to repair the relationship.

Interaction with reporters for Reuters and Agence France-Presse during an interview
with Rice on February 1, 2005, highlighted the importance of the upcoming speech at
Sciences Po. A reporter requested a “preview” of the speech, a request Rice denied
(Rice, “Interview with Reuters” par. 14). However, when questioned about why she
selected Paris for this speech, Rice replied, “This great alliance [with European nations]
which has first stood the test of time in winning the Cold War, then expanding to the
freed nations of Eastern Europe, and now is standing the test of time in the war against
terrorism.... the speech in Paris, I think will make that argument that we are looking at a
time of opportunity with this alliance” (Rice, “Interview with Reuters” par. 18-20). This
statement offered the first substantiation from Rice that media reports were accurate in
portraying the visit as a means to begin reconciling differences between America and
Europe. Beyond the symbolic gesture of delivering her first speech as Secretary in Paris
as a demonstration of France’s significance to America, Rice hinted she would address
verbally at least some of the concerns about the relationship between France and the United States as well.

A tendency among Americans had been to view the disagreements between Europe and the United States as involving the singular issue of the War in Iraq. However, in addition to conflict over Iraq, the United States and several European nations disagreed on issues ranging from how to pursue peace in the Middle East and dealing with nuclear threats from Iran and North Korea to whether America supported a unified and autonomous Europe (Wright and Richburg A1), and the strained relationships between America and several European nations were more extensive than any specific issue or topic. The *Boston Globe* noted, “Beyond any particular differences over Iraq, Iran, or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the deepest source of tension in those relations has been the temptation of each side to define the other as a strategic rival” (“Rice’s Grand” A14). Europeans especially looked to Rice’s speech for explanations of how the United States viewed Europe’s voice and place in the world. However, not only did people in Rice’s immediate European audience possess expectations for her speech, but people in America also looked to the speech for answers as to who Rice would be as Secretary of State.

*Sending a Message to the Audience at Home*

Rice faced questions about whether she would advocate diplomacy or military force as Secretary and contended with her depiction as Bush’s favored adviser installed to ensure agreement with his policies both within the United States and internationally. Ultimately, Americans comprised Rice’s mediated audience in Paris, and in addition to the speculation that her speech in Paris was designed to repair America’s relationship
with France and several other European nations, Rice’s speech in Paris also appeared designed to send symbolic messages to the audiences back home.

NBC’s State Department correspondent Andrea Mitchell illustrated this point by noting during an interview with Rice leading up to Paris, “Some people might suggest that you’re going into the belly of the beast by going to Paris, meeting with President Chirac, confronting the French who were the most critical of our policy in Iraq” (Rice, “Interview with Andrea Mitchell” par. 15). Rice replied by saying, “Well, it’s clearly time to put behind the differences of the past. That’s not what we’re going to be judged by; we’re going to be judged by our achievements. And I intend to go to Paris to talk about what we have done together, that’s a lot” (Rice, “Interview with Andrea Mitchell” par. 16). Although Rice focused on her audience in Paris in her reply, Mitchell’s awareness of how some Americans perceived Rice’s speech represented an additional element to Rice’s situation. For Rice to appear strong as the new Secretary, she needed to do things that would reflect that strength and that focused on diplomacy. Venturing into France to speak to the nation that had criticized America’s military and foreign policies demonstrated that strength.

Building on this sentiment, The Washington Post reporter Keith B. Richburg described the situation in which Rice found herself in Paris by writing, “It had all the trappings of a modern-day Daniel in the Lion’s Den: Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice venturing bravely into the heart of French intellectual opposition to America” (A16). Similarly, others felt that Rice’s choice of Paris as a venue sent a message more powerful than any words she could utter. In a February 9, 2005, editorial, The Wall Street Journal stated, “The choice of the elite Sciences Po, a training ground for French diplomats no
less, sent a message that the second Bush Administration won’t shy away from engaging its fiercest critics” (“Condi in Paris” A10). Not unlike how John F. Kennedy’s choice to address the protestant Houston Ministerial Association to respond to the “religious issue” of his Catholicism during the 1960 presidential campaign allowed him a powerful venue “to face the issue of religion frankly” (Warnick 184), Rice’s appearance in France sent a similar message in confronting her critics. Because of past disagreements between America and France over Iraq, Rice faced a potentially hostile audience with negative preconceived ideas about why she came to Paris. However, her willingness to face that type of an audience symbolized strength and courage for American audiences. Rice chose not to address an audience that would greet her automatically with cheers; any favorable response she received would be one she had to earn. As a result, the mediated audience in America looked to Rice’s speech for this demonstration of bravery and for information about her priorities and policies as Secretary of State.

Rice faced a rhetorical situation in which her personal and professional image, as well as that of the nation she represented, had been challenged and replaced by images that were predominantly unfavorable. People viewed Rice as a warmonger of sorts, committed to defending Bush’s initiatives in Iraq regardless of the cost to America and its influence in the world. Many questioned whether Rice could escape this image and her connection to advocating the War in Iraq, and if she were unable to do so, would this detract from her ability to represent America as its chief diplomat? These elements provided the context for Rice’s speech on February 8, 2005.
Rice’s Remarks

A superficial reading of Rice’s remarks indicates a customary speech of flattering an audience, discussing commonalities, and expressing an agenda and goals. However, a closer examination of these remarks reveals a wealth of strategic choices that address the many exigencies Rice faced. Rice flatters her audience and uses identification to gain reception of her ideas, to demonstrate her respect and understanding of her audience, and to deflect hostility before discussing more divisive issues. She chooses her examples carefully, focusing on diplomatic achievements rather than military victories, and she makes clear that violence is a tool that terrorists, not she or the United States, advocate. Each of these strategies contributes to presenting the image of Rice as a credible, diplomatic, respectful, and committed leader on behalf of her own country and the world.

Mending Fences and Building Coalitions

As mentioned previously, France had criticized the United States’ military action in Iraq, and Rice’s choice to address an audience there presents an obstacle to overcome. Some members of the audience may have agreed with America’s activities in Iraq, but media accounts indicate far more disagreed with them. As a result, Rice uses her remarks to build solidarity and similarity with her audience, harkening Kenneth Burke’s concept of identification (55). Burke writes, “You persuade a man insofar as you can talk his language by speech, gesture, tonality, order, image, attitude, idea, identifying your ways with his” (55). Strategies of identification build a sense of understanding and unity between the speaker and the audience, and they ultimately allow for differences to be diminished because similarities outweigh them. Burke notes that these choices are strategic because, “For the orator, following Aristotle and Cicero, will seek to display the
appropriate ‘signs’ of character needed to earn the audience’s good will” (55-56).

Achieving this good will builds credibility and allows for the acceptance of more divisive or controversial opinions.

Rice seeks to identify with her audience in two ways: on an individual level and on a national level. Although she jumps between the two in the opening moments of her speech, she focuses first on associating herself with the audience individually. For someone who criticized France for its opposition to the United States’ military activities, Rice’s choice to identify herself with her audience stands out as a key strategy. She begins by flattering the audience, Paris, and France as a whole by stating, “And let me thank the people of France for being such perfect hosts. I’ve just arrived. I wish I could stay longer. But it’s such a wonderful city; it’s wonderful to be here” (par. 1). Rice continues by mentioning her anticipation of visiting “one of your fine music schools” (par. 1); she then turns her attention back to her immediate audience by stating, “It is a real special pleasure for me to be here at Sciences Po. For more than 130 years, this fine institution has trained thinkers and leaders. As a political scientist myself, I appreciate very much the important work that you do” (par. 2). Using adjectives like “fine,” “wonderful,” “important,” and “perfect,” Rice expresses positive sentiments toward her French audience. She not only begins making up for past criticisms of her host nation, but by establishing this personal appreciation and link with her audience, Rice then is able to transition to broader discussions of relationships between the United States and France.

To increase the receptivity of her remarks to her audience, Rice must overcome the disagreements of the past between the United States and France regarding the War in
Iraq. To do this, Rice highlights the similarities in histories and values between the two nations. Rather than rely on innuendo or enthymeme, Rice makes her point clearly by stating, “The history of the United States and that of France are intertwined. Our history is a history of shared values, of shared sacrifice and of shared successes. So, too, will be our shared future” (par. 3). Rice returns briefly to personal identification with her audience by describing her first trip to Paris with President George H. W. Bush in the late 1980s, but she uses this personal identification to draw another broader connection between the two countries. Rice notes that her trip had been in honor of “the bicentennial celebration of the French Revolution and the Declaration of the Rights of Man” (par. 4). She then draws the connection between the nations by stating, “Americans celebrated our own bicentennial in that same year, the 200th anniversary of our nation’s Constitution and our Bill of Rights” (par. 4). Focusing on each nation’s celebrated document of liberty, Rice not only emphasizes a commonality but also provides the background for claims she will make about the importance both nations place on ideographs like democracy, liberty, and freedom. Having this mutual understanding is crucial for Rice gaining acceptance of her call to action that she makes later in her remarks for her audience to continue to work toward supporting these principles around the world.

Rice continues to describe the common values between France and America, and rather than glorify one nation over the other, she provides each with equal merit in the historical evolution of democracy. Although American history touts its Founding Fathers as the catalysts for democracy and freedom in the world, Rice shares the credit for such ideas with the ancestors of her French hosts. She asserts, “The founders of both the French and American republics were inspired by the very same values, and by each other.
They shared the universal values of freedom and democracy and human dignity that have inspired men and women across the globe for centuries” (par. 5). This statement, along with her discussion of the Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Bill of Rights, reveals another strategy Rice uses to shift focus off of the United States and onto France. She routinely refers to France or French historical events first, followed by an American counterpart. This strategy allows Rice to associate with her audience and build commonality by showing their independent but mutual histories. At the same time, she subtly and consistently places her French hosts first and avoids placing America ahead of them. This strategy helps Rice relay the importance and equality she places on her audience, as well as the respect she has for their history in relation to her own nation’s.

Another strategy Rice employs that contributes to bridging the gaps between France and America involves her use of inclusive language. Rice frequently incorporates words such as “we” (par. 7), “our” (par. 14), “shared” (par. 5), “together” (par. 15.), and “alliance” (par. 24), and these words express unity and commonality. Similarly, Rice refers to Thomas Jefferson, a historical figure with significance to both nations, to contribute to this goal. While Jefferson represents one of America’s Founding Fathers and America’s first Secretary of State (Kaplan 19), he spent considerable time in France during his tenure (Kaplan vii) and is credited with assisting Lafayette with the documents of the French Revolution (Adams 95; Thomas Jefferson 54). Thus, Rice’s reference to Jefferson serves a unifying function to assist her efforts to build credibility and to identify with her audience on a personal and national level. Again, all of these strategies are necessary for Rice to achieve open-mindedness and support from her audience in
anticipation of her discussion and request for assistance on more divisive issues such as Iraq, forthcoming in her speech.

A final move Rice makes to identify specifically with her French audience is to reference the French slogan of “Liberte, Egalite, and Fraternite” (par. 58). These concepts are connected as forcefully with French democracy as the American principles in the Declaration of Independence, “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness” (795). Rice shows her knowledge of French history and values through this reference; she also appeals to her audience’s sense of duty, history, and loyalty to these ideals to help build her case that Americans and the French have more in common than what divides them. Rice uses this reference to assert that the French are as different from terrorists in the world as Americans and that the two should be united because of their common values.

Although France frequently is credited with being one of America’s greatest critics regarding Iraq (Wright and Richburg A1), other European nations also questioned America’s military actions. Rice likewise needs to address the rifts with other nations, and after building unity with France, Rice expands her identification strategies to bridge the gap between America and Europe as a whole. Rice accomplishes this by referring to the actions of Lech Walesa in Poland (par. 9), the fall of the Berlin Wall in Germany (par. 13), the challenges in the Balkans (par. 16), and the actions of NATO to address these concerns (par. 15). Rice sums up these examples by stating, “Time and again in our shared history, Americans and Europeans have enjoyed our greatest successes, for ourselves and for others, when we refused to accept an unacceptable status quo” (par. 14). These examples and statements allow Rice to reach beyond her immediate audience and seek to overcome the differences between America and other European nations.
Similar to her strategies when addressing just French history, all of Rice’s efforts to describe the similarities between America and France and Europe contribute to her ability to discuss the disagreement over Iraq, which will be examined later in this chapter.

If audience members questioned the importance Rice and America place on improving relationships between America and Europe, she addresses those concerns explicitly. Discussing the upcoming visit by President George W. Bush to Europe, Rice states, “He is determined to strengthen transatlantic ties. As the President said in his recent Inaugural Address: ‘All that we seek to achieve in the world requires that America and Europe remain close partners’” (par. 19). This statement serves multiple purposes for Rice. First, she solidifies the importance America places on European coalitions and builds the credibility of her assertions by using the President’s own words to support her assertions. Second, she bolsters her own image. Even though Bush’s reputation may not have been positive among her audience members, he still is the President of the United States and symbolically (if not actually) wields great power and influence in the world. Implying she knows the strength of Bush’s convictions, this reference alludes to the fact that when Rice speaks, she is not speaking for herself or merely on behalf of her nation: she speaks with the approval and endorsement of Bush. Although this statement clearly is designed to bolster her credibility, it simultaneously gives credence to the concern that Rice is Bush’s mouthpiece and is using this speech as a means to convey his thoughts instead of her own.

Despite her efforts to elevate her audience and place them on equal footing with her own country, Rice inserts a sentiment seemingly contradictory to her assertions. Throughout her remarks, Rice portrays America and Europe as a team, a partnership.
She seeks to highlight the importance of their common work to bettering the world. However, she mentions an American-centered bias that detracts from her efforts to build a unified audience for some, yet answers an important question for others. Rice argues that the combined efforts of the transatlantic alliance are necessary for “historic global advances for justice and prosperity, for liberty and for peace…. That is why the United States, above all, welcomes the growing unity of Europe. America has everything to gain from having a stronger Europe as a partner in building a safer and better world” (par. 63-64). Through this statement, Rice shifts the focus off of the betterment of the global community and onto American gains. At the same time, Rice quashes the debate that America was concerned about a strong, united Europe. Depending on the audience member, Rice either reveals a self-serving national bias that questions the sincerity of her discussion on the equality of America and Europe, or she provides America’s supportive position on the European Union and its continuing strength. Unfortunately for Rice, she is not explicit about what she means, and she relies on her audience’s interpretation to make her point. In one sentence, Rice negates her previous identification strategies for some of her audience by placing America and its desires ahead of Europe’s.

Each of these strategies contributes to building an image of Rice as a partner, a colleague, and even as a respectful admirer. Rice presents herself as cognizant of French concerns and priorities and as an individual who recognizes the importance of an ideologically unified France and America. Each of these strategies contributes to building a positive image of Rice, all with the final goal of gaining acceptance of her discussion of Iraq and call for unified support of promoting democracy and freedom in the Middle East. However, the believability of this image is in question when she fails to
express clearly some of her points. These strategies answer one piece, but not all, of Rice’s rhetorical situation. She likewise needs to allay concerns in America and abroad regarding whether her primary tool as Secretary of State would be diplomacy or military force.

**Focusing on Diplomacy**

With both American and international leaders looking to her remarks for clues into whether she would advocate diplomacy or military force, Rice presents information that places nearly complete focus on diplomatic and non-violent actions to enact change. Through her choices of examples, Rice noticeably excludes those that bring to mind military actions by U. S. or international forces, and if violence is mentioned, Rice attributes it to an antithetical party outside of the transatlantic alliance. She makes it clear that she now is America’s chief diplomat.

To support her claims of the successful efforts by humans to enact change, Rice uses the actions of Rosa Parks (par. 8) and Lech Walesa (par. 9), neither of whom personally used violence in the events Rice describes. She likewise frames events in Afghanistan and Iraq in terms of freedom and democracy. She describes Afghani “men and women, once oppressed by the Taliban” as having “walked miles, forded streams and stood hours in the snow just to cast a ballot for their first vote as a free people” (par. 10). Although Rice does mention the threat of terrorism in Iraq, she states, “And just a few days ago in Iraq, millions of Iraqi men and women defied the terrorist threats and delivered a clarion call for freedom. Individual Iraqis risked their lives. One policeman threw his body on a suicide bomber to preserve the right of his fellow citizens to vote. They cast their free votes, and they began their nation’s new history” (par. 11). Rice connects terrorists with
violence and avoids mentioning any American or Coalition military actions in either of these nations or historically. She avoids celebrating violence, condoning it, or offering it as a solution to problems. This omission implies that Rice is focusing on diplomacy in her new role.

Later in her remarks, Rice again frames actions in Afghanistan and Iraq in terms of voting, democracy, and rights (par. 37). She uses these references as examples of success and again discusses violence in terms of something that others use by stating, “All of us were impressed by the high voter turnout in Iraq. Each ink-stained finger belonged to a man or a woman who defied suicide bombers, mortar attacks, and threats of beheading, to exercise a basic right as a citizen” (par. 38). These examples shift the focus from America’s military involvement in these nations and imply that Rice places great importance on democratic actions such as voting. Once again, violence is credited to terrorists who seek to disrupt democracy, not to those who are seeking to expand it in the world. Ultimately, these portrayals are designed to lessen the divisiveness of the situation in Iraq and draw on her audience’s common values of freedom and democracy.

Similarly, Rice uses the fall of the Berlin Wall (par. 15) and the Cold War (par. 20) as examples of successes and challenges that America and Europe have shared. Noticeably absent from Rice’s discussion of transatlantic efforts are discussions of World War I, World War II, the Korean War, and the Gulf War. Instead, Rice only mentions non-military work by NATO (par. 15, 22) and the European Union (par. 15, 22, 31). She keeps the focus on diplomatic efforts and institutions, and this strategy indicates Rice’s predisposition toward diplomacy, as well as emphasizes her point that violence is a tactic of terrorists, not the freedom-loving United States and Europe.
Audience members can infer from Rice’s statements that she is advocating diplomacy, but she provides explicit statements to reduce the possibility of misunderstandings. For example, Rice states,

Our work together has only begun. In our time we have an historic opportunity to shape a global balance of power that favors freedom -- and that will therefore deepen and extend the peace. And I use the word “power” broadly, because even more important than military and indeed economic power is the power of ideas, the power of compassion, and the power of hope. (par. 18)

Through statements such as this, Rice clearly indicates that she values other tools at her disposal rather than solely military force. Although “the power of ideas, the power of compassion, and the power of hope” (Rice, “Remarks at the Institut” par. 18) are vague, what becomes important is that she expands the definition of power beyond military force, and this expansion continues to support the image of an individual committed to diplomacy.

As Rice transitions from discussions of historical shared diplomatic successes to contemporary global issues and concerns, she again chooses to incorporate only diplomatic examples. Discussion of the Middle East peace process includes mention of “Arab-Israeli diplomacy” to achieve “a two-state solution” (par. 43), American and European “support [of] the Israeli Government’s determination to withdraw from Gaza and parts of the West Bank” (par. 45), as well as diplomatic meetings occurring while she was in Paris between “the Palestinian and Egyptian Presidents, the Israeli Prime Minister, and Jordan’s King” (par. 46). Rice’s discussion of ongoing efforts to ensure “the
blessings of peace...between Israelis and all of their Arab neighbors” (par. 50) uses diplomatic examples only such as discussions about the “G8-Arab League meeting” (par. 51) and the “Arab Summit” (par. 51). By retaining a focus on diplomatic efforts, Rice appears determined to present herself as America’s chief diplomat rather than as President Bush’s advocate for military action, and this is precisely the image Rice creates through these strategies. Having identified with her audience and made clear her support of diplomacy, Rice is able to turn to her discussion of some of the most divisive issues facing the world: the War in Iraq and the spread of democracy in the Middle East.

Garnering Support for and Addressing the Issues of Iraq and the Middle East

Rice’s efforts to create unity and identify with her audience discussed previously aim at building a foundation for her discussion of America’s presence in Iraq and her efforts to garner support for ongoing efforts in that country. Rice indicates the purpose of her remarks by stating, “I am here in Europe so that we can talk about how America and Europe can use the power of our partnership to advance our ideals worldwide” (par. 19). Although not mentioning Iraq specifically, Rice builds on this sentiment to make the case for European support for ongoing efforts in Iraq and the greater Middle East, and she reveals her recognition that America cannot proceed in these endeavors alone. The War in Iraq represents one of the most divisive issues between Rice and her immediate audience, and her earlier strategies all culminate to help her present her call to action for them to unite with America to promote the spread of freedom and democracy in the greater Middle East.

In order to lend weight to her argument, Rice asserts that past American and European successes can be attributed to a specific uniting premise. She states,
These achievements have only been possible because America and Europe have stood firm in the belief that the fundamental character of regimes cannot be separated from their external behavior. Borders between countries cannot be peaceful if tyrants destroy the peace of their societies from within. States where corruption, and chaos and cruelty reign invariably pose threats to their neighbors, threats to their regions, and potential threats to the entire international community. (par. 17)

Rice argues that the values America and Europe share of freedom and democracy require action and that democracies must be united together against those nations that fail to protect the rights of their citizens. Speaking in broad terms allows Rice to avoid delving too quickly and explicitly into the divisive issue of the War in Iraq. However, her meaning is clear. With this statement, Rice also solidifies the antithesis she seeks to build, clearly delineating Americans and Europeans from others such as terrorists or "tyrants."

Rice revisits this antithesis through additional statements such as her discussion of violence in Iraq. Rice's language choices once again present a division of "us versus them" through her pronoun usage. Rice states,

Today's radical Islamists are swimming against the tide of the human spirit. They grab the headlines with their ruthless brutality, and they can be brutal. But they are dwelling on the outer fringes of a great world religion; and they are radicals of a special sort. They are in revolt against the future. The face of terrorism in Iraq, Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, called democracy 'an evil principle.' To our enemies, Liberte, Egalite, and
Fraternité are also evil principles. They want to dominate others, not to liberate them. They demand conformity, not equality. They still regard difference as a license to kill. But they are wrong. Human freedom will march ahead, and we must help smooth its way. We can do that by helping societies to find their own way to fulfill the promise of freedom.
(par. 58-59)

Rice’s antithesis makes clear to her audience members that they have a choice. They can be terrorists, or they can be united behind “Liberte, Egalite, and Fraternite” against the terrorists. She offers no middle ground or compromise. In this section of her remarks, Rice draws on the identification with her audience she previously accomplished to begin transitioning from discussions of diplomacy to a posture of defending past actions by the United States. By creating a common enemy and reminding the audience of its common values with America, Rice can legitimize her call to action for her audience to support the expansion of democracy in the world.

Rice acknowledges the differences of opinion between America and European nations, but she seeks to overcome those differences by once again emphasizing the similarities among them. Rice argues, “We agree on the interwoven threats we face today: Terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and regional conflicts, and failed states and organized crime. We have not always seen eye to eye; [sic] however, on how to address these threats. We have had our disagreements” (par. 23-24). Rice’s acknowledgement of these differences of opinion builds her personal image of a realistic and credible individual and similarly lends credibility to her call to action. She acknowledges the disagreement between Europe and America without belittling opposing
views, and she describes Europe’s opposition to military action in Iraq not as a desire to support Saddam Hussein or terrorists but as a difference in opinion for how to handle threats. She is able to frame controversial issues as unified concerns: America and Europe disagree not on what is a problem but on how to rectify the problem. In this way, Rice frames the controversy over the United States’ military action in Iraq as a simple disagreement in how to solve a problem.

Rice indicates her purpose in Europe is to “talk about how America and Europe can use the power of our partnership to advance our ideals worldwide” (par. 19). However, she becomes even more specific as she seeks to garner support for America’s global involvement in places such as Iraq and Afghanistan. Rice asserts, “Our charge is clear: We on the right side of freedom’s divide have an obligation to help those unlucky enough to have been born on the wrong side of that divide” (par. 21). Again, Rice relies on antithesis to connect herself with her audience and motivate them to accept and act on her call to action. In order to be unified in this effort of helping the “less fortunate” of the world, Rice argues that the differences of opinion she identifies must be cast aside. She also frames the division between democracies of the world and others in terms of “luck,” or more specifically in terms of being “unlucky.” This description allows the audience to contemplate that any of them could have lived in the absence of freedom depending on their ancestry or if their national heroes during revolutionary times had failed to seek and embrace democracy.

Her previous statements could stand alone as a call to action, but Rice includes more than uniting together to advocate freedom with her French and European audiences. She continues her call to action by stating,
But it is time to turn away from the disagreements of the past. It is time to open a new chapter in our relationship, and a new chapter in our alliance. America stands ready to work with Europe on our common agenda -- and Europe must stand ready to work with America. After all, history will surely judge us not by our old disagreements but by our new achievements. (par. 24-25)

Rice emphasizes the common purposes between America and European nations and likewise inserts the discussion of the importance of working together and moving beyond past disagreements. She makes clear that unified efforts will fail unless the damaged relationships of the past can be transcended, even if this does not include endorsement of past behaviors. Rice avoids asking for forgiveness for America. She admits no fault and no mistakes on America’s behalf. She does not belittle her audience by offering America’s forgiveness for Europe’s past criticisms of Bush and his foreign policies. Instead, she argues for a fresh start, in essence an agreement to disagree about the past but to be united in the future.

Rice also strategically labels these differences of opinion as “disagreements” (par. 24) and “challenges” (par. 28) rather than using more emotive language. Disagreements and challenges sound far easier to overcome than feuds or obstacles. Similarly, while depicting some activities as “terrorism” (par. 58), Rice calls American and French revolutionaries “impatient patriots” (par. 7). The first labeling strategy diminishes differences among parties while the second strategy sharpens them between America and France and their common enemy. Each of these labeling strategies supports the creation of an audience unified with Rice.
Rice avoids specifically requesting assistance or support from her audience with America’s efforts in Iraq or Afghanistan, issues that already proved divisive. Instead, she frames the call to action more broadly. Rice portrays her request as a need for mutual support to expand the concept of freedom globally (par. 27). Within this broader context, Rice provides the activities in Afghanistan and Iraq (par. 27) as examples but focuses primarily on the Middle East peace process, for which a summit was occurring simultaneously in Sharm el-Sheikh, Egypt. By doing this, Rice reduces the emphasis on America’s military involvement and presents the audience with a less inflammatory and divisive cause around which to rally.

As a part of her call to action, Rice provides Iraq as an example of a successful effort towards democracy. Resembling the opening lines of the Declaration of Independence, Rice states, “There comes a time in the life of every nation where its people refuse to accept a status quo that demeans their basic humanity. There comes a time when people take control of their own lives. For the Iraqi people, that time has come” (par. 39). Rice presents this assertion as a rationale for Europe and America to combine their efforts in support of the Iraqi people. Rice asserts, “They have shown extraordinary bravery and determination. We must show them solidarity and generosity in equal measure. We must support them as they form their political institutions. We must help them with economic reconstruction and development. And we must stay by their side to provide security until Iraqis themselves can take full ownership of that job” (par. 41-42). Through this statement, Rice seeks to overcome the differences of the past between the United States and European nations and to rally her audience in support of America’s efforts in Iraq.
Rice encourages her audience to help in Iraq if not for America’s sake, then for the sake of the Iraqi people, and she ignores emphasizing that the two inherently are linked.

In a final attempt to legitimize her call to action, Rice references the linked histories of the United States and France one more time. She states,

We know we have to deal with the world as it is. But, we do not have to accept the world as it is. Imagine where we would be today if the brave founders of French liberty or of American liberty had simply been content with the world as it was. They knew that history does not just happen; it is made. History is made by men and women of conviction, of commitment and of courage, who will not let their dreams be denied. (par. 65-66)

By referencing successful fights for liberty, such as the American and French revolutions, Rice links contemporary, and controversial, efforts in Afghanistan and Iraq to events about which the audience likely already held positive sentiments. She appeals to her audience’s sense of duty and to their common values as a means of motivating them to move beyond their past disagreements with the United States to help the people of the Middle East.

However, the credibility of Rice’s call to action and justifications for her call diminish as the result of contradictions she inserts into her remarks. Although making a strong case in support of unified actions to change the world in favor of democracies, Rice errs by trying to portray these efforts as though they were the result of the Iraqis themselves. In reference to the Middle East peace process and expanding democracy in Arab nations, Rice states, “Different societies will advance in their own way. Freedom, by its very nature, must be homegrown. It must be chosen. It cannot be given; and it
certainly cannot be imposed” (par. 36). Although specifically addressing the conflict between Palestinians and Israelis, this sentiment contradicts Rice’s call to action for her audience by ignoring the role American and Coalition forces played in the liberation of Iraq. If freedom must be homegrown and cannot be imposed in the Palestinian/Israeli conflict, why is the opposite true in Iraq, and why is Rice encouraging her audience to take a more active role in helping spread democracy in the world? Rice fails to account for this contradiction and brushes over it instead.

A second contradiction Rice inserts at the end of her remarks stems primarily from a change in tone. After spending considerable time showing strong conviction of the successes America and Europe could achieve together to expand democracy in the world, Rice changes her tone within the span of one of her final sentences that sounds almost desperate. Rice asserts, “Great opportunities await us. Let us seize them, now, together…,” but she chooses to finish this sentiment with “…for freedom’s sake” (par. 68). After crescendoing toward the end of her remarks, this ending falls flat and potentially reveals that Rice’s conviction of the rightness and ultimate success of her cause might not be as strong as she previously asserts. If her cause is just and the correct course of action, and if she believes in it completely, Rice should not need to justify it with a final plea to freedom. If she has made her case, her audience will respond to her call to action because it is the right thing to do.

The majority of Rice’s strategies contribute to her image as an educated individual who is committed to spreading freedom globally and believes firmly in the righteousness of her cause. Rice acknowledges the divisiveness of issues such as the War in Iraq, and she does not seek to change her audience members’ minds about the past. Instead, she
argues for moving forward together and offers examples and explanations for why she is making that call to action. Rice presents herself as a forward-thinking individual committed to freedom and democracy. However, the believability of this image must be addressed in the next section.

Evaluation of Rice’s Response to Her Rhetorical Situation

In many ways, Rice fulfills the expectations for this speech. With the focus of pre-speech media being Rice’s efforts to repair America’s relationship with France and Europe, she provides information and uses strategies undeniably aimed at this goal. Those anticipating a defense of America’s activities in Iraq and Afghanistan are not disappointed. Her willingness to appear before a hostile audience and address the past disagreements between her nation and her audience demonstrates a courage and strength of character to Americans at home. Those looking for clues as to Rice’s priorities as Secretary of State receive ample information, as well. Present in this speech are characteristics of several of Fisher’s motives, but based on the exigencies Rice needs to address and her choices of strategies, Fisher’s motive of purification dominates this speech.

As noted previously, purification seeks to “refine” an image (Fisher 136), and central to the strategies a rhetor uses is defining terms or ideologies. Although Rice constructs a personal image through her rhetoric, she is far more concerned with purifying America’s image for her international audience. Prior to her remarks, America was seen as the aggressor in the world. It was the superpower committed to requiring compliance with
its way of thinking, and Rice’s strategies are aimed at defining what it means to be a superpower.

Of significance to Rice’s definition of a superpower is that she expands the role to include France and Europe. She takes the focus off of the United States and instead argues that all democratic countries must unite to support the expansion of freedom and democracy throughout the world. Rice deliberately flatters her French and European audience to repair a damaged relationship, to build a sense of unity and equality, and to motivate them to respond to her call for action. Rice mostly avoids the pitfall of glorifying American thoughts and history at the expense of other nations’. Each of these strategies contributes to expanding the definition of a superpower to include all who are willing to lead others toward freedom and democracy.

As Rice reaches out to her European audience by emphasizing similarities between them and Americans, she seeks to build unity between America and Europe. Boulding argues that rhetors are linked with the entities they represent, and hence, Rice’s strategies to build unity also reflect favorably on her. As her audience grows more understanding or open-minded toward America’s policies and why it endorses them, they likewise grow more understanding and open-minded towards her. These strategies combine to present an image of her as America’s chief diplomat, an individual committed to democracy and freedom in the world.

Rice’s focus on voting, the expansion of freedom, liberty, and democracy around the world also speaks to her American audience through ideographs and favorable sentiments attached to these words. These concepts reflect the narrative of American life and its values, and she uses these ideas to build unity between herself and her countrymen and
women back home. Her willingness to engage the French through this speech demonstrates courage, another valued attribute in American life, and Rice demonstrates that she is a representative of America as it sees itself by incorporating these elements.

However, the contrary of Boulding’s argument also holds true. An individual’s unfavorable image also can reflect poorly on the institution being represented and vice versa. Rice’s misstep in arguing that freedom must be homegrown and cannot be imposed detracts from her credibility and the believability of both America’s and her favorable image she is building with her international audience. This contradiction reflects the American narratives surrounding the Revolutionary War and revered documents such as the Declaration of Independence, but for an international audience, this contradiction portrays Rice more as a mouthpiece of Bush than an independent diplomat. This action also portrays America as oblivious to the contradiction between the philosophical ideas Rice presents and the reality of military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan. The American audience may or may not view her comments as a contradiction depending on whether individual audience members support military action in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Additionally, Rice’s reference to American support for a stronger European Union detracts from her definition of a superpower. Keeping in mind that Rice spends considerable time placing France and Europe on equal footing with her opinion of the United States and including them in the definition of a superpower, pointing out that America has “everything to gain” (par. 64) implies that America must support actions in order for them to occur. This implication detracts from her efforts to place European nations and America on equal footing in the world. Naturally, this statement does not
undermine her sentiment as much for the American audience as it does for her international audience. The question then becomes on which audience Rice focuses more.

Rice begins her remarks strongly and incorporates numerous elements to build solidarity with her audience. This foundation allows Rice to become more explicit in her comments and call to action for the audience. Once again, she shows great skill in organizing her speech in such a way as to allow for a cumulative effect in layering her strategies to increase the receptivity of her message. Instead of alienating her audience immediately by jumping into a discussion of Iraq, Rice weaves her message together piece by piece. Instead of addressing her comments to all of Europe from the beginning, Rice begins locally and first flatters her French hosts and their city. She constructs her remarks in such a way as to address her and her nation’s image by beginning on the most basic level of identification and moving forward to more complex issues later.

However, the contradictions Rice inserts raise concerns and questions. Which of Rice’s statements are to be believed? To which philosophy of expanding democracy does Rice and America subscribe? Does Rice believe that all freedom must be homegrown, or does she believe that free nations are obligated to help those “unlucky enough” (Rice, “Remarks at the Institut” par. 21) to be born elsewhere? Even worse, does Rice not see the contradictions between the sentiments she expresses? In her effort to build unity and appeal to common values with her audience, Rice strays from ensuring the internal validity of what she is saying. Naturally, the possibility exists that Rice’s sentiments do not contradict one another, but she fails to explain fully her thoughts so that the opposing ideas are reconciled with one another.
In her efforts to inspire the audience to embrace a fresh start in the relationship between America and Europe, Rice again avoids taking responsibility for any errors she or the Bush Administration may have made. More specifically, she again fails to allow even for the potential of error on her or the Bush Administration’s part. Rice does not account fully for the disagreements between France, America, and Europe over the War in Iraq, and this avoidance effectively eliminates any debate about which decisions could have been mistakes. She discusses how humans are flawed inherently and that any government created by humans also will be, but these flaws appear to stop short of America’s leaders. In her desire to move forward, Rice selectively ignores and diminishes the importance of different events and decisions of the past. People make mistakes, but based on what appears in this speech, Rice is not one of them.

In addition to the questions regarding the content of her remarks, the sincerity of her message also comes into question. Is the first part of her speech that is filled with flattery designed solely to placate the immediate audience to motivate them to support America’s efforts in Iraq, or are her comments genuine appreciation of their history and values? Is she more concerned with repairing her image at home and building solidarity with Americans, or is Rice’s priority in Paris repairing America’s relationship with France and Europe? If Rice sees France and Europe as America’s partners, why does she negate that sentiment by inserting American biases late in her remarks? Rice exerts great effort in building both her and America’s images to be good stewards in the world, committed to democracy and freedom. However, instead of resolving issues and purifying America’s image (and her own), Rice’s speech ultimately supports the image she sought out to purify. These missteps detract from the image Rice works to build and ultimately leave
the impression that, once again, America and Rice fail to understand the issues from Europe’s perspective.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

The previous chapters offer evaluations of each of the three speeches examined in this project, but those evaluations are limited to examining each speech for its own characteristics, Rice’s rhetorical strategies, and Fisher’s motives of communication. However, because this project also seeks to illuminate characteristics about Rice as a speaker, it is appropriate to look for patterns across the series of speeches. Central to the examination of these three rhetorical acts have been the rhetorical situations comprising the contexts for her remarks. As a result, this chapter begins with an examination of how Rice chose to address the challenges she faced throughout the speeches and the repercussions of those choices. Additionally, this chapter explores what can be learned about Rice as an individual speaker from the analyses of her strategies, and it concludes by outlining avenues for future studies on Rice.

Acknowledging, Addressing, and Responding to Critics

Among the most notable characteristics of Rice’s three speeches are the implicit and explicit references to the challenges comprising her rhetorical situations. Because she faces so many different and competing elements, Rice easily could have focused solely on what she perceived to be the most dominant concern. Doing this would have allowed Rice to delve deeply into specific issues and offer complete arguments countering the
criticisms she faced. However, focusing on only one exigence in each speech would have left multiple elements unaddressed, and Rice could appear to be ignorant or avoidant of the other issues comprising her rhetorical situations.

Instead, in each speech she acknowledges the many exigencies that exist in the situation, addresses them overtly or subtly, and ultimately responds to her critics in some way. Doing this demonstrates her awareness of the controversies surrounding her, and she refrains from belittling any of the concerns or the critics who voiced them. She includes information to speak to her many different audiences simultaneously, using ideographs and themes her audience members would recognize and understand. Through these actions, Rice deserves credit for appearing to understand the complexity of the situations, audiences, and issues she faces and for appearing to take the concerns seriously enough to provide counter-arguments and self-defense.

However, although she addresses the many components of her rhetorical situations, a natural next question becomes whether Rice addresses them to the satisfaction of her audiences, because the believability of the images she projects rests to some degree on whether she appeases and addresses these concerns satisfactorily. Evaluations based on the “effects” of discourse are problematic and difficult to render in that they look to extrinsic outcomes and sources for evidence of success. In Rice’s case, a complete analysis of audience sentiments prior to and following the address would need to be performed, and if the audience finds her remarks lacking, then her remarks would be lacking, regardless of any of the strategies she uses or any other successes she achieves. Certainly a speech can be deemed moving, persuasive, or artistic without addressing its effect.
Keeping the difficulty in rendering judgments based on effects in mind, there is at least some evidence to suggest that the speeches in this project were not as effective as Rice might have wished. Media accounts following her 9/11 Commission testimony indicate that many in the audience felt Rice withheld information (Xinhua par. 5). Wright and Richburg quote Paris audience member Francois Heisbourg as stating, “I was rather disappointed. I wasn’t getting what I was led to expect” (A1). At her Town Hall address, Rice’s remarks garnered only “[a]pplause” (“Remarks at Town” par. 33) in comparison to Powell’s “[a]pplause and cheers” (“Farewell Remarks” par. 1). Stone notes that in Paris, “Rice’s listeners never interrupted her speech with applause” (“Rice to Allies” A11), and the speech “garnered mixed reviews” (“Rice Sets” A7). These accounts certainly do not reflect the sentiments of all in attendance, but they raise the concern that Rice left many members of her audiences, particularly those at the 9/11 hearing and in Paris, not fully satisfied with her remarks. This dissatisfaction impedes the persuasiveness of her speeches and of the image she seeks to project in each case. Rice’s strategies for both her 9/11 Commission testimony and Paris speech fall short of her goal of purifying her image, and this is related to Rice’s unwillingness to address the exigencies of her rhetorical situations exhaustively and adamantly.

These criticisms can be attributed to strategies Rice uses, among them her use of abstract language. Wright and Richburg note that one of the criticisms of the audience in Paris is that “they heard only generalities, without specifics for how to overcome continuing differences” (A1). Thomas R. Burkholder, in examining the use of myths by Kansas Populists, asserts that language is more abstract to express “political ideologies” but that “specific policies are necessarily expressed and advocated in concrete language”
Becoming more specific increases the risk of alienating audience members, and Rice reveals that her focus in Paris is on building unity with her audience (both the international audience and those at home) rather than offering solutions by remaining predominantly abstract in her language. The same is true at the Town Hall Meeting. Rice avoids offering overly specific initiatives in both settings, which reduces the possibility of disagreement with her statements. However, this choice also leaves her audiences with few details on which to base their support or disagreement. Abstract language can be unifying initially, but at some point, specificity becomes necessary in order to garner support fully. Individuals look to Rice, America's chief diplomat, for articulation of America's foreign policies. Speaking abstractly and in ideographs can work in some situations, but when trying to repair or replace a damaged image, audiences require evidence to support the new image. In many cases, this requires details, and for the hostile audiences she faced at the 9/11 Commission hearing and in Paris, Rice provides minimal rationale for them to support her.

Writing about the downfall of the Know-Nothing Party of the 1850s, A. Cheree Carlson argues that one of the reasons the political party failed is because it “did not adjust its story to respond to the demands of the changing rhetorical situation” (376). However, perhaps part of the complication of Rice's work is that the story she asserts does change with elements of the rhetorical situation. When inspectors did not locate weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the Bush Administration altered its rationale for military action there to involve the spread of democracy and freedom in the world, and this is the story Rice projects in all three speeches. However, this alteration of the story presents an interesting dichotomy. From one perspective, Rice helps herself by refraining
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from continuing to argue the existence of weapons of mass destruction when evidence
does not support the assertion. However, this change fails to account for her previous
rhetoric on this subject, as well as that of other Bush Administration officials.
Ultimately, this change without explanation detracts from Rice’s credibility and also
complicates the rhetorical situation by adding another exigence.

The analyses of the speeches indicate that Rice’s primary motives are purification of
an image in both the 9/11 Commission testimony and her speech in Paris and affirmation
of an image at the Town Hall Meeting at the State Department. Of these three, Rice is
most successful in the Town Hall Meeting. Here, she addresses her many exigencies,
fully accounts for her rhetorical situation, and reflects the elements Fisher outlines as
characteristic of affirmative speeches. Rice provides evidence to support her willingness
to work with and her understanding of her new staff, and these strategies lead her
audience to be more receptive to her new image as the leader of the State Department and
her new policy of transformational diplomacy.

However, in the remaining two speeches, Rice falters in fully purifying the images
she sets out to address, and these are related to how Rice addresses her rhetorical
situations. Before the 9/11 Commission, Rice elects not to challenge directly or express
outrage about the attacks on her personal credibility, and in the case of the Paris speech,
she actually provides contradictory information and supports the unflattering image of
herself and America she seeks to correct. Particularly in Paris, Rice spends considerable
time associating herself with her immediate international audience, but she then fills her
speech with statements and narratives that reach out predominantly to her American
audience and appear as contradictions internationally. Up to the point of these
occurrences in the rhetorical acts, Rice successfully uses strategies to strengthen her credibility and project favorable images of herself, her nation, and her policies. However, in the end, her choices detract from the success of those strategies and leave the purification of the images unaccomplished.

These observations reveal that Rice addresses the many exigencies of her different rhetorical situations, an important feat to accomplish, but not necessarily in depth or to the satisfaction of her audiences. Additionally, Rice uses some strategies to greater success than others and accomplishes some communicative goals better than others, ultimately based on her treatment of her rhetorical situations. Beyond looking solely at rhetorical situations, each of these observations also allows for a closer examination of Rice as an individual rhetor.

Rice the Rhetor

Two key observations about Rice as a speaker emerge from these analyses. First, Rice possesses numerous skills, particularly involving the organization of her speeches and her willingness to address in at least a cursory fashion the many exigencies of her rhetorical situations. These elements allow Rice to respond to her critics and build a sense of unity with her audiences before attempting to discuss divisive issues. These are two of Rice’s strongest attributes that are evident in these speeches. However, a distinct flaw running throughout the speeches serves as a barrier between her audiences and her messages. Rice fails to admit to mistakes or even accept the possibility of personal error. Her willingness to explore the possibility of human error seemingly does not apply to her, and this characteristic represents one of Rice’s greatest weaknesses in these speeches.
Throughout the evaluations of the individual speeches, Rice’s organizational skills stand out. She flatters her audiences, identifies herself with them by pointing out their similarities, and makes efforts to build a sense of solidarity and unity prior to delving into any issues that could be divisive. Rice then revisits these unifying sentiments as she nears the end of her remarks. The depth of skepticism or dislike some in the audience may have for Rice naturally may make her efforts insufficient, but regardless, she follows this pattern to attempt to persuade her audiences in all three speeches. Doing so demonstrates her understanding of the importance of her audiences, and she places great effort into building her messages methodically, step by step and piece by piece in order to increase the receptivity of her audiences to her messages and the images she projects.

A second strategy Rice uses successfully involves her willingness to address the many exigencies of her rhetorical situations. As discussed previously, addressing these many elements reveals a sensitivity Rice has to her surroundings, her critics, competing viewpoints, and the world. Although she may not address them fully, she still uses her remarks to respond to her critics and their many concerns. She may not discuss issues to the audience’s satisfaction, but she still gives a voice to their concerns. Acknowledging these exigencies instead of ignoring them bodes well for Rice.

As successful as Rice is in these areas, her speeches are equally flawed in one distinct area: admitting to the possibility of personal error. Rice inserts discussion of the possibility of human error into her 9/11 testimony by arguing that officials nationwide did the best they could with the information they possessed. She discusses a similar sentiment in Paris by noting that governments created by humans are naturally flawed. However, Rice never acknowledges that she personally could have made mistakes as
Bush’s National Security Adviser regarding either the War on Terror or the War in Iraq. Her efforts to portray human weakness appear to apply to others, not to her or the Bush Administration. These strategies should indicate that Rice exudes a high level of confidence in her decisions, but instead, they portray Rice as either unaware of problems with the War in Iraq or in denial about them. Neither conclusion presents an ideal image of her.

These observations about Rice’s personal style illuminate the possibility that Rice is a rhetor better suited to the introduction of new concepts and images rather than the repair of the old. She appears most successful, and most comfortable, in rallying support for her new idea of transformational diplomacy and her new position as Secretary of State, and a fresh start suits Rice well in her remarks at the Town Hall Meeting. On the other end of the spectrum, apologizing or accounting for problems is more difficult for Rice. She makes pragmatic choices to strengthen her and others’ credibility in both the 9/11 Commission testimony and her remarks in Paris, but in both speeches, she falls short of altering fully the unfavorable images held of her and America. Perhaps because of her verbalized desire to move forward immediately, Rice neglects fully accounting for the past in both speeches, which would allow her audience members to move forward with her. The unwillingness to address personal missteps and to provide concrete policy information likewise contributes to the difficulty Rice has with moving her audience with her. Depending on the situation, her failure to admit mistakes proves more problematic, further supporting the argument that she is better with new beginnings than repair.
Future Studies and Conclusion

This project seeks to provide careful examination of three of Rice’s speeches, each presented amidst complex rhetorical situations. However, the body of Rice’s work is expansive and far beyond these three acts. Her career has included academia, government service, and private enterprise via work on numerous corporate boards (Rice, “Biography” par. 6). Each has produced artifacts, and they merit study as well. Because her work in different roles and across disciplines may possess noteworthy similarities or differences that provide further insight into Rice’s rhetorical abilities and style, scholars also should focus on examining not only Rice’s current work as Secretary of State but her past endeavors.

Among the voices critical of Rice have been some in the African American community (see Brown, Durham), who argue that Rice has failed to use her prominent positions to advocate on behalf of the African American community. Because of Rice’s role as the highest ranking African American woman in the federal government and in the history of the United States, examinations of her work from the perspective of African American rhetoric may reveal additional insights into her and her rhetorical choices. Does Rice include stylistic and topical elements consistent with previous studies of African American rhetoric? Do her messages discuss issues of race or racial discrimination in America or around the world? Does she advocate policies that would benefit the African American community? Similarly, as one of the two highest-ranking women in American history, analyzing Rice’s work from the perspectives of gender studies or feminine style also may illuminate important strategies characteristic to her rhetoric. Does Rice include traditionally female themes, or is her style more masculine?
Does her rhetoric or style change depending on the composition of her audiences? Exploration of these topics could provide additional insights into Rice’s abilities as a speaker and allow for comparisons of established literature on African American and women’s rhetoric with Rice’s personal style.

Finally, any studies on the rhetoric surrounding the War on Terror or the War in Iraq must include examinations of Rice’s voice on these topics in order to be complete. Her many media appearances following September 11, 2001, and leading up to Operation Iraqi Freedom reflect Rice’s involvement on these issues, and the fact that the White House sent her to counteract Clarke’s claims against the Bush Administration reflect the reliance on Rice as a key advocate for these programs. As scholars analyze Bush and his presidency, Rice’s role in both terms and on the dominant issues of the time must not be minimized or ignored. Together, biographers, historians, communication scholars, and rhetoricians can begin to determine the extent and type of the role Rice has played throughout Bush’s tenure, and these revelations may provide insight into the woman behind the roles and the name.

As Rice concludes her term as Secretary of State, speculation about her political and public future likely will increase. Although she has downplayed calls for her to run for the presidency in 2008, Rice likewise avoids declaring that she will never run for America’s highest office. Should Rice enter the sphere of elective office, America and the world will insist on learning more about her. Like all rhetors, Rice reveals elements of her personality and priorities in her remarks, and as a result, researchers and citizens alike must turn to Rice’s own words to learn more about her.
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