

May 2016

# The "World's Greatest Deliberative Body" and the Decision to Invade: The Rhetoric of Senatorial Debate on S.J.Res. 46

Henry Russell Castillo

University of Nevada, Las Vegas, [henryrcastillo@outlook.com](mailto:henryrcastillo@outlook.com)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#), [Public Policy Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

---

## Repository Citation

Castillo, Henry Russell, "The "World's Greatest Deliberative Body" and the Decision to Invade: The Rhetoric of Senatorial Debate on S.J.Res. 46" (2016). *UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones*. 2650.  
<http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/thesesdissertations/2650>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Digital Scholarship@UNLV. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNLV Theses, Dissertations, Professional Papers, and Capstones by an authorized administrator of Digital Scholarship@UNLV. For more information, please contact [digitalscholarship@unlv.edu](mailto:digitalscholarship@unlv.edu).

THE “WORLD’S GREATEST DELIBERATIVE BODY” AND THE DECISION TO INVADE  
IRAQ: THE RHETORIC OF SENATORIAL DEBATE ON S.J.RES. 46

by

Henry Russell Castillo

Bachelor of Arts – Communication Studies  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
2014

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the

Master of Arts – Communication Studies

Department of Communication Studies  
College of Urban Affairs  
The Graduate College

University of Nevada, Las Vegas  
May 2016

Copyright by Henry R. Castillo, 2016

All Rights Reserved

**Thesis Approval**

The Graduate College  
The University of Nevada, Las Vegas

April 20, 2016

This thesis prepared by

Henry Russell Castillo

entitled

The “World’s Greatest Deliberative Body” and the Decision to Invade Iraq: The Rhetoric of Senatorial Debate On S.J.RES. 46

is approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts – Communication Studies  
Department of Communication Studies

David Henry, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Chair*

Kathryn Hausbeck Korgan, Ph.D.  
*Graduate College Interim Dean*

Sara VanderHaagen, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Member*

Tara Emmers-Sommer, Ph.D.  
*Examination Committee Member*

John Tuman, Ph.D.  
*Graduate College Faculty Representative*

## **Abstract**

The “World’s Greatest Deliberative Body” and the Decision to Invade Iraq: The Rhetoric of Senatorial Debate on S.J.Res. 46.

by

Henry Russell Castillo

Dr. David Henry, Examination Committee Chair  
Chair and Sanford Berman Professor  
Department of Communication Studies  
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

On the issue of the Iraq invasion in 2003, many in the public view President George W. Bush as the primary actor in its execution. Yet Bush explicitly sought congressional approval before employing military force. In doing so, he elevated Congress’ role in the Iraq crisis. A plethora of academic research exists on how Bush attempted to persuade the public that invading Iraq was the correct choice. However, a dearth of scholarship exists on how Congress, specifically the Senate, deliberated on this decision. As a chamber often labeled the “World’s Greatest Deliberative Body,” the Senate carries constitutionally-unique responsibilities in matters of foreign affairs. The 107<sup>th</sup> Senate and the debate on the 2002 Iraq resolution constitute the focus of this thesis. Often viewed by scholars as highly influential in foreign policy matters, the Senate only dedicated five days to debate one of the most expansive military authorizations in recent American history. A close textual analysis of Senate speeches, selected from the Congressional Record, was conducted so as to trace the arguments that the Senators made. This analysis yielded three metaphorical clusters that help illuminate the Senators’ speech structure: FORCE, TIME, and STATUS. As federal representatives of the American public, it is crucial to understand how our Senators argued, and ultimately passed, a momentous resolution costing more than one-and-a-half trillion dollars and having become the third longest war in American history.

## Acknowledgements

A project of this size would have been unimaginable without support and encouragement. The late nights researching, the early mornings editing, and the long afternoons reviewing a chapter was no easy journey. Fortunately, that journey was not lonesome. First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. David Henry. Your guidance has been a source of professional growth and personal inspiration. You challenged me to consider critically every single word I put on paper. Your engaging pedagogical style and tenacious work ethic is what I aspire to emulate in my own work. I may have completed this thesis, but I have only begun employing the myriad of tools that you have equipped me with. In fact, I refuse to send a mere e-mail or note without scrutinizing every line I construct. It also helped that your witty humor has humbled me during some of the most arduous moments of this thesis project. Entering this program, I viewed you as a professor of rhetoric and an established scholar in his field. Leaving this program, I can proudly say I also view you as a mentor.

Graduate school would have been immensely more difficult without the support of one particular individual: Sarah Beth Shaw. Your confidence, your work ethic, your breadth and depth on a wide array of topics, and your comforting advice have all contributed to the academic experience that I will happily remember as two wonderful years. Every semester brought new classes, new assignments, and new challenges that we faced together. Your drive for success was so in sync with mine that I view you more as a sister than a colleague. The line between work and friendship became nonexistent. Editing each other's papers became a bonding experience. Studying for a midterm became an opportunity to strengthen both our minds and spirits. You became a support system that helped define my time as a graduate student. You became more much than a colleague situated in office #4121—you became a lifelong friend.

I want to extend my gratitude to the wonderful cohort at the Department of Communication Studies, both past and present. Molly Forgey and Colby Miyose have been instrumental colleagues that helped guide me through the uncertainty waters that was my first semester. Colby's calm and nurturing demeanor made me remember that during times of stress, remaining unruffled and steadfast toward my goals was key. Molly's confident attitude was a characteristic I always admired. Scarlett Schmidt, a friend I have ties with going back to high school speech and debate, was always there for me when I doubted my abilities as a writer. Larissa Terán, my officemate, is a fiercely loyal friend that I am forever indebted to. The several hours you spent watching me as I practiced graduate presentations, the number of interruptions I made to hear your opinion on various projects, and the amount of laughs we shared are all immeasurable. Your unconditional care for our friendship has made my experience as a graduate student a joy. Thank you for your support from the first day I met you. The "tea" that you and I share will always be hot and ready.

During the Rebel Grad Slam Three Minute Thesis Competition, as well as shortly after my thesis defense, Chloé Powell, Rachel Allen, Courtney McDaniel, Gabriella Tscholl, Yulia Yurashevich, David Almanza, Tyler Snelling, Chris Golightly, and Taylor Palmer all congratulated me in a way that I will never forget. Gabriella and Yulia's attendance during my Rebel Grad Slam practice round was supportive and kind. Your congratulations were warm and I could not have been happier to work in an office right across from theirs. Taylor helped coordinate a beautiful motivating poster outside my office door as I progressed to the final round of the Rebel Grad Slam. Further, placing delicious cupcakes on my desk after my thesis defense was not only sweet in taste, but sweet in soul. Your cheery attitude and beautiful spirit truly made me appreciate the importance of a support system in graduate school. Taylor, quite frankly,

made my days brighter. Chloé’s combination of humor and determination were qualities I admired—it is difficult to laugh and be serious during finals week, but she always found a way to do both! And David’s genuine demeanor helped pop the stressful academic bubble we often find ourselves in when we are deep into researching and writing. Thank you for encouraging me to try new cuisines.

I would like to acknowledge the patience and efforts of my committee members, whose guidance and time made this thesis successful. Thank you Dr. Tara Emmers-Sommer, who forced me to think outside of a strictly rhetorical lens and consider ideas in a quantitative way. You also cheered me on when I participated in various university-sponsored events and I am so grateful to have received such tremendous support. Thank you Dr. Sara VanderHaagen. You introduced me to key readings early on in the prospectus defense that helped shape the thesis. Your theory course was my first rhetorical graduate class and your “Adopt-A-Scholar” project still resonates with me today. Lastly, I want to thank Dr. David Dickens and Dr. John Tuman. Dr. Dickens, your wide-ranging expertise has helped me not only in writing this thesis, but your animated lectures is a lecturing style I try to emulate in the undergraduate classes I teach. Dr. Tuman, your service during the final two weeks of this thesis was instrumental. Your questions on gender discourse during the thesis defense was intriguing and was an idea I would love my research to consider for future directions.

This experience was punctuated by Mr. William Belk’s guidance. Mr. Belk, I could not thank you enough for your compassion and patience. Your sincere love for the art of oratory is inspiring, so much so that I find your zeal for public communication contagious. I progressed from a novice graduate teaching instructor into a coach and mentor for my students. I saw every student as an opportunity to help them grow and you taught me the appropriate tools to cultivate

that growth. You allowed me to bring out the best in my students by bringing out the best in me. I have not only become a better instructor and a better orator, but I have become a better person under your leadership. And while it may appear that I am just a few notches away from crediting you with the creation of the universe, I hope you can realize the enormous impact you have had on me. Thank you.

## **Dedication**

Success in this graduate program would have been impossible without my family. I dedicate this thesis to my mother, Leticia Castillo. Your willpower, your stamina, and your dedication to your family have become the building blocks of my academic career. You came from Guatemala to provide a better life for your family. You turned the humble upbringings of my youth into an explosive accomplishment. You made sure I woke up every day to take the bus to school and you were proud that I always had perfect attendance. You made sure I had three meals—and often more—to eat every day. You are the backbone of our family and this degree is as much mine as it is yours. You came from Guatemala to raise a family of three children. Thanks to your efforts, all three of your children have earned a college degree. Thanks to your efforts, I can add another degree to that growing list. And thanks to your efforts, I am the proud man that I have become today. A man that proudly holds the distinct honor of being your son. Thank you mom, I love you.

To my sister, Anastasia Prera, you were the inspiration for this project. Dedication and hard work is what you instilled in me as we grew up together. I will never forget how instrumental you were in getting me to several speech and debate tournaments. Forensics was a vital experience for me in high school, so much so that it helped propel me into becoming a Communication Studies scholar at UNLV. I could not have done this without you, so I want to thank you for your support. You cared about my education and you made it possible for me to become an up-and-coming public speaker. To Ernest Castillo, I will never forget our colorful childhood. As a brother, you and I shared many moments together. As a father, your love and passion for your daughter are qualities I aspire to reflect. My path in life would have been vastly different had you not been in it. Thank you for always supporting me.

Lastly, but surely not least, to Jimmy Nevius, the most supportive person I can thankfully call my partner. You are my rock. You care so deeply about my success that I could not envision completing this graduate program without your support. You became a mentor when I needed reassurance. You became a coach when I needed motivation. You became my best friend for life on December 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2011. This thesis is also for you. You might not have understood completely why I was speaking to a wall as I practiced to deliver research presentations, nor did you feel entirely comfortable when I had to spend 12 hour days in the lead up to my thesis defense. However, you did appreciate the hard work I put in. I know you sacrificed a lot of time to help make this graduate program a success for me. Thank you, Jimmy.

## Table of Contents

<b>Abstract</b> .....	iii
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	iv
<b>Dedication</b> .....	viii
<b>Chapter One: Introducing the Senate’s Debate</b> .....	1
Literature Review .....	3
Rhetorical Research on Senatorial Deliberation .....	10
The Senate’s Uniqueness .....	13
Analytical Framework.....	15
Rationale.....	17
Organization of Chapters .....	21
<b>Chapter Two: Descriptive Inventory</b> .....	31
Context .....	31
Inventory .....	33
Conclusion.....	49
<b>Chapter Three: Analyzing the Metaphoric Clusters Present in the Senate’s Debate</b> .....	60
FORCE Cluster .....	65
TIME Cluster .....	70
STATUS Cluster .....	76
Conclusion .....	81
<b>Chapter Four: Conclusion</b> .....	93
Implications .....	97
Limitations.....	101
Future Directions and Conclusion .....	103

<b>Appendix A</b> .....	110
<b>Bibliography</b> .....	112
<b>Curriculum Vita</b> .....	121

## Chapter One: Introducing the Senate's Debate

On the evening of September 11, 2001, a few hours following the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centers in New York City, President George W. Bush proclaimed from Barksdale Air Force Base, "Make no mistake, the United States will hunt down and punish those responsible for these cowardly acts."<sup>1</sup> He reinforced and extended these remarks from the Oval Office later that same day, where he said, "The search is underway for those who are behind these evil acts. I've directed the full resources of our intelligence and law enforcement communities to find those responsible and to bring them to justice. We will make no distinction between the terrorists who committed these acts and those who harbor them."<sup>2</sup> Here, Bush articulated what would ultimately shape the beginning of his "War on Terror" campaign. Broadly, his administration sought to dismantle Osama Bin Laden's Islamic Al-Qaeda organization in Afghanistan and dismantle Saddam Hussein's support for terrorism in Iraq.<sup>3</sup> While Congress quickly authorized the President to invade Afghanistan three days after the 9/11 terrorist attacks, 13 months later he was also authorized to invade Iraq. On October 11<sup>th</sup>, 2002, nine days after its formal introduction in Congress, the "Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002" was passed. President George W. Bush signed the legislation into law on October 16<sup>th</sup>.<sup>4</sup> Broadly, the resolution allowed Bush to attack preemptively a country that allegedly harbored Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) under the despotic rule of Saddam Hussein.

Despite the difference in time between the two authorizations, political discussions concerning the Iraq decision took place well before its passage. Shortly after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in New York City, Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld and other top White House officials were already discussing the possibility of invading Iraq.<sup>5</sup> Although Bush's

remarks on the day of the attacks were significant, nine days later on September 20, 2001, the president delivered a widely watched speech to a joint-session of Congress. After this address, a coalition of pro-invasion members of Congress began forming and Bush's nascent "War on Terror" quickly became popular.<sup>6</sup> As rhetorical scholar Herbert W. Simons chronicled in his rhetorical review of the Iraq invasion, "In subsequent speeches Bush would continue to capitalize on the appeal of his antiterrorist rhetoric, finding new enemies and new rationales for aggressive action."<sup>7</sup> Despite the problematic reasoning used to justify military force, Bush's persuasive campaign was largely successful. In 2002, the president enjoyed astronomical approval ratings.<sup>8</sup> By 2004, public opinion polls indicated that a majority of Americans still believed in the now refuted link between the terrorist group Al-Qaeda and Iraq that was often suggested by White House officials.<sup>9</sup>

Media coverage leading up to the invasion aided Bush's post-9/11 rhetoric. As president, his remarks on Iraq were heavily televised between 2002 and 2004.<sup>10</sup> However, news coverage on Congressional deliberation was markedly low; comments or speeches by those who opposed the war, primarily Democrats, received even less attention.<sup>11</sup> Juxtaposing these two pieces of data highlights the unequal concentration of coverage between the Congressional debates and Bush's speeches. Although consensus was needed from both branches of government to invade Iraq, the formal arguments forwarded by Congress were sidelined by news reports in comparison to the president's statements on the question of whether to invade Iraq. While it is not surprising that presidential rhetoric receives considerable attention due to the office's prestige and power, the discursive dimensions of Congressional deliberation should not be overlooked. Despite Bush receiving the burden of the Iraq crisis, we should not forget the Senate's instrumental role in passing one of the most expansive military authorizations in recent American history.

Despite such importance, the scarce coverage on how senators debated the resolution is alarming in general and the lacking media coverage of opposing senators is noteworthy in particular. Although various factors influence media exposure, the data presented above signify an object of study that should provoke greater scrutiny: texts from the senatorial debate on Iraq. Why? Presidential rhetoric, which is routinely studied by critics, often shapes and/or is shaped by Congressional rhetoric.<sup>12</sup> To ignore or sideline the arguments made by senators would overlook the political effects that the Senate has on the executive branch and vice-versa. This thesis thus investigates these texts to understand better the rhetorical implications stemming from the debate.

The purpose of this chapter is to address three objectives. First, prior literature salient to the thesis' direction is reviewed, documented, and explained. The significance of surveying past research lies in its capacity to generate new criticism, as well as to demonstrate the distinct and novel qualities of the proposed rhetorical experience.<sup>13</sup> This section is broken up into two areas: Analyses of American political argumentation and rhetorical research on senatorial deliberation. Attention then turns to a succinct orientation to the Senate's constitutionally unique qualities as the primary legislative body on foreign policy. Lastly, the project's analytical framework is offered and explicated.

## **Literature Review**

To explore specific congressional debates warrants a broad study in political and public argumentation. Understanding how past rhetorical research has analyzed U.S. foreign policy rhetoric and public deliberation can aid in critiquing the Iraq invasion. Addressing these pertinent areas of scholarship calls for two sub-sections: One entailing public deliberation studies within a

rhetorical framework and one including a narrower scope of American-led war and/or crisis studies.

Critic John Murphy claims that, “political speech calls up its authority from the depths of the past even as it reaches out for the symbolic charge of contemporary culture.”<sup>14</sup> Rhetorical deliberation is a democratic and symbolic expression; it is an ideal that, as Robert Ivie maintains, “is a needed measure of shared symbolic space . . . .”<sup>15</sup> Ivie proposes a hierarchical system of God and devil terms in which terms, like ‘human rights,’ possess the most value.<sup>16</sup> He details that before “freedom” or “democracy” can occur, second-order terms like “law” and “order” must first be obtained. The freedom to speak publicly for or against, and as well as engage in public debate, is intrinsic to the acquisition and preservation of other national goals. American leaders regularly employ these terms during war. Ivie offers Harry Truman’s use of the phrase “the rule of law” as an exemplar.<sup>17</sup> Truman argued that maintaining a sense of formal order was instrumental to democracy.<sup>18</sup> The discussion of God and devil terms, as Ivie explains, also necessitates a discussion of metaphor. The strategic manipulation of certain words and phrases to achieve an end is a powerful linguistic force, one that is innately metaphorical and central to American foreign policy rhetoric. As Ivie asserts, “Nowhere is the temptation to literalize a fertile metaphor any stronger or more consequential than in deliberations about war and peace.”<sup>19</sup>

The use of metaphor has historically punctuated U.S. political discourse. As literary devices intended to persuade, metaphors are common rhetorical tactics employed by American presidents, politicians, and public rhetors. Pro-war Republicans employed metaphors to justify the War of 1812 against Britain. The war, declared on June 18<sup>th</sup> of 1812, was the culmination of years of tensions and unresolved issues that remained following the American Revolutionary War. Republicans charged the British as a persistent, barbaric, pervasive entity that was trying to

re-colonize America.<sup>20</sup> Decivilizing vehicles, affirmation of threatening expectations, the suggestion of rational demonstrations, and the subversion of competing perspectives were metaphors used by Republicans to advocate for war against Britain.<sup>21</sup> These metaphors helped portray foreign adversaries of insidious or antagonistic motives. Subversion of competing perspectives, for example, relies on the premise that the world is constantly changing and evolving. This view pressured actors to “. . . [adapt] to new realities that were beyond their power to influence rather than delude themselves.”<sup>22</sup> Instead of seeking peace, Republicans argued that war opponents offered perspectives or viewpoints that were out-of-date and thus faulty. Britain was a hostile enemy and to entertain other perspectives would be costly. This type of metaphor, then, prioritizes a particular view on an international crisis or situation while also projecting any competing theory as deleterious.

Robert Ivie explains that the defining power of presidential rhetoric can influence Congressional rhetoric.<sup>23</sup> Following the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks and after Bush’s address to a joint session of Congress on September 20<sup>th</sup>, 2001, Ivie observed that, “One Republican member of the U.S. House of Representatives, Steve Buyer from Indiana, was sufficiently moved by the apocalyptic overtones of the president’s rhetoric to suggest that such circumstances could warrant even the use of ‘tactical nuclear devices’ to ‘close [Osama bin Laden’s] caves for a thousand years.’”<sup>24</sup> Ivie’s claim suggests that the rhetorical association between presidents and Congress during crises may influence each other. This connection is significant in that it can illuminate how congressional arguments take shape.

In her careful study of George W. Bush’s speeches in the few months preceding Iraq’s 2003 invasion, Kathleen Hall Jamieson argues that the president’s use of evidence to justify the invasion was more linguistically fearful than realistically truthful.<sup>25</sup> Being confident that Saddam

Hussein harbored Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD), Bush's word choices were often reused by Congress on the campaign trail and in floor statements, as well as by media pundits, to emphasize further the urgency behind the resolution's swift passage.<sup>26</sup> Jamieson's analysis is valuable in understanding how certain speakers crafted their arguments during the 2002 Iraq resolution debates by repeating and extending the President's ideas. Bryan Taylor adds to Jamieson's research by claiming that the presidential rhetoric surrounding nuclear war typically draws from a reservoir of easily repeatable ideas and phrases.<sup>27</sup> News reporters, politicians, and the general public then repeat these phrases.<sup>28</sup> As Taylor maintained, these ideas are “. . . [borrowed] and varied by Republican supporters, questioned by rank-and-file Democratic opponents, and picked over by Democratic leaders caught in the middle.”<sup>29</sup> Together, Jamieson's and Taylor's works illustrate how words, ideas, and themes expressed by a president can be recycled in future political debates. Understanding how politicians reuse different aspects of a president's speech(es) can inform critics on how Congress members construct and support their arguments during deliberations. As Taylor argued, “Congressional debate strategically deploys, vigorously contests, or slyly appropriates presidential policy articulation through intertextual reference to presidential argument as public acts and telling reasons in the debate.”<sup>30</sup>

The Gulf War crisis of 1990-1991 mirrors much of the rhetorical tactics employed by politicians in the War of 1812 that Ivie articulates. Drawing from the 1991 publication of the *Congressional Record*, scholars James Voss, Joel Kennet, Jennifer Wiley, and Tonya Schooler examined the most frequent metaphors senators used on the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.<sup>31</sup> Metaphorical language was employed by pro-war Republicans to portray Iraq as a savage enemy and a serious threat not only to Kuwait, but to other countries as well. Senator William Roth (R – DE) stated, “His [Hussein's] intentions are clear—intentions that pose a direct threat not only to

the security of our country but to the world at large.”<sup>32</sup> While this quote is literal, it helps Roth set up his next statement: “[Saddam Hussein] is a glutton for territory. . . .”<sup>33</sup>

Roth spoke of Hussein projected the despotic leader as a greedy enemy. Roth’s use of the “ENEMY” metaphor helped simplify Roth’s arguments so as to “induce a sharing of premises with an audience.”<sup>34</sup> Voss, Kennet, Wiley, and Schooler concluded that the Senator’s arguments reinforced “the image of Iraq as an enemy, and metaphor was a means to do this.”<sup>35</sup> Of the 756 metaphors that the authors identified, portraying adversaries as a villain or enemy was common within American political discourse between 1990-1991.<sup>36</sup>

In his study of periodicals between 1980 and 1985 scholar Nicholas Howe observed that, “originality and vividness are rarely relevant features of political metaphors.”<sup>37</sup> Between 1980 and 1985, when “Guerrilla Warfare” first became a popularly used phrase by American politicians,<sup>38</sup> Congress often presented U.S. soldiers as “manly” while the opponent as a savage.<sup>39</sup> One example focused on how then-National Security Advisor Richard Allen claimed that a U.S. soldier told him, “I am not a guerrilla fighter; I do my fighting in the trenches in the open.”<sup>40</sup> The enemy was a guerrilla fighter and thereby associated with cowardice and “of not being man enough to fight publicly.”<sup>41</sup> “Fighting in the Trenches” became a counter-metaphor that evoked a form of warfare that, as Howe observed, “has traditionally seemed more manly.”<sup>42</sup> Much like Ivie’s decivilizing vehicle metaphor, projecting adversaries as inhumane or brutal helps inform critics on how politicians define protagonists and antagonists within a conflict. Howe’s research suggests that metaphors face frequent recycling: “Original, vivid metaphors either disappear quickly because they are too exotic to be absorbed into the political vernacular, or else become highly popular and thus lose their initial luster through repetition.”<sup>43</sup>

Investigating how different crises relate to one another can illuminate further how war rhetoric operates. In her analysis of the Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush administrations, Carol Winkler studied how both presidents handled two different situations in a rhetorically similar manner. Specifically, Winkler examined Reagan's management of U.S. air strikes on Libya following clashes with Libyan military forces headed by Muammar Gaddafi; she also studied how Bush invaded Iraq after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. The notable similarities between the two events rested on how both presidents designated Libya and Iraq as long-standing state sponsors of terror. Winkler argues that both Bush and Reagan delegitimized their enemy as despotic and dangerous to increase support for preemptive military action.<sup>44</sup> She stated, "while reliance on strategic misrepresentation is an expected trait of war rhetoric, its prevalence and specific application in the discourse of preemption is noteworthy."<sup>45</sup> The recent 2003 Iraq invasion was presented as a preemptive strike against a terrorist threat and echoed Bush and Reagan's calls for military force during their respective administrations. Winkler's findings shed important light on how Ivie's "delegitimizing the enemy" metaphor permeated legislative deliberation during the 1980s and 1990s.<sup>46</sup> Consider how Reagan called Gaddafi "the mad dog of the Middle East."<sup>47</sup> Congress members sympathetic to the George H. W. Bush administration often recycled the president's arguments in their own speeches by calling Gaddafi "barbarian" and even used Reagan's specific words "mad dog."<sup>48</sup> The representation of the enemy as brutes by the Bush and Reagan administrations, as well as among Congress, was not surprising. Rather they, ". . . [arose] at predictable points where preemption strains conformity to the conventional expectations of the war genre."<sup>49</sup>

Much like Winkler, Hal Brands analyzed the rhetoric surrounding public discourse during times of crisis. Brands studied how politicians should assess the Japanese Emperor's culpability

for atrocities he oversaw during World War II.<sup>50</sup> Brands found that within the Congress, an anti-Emperor consensus grew quickly. The arguments forwarded by politicians were frequently metaphorical; they delegitimized an enemy through decivilizing vehicles. American Foreign Service officer and diplomat Joseph Grew, for example, described the Japanese as “sheep” or “bees.”<sup>51</sup> The Emperor thus served as the shepherd or queen bee. “Without intelligent leadership,” as Grew wrote and Brands quoted, the herd, or hive, would “disintegrate.”<sup>52</sup> He stated that senators, “[used] animal metaphors to make their point. Federal legislators echoed this theme, giving speeches or inserting statements into the *Congressional Record* asking that the Emperor feel the fury of American vengeance after the war.”<sup>53</sup> Brands’ research provides useful background analysis on how prior political rhetoric has employed arguments driven by metaphor.

Thomas Goodnight’s analysis of the 2002 Iraqi Congressional debate closely resembles this project’s intended artifact of study. Goodnight studied a segment of the debate from both chambers of Congress within the context of George W. Bush’s October 7, 2002 Cincinnati speech.<sup>54</sup> While he included a particular set of arguments by senators and representatives in his analysis, the author used the texts to help answer a larger concern: The exploration of presidential persuasion as an intertextual “hub” of legislative debate and foreign policy articulation.<sup>55</sup> Further, Goodnight was interested in examining how presidential rhetoric helped established the terms of congressional debate.<sup>56</sup> Goodnight’s analysis reinforced a theme present in other areas of American political discourse: Following crises, the rhetoric of war favors those who support military intervention or combat that would protect those “threatened” ideals, be it freedom, democracy, or others.

Goodnight studied the context of the congressional debates in two ways that contrast with this thesis project. First, he situates arguments made by Congress around a specific speech Bush made. In doing so, he limits the rhetorical context in which he can study the debates. He attempted, in part, to reconstruct Bush's October 7<sup>th</sup> speech around a specific policy framework that he maintained "[blended] the novel event of 9/11 and animosities toward Iraq as a rogue state, going back to the first Gulf War."<sup>57</sup> Second, Goodnight spent a small amount of research and textual evidence when analyzing the legislative texts from both chambers.<sup>58</sup> Whereas he provided preliminary analyses of selected congressional statements to support his essay's argument, this project will continue that conversation in a similar, yet distinct direction. Analysis here will focus on the modes of argumentation present in the Senate's texts of the 2002 Iraq resolution debate rather than on the framework created by presidential public policy.

Goodnight's research is helpful in that it acts as a preface to the thesis, but does not answer a critical question. Do important patterns of argumentation exist in the texts of the Senate's deliberation? A study of their speeches and remarks can help answer this question. Exploring various statements and responses made during the debate can help illuminate how politicians have constructed and forwarded their claims during the Iraq crisis. While the question of how researchers have studied prior conflicts is important, the works above only present a general view of American political discourse. A more detailed review of George W. Bush's rhetoric and its relationship to Senatorial deliberation is also in order.

### **Rhetorical Research on Senatorial Deliberation**

The rhetorical dimensions of the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 terrorist attacks as well as the Iraq invasion have been well documented. The topic's popularity among rhetorical scholars is evident through searches of journal databases and libraries. President George W. Bush's speeches

represent a majority of rhetorical publications concerning Iraq, while congressional statements have received much less attention. Despite such scarcity, several scholars have examined how Bush's rhetoric has influenced public debate in Congress. This subsection considers those studies.

Bush's speeches following the 9/11 terrorist attacks sought to influence political leaders and the public to support the invasion of Iraq. The White House urged Congress to pass the authorization swiftly through its "War on Terror" campaign.<sup>59</sup> Media coverage that drowned out anti-war sentiments and amplified his rhetoric also aided Bush. Research points toward a positive, reciprocal relationship between presidential support and affirmative news coverage.<sup>60</sup> The debate over the Iraq resolution was also short. Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) only allotted six days for speeches and statements after he formally introduced the resolution. Indeed, Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) asked from the Senate floor, "Why all the hurry? Why are we in such a hurry? I cannot understand why much of the leadership of this Congress has bought into the administration's political pressure."<sup>61</sup> The White House's urgency to invade Iraq may have influenced the debate. For instance, Senator Max Cleland (D-GA) exclaimed that "we need to act now"<sup>62</sup> in order to neutralize Saddam Hussein's threat and, like many other senators, cited Bush's push for a speedy authorization. In this particular case, Bush relied on a crisis to influence congressional deliberation.

During times of warfare, rallying around a common cause can provide temporary relief to a grieving nation. As polls have shown, Americans generally support war efforts during the beginning stages of a conflict.<sup>63</sup> However, this approval wanes over time. For example, after the Pearl Harbor attacks, Americans adamantly wanted war. A few years into World War II, such approval drastically weakened.<sup>64</sup> Similarly, the American public approved Lyndon B. Johnson's

Vietnam War efforts by 57% in January of 1967.<sup>65</sup> By February of 1968, though, the ratings fell to 32%.<sup>66</sup> After the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Americans again felt the need to respond with hard military power. During the Iraq/Afghanistan invasions, George Bush's approval ratings reached 76% in April of 2003.<sup>67</sup> Then he hit an all-time low of 41% in May of 2004 and continued to stay low throughout his second term.<sup>68</sup> By 2008, Democratic presidential candidate Barack Obama based his successful campaign on his efforts *against* the war. Thus, Bush's campaign for Iraq's invasion seized a kairotic moment—a classical term that describes how speakers have the ability to adapt to unfolding and changing circumstances.<sup>69</sup> Robert Ivie describes how Bush used God-terms like freedom and democracy soon after the terrorist attacks so as to ensure that Americans would “respond with patriotic fervor and rage. . . . [T]he battle line was plainly drawn and the choice reduced to siding with the United States or its enemy. . . .”<sup>70</sup>

What does this mean for Senate deliberation? Voices of dissent from Congress have not been met with kindness. Presidential demagoguery has galvanized pro-war politicians and has historically painted congressional dissidence as anti-American. The Red Scare against communism during the 1950s, for example, forced moderate and liberal Congress members to navigate matters of foreign affairs carefully.<sup>71</sup> Arguing against the blatant persecution of Communist sympathizers may have stifled political debate. Robert Ivie and Oscar Giner claim that prior to communism's fall, “scholars had warned that a rising rhetorical presidency constituted a serious and growing threat to republican governance—that a worsening condition of presidential demagoguery, or direct appeal to the masses, bypassed responsible deliberation in Congress.”<sup>72</sup> The Red Scare's influence on congressional debate may have discouraged or tempered an anti-war politician's arguments out of fear of undermining the president and a popularized cause.<sup>73</sup> This information is useful when studying the 2002 Iraq resolution's debate

because a critic, when examining senatorial texts, may discern patterns of reasoning that echo the types of arguments made against politicians who did not have a hard-line stance against communism in the 1950s.

Examining how George W. Bush's rhetoric influenced both public and legislative debates has helped elucidate how Congress reacts and responds to presidential rhetoric. The way that politicians argue for or against American intervention during crises is also noteworthy. The pressure to resolve threats militaristically can shape the types of arguments forwarded by members of Congress.

Yet, the existing rhetorical research concerning Iraq does not directly answer or completely document the particular modes of argumentation made by senators on the issue. This review of literature, however, indicates that the Senate's deliberation on the 2002 authorization resolution is unique and deserves study. The legislative body's function and responsibility to construct, analyze, and debate the laws it passes is indisputably important. As former Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle notes, "In a healthy democracy such as ours, it is not only the right, but it is the *duty* of the 'opposition party' to fight for what it believes in. It is out of the process and discipline of reasoned and rigorous debate that strong and sound legislation and policy are shaped. Such debate is at the heart of the system of government created by our Founding Fathers."<sup>74</sup>

### **The Senate's Uniqueness**

It is important to note the unique traits that differentiates the Senate chamber from the House chamber. These traits often shape the way debate is held and structured, either formally through Senate-specific rules or by chamber tradition. The Senate has policy goals and policymaking tools distinct from the House of Representatives. The Senate is often characterized

as individualistic because the chamber is “known for its oversized personalities and iconoclasts.”<sup>75</sup> Also, senators’ six-year terms provide more time to grow their policy agendas. Although there are significantly fewer senators than representatives, senators must cover the same policy ground and are more likely to be policy generalists rather than specialists.<sup>76</sup> The chamber also greatly values its debates.<sup>77</sup> For instance, unlike the House, the Senate has unlimited floor debate and is characterized as more collegial.<sup>78</sup> The chamber’s functions are “determined by the behavior of the individuals within it” and guided by the institution’s norms and rules.<sup>79</sup>

Throughout its long history, the Senate has established primacy in foreign affairs.<sup>80</sup> Senate influence in shaping international policy evolved from an “occasional and tangential function” in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to one that has “increased the Senate’s role in the formation of foreign policy far beyond what had been envisioned by the framers of the Constitution.”<sup>81</sup> While such expansion may have never been intended, the new global position of the United States following World War II equipped the Senate with an expanded function in foreign policy creation and consultation. Today, senators must make efficient use of their time when they speak on the floor because the chamber’s rules prohibit members from speaking more than twice on the same issue in a single day.<sup>82</sup> The body’s distinguishing features can help explain why senators may feel compelled to engage in certain rhetorical strategies, such as inflammatory comments or grandstanding. These features produce opportunities and constraints that can influence deliberations. As political scholars Sarah Binder and Steven Smith add, “in designing the Senate, the framers chose institutional features with an eye restraining any ill-considered or rash legislation passed by the popularly elected House. . . . That the Senate was intended to be the more deliberative and reasoning of the two chambers is well known.”<sup>83</sup>

## Analytical Framework

This project first employs a close textual analysis of the Senate's debate on the 2002 Iraq resolution. However, it is worthwhile to note that this project, in its initial stages, adhered to rhetorical scholar Wayne Brockreide's advice that critics be guided inductively by the discourse they are studying.<sup>84</sup> Rhetorical criticism unfolds most productively as an inductive practice that discovers the "relationship of persons and ideas within a situation texts."<sup>85</sup> Halloran's essay helps inform us on this process. He studied the televised debate of the House Judiciary Committee on the impeachment of Richard Nixon as an example.<sup>86</sup> The committee's debate represented a rhetorical experience that detailed how public proceedings, as a genre, should be studied in terms of both the situation and form.<sup>87</sup> Public proceedings refer to events where "an official business session of a representative body, including debate and decision specific issues, conducted before an audience made up of members of the body's constituency."<sup>88</sup> The Senate's debate on the 2002 Iraq resolution exemplifies this definition since the chamber is a representative body and its deliberation took place among those representatives. The texts of this debate thereby constitute a "series of persuasive messages addressed by participants to other participants whose agreement they hope to win."<sup>89</sup> The takeaway message from Halloran's teachings is that a greater understanding of the Senate's deliberation on Iraq is obtained when we allow the discourse to guide the criticism. A critical, and early, part of this process involves a deep textual study that can illuminate the unique attributes and modes of argumentation that emerge from a reading of those texts.

A close textual analysis requires two necessary components. First, the selected set of senatorial statements are examined intrinsically so that their unique characteristics are traced. These characteristics involve identifying and documenting their argument structure, supporting

material, tone, denotative and connotative meanings.<sup>90</sup> Second, the texts are oriented in terms of their external settings.<sup>91</sup> This step considers the text in relation to the audience and situation that is called forward by the rhetors. That is, the critic must understand how speeches form rhetorical acts and, as theorist Michael Leff explains, respond to political and economic circumstances that develop over time.<sup>92</sup> A close textual analysis must account for the interplay between the intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions of particular acts. Exploring this relationship will aid in revealing the significance between the rhetorical situation, which broadly centered on President Bush seeking Congressional authorization to invade Iraq, and the negotiated response, how the Senate debated whether or not to give Bush that authorization. “The central task of textual criticism,” as Leff describes, “is to understand how rhetorical action effects this negotiation, how the construction of a symbolic event invites a reconstruction of the events to which it refers.”<sup>93</sup> A close textual analysis, then, can yield cues of the Senate’s public discourse by evaluating the Senate’s texts on its own terms.

The close textual analysis is presented as a descriptive inventory on the Senate’s debate on S.J.Res. 46. In order to explain these cues, I then turn to Robert Ivie’s work on metaphoric criticism. For purposes of this project, metaphor is taken as a linguistic device for interpreting or experiencing a phenomenon in terms of something else. Kenneth Burke expands on this idea by explaining that metaphor aids in bringing out “the thisness of a that or the thatness of a this.”<sup>94</sup> A metaphor involves a pattern, event, object, person, or structure that is reinvented and reinterpreted through language. Burke labels metaphor as a perspective.<sup>95</sup> The Senate’s debate is thereby viewed through the perspectives of each speaker and the ways that they characterize those perspectives. For instance, while no two speakers refer to Saddam Hussein in exactly the

same way, they do employ metaphors that dehumanize the Iraqi leader. These patterns help form the metaphoric clusters discussed in chapter three.

## **Rationale**

Congressional discourse, like many public policy debates, is constrained by its polysemous and temporal nature. As texts, policy debates complicate a rhetorical study because they are neither isolated in authorship nor singular in time.<sup>96</sup> In comparison to a single speech, for instance, a public hearing may include tens or hundreds or even thousands of authors.<sup>97</sup> Policy debates also occur over a period of time. It is necessary to consider how debates unfold as a series rather than an isolated communicative act. Depending on how critics frame their studies, a debate may begin long before a formalized hearing and include artifacts of interest other than the conventional scripts of a debate. A critic must, as Robert Asen observed, analyze policy texts as a process rather than a fragmented set of case studies.<sup>98</sup> This leads to a critical question concerning the framework of this thesis project: What would a rhetorical study of the Senate's debate on S.J.Res. 46 look like?

To answer this question, the guides are Robert Asen's research in public policy rhetoric and Matthew Glass' 1993 work on the MX weapons system controversy. In his insightful study of the national debate on U.S. welfare policy in the 1990s, Asen described how he had to sift through the testimony of over a thousand witnesses and numerous hearings to determine his ultimate focus.<sup>99</sup> He explained, "My analysis does not attempt to reproduce these debates chronologically or entirely, but draws excerpts from disparate hearings to sketch the development of the debates thematically through key concepts and images. I consider individual statements in greater detail to explicate the functioning of the reform consensus."<sup>100</sup> This thesis follows a similar direction, although with a narrower scope. A macro and micro analysis of the

debate, as Asen did, allows the critic to synthesize individual speeches in order to reconstruct recurring themes and patterns. It is also important to pause and consider transformative moments in the debate, and to analyze exceptional or representative texts. This approach reflects Asen's argument that "participants in policy debates make meaning" and "circulate their preferred meanings more widely."<sup>101</sup> Rather than study every single speech from every participating senator, selecting individual texts based on the criteria explicated below can yield a richer analysis of the debates. Asen contends, "as rhetorical scholars interested in public policy, we have to delimit our studies somehow, and I do not mean to suggest that macro-analyses must examine every potentially relevant utterance. Instead, a macrolevel analysis must cast a sufficiently wide net to elucidate the diverse perspectives forwarded by the multiple authors of policy debate and the developments in policy debates over time."<sup>102</sup> Craig Rood adds that rhetorical studies like Asen's work on Social Security, Celeste Condit's study of how powerful visuals transformed the antiabortion movement during the 1960s and 1970s, and J. Michael Hogan's analysis of the Panama Canal Treaty debates, are not historically comprehensive even though their objects of study had a wide-ranging timeline.<sup>103</sup> "None examines each and every rhetorical artifact relating to its subject," Rood explains, "instead, they incorporated discourses circulating at different times."<sup>104</sup>

Moreover, while Asen helps explain how texts are selected for this project, Glass' work best informs the organization of the chapters that follow. In his study of the public debates surrounding the MX weapons system controversy during President Jimmy Carter's administration, Glass arranged his book so that he directly addressed the debate in his second chapter after providing necessary background information in the first chapter.<sup>105</sup> In doing so, he first explored the texts and allowed applications of relevant rhetorical, political, and social theory

to follow inductively in subsequent chapters. In addition to examining congressional and state hearings, Glass included “interviews between the summer of 1987 and the spring of 1988 with thirty-five individuals involved in the Great Basin opposition. I did not attempt to compile any sort of random sampling.”<sup>106</sup> Similarly, this project continues the context established in the first chapter into the second. A descriptive inventory of the senate’s texts is then presented. To avoid treating the debate as a succession of speeches, textual emphasis is placed on the arguments made so as to sketch the debate thematically.

While Asen’s teachings explain why scrutinizing every single senatorial remark made on S.J.Res. 46 would be inefficacious, his work does not detail how the thirty texts were chosen within the framework of this project. Since debates were held on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 7<sup>th</sup>, 8<sup>th</sup>, 9<sup>th</sup>, and 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002, six speeches from each date were chosen. The only exception is October 8<sup>th</sup>, where four speeches were selected because the debate was significantly reduced due to a shortened day. Further, the number of Republican and Democratic Senators who participated were uneven each day. For instance, on day one, twelve Republican Senators and seven Democratic Senators spoke. On day two, nine Republican Senators and fourteen Democratic Senators spoke. To adjust for this irregular composition, equal numbers of Democratic Senators and Republican Senators were selected. This decision also addressed the concern of possibly displaying bias based on political affiliation. Two factors further narrowed the selection of these speeches: Senators’ leadership roles and seniority. Why? Rather than choosing random speeches from each day, texts were chosen so as to highlight the possibly more influential speeches of higher-ranking Senators while still maintaining an equal count of Democrats and Republicans per day. Leadership role was prioritized because Senators with designated titles such as Senate Majority Leader, Senate Minority Whip, etc. receive greater news coverage than Senators who do not.<sup>107</sup> Congress

members in leadership roles are not only interviewed more often, but are often viewed as more credible sources of information.<sup>108</sup> Leadership may, therefore, bring greater attention to certain Senators' statements and the public may also lend greater credence to their arguments.

After considering leadership, Senators with higher seniority are given preference in selecting texts for analysis. This factor fits with the norms of the legislative branch. The seniority system describes the practice of granting privileges to Congress members who have served the longest.<sup>109</sup> Compared to junior senators, senior members are likely to be more influential in shaping legislation because their chances of being assigned with ranking membership or as chair of a committee typically increase with their seniority. Authors Gerald Gamm and Steven Smith found in their study of U.S. news coverage on Senatorial debates that, "Overall, it appears that the media in general focus on those senators whose ranking positions warrant such attention."<sup>110</sup> Consequently, a Senator's position may depict him or her as having greater authority during a debate.<sup>111</sup> The Senate Pro Tempore, for instance, is third in line to succeed the President and is the second highest official ranking in the Senate. Since 1890, this position has frequently been given to the longest serving senator in the majority party in power.<sup>112</sup> The nature of this ranking system not only helps narrow the selection of the texts based on different criteria, but also considers the norms of the Senate.

Table one (please see Appendix A) lists the Senators chosen in accordance with the rationale discussed above. Thirty speeches are gathered from twenty-four Senators. The additional two texts not listed in table one come from Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle on March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2002, and September 25, 2002. These two speeches, while not presented on the Senate floor during the formal debate on S.J.Res. 46, represent two key points before the debates that merit attention. The March 18<sup>th</sup> speech is the first formal recognition by the Majority Leader

of the 107<sup>th</sup> Senate on the issue of granting President George W. Bush congressional approval to invade Iraq. This address helps outline the beginning of the debate. The September 25<sup>th</sup> speech represents the final remarks a sitting Senator gave right before the debates began, which was also by Senate Majority Leader Daschle. It is important to note that leadership tradition in Congress has typically guided the Senate Majority Leader and the Speaker of the House of Representatives to opt out of the debates.<sup>113</sup> Instead, they deliver remarks about the progress of certain legislation more frequently than they participate in its deliberation. Including these two speeches reflects the project's efforts to represent the debates as a diachronic process rather than an isolated event or moment.

The discourse surrounding the 2003 Iraq invasion has received significant attention by rhetorical scholars. The sparse scholarly attention placed on the discursive dimensions of Congress' role in the invasion does not, by itself, justify why the project merits criticism. Studying the deliberation on the 2002 Senate Joint Resolution 46 can enhance our understanding of congressional debate broadly and political argumentation among senators between 2002 and 2004 specifically. While the Constitution grants Congress with the task to construct, debate, review, and pass legislation, the Senate has often been labeled as the "World's Greatest Deliberative Body"<sup>114</sup> and its expectation to debate is arguably higher. Studying the public arguments senators presented in support for or against the invasion of Iraq can lead to a greater appreciation of the invasion's rhetorical dimensions.

### **Organization of Chapters**

This thesis is separated into four chapters. Chapter two consists of an introduction focusing on the months before the Senate's debate on S.J.Res. 46. It is important to establish context information on the current events leading up to the debate. This section then transitions

into a descriptive inventory of the thirty selected speeches. The inventory provides a textual analysis of Senators' speeches and documents the recurring themes that emerged throughout the debate. Accomplishing this task required of the arguments the Senators made, the structure of the arguments themselves, and the advocates' supporting material. A metaphoric analysis of that inventory takes place in chapter three. This chapter accomplishes two tasks. First, it develops the framework that guides the analysis of the texts in greater depth, fully exploring the functions of metaphor criticism. Second, the descriptive inventory is then examined within that framework. This section dissects the metaphorical concepts, or clusters, observed in the debate, which included FORCE, TIME, and STATUS. These clusters are defined and the process that led to their discovery is explicated. The final section presents the results of the analysis and the relationship between the clusters are discussed. Finally, chapter four summarizes the analysis, discusses the potential implications stemming from the research, and delineates the studies' strengths and shortcomings.

---

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> George W. Bush, “Remarks at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, on the Terrorist Attacks,” Louisiana, September 11, 2001. [Http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58056](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58056): this text is six paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found in paragraph one. Accessed August 10, 2015.

<sup>2</sup> George W. Bush, “Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks,” Washington, D.C., September 11, 2001. [Http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057): this text is 13 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found in paragraph eight. Accessed October 24, 2015.

<sup>3</sup> Robert Kagan and William Kristol, ““What to do about Iraq,” in *The Iraq War Reader*, ed. Micah L. Sifry and Christopher Cerf (New York, NY: Touchstone Publishing, 2003), 244.

<sup>4</sup> United States Government Printing Office, “Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002,” October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2002. [Http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ243/html/PLAW-107publ243.htm](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ243/html/PLAW-107publ243.htm). This text is 32 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found in paragraph one. Accessed September 21, 2015.

<sup>5</sup> George Packer, *The Assassin’s Gate: America in Iraq* (New York, NY: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2005), 40-41.

<sup>6</sup> Herbert W. Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq: A Rhetorical History,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 186.

<sup>7</sup> Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq”: 187.

<sup>8</sup> Joseph Carroll, “The Iraq-Vietnam Comparison,” *Gallup*, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2004. [Http://www.gallup.com/poll/11998/iraqvietnam-comparison.aspx](http://www.gallup.com/poll/11998/iraqvietnam-comparison.aspx). This text is 18 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found at paragraph 10. Accessed September 21, 2015.

<sup>9</sup> Carroll, “The Iraq-Vietnam Comparison,” para 4.

---

<sup>10</sup> Danny Hayes and Matt Guardino, “Whose Views Made the News? Media Coverage and the March to War in Iraq,” *Political Communication* 27 (2010): 73.

<sup>11</sup> Hayes and Guardino, “Whose Views Made the News?”: 73.

<sup>12</sup> Robert L. Ivie, “Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 280-281.

<sup>13</sup> Wayne Brockriede, “Rhetorical Criticism as Argument,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974): 165. Credit goes to Brockriede for the term “rhetorical experience.”

<sup>14</sup> John M. Murphy, “History, Culture, and Political Rhetoric,” *Rhetoric Review* 20 (2001): 47.

<sup>15</sup> Ivie, “Rhetorical Deliberation”: 278.

<sup>16</sup> Robert L. Ivie, “Presidential Motives for War,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974): 339.

<sup>17</sup> Ivie, “Presidential Motives for War”: 342.

<sup>18</sup> Ivie, “Presidential Motives for War”: 342-343.

<sup>19</sup> Robert Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240.

<sup>20</sup> Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse”: 241-242.

<sup>21</sup> Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse”: 241.

<sup>22</sup> Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse”: 248.

<sup>23</sup> Ivie, “Rhetorical Deliberation”: 280.

<sup>24</sup> Ivie, “Rhetorical Deliberation”: 281.

<sup>25</sup> Kathleen H. Jamieson, “Justifying the War in Iraq: What the Bush Administration’s Uses of Evidence Reveal,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 249.

<sup>26</sup> Jamieson, “Justifying the War in Iraq”: 264.

- 
- <sup>27</sup> Bryan C. Taylor, “‘The Means to Match Their Hatred’: Nuclear Weapons, Rhetorical Democracy, and Presidential Discourse,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 37 (2007): 684-685.
- <sup>28</sup> Taylor, “‘The Means to Match Their Hatred’”: 685.
- <sup>29</sup> Taylor, “‘The Means to Match Their Hatred’”: 673.
- <sup>30</sup> Taylor, “‘The Means to Match Their Hatred’”: 676.
- <sup>31</sup> James F. Voss, Joel Kennet, Jennifer Wiley, and Tonya Schooler, “Experts at Debate: The Use of Metaphor in the U.S. Senate Debate on the Gulf Crisis,” *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity* 7 (1992): 197.
- <sup>32</sup> Voss, Kennet, Wiley, and Schooler, “Experts at Debate”: 210.
- <sup>33</sup> Voss, Kennet, Wiley, and Schooler, “Experts at Debate”: 211.
- <sup>34</sup> Voss, Kennet, Wiley, and Schooler, “Experts at Debate”: 197..
- <sup>35</sup> Voss, Kennet, Wiley, and Schooler, “Experts at Debate”: 209.
- <sup>36</sup> Voss, Kennet, Wiley, and Schooler, “Experts at Debate”: 212.
- <sup>37</sup> Nicholas Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse,” *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity* 3 (1988): 89.
- <sup>38</sup> Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse”: 95.
- <sup>39</sup> Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse”: 95.
- <sup>40</sup> Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse”: 95.
- <sup>41</sup> Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse”: 95.
- <sup>42</sup> Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse”: 95.
- <sup>43</sup> Howe, “Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse”: 89.
- <sup>44</sup> Carol Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric: Reagan on Libya; Bush 43 on Iraq,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 306.

- 
- <sup>45</sup> Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric”: 325.
- <sup>46</sup> Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric”: 320.
- <sup>47</sup> Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric”: 309.
- <sup>48</sup> Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric”: 304.
- <sup>49</sup> Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric”: 325.
- <sup>50</sup> Hal Brands, “Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Policy in the American Debate over the Japanese Emperor During World War II,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8 (2005): 432.
- <sup>51</sup> Brands, “Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Policy”: 435-436.
- <sup>52</sup> Brands, “Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Policy”: 436.
- <sup>53</sup> Brands, “Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Policy”: 436.
- <sup>54</sup> Thomas G. Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate: Public Policy and the Network Imaginary,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13 (2010): 70.
- <sup>55</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 88.
- <sup>56</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 66.
- <sup>57</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 74.
- <sup>58</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 88.
- <sup>59</sup> Sue L. John, David Domke, Kevin Coe, and Erica S. Graham, “Going Public, Crisis after Crisis: The Bush Administration and the Press From September 11 to Saddam,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 198.
- <sup>60</sup> John, Domke, Coe, & Graham, “Going Public, Crisis After Crisis”: 198-199.
- <sup>61</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, “Rush to War Ignores U.S. Constitution,” October 5, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19125-19126.

- 
- <sup>62</sup> Max Cleland, "Questions for the Bush Administration," October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 8938-8940.
- <sup>63</sup> Carroll, "The Iraq Vietnam Comparison": para 5.
- <sup>64</sup> Carroll, "The Iraq Vietnam Comparison": para 5.
- <sup>65</sup> Carroll, "The Iraq Vietnam Comparison": para 6.
- <sup>66</sup> Carroll, "The Iraq-Vietnam Comparison": para 7.
- <sup>67</sup> Carroll, "The Iraq-Vietnam Comparison": para 1.
- <sup>68</sup> Carroll, "The Iraq-Vietnam Comparison": para 1.
- <sup>69</sup> Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, translated by Edward Meredith Cope and John Edwin Sandys (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 110.
- <sup>70</sup> Ivie, "Rhetorical Deliberation": 281.
- <sup>71</sup> Robert Ivie and Oscar Giner, "Hunting the Devil: Democracy's Rhetorical Impulse to War," *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 37 (2007): 580.
- <sup>72</sup> Ivie and Giner, "Hunting the Devil": 583.
- <sup>73</sup> Dustin Harp, Jaime Loke, and Ingrid Bachmann, "Voices of Dissent in the Iraq War: Moving from Deviance to Legitimacy?" *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 87 (2010): 470.
- <sup>74</sup> Tom Daschle, *Like No Other Time: The 107<sup>th</sup> Congress and the Two Years that Changed America Forever* (New York, NY: Three Rivers Press, 2003), 196.
- <sup>75</sup> Steven S. Smith, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005), 259.
- <sup>76</sup> Smith, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate*, 261.
- <sup>77</sup> Smith, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate*, 258.
- <sup>78</sup> Smith, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate*, 250.

- 
- <sup>79</sup> Barbara Sinclair, *The Transformation of the U.S. Senate*, (Baltimore, MD: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989), p. 3.
- <sup>80</sup> Hubert H. Humphrey, "The Senate in Foreign Policy," *Foreign Affairs* 37 (1959): 525.
- <sup>81</sup> Humphrey, "The Senate in Foreign Policy" : 526.
- <sup>82</sup> Sinclair, *The Transformation of the U.S. Senate*, 10.
- <sup>83</sup> Sarah A. Binder and Steven S. Smith, *Politics or Principle?: Filibustering in the United States Senate* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1997), 4.
- <sup>84</sup> Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument": 171.
- <sup>85</sup> Brockriede, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument": 166.
- <sup>86</sup> Michael Halloran, "Doing Public Business in Public," in *Form and Genre: Shaping Rhetorical Action*, ed. Karlyn Kohrs Campbell and Kathleen Hall Jamieson (Falls Church, VA: Speech Communication Association), 118.
- <sup>87</sup> Halloran, "Doing Public Business in Public": 120.
- <sup>88</sup> Halloran, "Doing Public Business in Public": 119.
- <sup>89</sup> Halloran, "Doing Public Business in Public": 118.
- <sup>90</sup> Michael C. Leff, "Textual Criticism: The Legacy of G. P. Mohrmann," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72 (1986): 379.
- <sup>91</sup> Leff, "Textual Criticism": 384.
- <sup>92</sup> Leff, "Textual Criticism": 382.
- <sup>93</sup> Leff, "Textual Criticism": 385.
- <sup>94</sup> Kenneth D. Burke, *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969), 503.
- <sup>95</sup> Burke, *A Grammar of Motives*, 503.

- 
- <sup>96</sup> Robert Asen, "Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13 (2010): 124-125.
- <sup>97</sup> Asen, "Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy": 125.
- <sup>98</sup> Asen, "Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy": 125.
- <sup>99</sup> Robert Asen, *Visions of Poverty: Welfare Policy and Political Imagination* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2002), 241.
- <sup>100</sup> Asen, *Visions of Poverty*, 245.
- <sup>101</sup> Asen, "Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy": 132.
- <sup>102</sup> Asen, "Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy": 139.
- <sup>103</sup> Craig Rood, "Rhetorical Studies and the Gun Debate: A Public Policy Perspective," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18 (2015): 364.
- <sup>104</sup> Rood, "Rhetorical Studies and the Gun Debate": 364.
- <sup>105</sup> Matthew Glass, *Citizens Against the MX: Public Languages in the Nuclear Age* (Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993), 25.
- <sup>106</sup> Glass, *Citizens Against the MX*, xxii.
- <sup>107</sup> Karen Callaghan and Frauke Schnell, "Assessing the Democratic Debate: How the News Media Frame Elite Policy Discourse," *Political Communication* 18 (2001): 184.
- <sup>108</sup> Callaghan and Schnell, "Assessing the Democratic Debate": 184-185.
- <sup>109</sup> Glen Krutz and William Ellis, "Seniority's Place in the Contemporary Senate," Paper presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.
- <sup>110</sup> Gerald Famm and Steven Smith, "Last among Equals: The Senate's Presiding Officer," in *Esteemed Colleagues: Civility and Deliberation in the U.S. Senate*, edited by Burdett Loomis (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution: 2004), 110.

---

<sup>111</sup> Famm and Smith, “Last mong Equals,” 110-111.

<sup>112</sup> “The President Pro Tempore of the Senate: History and Authority of the Office,”

*Congressional Research Service*. Accessed January 15, 2015.

[Http://www.senate.gov/CRSReports/crs-](http://www.senate.gov/CRSReports/crs-)

[publish.cfm?pid='0E%2C\\*PL%3F%3D%22P%20%20%0A](http://www.senate.gov/CRSReports/crs-publish.cfm?pid='0E%2C*PL%3F%3D%22P%20%20%0A): this text is 26 pages long and the specific text reference is found on page six.

<sup>113</sup> Eric Schickler, “The U.S. Senate in the Mid-Twentieth Century,” in *The U.S. Senate: From Deliberation to Dysfunction*, edited by Burdett Loomis (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2011), 13.

<sup>114</sup> James Buchanan, “To Mr. Packer Et Al.,” in *The Works of James Buchanan: Comprising his Speeches, Stare Papers, and Private Correspondence*, ed. John Bassett Moore (Philadelphia, PA: J.B. Lippincott & Company), 1909.

## **Chapter Two: Descriptive Inventory**

On October 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2002, House of Representatives Speaker John Hastert (R-IL) and House Minority Leader Richard Gephardt (D-MI) presented the joint resolution titled “Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002” to the United States Senate chamber for consideration. The resolution, shortened S.J.Res. 46, spanned 14 days from its introduction on October 2<sup>nd</sup> to its signing by President George W. Bush on October 16<sup>th</sup>.<sup>1</sup> The Senate dedicated five days—October 4<sup>th</sup>, October 7<sup>th</sup>, October 8<sup>th</sup>, October 9<sup>th</sup>, and October 10<sup>th</sup>—to debate. While these dates provide most of the texts analyzed here, two speeches by Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle preceding October 4<sup>th</sup> are also included. Together, a total of thirty speeches are studied. This descriptive inventory of S.J.Res. 46 details what the Senators stated, how they argued for or against the resolution, and support for said arguments. This inventory allows for the inductive analysis in the succeeding chapter, taking the texts “on their own terms.” This chapter is separated into two sections: (1) a brief context surrounding the debates follows the inventory, and (2) the inventory itself.

### **Context**

Public policy deliberation operates in the present and aims to shape the future, but it is also mediated and guided by the past. Separating context from the debate would only impede understanding. This section builds upon the background information laid out in the first chapter and traces the context leading up to the Senate’s debate on S.J.Res. 46 on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002.

While Tom Daschle spoke of Bush’s handling of the Iraq crisis in March of 2002, Congressional inquiry into authorizing military force accelerated quickly after the President’s address before the United Nations General Assembly on September 12, 2002.<sup>2</sup> Bush asked the General Assembly that disarming Iraqi President Saddam Hussein required not only U.S.

initiative but also the backing of the international community.<sup>3</sup> Seven days later, on September 19<sup>th</sup>, the White House sent a draft of the “Resolution Authorizing Military Force Against Iraq” to Congress. Bush then held a press conference on September 24<sup>th</sup>, where he cited his U.N. speech and explained that he sought both international and legislative authorization to invade Iraq. In this speech, Bush urged Congress to debate and pass the resolution before the November 5<sup>th</sup> midterm elections. He contended, “Congress must act now to pass a resolution which will hold Saddam Hussein to account for a decade of defiance.”<sup>4</sup>

In the eleven months preceding the debate, the Bush administration argued that Hussein had maintained a stockpile of chemical and biological weapons or Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). This stockpile violated U.N. resolutions and, despite the Bush’s administration’s diplomatic efforts, Hussein had continued to develop these weapons.<sup>5</sup> Bush also claimed that Hussein’s threat extended beyond Iraq and that he could give these WMD to terrorists. Deputy Prime Minister Abdul Tawab Al-Mulah Huwaish publicly denied that his government possessed WMD and, amidst the possibility of an invasion, on October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002 offered U.N. weapons inspectors access to Iraq for the first time since 1998.<sup>6</sup> Huwaish stated, “If the American administration is interested in inspecting these sites, then they’re welcome to come over and have a look for themselves.”<sup>7</sup> The White House announced the following day that they rejected the offer and stated it would oppose the return of U.N. weapon inspectors to Iraq without a new resolution from the U.N. Security Council.<sup>8</sup>

Upon its presentation to the chamber by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the House Minority Leader, Senator Joe Lieberman (D-CT) officially introduced the resolution along with Senators John McCain (R-AZ), Evan Bayh (D-IN), and John Warner (R-VA). These Senators joined President Bush for a short announcement at the White House later that same day.

This event came on the heels of S.J.Res. 46's introduction into the Senate where Bush contended, "The text of our bipartisan resolution is clear and it is strong. The statement of support from the Congress will show to friend and enemy alike the resolve of the United States. In Baghdad, the regime will know that full compliance with all U.N. security demands is the only choice and the time remaining for that choice is limited."<sup>9</sup>

Ahead of the October 10<sup>th</sup> vote, Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) explained that it was important for the country "to speak with one voice at this critical moment."<sup>10</sup> He qualified this statement by warning Bush to move "in a way that avoids making a dangerous situation even worse."<sup>11</sup> S.J.Res. 46 passed the Senate and was approved by the House with wider margins than the similar 1991 resolution that gave former President George H. W. Bush legislative authority to force out Hussein's army from neighboring Kuwait.<sup>12</sup> S.J.Res. 46 limited the use of the U.S. military force in Iraq as well as any "current ongoing threats" present during the invasion.<sup>13</sup> Bush had to inform Congress within 48 hours before or after initiating military action against Iraq. The resolution also required his administration to submit a progress report to Congress every sixty days.<sup>14</sup>

### **Descriptive Inventory**

United States Senate Majority Leaders wield significant power as the chief spokesperson of the chamber and their political party.<sup>15</sup> During the 107<sup>th</sup> Congress, Senator Tom Daschle served as both the Minority and Majority Leader on different occasions.<sup>16</sup> On March 18<sup>th</sup>, 2002, then minority leader Daschle initiated the first of many skeptical remarks concerning Bush's strategy in the Iraq crisis. These statements were presented seven months before the formal Senate debate on the invasion and during the early diplomatic stages concerning how to disarm Saddam Hussein. In one of the most highly televised segments of his speech, he stated, "I am

saddened, saddened that this president failed so miserably at diplomacy that we're now forced to war. Saddened that we have to give up one life because this president couldn't create the kind of diplomatic effort that was so critical for our country."<sup>17</sup>

The speech exemplifies what political scholar Doris Graber described as strategic interpretation.<sup>18</sup> Politicians employ this pragmatic function of political language in order to "interpret events' meanings, put them into context, and speculate about their consequences."<sup>19</sup> Graber's work sheds insight into how senators used certain words or phrases to connect acts and/or actors to a particular conclusion.<sup>20</sup> The way a politician interprets an event can, as Graber writes, affect "the political consequences of media reports."<sup>21</sup> By linking or suggesting the relationships between events, political leaders may "shape opinions without explicitly telling audiences which views seem right or wrong."<sup>22</sup> Given Congress had already authorized Bush to invade Afghanistan, Daschle portrayed the President's diplomatic efforts as having "failed so miserably" concerning the Iraq crisis that the United States was pushed to the brink of a second war.<sup>23</sup> Controlling how the public interprets emerging events can explain why Daschle constructed his early comments on Bush's diplomatic efforts. As the representative of the opposition party, Daschle's speech presented his apprehensive position in authorizing the president to invade Iraq. For instance, he stated that if "the United States does act militarily against Iraq, it is important that we continue diplomacy to pull together the broadest coalition. . . . At the same time it is also important that we remain committed to addressing our other pressing national security threats."<sup>24</sup> Here, Daschle advocated for a broader strategic approach to resolving the Iraqi crisis in addition to military force. As the initial diplomatic foray into Iraq was underway, Daschle's speech presented the first of many critiques that questioned the administration.

On September 25, 2002, Daschle delivered another speech that denounced Bush's politicization of the Iraq crisis. His remarks, delivered on the Senate floor, came shortly after Bush's latest statement where Bush claimed, "the Senate is more interested in special interests in Washington and not interested in the security of the American people."<sup>25</sup> Daschle retorted, "We ought not politicize this war. We ought not to politicize the rhetoric about war in life and death. So, Mr. President, it's not too late to end this politicization."<sup>26</sup> This exchange reveals tensions that had been building between Daschle and the White House concerning Iraq.<sup>27</sup> Many Democrats suspected that Bush deliberately timed the resolution's debate to coincide with the November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2002 midterm elections, which many predicted would likely see a shift in the majority party that would determine control of Congress.<sup>28</sup> Daschle offered an explanation of politicization by stating, "It's not too late to forget the pollsters, forget the campaign fundraisers, forget making accusations about how interested in national security Democrats are, and let's get this job done right. . . ."<sup>29</sup> One solution he provided to avoid this politicization was to slow down and avoid rushing a resolution through the chamber. This argument became a recurring proposal during the debates. A few vocal Senators asserted that not enough debate time was delegated to discuss such a momentous resolution. In a similar claim, Senators also urged the chamber to hold a vote *after* the midterm elections. Despite these calls, the vote was still held before the elections.

On October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002, Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY) began the official Senatorial debate on S.J.Res. 46 with his immediate declaration supporting Bush's efforts to invade Iraq. His speech laid out a claim that frequently emerged in the arguments of other pro-resolution Senators: Saddam Hussein failed to fulfill past promises. Specifically, Bunning emphasized that Hussein had violated sixteen United Nations Security Council resolutions in the past six years,

having “broken his word at every opportunity.”<sup>30</sup> Bunning used the word “broke/broken” seven times throughout his speech and framed Hussein as the primary actor in Iraq’s state-sponsored terrorism. Believing Hussein had been given ample opportunity to comply with international sanctions, the Kentucky Senator began his speech by presenting Hussein as a growing threat—a threat that he stated the Bush administration had long been building before the debate.<sup>31</sup> Senator George Voinovich (R-OH) voiced support for the resolution based on similar claims of betrayal. Voinovich argued that, “I don’t see how we can let Saddam fool us again. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that Saddam Hussein cannot be trusted.”<sup>32</sup> Whereas Bunning made broader claims with little specific reference to material evidence, other than referencing U.N. Security Council resolutions, Voinovich provided a line-by-line documentation of wrongs by Hussein. Going back to the 1980-1988 Iraq-Iran War, he listed the number of casualties by Hussein’s deployment of chemical weapons “against his own people and his neighbors.”<sup>33</sup> He continued in a fashion similar to Bunning in that he dedicated a majority of the speech to discussing the wrongs made by Hussein rather than the specific content of S.J.Res. 46.

While Bunning and Voinovich represent only two speeches from this debate, the way they stylize their arguments to focus more on a perceived threat (Hussein) and less on the specifics of the resolution they are voting on becomes apparent in other pro-resolution Senators as well. Republican Senator John Warner (R-VA) spent much of his speech outlining the growing threat of Hussein’s despotism.<sup>34</sup> Warner publicly agreed with Bunning and Voinovich in that leaving Hussein alone would only put vital U.S. national security interests in harm’s way. “Time,” Warner warned, “is Saddam Hussein’s ally. Time is not ours.”<sup>35</sup> Bunning, Voinovich, and Warner employed the word “threat” with specific reference to Hussein a total of 32 times. Together, the top-ranking participating Republican Senators on the first day of the debate began

articulating an urgency to pass quickly a resolution. Bunning's, Voinovich's, and Warner's claims, which presented Hussein as a growing threat that demanded swift action, represent an emerging narrative in the debate. Their speeches echoed Bush's push for a quick resolution by framing Hussein as the target. They depicted his state-sponsored terrorism as an evolving threat and diagnosed said threat as requiring immediate action.

Senator Carl Levin (D-MI) was the first Democratic Senator to speak on the floor on S.J.Res. 46. In his statements, Levin presented two arguments for voting against the bill. First, despite claims made by the Bush administration that all diplomatic options in resolving Hussein's state-sponsored terrorism had been exhausted, the United States should continue to exercise multilateral diplomatic negotiations with Iraq rather than invading it. The latter half of Levin's speech turned to his second major claim: more time is needed before a decision can be made on whether military force should be authorized.<sup>36</sup> Moreover, much like Bunning's, Voinovich's, and Warner's arguments, Levin employed statistics and statements from the United Nations to support his argument. The primary difference was in how he used those references to warn the Senate against a rushed debate. Levin was cautious in word choice as he described that, "It is very important that we carefully consider the short-term and the long-term effects of unilateral action by the United States."<sup>37</sup> In fact, Levin used the word "careful" six times throughout his speech. Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR) took note that Levin in particular was "expressing caution, and with good reason."<sup>38</sup> In many ways, Wyden's speech continued many arguments that Levin forwarded; the cautious approach to invading Iraq was apparent. For example, Wyden observed that Senators sympathetic to the administration's cause were "very anxious" in equipping Bush with the legislative authority he requested.<sup>39</sup> Cutting his speech short to discuss matters of energy and foreign oil, Wyden yielded the floor by concluding, "I do not

think this is a matter [S.J.Res. 46] that Congress can afford to ignore. Let us dedicate more time to deliberate.”<sup>40</sup>

Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV), a verbose speaker on the Iraq invasion throughout the debate, commanded the floor during his speech on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002 as he delivered the longest speech on S.J.Res. 46 that day.<sup>41</sup> In these remarks, Byrd levied a number of claims. He emphasized what Democratic Senators before him had already mentioned: Slow down. Byrd argued that Hussein had long since been a foe to United States interests. “This is not new. This is not a new pretext. These things are not new, but they are new just before this election.”<sup>42</sup> Byrd rejected arguments that Hussein was, following the September 11<sup>th</sup> terrorist attacks, a fresh and emerging threat.<sup>43</sup> He described the rise of Hussein and the various actions taken by the United States government in the 1990s to evince his argument that Hussein, as a threat, should not come surprisingly. With this support in place, Byrd implied that the U.S. midterm elections may have politicized this issue so as to hasten deliberation. He stated, “Let us come back after the election and then debate, and then, who knows? I might join with the distinguished Senator in promoting a resolution to declare war, Congress declare war.”<sup>44</sup> The rest of this speech employed two pieces of evidence in support of prolonging debate beyond the six days that were scheduled. The 1,400 telephone calls from his constituents was the first piece, in which Byrd claimed that “almost every single caller has said: Wait. Slow down. Don't rush this through.”<sup>45</sup> The second supporting material recalled various points in American history that demonstrated how the U.S. has often rushed into warfare. Byrd cited the invasion of Grenada in 1983 and the “hasty”<sup>46</sup> Gulf of Tonkin resolution as examples. His pleas to extend debate and consideration became a common theme throughout his arguments in the days to come. Before yielding the floor, Byrd exclaimed, “You don't want this resolution rammed through this Congress. . . .”<sup>47</sup>

On October 7<sup>th</sup>, when Senate debate on the resolution resumed after a three-day hiatus, Senators Max Cleland (D-GA) and Bill Nelson (D-FL) presented two speeches in support of S.J.Res. 46. Their remarks were similar in that they referenced violations of United Nations Security Council resolutions by Hussein in supporting Iraq's invasion. Rather than echo the urgency of Hussein as an immediate threat, as Republican Senators before them had, Cleland and Nelson presented the resolution as an instrument of diplomacy rather than an assurance of war. Nelson stated, "This resolution will serve as Saddam's last chance at a peaceful conclusion to his years of defiance of international law,"<sup>48</sup> while Cleland proclaimed that the resolution is "one last chance to secure Saddam Hussein's final, unconditional surrender of those weapons, as he has pledged since 1991."<sup>49</sup>

A difference in the view of the debate time is worth discussing, because as the debates progressed pro-resolution Senators expressed the debate positively while opposing Senators, like Byrd, argued that although the debate was "robust,"<sup>50</sup> more time was needed. Whereas Byrd thought not enough debate time was allotted, Cleland disagreed. Cleland contended, "We are engaged in a deliberate and civil and thorough discussion. We are moving toward a strong resolution."<sup>51</sup> On October 7<sup>th</sup>, Byrd continued questioning the chamber at large why a resolution had to be passed by the end of the week. He asked, "Why now? Those two little words: Why now? Why are we in such a hurry?"<sup>52</sup> This speech was, in part, a response to Senator Warner who responded to Byrd's speech on October 4<sup>th</sup> by explaining that "the most significant concerns" regarding the invasion had either already been addressed by another Senator or the Bush administration.<sup>53</sup> Unsatisfied, Byrd asked a total of 63 questions in this speech to convey the point that not all answers relating to the resolution were provided. These questions included asking how long the invasion would take, if adequate care for deployed soldiers had been

accounted for, how an invasion would affect the growing instability of the Middle East, and dedicating fifteen questions to asking how much this invasion would cost.<sup>54</sup> In fact, he spent much of this speech asking questions to demonstrate his perceived observation that the Senate had not yet been thorough in its debate. This concern was expressed days prior by Democratic Senators, specifically Levin and Wyden, and continued to emerge as the debate progressed. Yet when considering this concern, an important question came to mind: How long of a debate is, or should be considered, enough? Byrd suggested that the Senators wait until after the midterm elections on November 5<sup>th</sup>, 2002 to vote. In one of his many calls to extend debate time, he stated, “We should not have this vote on the issue for war or for peace before the Congress has answers to these questions.”<sup>55</sup>

As was observed in the literature review, U.S. foreign policy rhetoric is no stranger to justifying military operations abroad, in part, by portraying the enemy in savage terms.<sup>56</sup> On October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2002, Senators Jon Kyl (R-AZ), Pete Domenici (R-NM), and Orrin Hatch (R-UT) depicted Hussein’s despotic regime as inhumane. Hatch argued, “If you have evidence of your enemy's cold capabilities and with Saddam Hussein we do and if you have evidence of his enmity and with Saddam Hussein we do--then do not err on the side of wishful thinking. With enemies with the destructive capabilities of Saddam Hussein, we must be hard-headed.”<sup>57</sup> Kyl vociferously went after Hussein in his speech, depicting him as a murderer, his government “so savage as to flaunt its crimes,” and the “shocking brutality” of a “vicious dictator.”<sup>58</sup> Domenici, the final speaker on the resolution for that day, offered a vivid decivilizing characterization of Hussein.<sup>59</sup> He presented the invasion of Iraq as a national commitment to address “a hostile and aggressive enemy.”<sup>60</sup> Comparing Hussein to a “beast” with multiple heads, Domenici argued that forceful disarmament is necessary. He stated, “How is he most apt to disarm? What is most apt

to make him disarm? Talk? Resolutions? I think not. Complete military force needs to be granted to the President and I will give the President authority to use our military forces along with other countries so as to avoid the use of weapons of mass destruction by Saddam Hussein.”<sup>61</sup> The way the Senators spoke when discussing the Iraqi leader was in a way that dehumanized him. How could one not want to topple his government? How could one not want to decapitate the “heads” of a beast? On October 7<sup>th</sup>, Senator Kyl (R-AZ) argued that Hussein was “not just another Arab despot. Saddam Hussein is a figure of singular repugnance, and singular danger. No one else comes close to matching his extraordinary and variegated record of malevolence.”<sup>62</sup> The following day, on October 8<sup>th</sup>, 2002, Senator McCain continued this portrayal of Hussein by labeling the dictator as a “predator.”<sup>63</sup> McCain spent much of his speech rebuking other Senators who stressed greater diplomacy by explaining that one cannot “negotiate with terror.”<sup>64</sup> Before ending his speech, he stated it was in America’s best interest to “[Get] rid of the menace posed by Saddam Hussein’s weapons of terror.”<sup>65</sup>

Robert Ivie explains how political metaphors become “habits of discourse that condition us to accept these images as literal statements.”<sup>66</sup> While Ivie focused on Cold War rhetoric, his broader historical discussion on how American foreign policy rhetoric tends to operate, in part, by the use of imagery adds insight in examining the Senate’s debate. The use of decivilizing comparisons helped portray adversaries as a brutal and violent entity in an effort to dehumanize them and, consequently, to impugn their actions.<sup>67</sup> The various terms used to describe Hussein helped support the frequent argument that Hussein was not only a threat, but a *barbaric* threat. The possibility of diplomatic negotiations was then argued as futile because the U.S. is no longer dealing with a person—rather they are dealing with a menace, a predator, a beast, and a murderer. Senator Joseph Lieberman (D-CT) double-downed on McCain’s portrayal of the Iraqi

leader by agreeing that “the extraordinary acts of brutality he has committed himself demands an extraordinary response.”<sup>68</sup> Lieberman’s description of Hussein lead him to conclude that such barbarianism was too large to ignore.<sup>69</sup>

Similarly, other Senators made the same claim of Hussein as an emerging threat using similar supporting material. After building the case that America was not dealing with a foreign leader but some inhumane entity, several Senators insisted that America’s response should be proportionate to the threat being faced. Lieberman addressed Hussein directly, stating, “The danger you represent is so great.”<sup>70</sup> Nearly every speaker, Democrat or Republican, employed decivilizing vehicle metaphors when referring to Hussein. This habit formed a pattern of imagery that not only qualified Hussein's character negatively, but also indirectly made opponents appear weak or sympathetic for opposing a resolution that would use military force against such an inhumane leader. McCain verbalized this idea on October 8<sup>th</sup> when he asked the chamber, “How can you ignore so much evil?”<sup>71</sup>

The use of decivilizing metaphors was complemented by another frequently used trope, that of affirming threatening expectations. Ivie describes this metaphor as an attempt to solidify a threat by pointing to a law or rule that was violated by said threat.<sup>72</sup> Senators referred to violations of past United Nations Security Council resolutions as an affirmation of Hussein’s threatening nature. Hussein was not only evil, but an international regulating body had served to confirm that evil. On the first day of the debate, October 4<sup>th</sup>, Senator Wyden (D-OR) proclaimed that the debate should treat Hussein “as a proven criminal.”<sup>73</sup> Senator Evan Bayh (D-IN) referenced Wyden and expressed his agreement with the Oregon Senator, stating, “Congress should give the President the authority he believes he needs to protect American national security against an often irrational dictator who has demonstrated a history of aggression outside his

borders. . . .”<sup>74</sup> Similarly, Senator Larry Craig (R-ID) supported the resolution, in part, by arguing “As we know, for more than a decade Saddam Hussein has defied the international community, flagrantly ignoring and violating dozens of U.N. resolutions. It has become apparent to many Americans that the only way to end his historical defiance was to end his regime.”<sup>75</sup> Conversely, Senators who opposed (and ultimately voted against) S.J.Res. 46 frequently referenced the grave error of preemptively invading another country that had not yet attacked us (specifically Senators Byrd, Levin, Wyden, and Sarbanes). Affirming Hussein as an imminent threat helped counter this concern. Throughout the debate, literalizing the “threat” became common among pro-resolution Senators in addressing (though certainly not quelling) the qualms of a preemptive invasion.

On October 9<sup>th</sup>, Senator Byrd waged a serious allegation against other Senators whom he claimed were making erroneous connections between Iraq/Hussein and the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks.<sup>76</sup> Indeed, many scholars and critics have commented on how the Bush administration, as well as other politicians including Congress members and cabinet officials, conducted interviews and/or gave speeches that implied a link between Hussein and the radical Islamist militant organization Al-Qaeda.<sup>77</sup> During the lead up to the invasion in 2003 and prior to the debate, President Bush alleged that Iraqi President Saddam Hussein and Al-Qaeda might conspire to launch terrorist attacks on the United States.<sup>78</sup> The administration's rationale for war was, in part, based on this allegation and others.<sup>79</sup> The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, commonly known as the 9/11 Commission, concluded in 2004 that there was no evidence connecting Al-Qaeda to Hussein.<sup>80</sup> On April 25, 2007, former Director of the Central Intelligence George Tenet disclosed that, "We could never verify that there was any Iraqi authority, direction, and control, complicity with al-Qaeda for 9/11 or any operational act against

America, period.”<sup>81</sup> On October 9<sup>th</sup>, Byrd asked the chamber, “Has anyone shown us any link between al Qaeda and Iraq? More than half of the American people, I would wager, believe that Iraqis carried out the attacks on the Twin Towers. Not a single Iraqi was among those attackers, those terrorists, those hijackers. There was not one Iraqi among -- in the whole group.”<sup>82</sup> Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) expressed agreement with the West Virginian Senator’s concern by asserting that “this administration continues to try to construe something as a link when there is no evidence that Saddam Hussein or Iraq had anything to do with Al-Qaeda and that attack.”<sup>83</sup>

Despite the erroneous evidence marring the administration’s subtle endorsement of this link, Congressional speeches during the debate often employed the Bush administration’s reasoning in support of S.J.Res.46. Senator Hatch (R-UT), on October 7<sup>th</sup>, argued that “with too many suggestions of Iraq's ties with terrorists like Al-Qaeda, and with no question about Iraq's animosity to the United States, and other countries as well, including many in the Middle East, should the United States consider an option of doing nothing, or too little, as we did with al-Qaeda before September 11?”<sup>84</sup> Hatch contended that preventing Iraq from accomplishing its “terroristic intentions”<sup>85</sup> required giving Bush authorization to invade the country. “I believe that this is President Bush's vision,”<sup>86</sup> Hatch stated, giving greater credence to his argument by invoking Bush’s leadership on this crisis. Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) spoke on October 9<sup>th</sup> and directly supported Hatch’s claim that Hussein may be supporting Al-Qaeda’s terrorist operations. Helms stated that what Hatch expressed was “a claim we all should be seriously considering,” adding that, “there have been contacts between senior Iraqi officials and members of Al-Qaeda. We know too that several of the detainees, in particular some high-ranking detainees, have said that Iraq provided some training to Al-Qaeda in chemical weapons.”<sup>87</sup> The day before on October 9<sup>th</sup> Senator Bayh (D-IN) stated, “I believe there is little doubt he [Saddam Hussein] will

reach out to al-Qaeda or Hezbollah or other international institutions of terrorism to develop a deterrent to threaten us, with unacceptable consequences, if in the future we decide to restrain his aggressive actions.”<sup>88</sup> And on the first day of the debate, October 4<sup>th</sup>, Senator Warner (R-VA) argued, “In this post-9/11 world, we as a nation cannot afford to wait while this evil dictator, who terrorizes his own people and shelters those who terrorize others--just think, al-Qaeda elements are now known to be within Iraq--acquires even more destructive capabilities to attack and terrorize our Nation, possibly his neighbors in the region and the entire world.”<sup>89</sup>

In total, 19 speeches of the 30 studied in this project indirectly suggested a connection between Al-Qaeda and Iraq/Hussein as seen in how the Senators employed the two in their sentence constructions; some suggestions were more explicit than others. It is important to note that Senators McCain, Nelson, Bayh, Hatch, Helms, Craig, and Nickles cited Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld’s report that arrived shortly before the debate, on September 27, 2002. Rumsfeld declared that the CIA possessed “bulletproof” evidence demonstrating “there are, in fact, Al-Qaeda in Iraq.”<sup>90</sup> In a review of about 600,000 documents related to the Iraq invasion, a military report released by the U.S. Joint Forces Command in 2008 contradicted Rumsfeld’s report.<sup>91</sup> It found no “bulletproof” evidence that would indicate any relation between the Iraqi leader and the terrorist network. In a resolution considering military force *against Iraq*, 28 speeches referenced the Afghanistan-native Al-Qaeda organization at least once. Twenty-five of those speeches referenced the now-discredited link between Al-Qaeda and Hussein as support for the resolution.

The allegation that Hussein and other members of his government conspired with terrorists tied to Al-Qaeda became a thread of support interwoven into arguments made by both Democratic and Republican Senators. This supporting material facilitated a conclusion that many

Senators at least referenced or alluded to in their speeches: The ultimate deployment of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). Twenty-five of the thirty speeches studied used the term “Weapons of Mass Destruction” at least once. Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE) argued on October 9<sup>th</sup> that while a preemptive invasion warranted greater legislative scrutiny than a country that had already attacked us, he cited Afghanistan’s terrorist network as an example, the “possibility of Weapons of Mass Destruction changes everything.”<sup>92</sup> He went on to end his speech by stating, “Saddam Hussein’s ambitions for weapons of mass death means our commitment must extend beyond the day after to the months and years after Saddam is gone.”<sup>93</sup> He argued that a sunset clause or a finite end to the invasion should not be added. On October 9<sup>th</sup> Senator Harry Reid (D-NV), using the several U.N. Security Council violations that Hussein committed as evidence, proclaimed, “Iraq has refused to destroy its weapons of destruction. That refusal justified armed conflict.”<sup>94</sup> Senator McCain (R-AZ), who followed Reid, made WMD the central focus of his October 9<sup>th</sup> remarks. McCain insisted that America must appreciate “that lesson from September 11<sup>th</sup>; that we cannot wait until there is a direct, imminent, or sudden attack upon the United States of America.”<sup>95</sup> A “clear and present danger” to national security came “in the form of Saddam Hussein’s inventory of weapons of mass destruction.”<sup>96</sup> On the final day of the debate, Senate Minority Leader Trent Lott (R-MS) presented a unique speech in that he used the phrase WMD fifteen times throughout his speech—more than any other Senator in this study. The primary reason to go to war, as Lott explained, was because of Hussein’s WMD.<sup>97</sup> In a move to hasten the vote on the resolution, Lott exclaimed that the possibility of WMD demanded the United States take action sooner rather than later. He argued, “I think we have had a full debate. To try to delay it another day, another week, is not going to be helpful. We need to stand up now, show we mean what we say, and we are going to get the results. . . .”<sup>98</sup>

On October 10<sup>th</sup>, Senators Don Nickles (R-OK) and Jeff Sessions (R-AL) echoed Lott's concern that delaying voting on the resolution only served to embolden Iraq. Nickles, who argued that Hussein was a vicious dictator that could only be neutralized by military force, blasted his colleagues who wanted to delay voting until after the 2002 midterm elections. He asked, "So for people who are saying we haven't been deliberative enough, and what is the consequence of this—what has changed?"<sup>99</sup> Nickles went on to cite a 1998 Congressional debate that passed sanctions against Iraq for non-compliance with "international obligations," contending that, "I don't remember the number of hours spent in debate, but it wasn't a lot. The fact is we passed it in one day."<sup>100</sup> Senator Byrd (D-WV) immediately responded to Nickles' apparent dissatisfaction with the length of the debate by asking, "Why at this critical time, when we are discussing the most critical legislation we have had before the Senate this year, the most critical legislation we may have in a long time? We are not considering a 1994 or 1998 resolution, we are considering a 2002 resolution. Yet we have been stampeded, we have been rushed, and it is unfair to the people of this country. Yet it has to be that way."<sup>101</sup> Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) followed and agreed with Byrd's call in elongating time to debate although for a different reason. Daschle explained that while it is clear that Hussein's WMD formed an alarming threat that demanded an investigation, the Senate should also consider how "public support for military action can evaporate quickly if the American people come to believe they have not been given all of the facts because of limited debate."<sup>102</sup>

The issue of time had been brought up in the days before October 10<sup>th</sup>. The media cited Byrd, in particular, as the loudest Senator on the issue of requesting more time to debate S.J.Res. 46.<sup>103</sup> Additionally, Senators Levin, Wyden, Daschle, Cleland, Bayh, Sarbanes, Hagel, and Kennedy all held that a longer debate would benefit, not a hinder, U.S. national interests. The

specific “interests” mentioned by each Senator varied, but two frequently surfaced among the speeches: cost and status. Cleland, for instance, argued on October 7 that the expense of the invasion needed to be better laid out by the administration. He likened his proposal to a “national invoice” of costs.<sup>104</sup> Thus, Cleland argued for more time to deliberate to satisfy this request. On the interest of status, Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA) spent a significant amount of time arguing that Congress should not only look at the material costs of invading Iraq but consider how it would shape America’s standing on the international stage. Before yielding the floor, he concluded his short speech by stating, “The world looks to America not just because of our superior might or economic weight; they admire us and emulate us because we are a friend and ally that defends freedom and promotes our values around the globe. Those same traits that are the envy of the world should guide us today as we conclude this important debate.”<sup>105</sup> Senator Sarbanes, on October 9<sup>th</sup>, argued that the Senate should delay debate until after the election. He justified this recommendation on the basis of how a preemptive invasion is “fraught with danger both for our position in the world and for our leadership status.”<sup>106</sup> Senator Daschle stressed that a substantial debate was not only permitted by extending time, but also was a responsibility of the chamber. He stated on the final day of the debate that, “In a healthy democracy such as ours, it is not only the right, but it is the *duty* of the ‘opposition party’ to fight for what it believes in. It is out of the process and discipline of reasoned and rigorous debate that strong and sound legislation and policy are shaped. Such debate is at the heart of the system of government created by our Founding Fathers.”<sup>107</sup>

Conversely, Senator Warner (R-VA) was among eight Republican Senators (with Voinovich, Bunning, Hatch, McCain, Lott, Sessions, and Hagel) who took a more explicit stance by arguing that S.J.Res. 46 would preserve or benefit America’s international status. These

Senators explained that the threat of Hussein and his stockpile of WMD demanded that the United States act now or face a deleterious blow to how other nations view America. For example, on October 4<sup>th</sup> Warner stated, “America's leadership and willingness to use force, confirmed by the Congress, is the best way to ensure compliance and preserve our status to the world.”<sup>108</sup> Senator McCain on October 8<sup>th</sup> added that, “My strong conviction is that our best chance to preserve our status abroad is through strong American leadership. So the best chance for a peaceful outcome, the best chance for a united front with our allies and with the imprimatur of the U.N., I believe, is by giving a strong hand to the President to present Saddam Hussein with no alternative. . . .”<sup>109</sup> On the other hand, Kennedy, Byrd, Daschle, Bayh, Sarbanes, and Reid explicitly mentioned America’s status or standing to stress the need for longer debate. While America’s “status” or “standing” likely carried different meanings to different Senators, it can be construed generally that they are addressing the way the United States was perceived by other nations.

## **Conclusion**

Upon completion of the final day scheduled for debate, October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002, the Senate voted down any time extensions and rejected three proposed amendments that would limit the statutory scope of the resolution to delineate what type of “military force” would be authorized. S.J.Res. 46 passed 77-23; of the 24 Senators studied in this project, 19 Yeas and five Nays were recorded.<sup>110</sup> The recurring thematic elements seen in the debate followed a similar pattern to other case studies observed in the literature review. First, the Senate primarily focused on either Iraq or Hussein as the primary agent regarding whom or what the military force would be used against. Many Senators who supported the resolution focused on decivilizing Hussein to demonstrate his threatening intentions and cited his violations of U.N. Security Council

resolutions as an affirmation of said threat. Senators wearier of the resolution mentioned Hussein's evil nature, but did not play it up as much as their pro-resolution colleagues. These Senators also used the threat of a WMD-armed Hussein to stress the need for faster deliberation. These Senators, who included Voinovich, Craig, Warner, Kyl, Hatch, Domenici, Levin, Hagel, McCain, Nelson, Helms, Reid, and Sessions, explicitly stated that the Senate should not waste time confronting such an urgent threat. For instance, Kyl asserted that, "We cannot wait until we are sure that Iraq has a nuclear weapon and is about to use it because it is unlikely we will ever have that evidence, and it will be too late when we do."<sup>111</sup> And Nelson claimed that, "Saddam poses an immediate, unchecked threat to our Nation and our allies, and unless we act now his arsenal will only grow."<sup>112</sup>

Second, the connection between Al-Qaeda and Iraq/Hussein also prevailed as a pro-war theme. Both Democratic and Republican Senators employed this faulty logic, often recycling the words used by President Bush or other administration officials in their speeches. The primary function of this connection was to build the case that Hussein was a terrorist because of the alleged links to terrorist networks throughout Afghanistan. While arguments that portrayed Hussein as barbaric relied on past evidence--including violations of international obligations, ignorance of U.S. condemnation in the 1980s and 1990s, and state-sponsored genocide of Iraqi citizens--connecting Hussein to Al-Qaeda helped associate the leader to more contemporary patterns of barbarism. With the debates being held shortly after the first anniversary of September 11<sup>th</sup>, associating Hussein with the terrorist organization that was assumed responsible for the 9/11 attacks aided that connection. In a public poll presented on the final day of the debate, October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002, 66% of survey participants said they believed "Saddam Hussein helped the terrorists in the September 12 attacks."<sup>113</sup> Less than a year after the debate, on

September 6<sup>th</sup>, 2003, a *Washington Post* poll found that 69% of Americans believed it was “likely. . . the Iraqi leader was personally involved in the attacks carried out by Al-Qaeda.”<sup>114</sup>

In all, after five days of debate, the Senate passed one of the most expansive military authorizations in recent American history. President Bush justified the decision to invade Iraq largely on the threats of WMD and Hussein’s ties to terrorism. Despite the problematic nature of the arguments for preemptive invasion, the Senate often cited and frequently recycled Bush’s arguments that relied on false allegations concerning WMD and Al-Qaeda-linked terrorism in Iraq. Of the thirty speeches studied, fifteen--by Senators Levin, Warner, Cleland, Hatch, Kyl, Nelson, Hagel, Helms, Sessions, Nickles, Lott, Hagel, McCain, Craig, and Bayh--referenced Bush, citing his “leadership” on the particular issue of the Iraq crisis and/or his arguments to invade Iraq, in support of S.J.Res. 46. Several Senators depicted Hussein as a decivilized threat, affirmed that threat with historical evidence, referenced the potential financial costs of the invasion and possible risks to U.S. status abroad, and all the while ignoring the requests made for extending debate time. In an effort to account for the arguments presented throughout the debate, this descriptive inventory traced the various trajectories observed. In the following chapter, attention turns from this inventory to elucidate the rhetorical implications stemming from the Senate’s debate.

---

## Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> “S.J.Res.46 – Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq,” Accessed January 12, 2016. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/46>.

<sup>2</sup> George W. Bush, “Address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York City,” New York City, NY, September 12, 2002. Accessed January 12, 2016.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=64069>: this text is 38 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph 34.

<sup>3</sup> Bush, “Address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York City”: 5.

<sup>4</sup> George W. Bush, “Remarks Following a Cabinet Meeting and an Exchange with Reporters,” Washington D.C., May 30, 2002. Accessed January 12, 2016.

<http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/youtubeclip.php?clipid=73017&admin=436:10>: The specific reference to this video is found at the 6:10 mark. For all future uses of the video, please refer to this URL.

<sup>5</sup> Glen Segell, *Disarming Iraq* (London, UK: British Library, 2004), 37.

<sup>6</sup> Segel, *Disarming Iraq*, 37.

<sup>7</sup> Segel, *Disarming Iraq*, 37.

<sup>8</sup> Segel, *Disarming Iraq*, 37.

<sup>9</sup> John King, Kate Snow, Jonathan Karl, and Dana Bash, “Iraq Resolution Introduced in Senate,” *CNN*, October 3, 2002. Accessed January 15, 2016.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/10/02/us.iraq/>: this text is 30 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph seven.

---

<sup>10</sup> Associated Press, “Voices from the Senate,” *Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 2002. Accessed January 15, 2016. [Http://articles.latimes.com/2002/oct/11/nation/na-votebox11](http://articles.latimes.com/2002/oct/11/nation/na-votebox11): this text is six paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph one.

<sup>11</sup> King, Snow, Karl, and Bash, “Iraq Resolution Introduced in Senate”: para 5.

<sup>12</sup> King, Snow, Karl, and Bash, “Iraq Resolution Introduced in Senate”: para 7.

<sup>13</sup> King, Snow, Karl, and Bash, “Iraq Resolution Introduced in Senate”: para 5.

<sup>14</sup> King, Snow, Karl, and Bash, “Iraq Resolution Introduced in Senate”: para 5.

<sup>15</sup> “Majority and Minority Leaders and Party Whips,” *United States Senate*. Accessed August 9, 2015. [Http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/16/opinion/a-deadly-legacy-in-iraq.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/16/opinion/a-deadly-legacy-in-iraq.html): this text is ten paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found at paragraphs four and five.

<sup>16</sup> “Majority and Minority Leaders and Party Whips”: specific text reference is found in the table at the bottom of this U.S. Senate webpage.

<sup>17</sup> Senator Tom Daschle, “Diplomatic Failure,” March 18, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 3373.

<sup>18</sup> Doris Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics* (Washington, D.C.: CQ Press, 2009), 26.

<sup>19</sup> Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics*, 26-27.

<sup>20</sup> Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics*, 26.

<sup>21</sup> Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics*, 28.

<sup>22</sup> Graber, *Mass Media and American Politics*, 28.

<sup>23</sup> Daschle, “Diplomatic Failure,” p. 3373.

<sup>24</sup> Daschle, “Diplomatic Failure,” p. 3373.

<sup>25</sup> William Welch, “Daschle Condemns Bush on Iraq Debate,” *USATODAY*, September 26, 2002. Accessed January 16, 2016. [Http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2002-09-25-](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2002-09-25-)

---

daschle\_x.htm: this text is 17 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph five.

<sup>26</sup> Senator Tom Daschle, “Stop Politicizing Iraq,” September 25, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 17759.

<sup>27</sup> Judy Keen and William Welch, “Bush, Daschle Fall out as Congress Returns,” *USATODAY*, January 23, 2002. Accessed January 16, 2016.

[Http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washdc/2002/01/23/usat-bush-daschle\(acov\).htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washdc/2002/01/23/usat-bush-daschle(acov).htm): this text is 29 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph five.

<sup>28</sup> Keen and Welch, “Bush, Daschle Fall out as Congress Returns”: para six.

<sup>29</sup> Daschle, “Diplomatic Failure,” p. 17759.

<sup>30</sup> Senator Jim Bunning, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19112.

<sup>31</sup> Segel, *Disarming Iraq*, 36-37.

<sup>32</sup> Senator George Voinovich, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19112-19113.

<sup>33</sup> Voinovich, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19113.

<sup>34</sup> Senator John Warner, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19128.

<sup>35</sup> Warner, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19128.

<sup>36</sup> Senator Carl Levin, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., 19115.

<sup>37</sup> Levin, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19115-19116.

<sup>38</sup> Senator Ron Wyden, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19117.

<sup>39</sup> Wyden, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19117.

<sup>40</sup> Wyden, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19118.

<sup>41</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19136.

- 
- <sup>42</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19135.
- <sup>43</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19136.
- <sup>44</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19136.
- <sup>45</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19137.
- <sup>46</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19137.
- <sup>47</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19138.
- <sup>48</sup> Senator Bill Nelson, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19227.
- <sup>49</sup> Senator Max Cleland, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19208.
- <sup>50</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19138.
- <sup>51</sup> Cleland, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19208.
- <sup>52</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19205.
- <sup>53</sup> Warner, S.J.Res. 46, 19128.
- <sup>54</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19206.
- <sup>55</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19207.
- <sup>56</sup> Robert Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240.
- <sup>57</sup> Senator Orrin Hatch, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19225.
- <sup>58</sup> Senator Jon Kyl, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19217.
- <sup>59</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 240. Credit goes to Ivie for the term "decivilizing."
- <sup>60</sup> Senator Pete Domenici, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19217.
- <sup>61</sup> Domenici, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19217.
- <sup>62</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 191436.

---

<sup>63</sup> Senator John McCain, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19436.

<sup>64</sup> McCain, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19436.

<sup>65</sup> McCain, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19437.

<sup>66</sup> Robert Ivie, “Cold War Motives and the Rhetorical Metaphor: a Framework of Criticism,” in *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*, edited by Martin Medhurst, Robert Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert Scott (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1997): 202.

<sup>67</sup> Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse”: 242.

<sup>68</sup> Senator Joe Lieberman, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19429.

<sup>69</sup> Lieberman, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19431.

<sup>70</sup> Lieberman, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19431.

<sup>71</sup> McCain, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19437.

<sup>72</sup> Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse”: 242.

<sup>73</sup> Wyden, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19118.

<sup>74</sup> Senator Evan Bayh, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19436.

<sup>75</sup> Senator Larry Craig, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19437.

<sup>76</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19732.

<sup>77</sup> Sue Chan, “Bush Administration Links Iraq, Al-Qaeda,” *CBSNEWS*, September 26, 2002.

Accessed January 15, 2016. [Http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bush-administration-links-iraq-al-qaeda/](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bush-administration-links-iraq-al-qaeda/): this text is 21 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found at paragraphs three and six.

<sup>78</sup> Chan, “Bush Administration Links Iraq, Al-Qaeda”: para seven.

<sup>79</sup> Chan, “Bush Administration Links Iraq, Al-Qaeda”: para eight.

---

<sup>80</sup> Jeffrey Smith, "Hussein's Prewar Ties to Al-Qaeda Discounted," *The Washington Post*, April 6, 2007. Accessed January 15, 2016. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/05/AR2007040502263.html>: this text is 12 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph one.

<sup>81</sup> Scott Pelley, "George Tenet: At the Center of the Storm," *CBS NEWS*, April 25, 2007. Accessed January 15, 2016. <http://www.cbsnews.com/news/george-tenet-at-the-center-of-the-storm/>: this transcript is 82 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph 52.

<sup>82</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19732.

<sup>83</sup> Senator Paul Sarbanes, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19728.

<sup>84</sup> Senator Orrin Hatch, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19225.

<sup>85</sup> Hatch, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19225.

<sup>86</sup> Hatch, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19225.

<sup>87</sup> Senator Jesse Helms, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 1967.

<sup>88</sup> Senator Evan Bayh, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19434.

<sup>89</sup> Senator John Warner, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19127.

<sup>90</sup> Eric Schmitt, "Rumsfeld Says U.S. Has 'Bulletproof' Evidence of Iraq's Links to Al-Qaeda," *New York Times*, September 28, 2002. Accessed January 16, 2016.

<http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/28/international/middleeast/28QAED.html>:

<sup>91</sup> Michael Mount, "Hussein's Iraq and Al-Qaeda Not Linked, Pentagon Says," *CNN*, March 13, 2008. Accessed January 15, 2016. <http://www.cnn.com/2008/US/03/13/alqaeda.saddam/>: this text is 10 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph two.

<sup>92</sup> Senator Chuck Hagel, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19704.

- 
- <sup>93</sup> Hagel, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19704.
- <sup>94</sup> Senator Harry Reid, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19727.
- <sup>95</sup> Senator John McCain, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 10170.
- <sup>96</sup> McCain, S.J.Res. 46, p. 10170.
- <sup>97</sup> Senator Trent Lott, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20383.
- <sup>98</sup> Lott, S.J.Res. 46, p. 20383.
- <sup>99</sup> Senator Don Nickles, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20389.
- <sup>100</sup> Nickles, S.J.Res. 46, p. 20383.
- <sup>101</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20425.
- <sup>102</sup> Senator Tom Daschle, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec. p. 20385.
- <sup>103</sup> Danny Hayes and Matt Guardino, *Influence from Abroad: Foreign Voices, the Media, and U.S. Public Opinion* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press), 82.
- <sup>104</sup> Senator Max Cleland, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19208.
- <sup>105</sup> Senator Ted Kennedy, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20378.
- <sup>106</sup> Senator Paul Sarbanes, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19728.
- <sup>107</sup> Tom Daschle, *Like No Other Time: The 107<sup>th</sup> Congress and the Two Years that Changed America Forever* (New York, NY: Three Rivers Press, 2003), 196.
- <sup>108</sup> Senator John Warner, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19130.
- <sup>109</sup> Senator John McCain, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19435.
- <sup>110</sup> Nineteen Nays included Senators Evan Bayh (D-IN), Jim Bunning (R-KY), Max Cleland (D-GA), Larry Craig (R-ID), Tom Daschle (D-SD), Pete Domenici (R-NM), Chuck Hagel (R-NE), Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Jesse Helms (R-NC), Jon Kyl (R-AZ), Joe Lieberman (D-CT), Trent Lott (R-MS), John McCain (R-AZ), Bill Nelson (D-FL), John Nickles (R-OK), Harry Reid (D-NV),

---

Jeff Sessions (R-AL), George Voinovich (R-OH), and John Warner (R-VA). In opposition were Senators Robert Byrd (D-WV), Carl Levin (D-MI), Ron Wyden (D-OR), Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), and Ted Kennedy (D-MA). See S.J.Res.46 – Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq, *Congress.gov*. Accessed January 16, 2016. <https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/46>.

<sup>111</sup> Senator Jon Kyl, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19216.

<sup>112</sup> Senator Bill Nelson, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19227.

<sup>113</sup> Lee Feinstein, “Most Americans Support War with Iraq, Shows New Pew/CFR Poll,” *Council on Foreign Relations*, October 10, 2002. Accessed January 17, 2016.

[http://www.cfr.org/iraq/most-americans-support-war-iraq-shows-new-pewcfr-poll---](http://www.cfr.org/iraq/most-americans-support-war-iraq-shows-new-pewcfr-poll---commentary-lee-feinstein/p5051)

[commentary-lee-feinstein/p5051](http://www.cfr.org/iraq/most-americans-support-war-iraq-shows-new-pewcfr-poll---commentary-lee-feinstein/p5051): this text is 20 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph seven.

<sup>114</sup> “Poll: 70% Believe Saddam, 9-11 Link,” *USATODAY*, September 6, 2003. Accessed January 17, 2016. [http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-09-06-poll-iraq\\_x.htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2003-09-06-poll-iraq_x.htm): this text is 11 paragraphs and the specific text reference is found on paragraph two.

### **Chapter Three: Analyzing the Metaphoric Clusters Present in the Senate's Debate**

While the Senate's debate over the decision to invade Iraq contained language that was at times strong and colorful, both Democrat and Republican Senators were in consensus that Saddam Hussein's actions demanded attention. A majority of the Senators also agreed that no time extensions should be approved, with three separate amendments requesting said extensions having been rejected on October 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002, October 7<sup>th</sup>, 2002, and October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002. These rejections came after certain speakers, most notably Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV), sought explicitly to postpone the debate until after the 2002 midterm elections. These two issues—Hussein and time—were interwoven into several speeches Senators made as they debated for or against the resolution's passage. The descriptive inventory developed in chapter two helps document these common threads. The inventory also revealed that an additional thread, that of U.S. status, was present in a majority of the speeches as well. Hussein, time, and status were often cited metaphorically. For example, as seen in chapter two, speakers frequently projected Hussein as savage and inhumane. Metaphor, therefore, is important for understanding this debate because it was a tactic that Senators commonly used in support or rejection of S.J.Res. 46.

In this regard, scholars have examined metaphor as a rhetorical device capable of facilitating persuasion. William Franke, in his broad study of metaphor's revival in recent decades, suggests that “the power of rhetoric to reshape cognitive meaning and to even reinvent, or at least reconfigure, reality” is regularly found in metaphor.<sup>1</sup> When quantitatively measuring how participants, who were psychology students at the University of Southern California and disclosed that they were eligible to vote in national elections, assessed metaphors in political speeches, Stephen Read, Ian Cesa, David Jones, and Nancy Collins observed that employing metaphors can result in a more positive evaluation of a speech's arguments, increased positive

views of the speaker, and a greater likelihood of attitude change.<sup>2</sup> Robert Ivie adds that “nowhere is the temptation to literalize a fertile metaphor any stronger or more consequential than in deliberations about war and peace.”<sup>3</sup> Indeed, war rhetoric frequently requires political leaders to paint a crises or event as worthy of immediate and stern action. Imagery imparted through metaphor is a strategy that Presidents have used to justify warfare.<sup>4</sup> Metaphor's ability to shape reality offers an expedient opportunity for politicians seeking quick foreign policy action. Benjamin Bates, in a study of President George H. W. Bush’s Persian Gulf war addresses, noted that the President’s war rhetoric was “shown to be persuasive” to international audiences.<sup>5</sup> George H. W. Bush employed metaphors of savagery to define Saddam Hussein and increase international support for the Persian Gulf War. Bates concluded that metaphors can, "reshape public perceptions of the enemy so that there is no alternative to war."<sup>6</sup> While the Senate’s rhetoric is the artifact of study for this project, many of the ideas and arguments disseminated by the George W. Bush administration were often recycled in the Senate’s debate. Within the broader context of the Iraq crisis, metaphor is particularly relevant because many Senators employed them in their speeches. Filtering the debate through a metaphoric lens aligns with prior research. During times of war or crisis, political leaders often decivilize<sup>7</sup> enemies through metaphors. This chapter is outlined into three major sections. The first section explicates why a metaphoric analysis serves this thesis best and the steps necessary to conduct it. Second, the analysis is executed and the metaphorical concepts, or clusters of metaphors, are identified, documented, and explained. The chapter then concludes with a summary and discussion of those clusters.

Robert Ivie’s work is a helpful guide to the thesis’ analysis. In one particular piece that was examined in the literature review, Ivie investigated how metaphors influenced pro-war

discourse during the War of 1812 between the United States and Britain.<sup>8</sup> Identifying metaphor as a “master trope,” he analyzed how four in particular played out during the war. These included the use of decivilizing vehicles, affirmation of threatening expectations, the suggestion of rational demonstrations, and the subversion of competing perspectives.<sup>9</sup> As was observed in the prior chapter, Senators frequently employed two metaphorical strains—decivilizing vehicles and affirmation of threatening expectations—in their arguments. Analyzing only these strains, however, would provide an incomplete assessment of the debate.

Other work by Ivie helps to provide a more in-depth examination of S.J.Res. 46. In his research on Cold War rhetoric, Ivie noted that identifying key metaphors is necessary to unearth the motives, or “interpretations of reality,”<sup>10</sup> that speakers forward in their speeches. He writes, “The value of locating underlying metaphors is in revealing their limits or untapped potential as sources of invention, something that is far more difficult to accomplish when a generating term is allowed to operate without being explicitly acknowledged as such.”<sup>11</sup> Metaphor can exaggerate an event, a place, or person. It can connote new meaning to an object or actor in a way that is condensed and easy to understand. Metaphor can communicate complex concepts quickly and clearly. When considering the use of metaphor in policy deliberations, George Lakoff and Mark Johnson argue that it is entrenched within American political language. For example, they examined the metaphor “argument is war.”<sup>12</sup> That is, American western culture tends to argue using terms of warfare. “Your claims are *indefensible*. He *attacked every weak point* in my argument. I *demolished* his argument”; these examples by Lakoff and Johnson help demonstrate how an analysis on American foreign policy rhetoric benefits from acknowledging the metaphor’s power. “Many of the things we *do* in arguing are partially structured by the concept of war. It is one that we live by in this culture; it structures the actions we perform in arguing.”<sup>13</sup>

On the process of metaphoric criticism, Ivie writes that a critic should group metaphors into clusters and analyzes each cluster individually.<sup>14</sup> This “clustering” approach produces metaphorical concepts that help unearth relevant patterns present in a text or series of texts. These patterns can then direct the critic to a speaker’s “master metaphors, which more often than not are the essential terms of the speaker’s ‘terministic screen.’”<sup>15</sup> The terministic screen is a concept coined by Kenneth Burke to describe how language systems affect a person’s perception of their reality.<sup>16</sup> In his original essay on this concept, Burke asks readers to consider various photos of the same object. These photos had unique looks to them because of the different lenses used in the camera. Burke uses the camera lenses as a metaphor to explain how terministic screens operate. Perception changes depending on the lenses we use to observe them. Language shapes the way a certain object is perceived. So while Saddam Hussein was the sovereign leader of the Republic of Iraq, he was perceived as a savage dictator by every Senator that referenced him. These linguistic lenses affect and determine the way actors perceive and interpret the world and the objects within that world. A terministic screen thereby relies on the various terms used. Clustering as a method is helpful in grouping these terms that can then be useful for analysis. As a methodological process that can provide significant insight into the Senate’s debate, this thesis employs metaphoric criticism.

This process requires five steps, three of which unfold in this chapter. The first two steps refer to what has already taken place in the two prior chapters; situating oneself within the context of the artifact(s) being studied and selecting representative texts to engage in close readings of. For example, in his review of Cold War rhetoric, Ivie explained that he found “terministic networks” of metaphors by “examining sets of messages in various contexts.”<sup>17</sup> These included the speeches and remarks of political leaders relevant to the scope of his project.

In what is comparative to the descriptive inventory developed in chapter two, the thirty texts selected from the Senate's debate represents the second step. The critic then reads these texts and "encounters the terms that are most obviously figurative. As these clusters of vehicles become more refined, the critic begins to examine their interaction throughout the text to determine how they function as a system of conceptual metaphors."<sup>18</sup>

The third step, where Ivie cites Kathleen Hall Jamieson,<sup>19</sup> is to cluster the metaphorical concepts featured in the discourse of interest. That is, outline a system of terms, or clusters, that represent the recurring themes observed. Ivie explains that one should divide the metaphors based on their meanings, or "similar 'entailments,'" into subgroups.<sup>20</sup> These subgroups are, arguably, the speaker's metaphorical concepts, or clusters. This leads to the fourth and fifth steps, where the critic compiles separate files of these subgroups to then evaluate them individually. Ivie writes, "Attention is focused on prevailing patterns. With this fifth step completed, the critic is in a position to assess both the limits and untapped potential of the metaphorical system guiding the speakers' arguments."<sup>21</sup> The finished version of each metaphorical concept cluster includes the "various incarnations" of that metaphorical concept.<sup>22</sup> The critic can then analyze the texts through these clusters and trace the unique terministic screen that they produce. In Ivie's case, he selected five speeches by Henry A. Wallace's third-party presidential campaign run in 1948.<sup>23</sup> As he read through each speech, he documented recurring patterns and the terms used to convey each theme. The GAME cluster, for instance, was identified by Ivie as "comprising terms such as 'game,' 'race,' 'cards,' etc."<sup>24</sup> Similarly, I took the themes identified in chapter two's inventory and asked, what are the markers of these themes? This led to discovering the terms that are explicated below, of which are categorized into the following clusters: FORCE, TIME, and STATUS. Various terms unique to each grouping emerged as the

speeches were studied. I identified these terms, documented their position within each speech, and began categorizing them into separate files. These three clusters acted as reservoirs that the Senators frequently drew from to justify the invasion, extend or delay debate time, and/or reference how American global leadership status would be affected by either supporting or rejecting S.J.Res. 46.

### **FORCE Cluster**

The FORCE cluster serves as the dominant cluster in the Senate's debate, as observed by the number of Senators who drew from it. This grouping comprises terms such as "bullied" or "bully," "kicked," "forced," "cornered," and "aggression" to help define the acts performed by the adversary Saddam Hussein. Metaphors of FORCE imply a fight for control. The enemy is trying to exert pressure or control over the United States or its allies, and America must respond so as to maintain its own independence and standing. For example, Ivie's study of the War of 1812 revealed that pro-war Republicans compared Great Britain's behavior as tantamount to "re-colonizing America."<sup>25</sup> Ivie noted that it was not only the word choices themselves that helped define the FORCE metaphors, but also the tone that they emitted. For instance, he explained that these Republicans made America appear as if it had "been 'bullied,' 'kicked,' 'trampled,' 'trodden,' and 'pounded' by Great Britain."<sup>26</sup> This projection contributed to an "overall vision of malevolence" that in turn "put the worst possible construction on British policies and motives without mentioning settlements, the shifting course of negotiation, and possible alternative interpretations of British intentions."<sup>27</sup> In her work on President George W. Bush's War on Terror, Carol Winkler compared Bush's rhetoric against Iraq to President Ronald Reagan's rhetoric on invading Grenada.<sup>28</sup> Winkler quoted Bush as stating, "They stand against us because we stand in their way."<sup>29</sup> The enemy's forcefulness required the United States to respond with

equal or greater ferocity. Winkler contended that the U.S. was not the first aggressor, thereby presenting the U.S. not as the initiator of military force, but as the victim trying to defend itself. Bush made it clear the U.S. would employ military efforts as necessary to protect itself. "This country will define our times, not be defined by them,"<sup>30</sup> as Winkler cited Bush as stating. FORCE is characterized by its linguistic choices of power and physical abuse. It is these choices that help outline the FORCE cluster.

Republican and Democratic Senators alike recalled Hussein's forceful and abusive past, most notably his government's invasion of Kuwait. Senators Levin (D-MI), John Warner (R-VA), Ron Wyden (D-OR), Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Bill Nelson (D-FL), John McCain (R-AZ), Robert Byrd (D-WV), Tom Daschle (D-SD), and Trent Lott (R-MS) all mentioned the 1991 Persian Gulf War as an example of Hussein's violent history. Senator Warner argued that, "Almost 12 years later, we are still waiting for Iraq to comply with international mandates. Hussein and his regime need a very strict set of resolutions in order to prevent any comparable use of aggression by his forces beyond his borders."<sup>31</sup> Senator Daschle contended, "And we know Saddam Hussein is committed to one day possessing nuclear weapons. If that should happen, instead of simply bullying the gulf region, as he did in the past, he could dominate it."<sup>32</sup> Senator Warner, upon referencing the Persian Gulf War as indicative of Hussein's abusive past, also depicted Hussein as a "brute" and "evil dictator."<sup>33</sup> He stated that, "Saddam Hussein brutally invaded Kuwait in August of 1990. In the ensuing Persian Gulf war, he was decisively defeated on the battlefield by the coalition of forces in that heroic battle of roughly 100 hours."<sup>34</sup> Senator Wyden compared the Iraqi government to a cartel and that his regime "threatens our nation's economy and security."<sup>35</sup> Similarly, Daschle ended his speech by stating, "There is no question that Saddam Hussein is a dangerous man who has done barbaric things."<sup>36</sup>

Once it was established that Hussein's actions were reprehensible, the connection between his behavior and his character was easier to argue. Indeed, every Senator that mentioned Hussein referred to specific actions he committed first, followed by a broader assessment of his character. Comparing the Iraqi leader to a beast, a predator, and a menace, several Senators did not mince words on Hussein's evil nature during the debate. This depiction was further supported by the observation that not a single speaker studied in this project referred to him positively. Rather, every sentence or paragraph that mentioned Hussein associated his character or behavior with one of the following qualifiers: "threat," "negative," "evil," "wicked," "malicious," "villainous," "murderer," or "corrupt." Presenting Hussein in this manner made him appear guilty. The language used to describe his behavior helped literalize the metaphor of force so as to outline a military invasion against a country that had not directly attacked us appear more palatable. Assailing Hussein's character also raised suggestions of his diabolical motives. For instance, Senator Domenici (R-NM), after comparing Hussein to a multi-headed beast, asked the chamber, "Do we really know what he could do to America? Are we really sure?"<sup>37</sup> Connecting Hussein's goals to his coercive behavior helped present a conclusion that his actions and his intentions were identical. With Hussein's past abuses confirmed and his alleged conspiracy with Al-Qaeda being lent credence by then-Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld's assurance that the CIA possessed bulletproof evidence on this matter,<sup>38</sup> or Collin Powell's speech to the United Nations arguing that Hussein had Weapons of Mass Destruction,<sup>39</sup> pro-resolution Senators were able to condition the debate in their favor.

Within this cluster, it is also important to note that two types of forces became apparent as the debate progressed: negative force and positive force. Negative force is defined by its damaging depictions of antagonists. Ivie describes it as "that which violated rules and laws and

consequently was destructive.”<sup>40</sup> It implies negative consequences if said force was not neutralized or contained. Consider Ned O’Gorman’s study on how the Dwight Eisenhower administration began shifting U.S. foreign policy rhetoric away from a defensive strategy of “containing” communism to a more offensive strategy of “liberation.”<sup>41</sup> O’Gorman argues that it is difficult to contain communism because it is an ideological spirit, one that he observes as having being framed as a negative force. The insidious nature of communism demanded a policy that freed the people of its manipulation.<sup>42</sup> Negative force can be viewed similarly, where Senators would link the insidious nature of terrorism to Hussein’s actions through their word choices. Conversely, positive force not only imbues righteous qualities to an actor or agent, but also suggests that the actor or agent would use those qualities to eradicate any negative forces.<sup>43</sup> The United States was frequently positioned as that positive force.

Every Senator charged Hussein as a negative entity that threatened global security. When describing Hussein or his government as a threat, twenty Senators employed the specific term “force.”<sup>44</sup> Senator Nelson, for instance, narrated a story when he described Hussein’s threat as a “force not to be reckoned with.”<sup>45</sup> He expressed his concern when he stated, “I fear we have not yet heard enough about what Iraq will look like when the smoke clears.”<sup>46</sup> Senator Hatch added that, “From this perspective, I believe that the frightening force of Saddam’s chemical and biological weapons pose a threat to the region, and to the stability of the Gulf, and therefore to our vital national interests.”<sup>47</sup> Not only were Hussein’s character and actions condensed into simple, villainous terms, but he was further compressed into an almost abstract-like force. Senator Bunning described that President George W. Bush should have “every tool at his disposal to prevail in this struggle with evil.”<sup>48</sup> The Senate’s debate literalized Hussein from

being an elected President of a country that had yet to attack the United States into a malevolent force that could not be dismissed.

Conversely, the United States was frequently framed as a positive force. Every Senator, whether they supported the resolution or not, spoke of the United States in this fashion. Twelve Senators—Byrd, Carl Levin (D-MI), Jeff Sessions (R-AL), George Voinovich (R-OH), Warner, Max Cleland (D-GA), Hatch, Jon Kyl (R-AZ), Nelson, Evan Bayh (D-IN), Joe Lieberman (D-CT), and McCain—defined the United States as being a virtuous agent capable of neutralizing Hussein. Senator Sessions argued that, “And while as leaders of the people of the United States we must focus primarily on the just national security interests of our country, we, as enlightened, moral and decent people, ought to ask ourselves, whether our actions will ultimately benefit the world and even our adversary. When the status quo presents more dangers than the war the most just, the most logical, the most moral thing is to fight.”<sup>49</sup> Presenting the United States as righteous helped project a dichotomy that resembled the Cold War era. Similar to how it was the United States and democracy against the U.S.S.R and communism, it was now the United States and freedom against Iraq and terrorism. The invasion was also often regarded as a struggle, implying that America was, as Senator Byrd claimed, “fighting the good fight.”<sup>50</sup> This reinforced America’s image as a positive power as we struggled to “win this good war against terrorism,” as Senator Wyden contended.<sup>51</sup>

The “FORCE” cluster provided a damning assessment of Hussein. Saddam was not only brutal as evinced in his actions but was also innately evil. His appetite for terrifying weapons was insatiable and his hostility could neither be contained nor appeased. The image was virtually self-confirming. Citing Hussein’s past helped Senators narrate, and subsequently literalize, his future motives. Having established the premise that a brutal dictator drove Iraq, pro-resolution

Senators were then able to craft a persuasive logic in their favor: Hussein was evil, America good, and the invasion just.

### **TIME Cluster**

The TIME cluster included terms that addressed two different concerns: the length of the debate and the prospective length of the invasion. Before dissecting each concern, it is important to explain what the TIME cluster entails. During moments of national crisis, Presidents and other political leaders often employ arguments that highlight the urgency of a situation.<sup>52</sup> Following the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 terrorist attacks, the urgency was defined by President Bush as, in part, righting the injustices of terrorists as soon as possible and preventing future attacks from occurring.<sup>53</sup> Similarly, many Senators argued that time was essential. Having established that Hussein was an evil entity, how could we not neutralize that entity as soon as possible? Times of crisis are not times of discussion and debate. While only a brief line from his extensive work on presidential crisis rhetoric is cited, Jim Kuypers found that this type of rhetoric in the post-Cold War era often sidelines deliberation. He stated, "By announcing the crisis, the president asks for his decision to be supported, not for debate upon what should be done."<sup>54</sup> Many pro-resolution Senators pointed out that the five days designated for debate could be emboldening the enemy. Debate was, for these Senators, a hindrance rather than a benefit. On the other hand, anti-resolution Senators would conclude that not enough time was being allotted for an issue of this importance. They would use terms that labeled such urgency as hasty, not prudent, behavior. Time was spoken of as constituting more than just minutes or seconds.

The five days that the Senate debated S.J.Res. 46 were no longer just hours on a clock. Senator Jon Kyl (R-AZ) argued that the debate was a “time bomb” that would encourage Saddam Hussein. Kyl argued:

Consider having this debate a few months or years from now after we've ascertained that he definitely has a nuclear saber to rattle. This will make a move against Saddam, or any other American action in the Middle East, more dangerous, and in all probability, less likely. It is Saddam's dream come true. He will be able to check our actions. Postponing the debate until after the elections is ludicrous. Our decision on this matter is pressing. Our decision on this matter can be a time bomb that can explode in our faces. So, again, the time to act is now.<sup>55</sup>

Time is a metaphor because Kyl no longer treats it as a measurement of change. Rather, he imbues time with tangible qualities. Senator John McCain (R-AZ) stressed that the chamber “should not be wasting and throwing away the taxpayer’s time and money” by prolonging debate beyond October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002. Time also had worth, similar to the metaphor “Time is Money.” Senators supporting the resolution argued that time was short, which implied quantity, and therefore valuable in preserving. Those wearier of the resolution contended that not enough time was being held to debate. Time ultimately became a commodity. These linguistic choices are useful markers in identifying this cluster.

The debate length itself was frequently referred to as either incomplete in discussion or demanding in resolve. For example, every Senator who voted against the resolution in this study—Senators Byrd, Levin, Wyden, Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), and Ted Kennedy (D-MA)—questioned why the resolution was not receiving more debate time. Within this group, Senator

Byrd was the most vocal. In every speech he delivered, Byrd brought up his concern that the Senate was not debating longer the merits of S.J.Res. 46. In one instance he asked, “Why is the President telling Congress it has to act before the elections? Why are our own leaders telling us we have to act before the elections? What are we signing up for?”<sup>56</sup> Byrd likened the resolution to a blank check in an effort to raise awareness of how much power the President would receive and how consideration of that power necessitated greater attention. He asked, “We are about to give the President a blank check to deal with Iraq however he sees fit. What exactly is he planning to do with this power?”<sup>57</sup> Even Senator Hagel, who ultimately voted for the resolution’s passage, stated, “I regret that this vote will take place under the cloud and pressure of elections next month. Some are already using the Iraq issue to gain advantage in political campaigns. It might have been better for our vote to have been delayed until after the election. . . .”<sup>58</sup>

Words like “rushed,” “hasty,” “quick,” and “rash” were used to describe the debate as incomplete. Interestingly, these words were often employed in metaphors that would compare the debate as fluid-like. Senator Daschle, who agreed and even specifically cited Byrd’s trepidations, contended, “We do know from our own national experience, however, that public support for military action can evaporate quickly if the American people come to believe they have not been given all of the facts. This debate should not evaporate as quickly as public support can.”<sup>59</sup> Senator Nelson, concerned that not enough statements have been heard on the resolution, likened his uncertainty on S.J.Res. 46 to smoke. He stated, “As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have heard many hours of testimony from administration officials outlining their case for war. But I fear we have not yet heard enough about what Iraq will look like when the smoke clears. The smoke of uncertainty looming on a war against Iraq may be clouding this chamber’s judgment.”<sup>60</sup> The “thick haze of war,” as Senator Sarbanes warned,

could stifle meaningful debate and, as Byrd had suggested before him, a vote on the resolution should be postponed until after the November 2002 midterm elections.<sup>61</sup> He warned that moving too quickly on a resolution this significant could mean “. . . moving down the path of asserting a unilateral preemptive prerogative, in effect, asserting our right to do what we want anywhere, anytime, to anyone.”<sup>62</sup>

Conversely, fifteen Senators referred to the debate’s length as excessive.<sup>63</sup> These Senators frequently used terms like “fully,” “complete,” “quick,” to define the five days allowed to the resolution’s debate as ample. Additionally, advocates used “disruption,” “obstacle,” “hindrance,” and “impediment” to describe the debate as either obstructing President Bush’s executive power as Commander-in-Chief or threatening national security. Senator Lott, appearing fed up at the surfeit of time spent on debating S.J.Res. 46, stated on the final day of the debate, “I believe this issue has been aired fully. It is not new. We have been worrying about this, talking about this, and debating the seriousness of the threat from Saddam Hussein and his weapons of mass destruction for years--really, for 11 years. So Senators know what the issue is. We have seen, yesterday, Senators from both parties moving toward giving the President the authority to do this job.”<sup>64</sup> Senator McCain explained that “the threat is not new”<sup>65</sup> while Senator Bayh argued that extending debate time would “be a major impediment to the use of military force against an armed and dangerous Iraq.”<sup>66</sup> In an attempt to hasten debate, the threatening nature of Iraq—which was established through the decivilizing metaphors used to dehumanize Hussein and his government—aided pro-resolution Senators to argue for a faster vote on S.J.Res. 46.

Many speakers addressed the prospective length of the invasion as a recurring topic. Senators from both parties frequently spoke of the length as an “unknown,” a “commitment,” a

“dedication,” an “obligation,” a “liability,” or a “perseverance.” Senator Hagel warned that “War is too serious, the human price too high, and the implications unknown.”<sup>67</sup> Ten Senators used the term “commitment” in reference to the invasion.<sup>68</sup> Senator Byrd, for instance, asked, “Are the American people ready to make that kind of long-term regional commitment?”<sup>69</sup> And, on the final day of the debate, he seemed disappointed in the time spent on deliberating S.J.Res. 46. Byrd explained that, “The Senate is a great institution, but somehow I think we are failing. We are failing to educate the people. Why? Because we do not want to spend enough time. How much time have we spent on this resolution as of yesterday at 4 p.m.? A little over 25 hours on this bill--25 hours. Why, many of the larger municipalities in this country would spend a week on an application for a sewer permit. And here we spend 2 days?--that is what it amounts to, 25 hours--and we are ready to quit.”<sup>70</sup>

For a preemptive invasion, the question of commitment is particularly significant. A majority of the Senators either mentioned the length of the debate as sufficient enough, bordering on excessive, or already excessive. Interestingly, several of these Senators either ignored or criticized any attempts at extending debate time. However, they were still concerned with the significant commitment that an invasion would bring. In one jarring example, Senator Lott stated on the final day of the debate, “Having had a full debate, I feel confident about holding a vote. There has been thoughtful discussion on both sides of the issue. Invading Iraq is an unknown feat, and it can bring unknown challenges, but I think we have had a full debate. To try to delay it another day, another week, is not going to be helpful.”<sup>71</sup>

In many ways, pro-resolution Senators often refuted any requests to lengthen or postpone debate time in a melodramatic tone. Senator Kyl recounted that Hussein’s “murderous rampage”<sup>72</sup> against his own citizens warranted a hastened debate. He stated, “There have been

reports of bodies of victims left in the street or returned to families bearing clear marks of torture every month. Imagine the next country to face Hussein's wrath. Imagine Americans facing that unspeakable horror."<sup>73</sup> Several Senators went into significant detail into how victims—both actual victims in Iraq and potential victims back home in the United States—would be affected by a lengthy debate. Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY) cited Hussein's invasion of Kuwait to describe how, "He has had his followers assassinate opponents in Iraq and abroad. During the Gulf War, his regime beat and tortured Americans and used them as 'Human Shields.'" We cannot afford to wait anymore. It is time for us to act. It is time for us to be bold."<sup>74</sup> Senator Warner, when discussing the ongoing war in Afghanistan, urged the Senate to consider "the valiant efforts of our troops today in Afghanistan, where the casualties, fortunately, are in the 100s to 200s so far in their heroic efforts to turn the tide of terrorism. Let us continue that effort in Iraq. It is with a sense of deep emotion I deliver these remarks today in support of this resolution which I was privileged with others to draw."<sup>75</sup>

As was seen above, Senators would often exaggerate the crisis. This exaggeration reflects certain properties of political crisis rhetoric, where several debaters stressed and described the death toll that were affected under Hussein's regime to increase urgency. Herbert Simons, in his discussion of the rhetorical history behind the invasion of Iraq, argued that threat-induced crisis rhetoric can provide politicians with policy support on a variety of issues.<sup>76</sup> The conflict with Hussein's government was not only presented in simplistic terms of positive forces versus negative forces, but was used to support arguments favoring immediate action. A melo-dramatic framing of the Iraq crisis by the Bush administration, as Simons details in his essay, likely aided Senators in continuing that framing into their debate.<sup>77</sup> Amplifying and overstating Hussein's threatening nature implied that time was short. Not only was Hussein a savage, but ten Senators

went further and detailed that savagery.<sup>78</sup> Citing reports on the body counts that rose under Hussein's regime and the blood shed because of his actions animated the TIME cluster. Dramatically emphasizing the gory specifics of Hussein's behavior implied that the chamber should not wait or postpone passing S.J.Res. 46.

Invading Iraq was a peculiar effort since it meant preemptively deploying military forces against a country that had yet to directly assault the United States. Accessible documentary records, interviews and recollections of Bush administration officials, and the growing body of testimony and materials various sources—like the U.S. Joint Forces Command—, support the argument that the United States went to war in Iraq without clear consideration of whether war was a proper recourse.<sup>79</sup> Simons adds that “from the outset, it seemed, consideration of invading Iraq occasioned more debate than usual.”<sup>80</sup> Being a war of choice, S.J.Res. 46 warranted longer consideration. Yet despite a few Senators requesting more debate time, or to postpone debate until after the elections, the resolution passed with only a total of 51 Senators having participated over the course of five days.

### **STATUS Cluster**

The final cluster observed in the debate referred to America's leadership and standing on the world stage, termed here the country's STATUS. The perception of the United States abroad is a significant concern to politicians. This cluster references the idea that American strength and leadership demands perseverance, especially during times of crisis. Referring back to Carol Winkler's piece on Reagan's Grenada campaign and Bush's Iraq rhetoric, she noted that both presidents used language that sought to bolster America's stature on the world stage during the crisis their country faced. She observed that both Grenada and Iraq were positioned as enemies in speeches made by Reagan and Bush. These enemies would be victorious if America relinquished

its standing to other countries by not responding with military might. By doing nothing, "America's posture grows fearful, retreating from the world and forsaking our friends."<sup>81</sup> The STATUS grouping is marked by terms that represent the desire to protect or maintain America's international stature. Both pro-resolution and anti-resolution Senators disclosed that they were interested in defending U.S. perception abroad. Anti-resolution speakers did not want an unsuccessful military invasion to occur because failure would likely damage America's reputation. Conversely, pro-resolution Senators would use the same words from the STATUS cluster to argue that is precisely for reasons like the Iraq crisis that we had intervene in order to uphold our reputation. The cluster included "power," "rank," "leadership," "status," "standing," "stature," "influence," and "reputation." Debaters frequently associated images of U.S. leadership with the positive force of military deployment. As Warner explained, President Bush needed military force to demonstrate "extraordinary American leadership."<sup>82</sup> Sarbanes added that equipping Bush with this force could help to "re-affirm our long standing principle of leadership by aiding our allies and neutralizing our enemies."<sup>83</sup> Invading Iraq transformed into an opportunity to sustain strong U.S. standing abroad.

Discussions of morality and national duty buttressed the arguments made by several pro-resolution Senators. For example, Senator Kyl referenced America's involvement in past wars to justify its involvement in Iraq. He stated that it "is no accident that the oppressed peoples of the world look at us, rather than other countries or the U.N., as their ray of hope. It is no accident that it devolved to us to end German imperialism in World War I, stop Adolf Hitler in World War II, and defeat the forces of international communism in the Cold War. That is why we lead, and why we must lead."<sup>84</sup> "Leadership" was the most commonly cited term under this cluster, where its usage equated exclusively to *American* leadership. Senator Bayh contended that, "It is

only with American leadership and taking a strong hand in this instance that we will receive the kind of united allied support we seek.”<sup>85</sup> And Senator Craig claimed that equipping the President with Congressional authorization would fulfill America’s responsibility as a global leader. He stated, “It is called the responsibility of leadership. It is recognized as the role we play in the world today.”<sup>86</sup> In total, seventeen speeches employed the phrase “U.S. leadership” or “American leadership.”<sup>87</sup>

The STATUS cluster associated U.S. stature with external leadership abroad and internal image perception among the Senators. That is, upholding a positive image of global leadership was not only acquired by invading Iraq and, by implication, the success of S.J.Res. 46, but to go against that resolution would also bet against that image. Consider Senator Cleland’s statements, “I want to single out the leadership of my President in calling the country’s and the Senate’s attention to the dangers of an armed Iraq. And this objective, the disarming of Saddam Hussein, is the objective which this Senate, this Congress is prepared to overwhelmingly endorse as we close ranks behind the President.”<sup>88</sup> Refusing to support S.J.Res. 46 soon became tantamount to undermining American leadership. How could one refuse to support our President? How could the Senate deny what Senator Hagel exclaimed was a “constitutional responsibility and an institutional obligation”<sup>89</sup> to disarm Hussein? Neutralizing the threat Iraq posed was intimately tied to U.S. leadership. “The perception of American power is power,” as Hagel continued in his speech, “and how our power is perceived can either magnify or diminish our influence in the world.”<sup>90</sup>

Status was also frequently associated with U.S. service women and men. Historically, American foreign policy rhetoric has seen the exploitation of U.S. soldiers in an effort to rally public support behind a war.<sup>91</sup> Military might has been a powerful marker of American

nationalism in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, where supporting the troops has become synonymous with supporting the country. Although this has not always been the case—consider the backlash that American soldiers whom fought in the Vietnam War faced upon their return—the recent Iraq crisis saw a revival of troop lionization in that their service was to be unquestioned and their sacrifices memorialized. Depicting Hussein as a savage not only positioned U.S. leadership as a positive force, but by extension its military as well. Senator Hatch stated, “I believe that every member of this body will fully support our President, his leadership on this matter, and our Armed Forces.”<sup>92</sup> Senator Daschle argued that not involving ourselves in Iraq would “. . . have profound consequence for our Nation, for our allies, for the war on terror, and perhaps most importantly, for the men and women in our Armed Forces who’s legitimacy would be questioned.”<sup>93</sup> Senator Cleland stated, “I will be supporting the resolution backed by the President and opposing the alternatives because I believe it is imperative that we now speak with one voice to Saddam Hussein, to the entire international community and, most importantly, to our servicemen and women.”<sup>94</sup> Cleland seemingly implied that speaking against the resolution, as a few Senators chose to do, would have a deleterious effect to our troops. Supporting the resolution meant upholding our status as a world leader and, consequently, the troops that aided those efforts.

With a total of twenty speeches employing the term “troops,” this choice reveals the debate’s more emotional character. A variety of alternatives existed, of course, and a few Senators indeed used “Armed Forces” or “Soldiers,” when referring to the military. However, no other descriptor came close to the frequency that the word “troops” experienced. “Troops” produces a unique effect in that it softens the relationship between public citizens and military service members. Rather than demarcating the clear difference between a public citizen and a

military official, a distinction that is reflected in the Founding Fathers decision to delegate the tasks of Commander of the Armed Forces to a public civilian, the term “troops” helps bridge that gap. Placing the military within the metonym of “troops” disrupts the hierarchical structure that has traditionally defined the military. This effort was aided as several Senators often used the phrase “our men and women” immediately or soon after using the specific term “troops.” Projecting the military not as a militia capable of death and destruction but as a humanized assembly of “men and women” distances the soldier from its horrific duties. In this capacity, it is easier to support the troops and the particular mission they are on.

The term “troops” carries significant implications for the Senate’s deliberation. In his study of the genealogy behind the ideograph <Support Our Troops>, rhetorical critic Roger Stahl argues that this phrase “anchors the soldier at the center of war discourse, calling civic attention away from the point of policy’s deliberation and toward its point of execution.”<sup>95</sup> If America’s status is tied to its military and its troops, the Iraq invasion was an opportunity to reinforce that status abroad. Further, many Senators constructed their speech in a way that assumed the invasion was a sealed deal. Senator Byrd, angry that the chamber had seemingly already made up its mind, exclaimed, “It seems the course of destiny has already been set by this Senate.”<sup>96</sup> While various factors likely affected his statement, focusing on the military drew attention away the complexities of S.J.Res. 46. By continuously referencing the troops, the invasion had ostensibly begun and to back out would mean surrendering. Senator Nickles, drawing parallels between the 1998 Persian Gulf resolution and the 2002 Iraq resolution, argued that “our troops, our dear men and women” deserve a unified voice “going into Iraq.”<sup>97</sup> He concluded his speech by stating “Congress spoke in a united fashion in 1998. It was proud to be part of that then, and I am proud

to be part of the sponsorship of this resolution, which I believe will also pass with a very strong voice. . . .”<sup>98</sup>

STATUS is a cluster that is closely tied to American exceptionalism, a concept that, as Philip Wander noted, has influenced many foreign policy decisions in our history.<sup>99</sup> Though the meaning behind American exceptionalism has changed over time, the bedrock belief that America is exceptional still rings true today. It has helped forge defining moments in American history, moments that several Senators often cited in their speech. Referring to America’s greatness during the Civil War or both World Wars aided arguments in favor of S.J.Res. 46 because Iraq was frequently positioned as another Nazi Germany or Soviet Union. This cluster contributed in positively spinning the invasion not in terms of cost or human sacrifice, but in terms of stature and leadership.

## **Conclusion**

Against the backdrop of the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 terrorist attacks, Senators were mobilized to not only approve President Bush with military force against Afghanistan in 2001, but were asked again to approve his request in disarming a dangerous Iraq. In order for the President to call upon Congress to imbue him with authorization, he and his administration began a concerted rhetorical campaign shortly after the terrorist attacks to garner public support for his War on Terror. This campaign, marked by speeches from top cabinet members like Secretary of State Colin Powell and Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld, expressed key terms that were later recycled in the Senate’s debate. In this capacity, pro-resolution Senators ostensibly became a surrogate for Bush on the chamber floor. Presidential rhetoric is influential, and presidential speeches have gained significant power under the rhetorical presidency.<sup>100</sup> It can potentially shape congressional discourse in favor of a certain policy action or legislation.

Consider Roderick Hart's research, which scanned more than 10,000 presidential speeches between the Harry Truman's administration and the second term of Ronald Reagan's administration. Hart argues that presidential rhetoric is powerful enough that it "may overpower Congress."<sup>101</sup> The rhetorical campaigns that presidents engage in to sway public opinion can likely impact and influence Congressional deliberation. An analysis of S.J.Res. 46 must consider this relationship between presidential rhetoric and congressional rhetoric.

In the Senate's debate, metaphor emerged as a useful tool to narrate the Iraq crisis. The three clusters, FORCE, TIME, and STATUS, worked in tandem to reinforce or extend much of what Bush had already said in his speeches leading up to the debate. However, they also worked against the passage of the resolution as seen by the speeches of the four Senators studied that voted NAY on S.J.Res. 46. These clusters reveal Senators constructed their arguments and the way certain entities, like Saddam Hussein, or certain values, like U.S. leadership, were used to buttress their support or rejection of S.J. Res. 46.

Interestingly, for pro-resolution Senators, the clusters typically operated in a particular direction: FORCE → TIME → STATUS. For example, images of a threatening savage, categorized under the FORCE cluster, often led to the argument that extensively debating S.J.Res. 46 would only hinder the President in neutralizing that threat. All but four Senators incorporated the TIME cluster, where they stressed that the exigency surrounding the Iraq crisis demanded quick action. Several Senators ended their speech by drawing from the STATUS cluster by arguing that if the U.S. did not act swiftly, the nation's stature abroad would be negatively affected. To demonstrate this process, consider Senator Kyl's speech. He began his speech by describing Hussein's government as "so savage as to flaunt its crimes obviously wants to strike terror in the hearts of its citizens."<sup>102</sup> Hussein himself was labeled as a "vicious dictator"

and Kyl qualified his threat level as “immediate.”<sup>103</sup> Followed by this description, he stated, “A great effort was made to make sure Senators had a chance to speak. Some people say, why now? Well, because the threat is not going to lessen.”<sup>104</sup> He then transitioned into a discussion that stressed the urgency of disarming a leader that was killing his own citizens “weekly.”<sup>105</sup> Kyl’s conclusion cited America’s role in past crises to further justify the resolution. He argued, “It is no accident that the oppressed peoples of the world look at us, rather than other countries or the U.N., as their ray of hope. That is why we lead, and why we must lead.”<sup>106</sup>

The order of these clusters was also evident in the speeches given by anti-resolution Senators. Senator Byrd, for example, started his speech by broadly agreeing with how Hussein was being depicted. “There is no disagreement about the character of Saddam Hussein,” Byrd stated, “neither on Capitol Hill nor in the minds of every American. The repressive dictator’s long history of violence and aggression is clear.”<sup>107</sup> This FORCE cluster was then followed with arguments that contained terms from the TIME cluster. Byrd asked, “Shouldn’t the President be spending more time with his military advisors in Washington, instead of making campaign speeches all over the country? Shouldn’t we be spending more time debating this resolution?”<sup>108</sup> In one particular moment of frustration, Byrd asked, “I have a lot of questions. The American people have a lot of questions. We are going to be stampeded and rushed pellmell into a showdown right here in the Senate and in the House, and in the next few days. Why all the hurry?”<sup>109</sup> After going through a list of questions, Byrd began discussing American leadership and concluded by claiming, “A hasty invasion can damage our reputation abroad.”<sup>110</sup>

This study supports current understanding of how metaphors aid in justifying war. Their ability to literalize images is powerful, so much so that they produce what Ivie labels as “subjective illusions.”<sup>111</sup> Ivie writes that, “Americans traditionally have exonerated themselves

of any guilt for war, hot or cold, by decivilizing the image of their adversaries.”<sup>112</sup> The FORCE cluster, therefore, serves as an essential cluster that, without it, likely would not have given strength to the TIME and STATUS clusters that proceeded. It also likely helped that the Senate had defined Hussein in the recent past. Historically, references to Hussein’s barbarous nature can be traced back to the 1990s, where Congress made similar accusations of the Iraqi leader. This image continued again after the 2001 terrorist attacks as Bush sought Congressional approval to invade Iraq, and was reinforced by the Senate in 2002. This FORCE cluster was then lent further authority when Senators urged that the President receive speedy congressional approval on S.J.Res. 46 to neutralize said adversary, thereby undermining any debate time extensions.

The tendency for the metaphoric clusters to appear in a certain order is argumentatively significant. Of the texts studied, the structure of the speeches largely followed a particular pattern regardless of the speaker’s final vote on the resolution. These clusters were further verified as Senators often recycled erroneous information that the Bush administration was reporting; from Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld’s “bulletproof evidence” remarks that the CIA knew Hussein was conspiring with Al-Qaeda to Secretary of State Colin Powell’s speech advocating for the invasion before the United Nations General Assembly. STATUS terms helped disguise pro-resolution arguments under a veneer of American greatness and preserving humanitarian duties abroad.

While each cluster’s persuasive power can be difficult to assess—studies have demonstrated that Congressional debate may not persuade Congressmen and women as much as external factors like party loyalty or public opinion polls<sup>113</sup>—they likely helped pro-resolution Senators in making their case for war. The use of decivilizing vehicles cemented a foundation upon which the Senators could then construct quasi-logical arguments supported by a varied set

of terms. Once Hussein's image had been literalized in the debate, arguing urgency was easy. To debate longer would mean a barbarous threat would remain unchecked. That threat, as many Senators then argued, would significantly affect America's status to other countries depending on our response.

The Senate's deliberation on S.J.Res. 46, designed to carefully consider the President's request to deploy military troops to invade Iraq, left Americans well-disposed to view Saddam Hussein as capable of perpetuating, or at least endorsing, egregious acts of abuse and terror. The administration's rhetorical efforts to link his regime to the horrific attacks carried out by Al-Qaeda on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 was made easier as Democratic and Republican Senators continued the siren calls made by Bush into their debate. Together, the FORCE, TIME, and STATUS clusters produced a narrative that shined a favorable light on the resolution and sidelined dissenting voices like Senator Byrd and a handful of other vocal Democratic Senators. These clusters host a constellation of terms that Senators employed in their arguments; terms that supported claims that America should go to war to defeat a barbaric enemy and engage in that war immediately, and all the while continuing the country's status as a beacon of hope and good.

---

Endnotes

- <sup>1</sup> William Franke, "Metaphor and the Making of Sense: The Contemporary Metaphor Renaissance," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33 (2000): 137.
- <sup>2</sup> Stephen J. Read, Ian L. Cesa, David K. Jones, & Nancy L. Collins, "When is the Federal Budget Like a Baby? Metaphor in Political Rhetoric," *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 5 (1990): 129-130.
- <sup>3</sup> Robert Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240.
- <sup>4</sup> Philip Wander, "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 355.
- <sup>5</sup> Benjamin Bates, "Audiences, Metaphors, and the Persian Gulf War," *Communication Studies* 55 (2004): 447.
- <sup>6</sup> Bates, "Audiences, Metaphors, and the Persian Gulf War": 451.
- <sup>7</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 240. Credit goes to Ivie for the term "decivilizing."
- <sup>8</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 240.
- <sup>9</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 242.
- <sup>10</sup> Robert Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists'" in *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst, Robie Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert Scott (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1997), 105.
- <sup>11</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War 'Idealists,'" 107.
- <sup>12</sup> George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1980), 124.

- 
- <sup>13</sup> Lakoff and Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*, 125.
- <sup>14</sup> Robert Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War 'Idealists,'" *Communication Monographs* 54 (1987): 165.
- <sup>15</sup> Robert Ivie, "The Ideology of Freedom's 'Fragility' in American Foreign Policy Argument," *Journal of the American Forensic Association* 24 (1987): 29.
- <sup>16</sup> Kenneth Burke, *Language as Symbolic Action: Essays on Life, Literature, and Method* (Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press, 1968), 44-45.
- <sup>17</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War 'Idealists,'" 166.
- <sup>18</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War 'Idealists,'" 168.
- <sup>19</sup> Kathleen Hall Jamieson, "The Metaphoric Cluster in the Rhetoric of Pope Paul VI and Edmund G. Brown, Jr.," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 51-72.
- <sup>20</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War 'Idealists,'" 167.
- <sup>21</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" 107.
- <sup>22</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" 106.
- <sup>23</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" 107.
- <sup>24</sup> Ivie, "Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War 'Idealists,'" 107.
- <sup>25</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 242.
- <sup>26</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 241.
- <sup>27</sup> Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse": 241-242.
- <sup>28</sup> Carol Winkler, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric: Reagan on Libya; Bush 43 on Iraq," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 304-306.
- <sup>29</sup> Winkler, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric": 306.
- <sup>30</sup> Winkler, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric": 306.

---

<sup>31</sup> Senator John Warner, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19128.

<sup>32</sup> Senator Tom Daschle, “Diplomatic Failure,” March 18, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 3373.

<sup>33</sup> Warner, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19128.

<sup>34</sup> Warner, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19128.

<sup>35</sup> Senator Ron Wyden, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19117.

<sup>36</sup> Senator Tom Daschle, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec. p. 20385.

<sup>37</sup> Senator Pete Domenici, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19217.

<sup>38</sup> Eric Schmitt, “Rumsfeld Says U.S. Has ‘Bulletproof’ Evidence of Iraq’s Links to Al-Qaeda,” *New York Times*, September 28, 2002. Accessed January 16, 2016. This text is ten paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found on paragraph five.

<sup>39</sup> Schmitt, “Rumsfeld Says U.S. Has ‘Bulletproof’ Evidence of Iraq’s Links to Al-Qaeda”: para five.

<sup>40</sup> Ivie, “Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War ‘Idealists’”: 108.

<sup>41</sup> Ned O’Gorman, “‘The One Word the Kremlin Fears’: C.D. Jackson, Cold War ‘Liberation,’ and American Political-Economic Adventurism,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12 (2009): 389.

<sup>42</sup> O’Gorman, “The One Word the Kremlin Fears”: 392.

<sup>43</sup> Ivie, “Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of the Cold War ‘Idealists’”: 108-109.

<sup>44</sup> The twenty Senators who employed the specific term “force” included Senators Robert Byrd (D-WV), Jim Bunning (R-KY), Carl Levin (D-MI), George Voinovich (R-OH), John Warner (R-VA), Max Cleland (D-GA), Pete Domenici (R-NM), Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Jon Kyl (R-AZ), Bill Nelson (D-FL), Evan Bayh (D-IN), Larry Craig (R-ID), Joe Lieberman (D-CT), John McCain (R-AZ), Chuck Hagel (R-NE), Harry Reid (D-NV), Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), Tom Daschle (D-SD), Don Nickles (R-OK), and Jeff Sessions (R-AL).

- 
- <sup>45</sup> Senator Bill Nelson, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19227.
- <sup>46</sup> Nelson, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19227.
- <sup>47</sup> Senator Orrin Hatch, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19225.
- <sup>48</sup> Senator Jim Bunning, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19112.
- <sup>49</sup> Senator Jeff Sessions, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20455.
- <sup>50</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20425.
- <sup>51</sup> Wyden, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19117.
- <sup>52</sup> Herbert W. Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq: A Rhetorical History,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 183.
- <sup>53</sup> Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq”: 183-184.
- <sup>54</sup> Jim Kuypers, *Presidential Crisis Rhetoric and the Press in the Post-Cold War World* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997), 17.
- <sup>55</sup> Senator Jon Kyl, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19216.
- <sup>56</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19205.
- <sup>57</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19205.
- <sup>58</sup> Senator Chuck Hagel, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19704.
- <sup>59</sup> Daschle, S.J.Res. 46, p. 20385-20386.
- <sup>60</sup> Senator Bill Nelson, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19227.
- <sup>61</sup> Senator Paul Sarbanes, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19728.
- <sup>62</sup> Sarbanes, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19728.
- <sup>63</sup> The fifteen Senators that referred to the debate as excessive included Senators John Warner (R-VA), Pete Domenici (R-NM), George Voinovich (R-OH), Jon Kyl (R-AZ), Orrin Hatch (R-UT), John McCain (R-AZ), Larry Craig (R-ID), Jesse Helms (R-NC), Trent Lott (R-MS), Don

---

Nickles (R-OK), Jeff Sessions (R-AL), Jim Bunning (R-KY), Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), Bill Nelson (D-FL), and Evan Bayh (D-IN).

<sup>64</sup> Senator Trent Lott, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20383.

<sup>65</sup> Senator John McCain, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 10170.

<sup>66</sup> Senator Evan Bayh, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., 19436.

<sup>67</sup> Senator Chuck Hagel, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19704.

<sup>68</sup> The ten Senators who used the term “commitment” included Senators Jim Bunning (R-KY), John Warner (R-VA), Robert Byrd (D-WV), Max Cleland (D-GA), Jon Kyl (R-AZ), Bill Nelson (D-FL), Chuck Hagel (R-NE), Jesse Helms (R-NC), Trent Lott (R-MS), and Tom Daschle (D-SD)

<sup>69</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19206.

<sup>70</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20425.

<sup>71</sup> Lott, S.J.Res. 46, p. 20383.

<sup>72</sup> Senator Jon Kyl, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19216.

<sup>73</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19218.

<sup>74</sup> Senator Jim Bunning, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19112.

<sup>75</sup> Senator John Warner, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19125.

<sup>76</sup> Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq: A Rhetorical History:” 183.

<sup>77</sup> Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq”: 183-184.

<sup>78</sup> Ten Senators gave specific detail on Saddam Hussein’s human rights violations. These details are defined as having provided testimony from victims or their surviving families, statistics, and other supporting materials. These Senators included Senators John Warner (R-VA), George Voinovich (R-OH), Jim Bunning (R-KY), Pete Domenici (R-NM), Orrin Hatch (R-UT), Max

---

Cleland (D-GA), Bill Nelson (D-FL), John McCain (R-AZ), Trent Lott (R-MS), and Jeff Sessions (R-AL).

<sup>79</sup> Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq”: 184.

<sup>80</sup> Simons, “From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq”: 184.

<sup>81</sup> Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric”: 306.

<sup>82</sup> Warner, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19128.

<sup>83</sup> Senator Paul Sarbanes, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19728.

<sup>84</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19218.

<sup>85</sup> Senator Evan Bayh, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19436.

<sup>86</sup> Senator Larry Craig, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19438.

<sup>87</sup> The Senators who employed the phrase “U.S. leadership” or “American leadership” included Senators Tom Daschle (D-SD), John Warner (R-VA), Robert Byrd (D-WV), Chuck Hagel (R-NE), Jesse Helms (R-NC), Paul Sarbanes (D-MD), Harry Reid (D-NV), John McCain (R-AZ), Evan Bayh (D-IN), and Carl Levin (D-MI).

<sup>88</sup> Senator Max Cleland, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19208.

<sup>89</sup> Hagel, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19704.

<sup>90</sup> Hagel, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19704-19705.

<sup>91</sup> Philip Wander, “The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy”: 355.

<sup>92</sup> Senator Orrin Hatch, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19225.

<sup>93</sup> Daschle, S.J.Res. 46, p. 20384.

<sup>94</sup> Cleland, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19208.

<sup>95</sup> Roger Stahl, “Why We ‘Support the Troops’: Rhetorical Evolutions,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12 (2009): 549.

- 
- <sup>96</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20425.
- <sup>97</sup> Senator Don Nickles, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20389.
- <sup>98</sup> Nickles, S.J.Res. 46, p. 20389.
- <sup>99</sup> Philip Wander, “The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy”: 360.
- <sup>100</sup> James W. Ceaser, Glen E. Thurow, Jeffrey Tulis, and Joseph M. Bessette, “The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency,” *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11 (1981): 160.
- <sup>101</sup> Roderick Hart, *The Sound of Leadership: Presidential Communication in the Modern Age* (Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 1989), 203.
- <sup>102</sup> Senator Jon Kyl, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19217.
- <sup>103</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19218.
- <sup>104</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19218.
- <sup>105</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19218.
- <sup>106</sup> Kyl, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19218.
- <sup>107</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19205.
- <sup>108</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19205.
- <sup>109</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19205.
- <sup>110</sup> Byrd, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19205.
- <sup>111</sup> Ivie, “The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse”: 253.
- <sup>112</sup> Ivie, “Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War ‘Idealists’”: 119.
- <sup>113</sup> James Snyder and Tim Groseclose, “Estimating Party Influence in Congressional Roll-call Voting,” *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2000): 194-195.

## Chapter Four: Conclusion

The Senate delivered a landmark decision when, following the House of Representatives passage of their respective military force resolution, the body decided to equip President George W. Bush with the authority to invade Iraq. Their five-day long debate responded to one of the most destructive attacks on domestic soil in recent American history. This debate is rich with metaphor concerning the status of America, the depiction of an enemy, and the expediency of the response. This project, then, explored the rhetorical dimensions of how the Senate considered S.J.Res. 46. The speeches from the debate supplied the primary source of textual data for study. From this selection, an inductive process took place to identify, document, and analyze salient features of those texts. Due to the frequent number of comparisons made in the Senators' speeches, especially toward Saddam Hussein, a metaphoric analysis commended itself. The analysis grouped the patterns of metaphor into three clusters: FORCE, TIME, and STATUS. These clusters yielded a greater understanding of the debate by illuminating the construction of the Senators' arguments, both regarding the supporting material they used and the order in which that support was structured within their remarks. That order progressed from FORCE to TIME to STATUS. This chapter reviews this process and discusses the significant conclusions reached in order to demonstrate the project's contributions to rhetorical studies. Limitations of the project are noted, and insight is offered for future research seeking to critique Congressional discourse.

The thesis took an inductive route when investigating the selected texts. Thus, assessment of the debate unfolded as the texts were read and scrutinized. Metaphoric criticism emerged as a primary method of analysis. In rhetorical scholarship, the presence of metaphor in U.S. foreign policy rhetoric is well known. Robert Ivie discusses how metaphors offer a strategic choice for politicians as a tool of persuasion. In his study of Cold War Rhetoric, Ivie outlines how rhetors

depicted the U.S.S.R. as an evil entity that demanded resolve.<sup>1</sup> In more recent examples, Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush employed metaphors to define the enemy in abstract, negative terms during the invasions of Grenada and the Persian Gulf War, respectively.<sup>2</sup> Chapter one provided readers with an orientation to the context behind the Iraq crisis. To accomplish this task, the early remarks by President George W. Bush and his administration were briefly included. Presidential rhetoric can influence Congressional rhetoric, thus reviewing past literature on how U.S. political discourse operates during times of war helped document the relationship between the executive and legislative branches.<sup>3</sup>

The second chapter presented a descriptive inventory without a pre-set analytical framework, where thirty selected texts were analyzed on their own terms. This approach permitted a “ground-up” approach so that salient rhetorical theories were considered as the project unfolded. Overarching themes were dissected and parsed so as to identify which Senators said what and how they supported their arguments. As the inventory developed, the frequent use of metaphors and the terms used to comprise those metaphors revealed recurring patterns. While each Senator spoke of Hussein differently, viewed the concept of time uniquely, and highlighted the importance of America’s stature distinctly, they all employed similar terms to address these issues. This led to three metaphoric clusters or groupings of concepts and illuminated the terms used to delineate those concepts. FORCE depicted the enemy as brutal, aggressive, and savage. The TIME cluster, which referred to both the urgency of the crisis and the length of the debate, included terms that both pro-resolution and anti-resolution Senators used. The difference was in how these Senators employed the same word to aid their endorsement or rejection of S.J.Res. 46. Lastly, the STATUS cluster referred to linguistic choices made by every Senator near the end of his speech. Regardless of the Senators’ feelings on S.J.Res. 46, speakers referenced how they

believed U.S. leadership would be affected by U.S. responses to the Iraq crisis. Together, these clusters wove a narrative that, while difficult to determine absolutely its persuasive power, likely contributed to Bush's rhetorical campaign in persuading the public that invading Iraq was the right choice.

In his research on the 2002 Iraq debate, Thomas Goodnight analyzed Congressional speeches, media reports, and presidential addresses in an effort to “open a metapolitics” on the reflexivity of presidential and political rhetoric.<sup>4</sup> Goodnight explored the discursive relationship that existed between the private and public sectors. His concluding remarks are especially insightful for the thesis' conclusion. Goodnight claims that critics of public policy must become familiar with the traditional topics of war and peace.<sup>5</sup> Political topics, or *topoi*, are what Goodnight explains as “resting places.”<sup>6</sup> Their familiarity is vital to public policy studies from a rhetorical perspective because of their frequency within political discourse and, as Goodnight explains, stem from Aristotle's work. In a summary of Aristotle's topics, he states:

Accessible in historical documents and collective memory, *topoi* are embedded in the practices of expert advisors, elected officials, and publics. Advocates work to (1) justify policy from a politically supportable standpoint, (2) assess material limitations to intelligence, planning, tactics, and strategy, (3) compare the present range of threats, duties, and opportunities as similar to those past or emergent and novel, and (4) finds the means of public translation of doctrinal, technical, historical, and strategic discourses internal to think tanks, public institutions, and other specialized communities.<sup>7</sup>

These topoi can inform critics on the process of public policy creation. Since debate is a prime forum for public policy analysis, it is within these areas that critics find topics for the study and analysis of public policy. Goodnight adds that to grasp fully the rhetorical implications of a certain policy, critics must first “locate where political debate takes place, the actors and advocates involved, and the strategies employed to justify them.”<sup>8</sup> A study of the Senate’s debate thus required the identification and documentation of who was speaking, where they were speaking, and what rhetorical tactics were used to support their position in that debate. To accomplish this, Robert Asen served as a helpful guide in framing the debate. Unlike presidential speeches, public hearings and forums typically contain multiple authors and plural audiences. Hence, productive public policy critique, from a rhetorical perspective, must consider these differences between competing perspectives and arguments through identification of parties and interests. Leah Ceccarelli, in her theoretical study of polysemy in rhetorical criticism, refers to this process as a “critic-induced polysemy,” where the analyst draws multiple meanings from a text that may or may not be accessible or even perceived by certain audiences.<sup>9</sup> Robert Asen might consider Ceccarelli’s methodological suggestions impractical. On his view, public policy debates contain multiple authors and it would be difficult, if not impossible, to determine how many audiences read—and conversely, how many do not read—policy texts.<sup>10</sup> Rather, Asen encourages critics to approach public policy as a diachronic process and not as a collection of distinct, individual texts. While this method is far from flawless, it helps summarize and address transformative moments that represent the debate as a whole. This project was guided, in part, by Asen’s work and it prioritized leadership and seniority. These speakers were more likely to receive greater media attention and reflect Asen’s belief that we, as critics, should not feel compelled to explore “every potentially relevant utterance.”<sup>11</sup> Instead, critics should “cast a

sufficiently wide net to elucidate the diverse perspectives forwarded by the multiple authors of policy debate and the developments in policy debates over time.”<sup>12</sup>

## **Implications**

A primary objective from the outset was to gain a better understanding of a particular policy debate conducted by the Senate. Policy debates, from a rhetorical standpoint, are often “under-observed,”<sup>13</sup> according to Asen, and their critiques appear infrequent. As seen in the literature review in chapter one, not many rhetorical publications focused on policy debates, specifically Congress, as their central object of study. Yet, Congressional policy debates often carry significant national implications. In his book on the welfare reform legislation debates during the 1990s, Asen explored how Senators and Representatives recounted the images of poverty in their speeches. He argues that the manner in which politicians represented disadvantaged groups—those who need government welfare—had significant implications on the legislation they passed.<sup>14</sup> Federal representatives’ words matter. They matter because their effects may well resonate beyond the walls of the oval office or the halls of Capitol Hill. Thus, this thesis seeks to contribute to the current body of scholarship concerning congressional rhetoric specifically and policy debates broadly. To expand on this idea, the implications and contributions of the study follow.

The analysis of political debates is important because it can not only shed light on the result of a political policy—in this case, the invasion of Iraq—but may also trace the complex decision-making process of governmental decisions. Trevor Parry-Giles, in his study of the 2004 presidential election and the ideological values espoused by the campaigns of both incumbent President George W. Bush and then-Senator John Kerry (D-MA), maintains that studying public policy can prove advantageous to the public. It “frees citizens from the burden of extensive

public-policy knowledge and expertise.”<sup>15</sup> This, of course, assumes the public has access to these publications. Yet, consider how the first step in publicly disseminating policy research often begins at the scholarly level. In his book on the educational policy debates that three school boards in Wisconsin regularly hold, Asen illustrates “how ordinary folks build and sustain their vision for a community through policy and consequential public decision making.”<sup>16</sup> He further notes that in a field dominated “by either abstract theory or case studies focused on elite actors and agents, I demonstrate how rhetorical theory plays itself out in the humble but high-stakes world of local school board deliberations.”<sup>17</sup> The legislative process is complex, prohibitively so for many citizens seeking to participate in it. Deconstructing the mechanisms of this process can begin with a study of the words that our representatives express.

The Senate’s debate on S.J.Res. 46 was a significant moment in the Bush administration’s broader “War on Terror” campaign. Moreover, while the thesis focused on a specific policy debate during a specific period, several noteworthy implications exist. First, this study supports current understanding of Congressional rhetoric within a public policy framework. As observed in the literature review, presidential rhetoric can influence congressional discourse. The ideas, phrases, and terms that Presidents employ in their speeches are regularly repeated in committee hearings and floor debates.<sup>18</sup> It also likely helped that President Bush’s approval ratings were at a historic high of 90% following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks.<sup>19</sup> Quoting a popular president is not uncommon in the Senate’s debate on S.J.Res. 46. All but two Senators—Tom Daschle (D-SD) and Harry Reid (D-NV)—who voted for the resolution’s passage cited Bush directly. Twenty-two Senators explicitly mentioned Bush and, as Congressional bylaws require, their words were specifically labeled as a quote in the Congressional Record. Similarly, Carol Winkler found in her study of Ronald Reagan’s and

George H.W. Bush's speeches on Grenada and Iraq, respectively, that Congress recycled many of the same ideas and phrases advanced by these presidents.<sup>20</sup> This study does not examine George W. Bush's rhetoric, but to ignore his presence would inadvertently diminish his influence on the Senate's debate. While myriad reasons could explain why Senators chose to quote Bush, his high approval ratings and crisis rhetoric may have contributed.

On the persuasiveness of metaphor in the debate, available data do not reveal with certainty how effective metaphors were in influencing any particular behavior. However, the analysis conducted in chapter three does indicate that metaphors were employed to support several claims. These claims simplified, emphasized, described, and/or exaggerated a particular issue. For example, Iraqi leader Saddam Hussein was reduced to abstract notions of brutality and savagery. This acted as support for many pro-resolution Senators arguing for S.J.Res. 46's passage. The use of decivilizing metaphors when addressing Hussein was so dominant in the debate that anti-resolution Senators also addressed the Iraqi leader's barbarism. In line with prior research, foreign enemies frequently face this process of decivilization.

The pervasiveness of the decivilizing metaphor made the FORCE cluster a fundamental premise many Senators used to justify other arguments in their speeches. Senator Evan Bayh (D-IN) exemplifies this observation. He began by stating that, "Unfortunately, in dealing with Saddam Hussein and the regime of Iraq, we are dealing with a brutal and savage dictator who understands one thing, and one thing only: either the threat of force or the use of force."<sup>21</sup> Bayh then discussed the Iraqi leader's "inhumane" and "despotic" behavior for an additional two paragraphs. Bayh then argued that such brutality demanded immediate action. He drew from the TIME cluster to accomplish this task, stressing the urgency of resolving the Hussein challenge by issuing a warning: "I remind my colleagues that in a world of imperfect intelligence--and

there will always be imperfect intelligence--if we wait, we run the very real risk of having waited too long. We have seen the kind of tragedy to which that can lead.”<sup>22</sup> Bayh concluded by emphasizing what was at risk if the U.S. did not, a) respond to Hussein and, b) respond quickly. He defined that risk as possibly damaging America’s reputation abroad by failing to act. In Bayh’s view, “It is only through strong leadership, leadership by the United States, that we will preserve the peace, rally our allies, and convince the United Nations to enforce its own resolutions. If these efforts avail us not, it is my heartfelt conviction that weapons of mass death in the hands of a brutal dictator such as Saddam Hussein represent an unacceptable risk for the reputation America holds so dearly and the well-being of the American people.”<sup>23</sup>

The direction of the clusters within the Senators’ speeches is particularly interesting. With the exception of four Senators who did not draw from the TIME cluster, every text followed the format of FORCE → TIME → STATUS. That is, the speeches began with metaphors that decivilized<sup>24</sup> Hussein and the Iraqi government, continued with an emphasis on time—whether it was used to urge a quick vote on S.J.Res. 46 or to advocate for longer time—and ended by discussing how an invasion might harm the international perception of America. The importance of this conclusion is that it suggests metaphor helped structure several speeches in a particular way. It is important to note that while Democratic Senators viewed Hussein as highly aggressive, their expression was not as strong as that of the Republicans. The differences in Hussein-related metaphors supports this claim. While every Senator drew from the FORCE cluster, Democratic speakers were largely more forgiving in their depiction of Hussein. For instance, Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) avoided specifics and contended, “Rather than hearing more about Saddam Hussein—we know enough about him and his savage acts—what we need to hear from the President are answers to our questions about what he plans to do in Iraq.”<sup>25</sup> With

respect to the decision process, Democrats and Republicans alike viewed the Iraqi government as monolithic and its leader ruthless, but Democrats used fewer metaphors than the Republicans regarding Hussein's ruthlessness. No speaker praised Hussein as a sovereign and rational leader.

### **Limitations**

The descriptive inventory and analysis yield one addition to the growing body of work in deliberative criticism. Scrutinizing the Senate's debate forwards an increased understanding of a previously understudied set of texts. However, the study was not without limitations. This section addresses those constraints and proposes possible directions that future research might take.

Asen recommends that critics should delimit the objects of their study to avoid unnecessarily reviewing every relevant text or remark. That recommendation, though, comes with restrictions. Having only studied thirty speeches, twenty-eight from the Senate floor and two by Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, the conclusions reached in this thesis do not, obviously, represent the entire chamber. Nor do they represent the legislative debate as a whole since the U.S. House of Representatives also held a separate debate. Although it may seem that thirty speeches from twenty-four Senators are relatively scarce out of a chamber capable of hosting 100 Senators, not every Senator participated. In fact, more Senators voted on the resolution than debated it. In total, 51 Senators spoke on the resolution and the Congressional Record documented 68 speeches. Not including the two statements delivered by Senator Daschle outside of the chamber floor, the twenty-eight speeches represents 41% of the texts available. The twenty-four unique Senators represents 47% of the total number of speakers who debated S.J.Res. 46 on the Senate floor.

Policy debates are customarily events without a clear, finite beginning or end. The debate on S.J.Res. 46 extended beyond the Congressional chambers; media pundits, state governors, private think tanks, and many other sources addressed whether or not we should invade Iraq. Twenty-four Senators represent a select group of targeted speakers. There is little question of the Senate's importance in the Iraq crisis, yet they may not have received significant media coverage in comparison to the President and his administration. Temporally, some scholars argue that the George H. W. Bush administration primed the 2003 decision to invade Iraq during the 1990s.<sup>26</sup> Several Senators even recalled the Persian Gulf War congressional debates in their remarks. The scope of the project, thus, was a limitation because it did not include texts from before the September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2001 terrorist attacks—including Bush's formal declaration that he wanted to deploy military force against Iraq—or texts after the debate as Congressional oversight of the invasion continued. It is appropriate, then, to orient the thesis as one piece to the broader rhetorical history of the 2002-2003 crisis in Iraq.

Within the selected texts, only influential speakers were chosen. Their ranking, such as leadership positions, and their seniority within their party helped determine the Senators' selection. Whether or not a Senator was up for re-election that year or if they planned to run for some other office were not considered. These factors may have contributed to increased media attention of a particular speaker, whether or not he had a high ranking or high seniority on the day of a speech. Senator Kerry (D-MA), for instance, participated in the debate yet was not selected for study despite having been considered in the running for the Democratic nomination for President since early 2002.<sup>27</sup>

Lastly, the source for the thirty speeches came from the Congressional Record. That choice was not without some limitations. This official journal documents only the remarks of

Congress members who wish to be heard and recorded. Many Senators chose to remain silent. Thus, the discourse contained in the Congressional Record only involves the voices of a privileged or interested segment. This is especially true of the Senate because strict limits listed in the Senate Rules can circumscribe debates to a chosen few as determined by party leaders.<sup>28</sup> There is also the reality that legislative debates are not a reliable record of what was actually meant on the floor. Several speeches were later clarified by various Senators as the invasion decreased in popularity. Former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton, who is now running for the Democratic Presidential nomination, has retracted certain statements she made during the debate.<sup>29</sup> Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid spoke against the Iraq invasion later despite having voted for it in 2002.<sup>30</sup> This thesis did not consider those texts.

Realistically, partisanship, constituency pressures, public opinion, and the legislator's ideology are variables that influence the outcome of congressional debates and the arguments presented in them. Confirming a Senator's actual motivations is difficult to achieve through the Record. For the purposes of a rhetorical study, the Congressional Record suffices as a collective body of official statements. Despite its flaws, the Record serves as the best documentary evidence of what members are willing to state for the record. It is what they openly ascribe their reputations to. For example, when federal judges attempt to discern the intentions of the framers of a particular law, the canons of statutory construction prefer the Record as the best source of those intentions.<sup>31</sup>

### **Future Directions and Conclusion**

This project adds to current research by exploring the ways that metaphor was used as supporting material during times of crisis. The power of metaphor is well-known. The trope's capacity to condense complex policy decisions is remarkable. Senators wasted little time in

literalizing Saddam Hussein into an inhumane entity. Hussein was *evil*. Despite the appropriateness of metaphoric analysis for this project, it is but one of many ways to analyze the Senate's debate. For instance, Robert Asen observed that the national welfare reform debates of the 1990s projected certain groups as different from others. Asen tracked the "rhetorical imagination" of how Congressional leaders addressed those in poverty in their speeches, presidential depictions of the poor, and other social leaders' remarks.<sup>32</sup> Similarly, future critics could approach the debate by focusing not on the arguments made, but on the specific audiences that the Senators targeted in their speeches. Other avenues of possibility include analyzing all 68 speeches by all Senators or expand the scope of one's project to include both chambers and their debates.

Deliberative criticism provides a foundation for scholars interested in engaging and facilitating public policy. There is a significant difference between envisioning the critic as a theorist who describes what academic critics can and should do, and envisioning the critic as a public citizen or activist.<sup>33</sup> The latter discovers practical ways of addressing public issues that in turn can offer suggestions that make a noticeable difference in public policy. Ideally, the descriptive inventory and analysis of the Senate's debate—along with many other scholarly works on public policy—should be made more accessible. And not only to academic echelons but to the public at large.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, the word "deliberative" denotes participation. These efforts get at the heart of what deliberative criticism should aim to do, to deconstruct the notion of accessibility. The importance of this goal is especially evident when considering the idea that deliberative criticism usually explores the speeches made by local, state, and federal legislators. These political leaders represent a larger audience than only the select few who can obtain and read these studies.

The 2003 Iraq invasion evolved into the third longest war in American history.<sup>35</sup> While many public and private reports have attempted to calculate the damage of this preemptive response, its impact has yet to be fully measured. The statements and remarks made by the Senators who fought for and against S.J.Res. 46 remain lasting vestiges of this transformative policy debate. Debates frequently simplified the multi-faceted operation required of an American invasion. This simplification was fueled by comparisons that not only were popular at the time, but was aided by the use of metaphor. Research on senatorial rhetoric and public policy deliberation presented in this project may serve as a springboard for other critics to expand on, criticize, or completely revise. U.S. history informs us that the initiation of another large-scale war or invasion is inevitable. It was not too long ago that a Senate chamber presented similar arguments against Saddam Hussein during the Persian Gulf War. Thirteen years have passed since the 2003 Iraq invasion began, yet the nearly two trillion dollar price tag is still outstanding from that commitment. As an institution designed to deliberate and in a world of increasingly fragmented terrorist threats, the Senate will almost surely face another decision similar to that of Iraq. One hopes that future congressional session will consider what Robert Byrd exclaimed on the final day of the debate on October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002:

If the Senate will allow me one more minute, I plead with those people out there, I plead with the American people, let your voice be heard. You need to be heard. You have a right to be heard. You have questions that should be asked and answered. Let the leadership of this Congress know that you don't want this resolution rammed through this Congress. The life of your son may depend upon it. The life of your daughter may depend on it. I do not believe the Senate has given enough time or enough consideration to the question of

handing the President unchecked authority to usurp the Constitution and declare war on Iraq. I say to the people of America, to those who have encouraged other Senators and me to uphold the principles of the Constitution: Keep up the fight. Keep fighting for what is right. Let your voices be heard.<sup>36</sup>

---

Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Robert Ivie, “Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War ‘Idealists’” in *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*, edited by Martin J. Medhurst, Robie Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert Scott (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 1997), 105.

<sup>2</sup> Carol Winkler, “Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric: Reagan on Libya; Bush 43 on Iraq,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 304-306.

<sup>3</sup> Robert L. Ivie, “Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 280-281.

<sup>4</sup> Thomas G. Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate: Public Policy and the Network Imaginary,” *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13 (2010): 70.

<sup>5</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 66.

<sup>6</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 78.

<sup>7</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 80.

<sup>8</sup> Goodnight, “The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate”: 80.

<sup>9</sup> Leah Ceccarelli, “Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 401.

<sup>10</sup> Robert Asen, *Visions of Poverty: Welfare Policy and Political Imagination* (East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press, 2002), 241.

<sup>11</sup> Asen, “Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy”: 139.

<sup>12</sup> Asen, “Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy”: 139.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Asen, “Deliberation and Trust,” *Argumentation and Advocacy* 50 (2013): 3.

<sup>14</sup> Asen, *Visions of Poverty*, 5.

---

<sup>15</sup> Shawn J. Parry-Giles and Trevor Parry-Giles, "Introduction: Campaign 2004: Looking to the Past for Ideological Certainty in a Period of National Anxiety," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8 (2005): 544.

<sup>16</sup> Robert Asen, *Democracy, Deliberation, and Education* (University Park, PA: Penn State University Press, 2015), 3.

<sup>17</sup> Asen, *Democracy, Deliberation, and Education*, 11.

<sup>18</sup> Ivie, "Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now": 290.

<sup>19</sup> David W. Moore, "Bush Job Approval Highest in Gallup History," *Gallup Poll*, September 24, 2001. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/4924/bush-job-approval-highest-gallup-history.aspx>: this text is thirteen paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found in paragraph one. Accessed April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

<sup>20</sup> Winkler, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric": 305.

<sup>21</sup> Senator Evan Bayh, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8th, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19436.

<sup>22</sup> Bayh, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19436.

<sup>23</sup> Bayh, S.J.Res. 46, p. 19437.

<sup>24</sup> Robert Ivie, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812," *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240. Credit goes to Ivie for the term "decivilizing."

<sup>25</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19205.

<sup>26</sup> Herbert W. Simons, "From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq: A Rhetorical History," *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 183.

<sup>27</sup> "Former Colleagues Rally Around Kerry," *CNN*, April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2001.

<http://edition.cnn.com/2001/Business/09/26/jkerry>: this text is fifteen paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found in paragraph four. Accessed April 5<sup>th</sup>, 2016.

---

<sup>28</sup> Steven S. Smith, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2005), 265.

<sup>29</sup> Charles Blow, “Hillary Clinton and other Party Leaders Stumble,” *New York Times*, January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016. [Http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/25/opinion/hillary-clinton-stumbles.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/25/opinion/hillary-clinton-stumbles.html): this text is 22 paragraphs long and the specific text reference is found in paragraph 22.

<sup>30</sup> Blow, “Hillary Clinton and Other Party Leaders Stumble”: para 15.

<sup>31</sup> Donna L. Goldstein, “Implied Private Rights of Action Under Federal Statutes: Congressional Intent, Judicial Deference, or Mutual Abdication?” *Fordham Law Review* 50 (1982): 612-613.

<sup>32</sup> Asen, *Visions of Poverty*, 230.

<sup>33</sup> James F. Klumpp and Thomas A. Hollihan, “Rhetorical Criticism as Moral Action,” *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75 (1989); 94.

<sup>34</sup> Klumpp and Hollihan, “Rhetorical Criticism as Moral Action”: 91.

<sup>35</sup> Robert Kagan and William Kristol, “What to do about Iraq,” in *The Iraq War Reader*, ed. Micah L. Sifry and Christopher Cerf (New York, NY: Touchstone Publishing, 2003), 240.

<sup>36</sup> Senator Robert Byrd, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10<sup>th</sup>, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19138

**Appendix A: Selected Texts from the 2002 U.S. Senate’s Debate on S.J.Res. 46**

Selection of Senators based on: (1) Leadership Role (2) Seniority 107 <sup>th</sup> Congress (2001 – 2002)
---

<u>October 04, 2002</u>	
<u>Senate Democrat Author &amp; Ranking</u>	<u>Senate Republican Author &amp; Ranking</u>
Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV)  <i>President Pro Tempore &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator John Warner (R-VA)  <i>16<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Carl Levin (D-MI)  <i>17<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator George Voinovich (R-OH)  <i>8<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Ron Wyden (D-OR)  <i>64<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Jim Bunning (R-KY)  <i>81<sup>st</sup> in seniority</i>
<u>October 07, 2002</u>	
Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV)  <i>President Pro Tempore &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Pete Domenici (R-NM)  <i>8<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Max Cleland (D-GA)  <i>73<sup>rd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Orrin Hatch (R-UT)  <i>13<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Bill Nelson (D-FL)  <i>90<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Jon Kyl (R-AZ)  <i>60<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
<u>October 08, 2002</u>	
Senator Joe Lieberman (D-CT)  <i>41<sup>st</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator John McCain (R-AZ)  <i>33<sup>rd</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Evan Bayh (D-IN)	Senator Larry Craig (R-ID)

<i>85<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>	<i>45<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
<u>October 09, 2002</u>	
Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) <i>President Pro Tempore &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Jesse Helms (R-NC) <i>7<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Harry Reid (D-NV) <i>Senate Minority Whip &amp; 34<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator John McCain (R-AZ) <i>33<sup>rd</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Paul Sarbanes (D-MD) <i>11<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Chuck Hagel (R-NE) <i>77<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
<u>October 10, 2002</u>	
Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) <i>President Pro Tempore &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Trent Lott (R-MS) <i>Senate Minority Leader &amp; 38<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Tom Daschle (D-SD) <i>Senate Majority Leader &amp; 32<sup>nd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Don Nickles (R-OK) <i>Senate Minority Whip &amp; 21<sup>st</sup> in seniority</i>
Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA) <i>3<sup>rd</sup> in seniority</i>	Senator Jeff Sessions (R-AL) <i>75<sup>th</sup> in seniority</i>

## Bibliography

- Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, translated by Edward Meredith Cope and John Edwin Sandys. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Asen, Robert, "Deliberation and Trust," *Argumentation and Advocacy* 50 (2013): 3.
- Asen, Robert, "Reflections on the Role of Rhetoric in Public Policy." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13 (2010): 124-125.
- Asen, Robert, *Visions of Poverty: Welfare Policy and Political Imagination*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2002.
- Associated Press, "Voices from the Senate," *Los Angeles Times*, October 11, 2002.  
[Http://articles.latimes.com/2002/oct/11/nation/na-votebox11](http://articles.latimes.com/2002/oct/11/nation/na-votebox11).
- Bates, Benjamin, "Audiences, Metaphors, and the Persian Gulf War." *Communication Studies* 55 (2004): 447.
- Binder, Sarah, and Steven S. Smith, *Politics or Principle?: Filibustering in the United States Senate*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 1997.
- Blow, Charles, "Hillary Clinton and other Party Leaders Stumble," *New York Times*, January 25<sup>th</sup>, 2016. [Http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/25/opinion/hillary-clinton-stumbles.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/01/25/opinion/hillary-clinton-stumbles.html).
- Brands, Hal, "Rhetoric, Public Opinion, and Policy in the American Debate over the Japanese Emperor During World War II." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8 (2005): 432.
- Brockriede, Wayne, "Rhetorical Criticism as Argument." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974): 165. Credit goes to Brockriede for the term "rhetorical experience."
- Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969.
- Bush, George W., "Address to the Nation on the Terrorist Attacks," Washington, D.C., September 11, 2001. [Http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58057).

- Bush, George W., "Remarks at Barksdale Air Force Base, Louisiana, on the Terrorist Attacks," Louisiana, September 11, 2001. [Http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58056](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=58056).
- Bush, George W., "Address to the United Nations General Assembly in New York City," New York City, NY, September 12, 2002. [Http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=64069](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/?pid=64069).
- Bush, George W., "Remarks Following a Cabinet Meeting and an Exchange with Reporters," Washington D.C., May 30, 2002.  
[Http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/youtubeclip.php?clipid=73017&admin=436:10](http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/youtubeclip.php?clipid=73017&admin=436:10).
- Callaghan, Karen and Frauke Schnell, "Assessing the Democratic Debate: How the News Media Frame Elite Policy Discourse." *Political Communication* 18 (2001): 184.
- Carroll, Joseph, "The Iraq-Vietnam Comparison," *Gallup*, June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2004.  
[Http://www.gallup.com/poll/11998/iraqvietnam-comparison.aspx](http://www.gallup.com/poll/11998/iraqvietnam-comparison.aspx).
- Ceaser, James, Glen Thurow, Jeffrey Tulis, and Joseph Bessette, "The Rise of the Rhetorical Presidency." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 11 (1981): 160.
- Ceccarelli, Leah, "Polysemy: Multiple Meanings in Rhetorical Criticism." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 84 (1998): 401.
- Chan, Sue, "Bush Administration Links Iraq, Al-Qaeda," *CBSNEWS*, September 26, 2002.  
[Http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bush-administration-links-iraq-al-qaeda/](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/bush-administration-links-iraq-al-qaeda/).
- Cleland, Max, "Questions for the Bush Administration," October 6<sup>th</sup>, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 8938-8940.
- Daschle, Tom, *Like No Other Time: The 107<sup>th</sup> Congress and the Two Years that Changed America Forever*. New York: Three Rivers Press, 2003.
- Daschle, Tom, *Like No Other Time: The 107<sup>th</sup> Congress and the Two Years that Changed America Forever*. New York, NY: Three Rivers Press, 2003.

- Famm, Gerald and Steven Smith, "Last among Equals: The Senate's Presiding Officer," in *Esteemed Colleagues: Civility and Deliberation in the U.S. Senate*, edited by Burdett Loomis. Washington: The Brookings Institution: 2004.
- Feinstein, Lee, "Most Americans Support War with Iraq, Shows New Pew/CFR Poll," *Council on Foreign Relations*, October 10, 2002. [Http://www.cfr.org/iraq/most-americans-support-war-iraq-shows-new-pewcfr-poll---commentary-lee-feinstein/p5051](http://www.cfr.org/iraq/most-americans-support-war-iraq-shows-new-pewcfr-poll---commentary-lee-feinstein/p5051).
- "Former Colleagues Rally Around Kerry," *CNN*, April 30<sup>th</sup>, 2001. [Http://edition.cnn.com/2001/Business/09/26/jkerry](http://edition.cnn.com/2001/Business/09/26/jkerry).
- Franke, William, "Metaphor and the Making of Sense: The Contemporary Metaphor Renaissance." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 33 (2000): 137.
- Glass, Matthew, *Citizens Against the MX: Public Languages in the Nuclear Age*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press, 1993.
- Goldstein, Donna, "Implied Private Rights of Action Under Federal Statutes: Congressional Intent, Judicial Deference, or Mutual Abdication?" *Fordham Law Review* 50 (1982): 612-613.
- Goodnight, Thomas, "The Metapolitics of the 2002 Iraq Debate: Public Policy and the Network Imaginary." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 13 (2010): 70.
- Graber, Doris, *Mass Media and American Politics*. Washington: CQ Press, 2009.
- Harp, Dustin, Jaime Loke, and Ingrid Bachmann, "Voices of Dissent in the Iraq War: Moving from Deviance to Legitimacy?" *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 87 (2010): 470.
- Hart, Roderick, *The Sound of Leadership: Presidential Communication in the Modern Age*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Hayes, Danny, and Matt Guardino. "Whose Views Made the News? Media Coverage and the March to War in Iraq." *Political Communication* 27 (2010): 73.

- Howe, Nicholas, "Metaphor in Contemporary American Political Discourse." *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity* 3 (1988): 89.
- Humphrey, Hubert, "The Senate in Foreign Policy." *Foreign Affairs* 37 (1959): 525.
- Ivie, Robert, "Cold War Motives and the Rhetorical Metaphor: a Framework of Criticism," in *Cold War Rhetoric: Strategy, Metaphor, and Ideology*, edited by Martin Medhurst, Robert Ivie, Philip Wander, and Robert Scott. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1997.
- Ivie, Robert, "Presidential Motives for War." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 60 (1974): 339.
- Ivie, Robert, "Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 280-281.
- Ivie, Robert, "Rhetorical Deliberation and Democratic Politics in the Here and Now." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 5 (2002): 280-281.
- Ivie, Robert, "The Metaphor of Force in Prowar Discourse: The Case of 1812." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 68 (1982): 240.
- Ivie, Robert, and Oscar Giner, "Hunting the Devil: Democracy's Rhetorical Impulse to War." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 37 (2007): 580.
- Jamieson, Kathleen, "Justifying the War in Iraq: What the Bush Administration's Uses of Evidence Reveal." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 249.
- Jamieson, Kathleen, "The Metaphoric Cluster in the Rhetoric of Pope Paul VI and Edmund G. Brown, Jr." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 66 (1980): 51-72.
- John, Sue, David Domke, Kevin Coe, and Erica S. Graham, "Going Public, Crisis after Crisis: The Bush Administration and the Press From September 11 to Saddam." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 198.

- Judy Keen and William Welch, "Bush, Daschle Fall out as Congress Returns," *USATODAY*, January 23, 2002. [Http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washdc/2002/01/23/usat-bush-daschle\(acov\).htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washdc/2002/01/23/usat-bush-daschle(acov).htm).
- Kagan, Robert and William Kristol, ""What to do about Iraq," in *The Iraq War Reader*, ed. Micah L. Sifry and Christopher Cerf. New York: Touchstone Publishing, 2003.
- King, John, Kate Snow, Jonathan Karl, and Dana Bash, "Iraq Resolution Introduced in Senate," *CNN*, October 3, 2002. [Http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/10/02/us.iraq/](http://edition.cnn.com/2002/ALLPOLITICS/10/02/us.iraq/).
- Klumpp, James and Thomas A. Hollihan, "Rhetorical Criticism as Moral Action." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 75 (1989): 94.
- Krutz, Glen and William Ellis, "Seniority's Place in the Contemporary Senate," Paper presented at the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Southern Political Science Association.
- Kuypers, Jim, *Presidential Crisis Rhetoric and the Press in the Post-Cold War World* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1997), 17.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Leff, Michael, "Textual Criticism: The Legacy of G. P. Mohrmann." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 72 (1986): 379.
- "Majority and Minority Leaders and Party Whips," *United States Senate*.  
[Http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/16/opinion/a-deadly-legacy-in-iraq.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2014/10/16/opinion/a-deadly-legacy-in-iraq.html).
- Moore, David, "Bush Job Approval Highest in Gallup History," *Gallup Poll*, September 24, 2001.  
[Http://www.gallup.com/poll/4924/bush-job-approval-highest-gallup-history.aspx](http://www.gallup.com/poll/4924/bush-job-approval-highest-gallup-history.aspx).
- Mount, Michael, "Hussein's Iraq and Al-Qaeda Not Linked, Pentagon Says," *CNN*, March 13, 2008.  
[Http://www.cnn.com/2008/US/03/13/alqaeda.saddam/](http://www.cnn.com/2008/US/03/13/alqaeda.saddam/).

- Murphy, John, "History, Culture, and Political Rhetoric." *Rhetoric Review* 20 (2001): 47.
- O’Gorman, Ned, "'The One Word the Kremlin Fears': C.D. Jackson, Cold War 'Liberation,' and American Political-Economic Adventurism." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12 (2009): 389.
- Packer, George, *The Assassin’s Gate: America in Iraq*. New York: Farrar, Strauss, and Giroux, 2005.
- Parry-Giles, Shawn and Trevor Parry-Giles, "Introduction: Campaign 2004: Looking to the Past for Ideological Certainty in a Period of National Anxiety." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 8 (2005): 544.
- Pelley, Pelley, "George Tenet: At the Center of the Storm," *CBS NEWS*, April 25, 2007.  
[Http://www.cbsnews.com/news/george-tenet-at-the-center-of-the-storm/](http://www.cbsnews.com/news/george-tenet-at-the-center-of-the-storm/).
- "The President Pro Tempore of the Senate: History and Authority of the Office," *Congressional Research Service*. [Http://www.senate.gov/CRSReports/crs-publish.cfm?pid='0E%2C\\*PL%3F%3D%22P%20%20%0A](http://www.senate.gov/CRSReports/crs-publish.cfm?pid='0E%2C*PL%3F%3D%22P%20%20%0A).
- Read, Stephen, Ian L. Cesa, David K. Jones, & Nancy L. Collins, "When is the Federal Budget Like a Baby? Metaphor in Political Rhetoric." *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 5 (1990): 129-130.
- Rood, Craig "Rhetorical Studies and the Gun Debate: A Public Policy Perspective." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 18 (2015): 364.
- "S.J.Res.46 – Authorization for the Use of Military Force Against Iraq,"  
[Https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/46](https://www.congress.gov/bill/107th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/46).
- Schmitt, Eric "Rumsfeld Says U.S. Has 'Bulletproof' Evidence of Iraq’s Links to Al-Qaeda," *New York Times*, September 28, 2002.  
[Http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/28/international/middleeast/28QAED.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2002/09/28/international/middleeast/28QAED.html).
- Segell, Glen, *Disarming Iraq*. London: British Library, 2004.

Senator Bayh, Evan speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19436.

Senator Bunning, Jim, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19112.

Senator Byrd, Robert speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19732.

Senator Byrd, Robert, “Rush to War Ignores U.S. Constitution,” October 5, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19125-19126.

Senator Byrd, Robert, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20425.

Senator Byrd, Robert, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19136.

Senator Byrd, Robert, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19205.

Senator Cleland, Max, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19208.

Senator Craig, Larry speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19437.

Senator Daschle, Tom, “Diplomatic Failure,” March 18, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 3373.

Senator Daschle, Tom, “Stop Politicizing Iraq,” September 25, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 17759.

Senator Daschle, Tom, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec. p. 20385.

Senator Domenici, Pete, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19217.

Senator Hagel, Chuck speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19704.

Senator Hatch, Orrin, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19225.

Senator Helms, Jesse speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 1967.

Senator Kennedy, Ted, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20378.

Senator Kyl, Jon, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19217.

Senator Levin, Carl, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., 19115.

Senator Lieberman, Joe, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19429.

Senator Lott, Trent speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20383.

Senator McCain, John, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 8, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19436.

Senator Nelson, Bill, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 7, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19227.

Senator Nickles, Don, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 10, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 20389.

Senator Reid, Harry speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19727.

Senator Sarbanes, Paul, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 9, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19728.

Senator Voinovich, George, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19112-19113.

Senator Warner, John, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19128.

Senator Wyden, Ron, speaking on S.J.Res. 46, October 4, 2002, 148 Cong. Rec., p. 19117.

Simons, Herbert, "From Post-9/11 Melodrama to Quagmire in Iraq: A Rhetorical History." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 186.

Sinclair, Barbara, *The Transformation of the U.S. Senate*, Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1989.

Smith, Jeffrey, "Hussein's Prewar Ties to Al-Qaeda Discounted," *The Washington Post*, April 6, 2007. [Http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/05/AR2007040502263.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/04/05/AR2007040502263.html).

Smith, Steven, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate* New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Smith, Steven, *Parties and Leadership in the Senate*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Snyder, James and Tim Groseclose, "Estimating Party Influence in Congressional Roll-call Voting," *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (2000): 194-195.

Stahl, Roger, "Why We 'Support the Troops': Rhetorical Evolutions." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 12 (2009): 549.

Taylor, Bryan, "'The Means to Match Their Hatred': Nuclear Weapons, Rhetorical Democracy, and Presidential Discourse." *Presidential Studies Quarterly* 37 (2007): 684-685.

United States Government Printing Office, "Authorization for Use of Military Force Against Iraq Resolution of 2002," October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2002. [Http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ243/html/PLAW-107publ243.htm](http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-107publ243/html/PLAW-107publ243.htm).

Voss, James, Joel Kennet, Jennifer Wiley, and Tonya Schooler, "Experts at Debate: The Use of Metaphor in the U.S. Senate Debate on the Gulf Crisis." *Metaphor & Symbolic Activity* 7 (1992): 197.

Wander, Philip, "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy." *Quarterly Journal of Speech* 70 (1984): 355.

Welch, William, "Daschle Condemns Bush on Iraq Debate," *USATODAY*, September 26, 2002. [Http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2002-09-25-daschle\\_x.htm](http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/washington/2002-09-25-daschle_x.htm).

Winkler, Carol, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric: Reagan on Libya; Bush 43 on Iraq." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 306.

Winkler, Carol, "Parallels in Preemptive War Rhetoric: Reagan on Libya; Bush 43 on Iraq." *Rhetoric & Public Affairs* 10 (2007): 304-306.

**Curriculum Vita**  
**Henry R. Castillo**  
Las Vegas, NV  
(702) 815-3739  
HenryRCastillo@outlook.com

---

## **Education**

*University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Spring 2016)*

- Master of Arts – Communication Studies
- Committee: David Henry, (Chair), Tara Emmers-Sommer (Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Education), Sara VanderHaagen, John Tuman (Chair of Political Science)

*University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Fall 2013)*

- Bachelor of Arts – Communication Studies
- Student member of Lambda Pie Eta – Communication Studies Honor Society

## **Honors, Affiliations, and Scholarships**

- 2016 Outstanding Graduate Teaching Assistant
- 2016 UNLV Inspiration, Innovation, and Impact Graduate Student Research Event (sponsored by the Graduate College)
- Second Place in the 2016 UNLV Greenspun College of Urban Affairs Graduate Research Symposium
- First Place in the 2015 UNLV Rebel Grad Slam Competition
- Graduate Teaching Assistantship, University of Nevada, Las Vegas
- Dean's Honor List at UNLV Fall 2012, Spring 2013, 2013 Fall
- Nevada State Dramatic Interpretation Champion, 2009
- Qualifier to the National Forensic League Championship, 2007 & 2009
- Clark County Lincoln-Douglas Debate Champion, 2007
- National Forensics League Alumni (2009 – Present)

## **Teaching Experience**

*University of Nevada, Las Vegas*

- Instructor of Record
  - Summer Session II (2015)
- Communication Studies 101: Oral Communication
  - Graduate Teaching Assistant
  - Spring 2016, Fall 2015, Spring 2015, Fall 2014

## **Course Work**

- Thesis—D. Henry
- Security Discourse – J. Thompson
- Contemporary Theories in Sociology – D. Dickens
- Political Communication – D. Henry
- Empirical Research Methods – T. Emmers-Sommer
- Classical Sociological Theories – D. Dickens
- Rhetorical-Critical Research Methods – D. Conley
- Theories of Communication – D. Conley
- Survey of Communication Studies – T. McManus
- College Teaching in Communication – W. Belk

## **Volunteer Experience & Outreach**

- Presenter at a UNLV workshop titled, “Polishing Your Presentation Skills & Preparing an Excellent Poster,” University of Nevada, Las Vegas (2016)
- Nevius & Associates CARE Volunteer Program Coordinator (January 2013 – August 2014)
- Judge, Golden Desert Forensic League Tournament held at UNLV (2011)

## **Work Experience**

- Marketing & Communications Specialist, Nevius & Associates Realty (December 2012 – August 2014)
- Computer Support Technician – Student Assistant, UNLV Office of Information Technology (April 2010 – December 2012)