

Vicki Opalewski  
Prof. Kathryn Olson  
Prof. William Keith  
Prof. John Jordan  
February 12, 2004

## Thesis Proposal

### I. Introduction (preview argument and conclusions/importance)

According to Lloyd Bitzer (1968), rhetorical discourse obtains its character “from the circumstances of the historic context in which they occur” (3). He also points out that rhetoric does not dwell in a vacuum; it exists in order to either perform some task or to produce an action of some kind (4). Frequently, rhetoric does both. For example, Steven R. Goldzwig and Patricia A. Sullivan (1995) proposed that the post-assassination eulogies printed in newspaper functioned not only to facilitate the process of public mourning, but also to propose policy changes, which helped the nation feel that order could be made from the chaotic situation. In other words, the situation (the assassinations of Martin Luther King and John F. and Robert F. Kennedy) called forth a particular sort of reaction—a eulogy. However, the rhetoric also functioned as a call for action.

In the case of multiple or violent deaths brought about in the course of performing some duty for the nation, the President is compelled to make a statement about the lives that were lost. The President will often eulogize the victims as he explains the circumstances of how the lives were lost for the nation’s benefit. These speeches take on greater significance when the government in general or even the President can be construed as being either directly or indirectly to

blame for the loss of life. Due to the nature of rhetoric, it can be used to produce a change in action or attitude; for instance, a speaker may manipulate the eulogies of victims of tragedies in order to serve other purposes, including deflecting blame or advocating a particular policy. Eulogies may encompass the strategies of apologia in order to deflect the potential blame for the deaths and transcend the negative emotions associated with the tragedy in order to affect some positive action, ostensibly in the name of the victims. Therefore, the four factors of apologia-denial, bolstering, differentiation, and transcendence (Ware & Linkugel, 1973) -can have relevance outside the realm of specifically designated speeches of apology.

Edwin Black's (1970) work claims, "moral judgments coerce one's perceptions of things" (109). However, the process of forming those moral judgments is not as simple as just having a thought. According to Richard A. Vatz (1973), "we learn of facts and events through someone's communicating them to us" (156). In other words, we do not formulate our own interpretations of events; therefore, moral judgments about events are not necessarily our own either. When a speaker selects which aspects of an event to highlight, he or she is making a choice to give importance to that particular aspect of the event. Vatz insists, "meaning is not discovered in situations, but created by rhetors" (157). The choice is the significant action, and speakers must be held accountable for the choices within their own rhetoric (Vatz, 158). These choices may not be found in a single speech, but over a course of several public statements (Kramer & Olson, 2002). Black discusses how rhetoric can be structured in such a way as to invite the audience to become something other than what they are (1970). In the cases of violent deaths in

the service of the country, a President has a huge opportunity to define the situation and invite the audience, the American public, to become people who have certain non-controversial beliefs that align them with the values that the President has chosen to emphasize. In accepting the rhetor's call to become this second persona of the ideal audience, the actual audience aligns itself with whatever interpretation the speaker offers.

Eulogies are typically used to promote specific ideals. A common function is the epideictic; however, in appealing to the second persona, the speakers encourage audiences to move away from blaming them or the government for the deaths and into mortification or an improved second persona, so eulogies move from epideictic to forensic or deliberative.

## II. Theoretical framework

### A. Eulogy Discourse

Eulogies are assumed to serve several primary functions: (1) to make the death real for a questioning audience; (2) to lessen fears of mortality with how the deceased "lives on"; (3) to allow the audience to reorient themselves to the deceased; and (4) to reassure the audience that the community will continue, despite the death (Jamieson, 1978, in Foss, 1983). Karen A. Foss reviews the work of Ronald H. Carpenter and Robert V. Seltzer (1971), who claimed, "Of course a eulogy also may use praise...as a basis for inspiring an audience to some future virtue on their part" (Foss, 187-88). In the case that there has been some sort of death in serving the country, the President is able to expand on this "future virtue" idea. If he is able to make the audience believe that the deaths served some noble purpose, then

the audience can be lead to believe that they are required to continue the efforts and ideals of those who fell pursuing them.

Foss (1983) proposes another function of eulogies. She claims that eulogies serve as a means of providing advice to the audience. She writes, “Aristotle recognized that eulogies can contain a deliberative or exhortative component, since praise can be phrased in such a way as to assume the force of suggest” (187). By examining the eulogistic discourse after John Lennon’s death, Foss makes a case for advice-giving in eulogies based partially on Kenneth Burke’s work with motivation. Humans have created hierarchies, and they are constantly moved to reach or be near things associated with the highest hierarchy. In the case of John Lennon, Foss claims that the upper hierarchy was not the man himself, but his ideals for a peaceful, truthful society. When he was killed, his fans felt guilt that they had not followed his beliefs, which belong to the highest level of the hierarchy in that situation. According to Burke, guilt cannot be separated from the idea of hierarchy; hierarchies are a constant source of guilt because of the continuous drive toward the ideal without being able to accomplish it (Foss, 193). In order to purge themselves of the guilt, humans can engage in victimage (making others suffer; scapegoating) or mortification (punishing one’s self). Some eulogistic discourse, Foss claims, creates an awareness in the audience of how they have distorted the relationship in the past and asks them to examine their own behavior toward the person who has died (in this case, John Lennon). Another function of the eulogistic discourse can be to advise the audience to shift their hierarchic emphasis to the one embraced by the person who has passed (Foss, 194).

This suggestion toward a hierarchical shift can be combined with an idealized idea of who the actual audience could become in order to shift blame away from a speaker who might be held responsible for the deaths they are memorializing. The ideology would then become more important than who actually caused the deaths. Edwin Black's work (1970) describes a function of rhetoric in which a text can beckon to an idealized, implied auditor (111). Rather than concern himself with the actual audience's demographics or predisposition toward the topic, Black claims that rhetorical discourse suggests a particular audience and functions to link this implied audience to a particular ideology (112). Although this invitation may not work on all who hear a particular speech, actual audiences look to discourse for cues as to how they should view or define the world (Black, 113). Rhetors can project a model of what the actual auditors can become, and this, according to Black, makes moral judgment possible (113).

Speakers can use the feelings of guilt within their audiences to motivate them to prefer one definition of the situation to another. If it is possible to make the audience feel guilty about their role or in a particular political situation, then the audience will feel the need for atonement. The options are limited to relieve their guilt; they can engage in blaming others or self-mortification. The speaker's job, in cases of political preservation, is to encourage the audience to choose mortification over assigning blame to others. Once guilt is established within the audience, Black's idea of the second persona comes back into the situation. When the discourse offers a better version of themselves, the audience will move toward that definition. The mortification and second persona work together in that the guilt is a

figurative push toward the need for a better self; the second persona offers an ideology that one could subscribe to and become that better self. By realigning their beliefs, the audience is changed. A changed audience, one who believes in the ideology offered by the speaker, is now a powerful ally, rather than a group of people who question and demand answers and accountability following some sort of national tragedy or botched political maneuver. The change into the improved, second persona then has implications beyond the immediate topic at hand. This type of eulogistic discourse results in action undertaken in order to honor the way the deceased lived, and the manner in which they died.

#### **B. Hybrids**

Epidictic speeches are most easily characterized as those of praise and blame; however, there is more to it than that. Celeste Michelle Condit (1985) reviews the work of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969), in which they claimed that one of the prime function of epidictic speeches is to increase the adherence to values that could later support legislative and judicial arguments (Condit, 285). Additionally, in the audience perspective of epidictic speeches, Christine Oravec (1976) claims that although the audience learns about the world through the epidictic, that is secondary to judging the speaker (Condit, 287).

In the definition and understanding function of epidictic speeches, “audiences seek and invite speech...when some event, person, group, or object is confusing or troubling” (Condit, 288). According to Condit (1985), the speaker explains the troubling issue through the audience’s value system, which in turn gives the speaker the tremendous power to define the situation (288). Condit

articulates the power of epideictic speech, which is certainly found around the time of national tragedies such as the Iran hostage crisis, the Challenger explosion, and Waco, as she states, “In giving a speaker the right to shape the definition of the community, the audience gives the speaker the right to select certain values, stories, and persons from the shared heritage and to promote them over others” (289). If the major function of epideictic speaking is to shape the shared communal values (Condit, 1985), then the application to deflect blame is certainly fitting.

### C. Apologia

Unlike some others (Kruse, 1981), Halford Ross Ryan (1982) claims that “since classical accusation was not limited to attacks on character” (255-56), the rhetorical devices known as *kategoria* (accusations) and *apologia* should be defined broadly. Apologies are different when a speaker’s policies rather than their character have been accused (Ryan 258). Accusation of both character and policy share the similar organizational patterns of fact, definition, and quality, and apologies in both realms share the desire to correct the persona of the accused. They differ, however, at the critical moment when the speaker must make a decision on how to respond to the accusation. However, this moment does not necessarily have to be discreet; it may change over the course of an on-going accusation (Kramer & Olson, 2002).

Although Ryan believes that much can be gained from studying *kategoria* and *apologia* speeches as a set, he claims the critical rhetorician should not “ignore instances where an accusation or apology is somehow missing” (258). This may be important in cases where accusations are implied but not spoken, or come from

general, indefinable sources. Apologia is not necessarily linked to kategoria (accusation); there is not always an explicit accusation of wrongdoing. For example, the Presidential election of 1976 was colored by a general uneasiness about politicians rather than any direct accusations of wrongdoing. According to Ellen Reid Gold, the scrutiny in the media “combined with the general public mistrust made the need to defend one’s character more imperative-and more difficult-than ever” (306). In this case, the communication climate surrounding the entire election was a huge situational factor. Significantly, despite the lack of formal charges of wrongdoing, the candidates were forced into a defensive opposition, adopting apologetic postures. After a national tragedy, the accusation toward the government may be implied rather than explicit.

### III. Artifacts

#### A. Carter’s April 25, 1980 speech (“Rescue Attempt for American Hostages in Iran”)

Carter begins his speech as most eulogies would; he comforts the families. He states, “to the families of those who died and who were wounded, I want to express the admiration I feel for the courage of their loved ones and the sorrow I feel personally for their sacrifice.” This speech is not directed at the wounded soldiers per say, but at the grieving families and friends of those who were killed. This choice shows his aim as being toward a wider audience-that of the nation. It is interesting to note that Carter chooses to use personal pronouns such as “I” rather than inclusive pronouns such as “we” or “our.” According to Oravec (1976, in Condit, 1985), the audience judges speakers in epideictic speeches on their ability to



present praise- and blame-worthy subjects appropriately. He refers to his title and the duty it implies to strengthen his position. He claims, “this attempt was a necessity and a duty.” No one should blame him; he was just trying to do what he was supposed to do. He continues, “As President...the nation feels deep gratitude for the brave men” who were “prepared to rescue their fellow Americans from captivity. And as President, I also know that the nation shares not only my disappointment that the rescue effort could not be mounted, because of mechanical difficulties, but also my determination to persevere and to bring all of our hostages home to freedom.” This statement is rich in apologetic strategies. First, he shifts the focus away from the deaths of the soldiers. He is no longer eulogizing them and mourning the casualties of the mission; he is focused on the hostages and how the mission failed to rescue them. He also carefully mentions the mechanical difficulties that prevented the rescue mission (and the deaths of the soldiers) to remind the audience that it was beyond his control. He also talks about America; patriotism is a huge motivator. He wants to bring the hostages home not to just safety, but to “freedom.”

In this speech, Carter accepts responsibility for the deaths of the soldiers killed in the aborted hostage rescue attempt; he has nowhere else to place it. He cannot place blame on those actually involved with the unsuccessful military operation, as this would undermine his treatment of them as heroes. He must accept the blame because it is subordinate to his larger agenda of defining the situation in order to move his audience toward his version of who they should become. An additional eulogistic function is fulfilled by the speech when Carter

defines the situation in such a way as to reassure the audience of their shared communal values. He defines the mission clearly by stating that it was a “humanitarian mission” and that it was “not directed against Iran...people of Iran...not ...any feeling of hostility toward Iran or its people.” He also emphasizes that there were “no Iranian casualties.” This is an important point; soldiers may be killed in accidents, but that is their job. He plays up their sacrifice, the loss of life through doing their job, so he has to be clear that there were no Iranians killed or that spoils the “sacrifice” imagery. He is careful to paint a picture that is decidedly unlike a war situation. If he is to be successful in pushing his audience to become people who support his vision, they must advocate a peaceful, non-aggressive solution to the crisis. He states that he had been hoping to resolve the conflict through negotiation, and without violence. He claims that it was undertaken for a noble purpose, to “safeguard American lives, to protect America’s national interests and to reduce the tensions.”

His choice of the word “sacrifice” conjures up many patriotic images, and this ties to his later theme of continued American support in order to “bring all of our hostages home to freedom.” Since the soldiers have made a sacrifice with their lives, Carter’s claim that “the support of the American people...has been a most crucial effort” seems to be colored with responsibility and guilt. If the soldiers can make the ultimate sacrifice, then the average citizens can surely muster the courage to give their support to the efforts they died for. In fact, Americans must continue to act in order to pay tribute to their fallen soldiers and those who are still being held hostage. Carter uses their feelings of guilt in order to motivate them to honor

the fallen soldiers by continuing the negotiation and other attempts for the release of the hostages. Patriotism in the face of a military crisis is a very important building block for Carter's speech; he uses it to deflect blame for the mishandled rescue attempt, even while claiming "full responsibility" for it.

Patriotism as a central issue serves a dual purpose in this speech. First, it reinforces the communal values that Americans share. It is not a bunch of strangers they were trying to rescue, and it was not strangers who were killed; they were Americans. This brings to mind the cohesiveness that most citizens long for in their lives. It also serves as a springboard for the definition of Carter's ideal audience. He uses patriotism to reassure the nation that their community, the one that values patriotism, will go on despite the deaths of the soldiers. However, the journey cannot continue without each audience member's participation.

The role that Carter is encouraging his actual audience to take is that of the American Patriot. In this definition, the audience would be one who would accept their President's shortcomings; he is their leader, after all. They are all on the same team, so to speak, and everyone makes mistakes. In this newly defined role for the audience, it is important that people, even the President, admit their shortcomings in order to gain forgiveness. Carter justifies the mission by emphasizing the planning several times, thus bolstering his position that it was an accident and not the result of poor leadership. They waited several months to attempt a rescue of the hostages, but he explains that by stating, "this complex operation" required "intensive planning and...training...repeated rehearsal."

The Patriot audience is also required to continue supporting efforts to bring

the hostages home, but using peaceful methods. The noble purpose of the mission will support the waiting; the implied audience would rather be right than hurt innocent people or cause harm to the imprisoned Americans. By using the eulogistic strategies early on in the speech, Carter sets it up so that the only way that the idealized second persona can feel that their community will continue is to give meaning to the lives of the soldiers who died in the name of an American ideal. Therefore, the audience must continue to support Carter and his efforts.

Overall, Carter takes responsibility for the failed actions, but he stresses the justification for the actions he took in a way that he cannot be held responsible. As a Patriotic audience, the carefully designed one that Carter invites them to be, they cannot find him at fault. If the audience accepts the second persona as it is offered to them, then although they acknowledge the role Carter played in the botched rescue and its resulting deaths, they cannot blame him. The two ideologies-believing that your President is fallible and caused several deaths and the Patriotic dogma-cannot coexist.

#### B. Reagan's January 28, 1986 speech ("The Challenger Disaster Address")

After the Challenger exploded on live television, Ronald Reagan made a beautiful address to the nation. However, among the eulogistic function of his epideictic speech, he also incorporates the forensic and deliberative functions. He eulogizes the crew, but he also employs the apologetic strategies of bolstering and transcendence in order to promote the space program and its support by the American people.

Eulogies function to make a death seem real to a shocked audience (Jamieson, 1978, in Foss, 1983). Reagan directly addresses this when he speaks to the “schoolchildren of American who were watching the live coverage of the shuttle’s take-off.” Children certainly don’t grasp the concept of death as easily as adults, and the teacher in space program had whole classrooms fixated on the media-hyped images of the astronauts. He explains the deaths they have just witnessed in terms that fulfill another function of eulogies: to reassure the audience that the community will continue despite the death (Jamieson, 1978, in Foss, 1983). Reagan states, “sometimes painful things like this happen...the future doesn’t belong to the fainthearted; it belongs to the brave. The Challenger crew was pulling us into the future, and we’ll continue to follow them.” Due to Reagan’s investment in the space program, he obviously wants to see it succeed. In order for that to happen, he needs the adults to continue supporting it, and he also has to develop children who are unafraid to become astronauts, despite the images they have just witnessed. He also shores up his eulogy by emphasizing that the community can continue on without the astronauts who were lost. He states, “We’ll continue our quest in space. There will be more shuttle flights and more shuttle crew, and yes, more volunteers, more civilians, more teachers in space.” In order to relieve some of the grief and shock the audience is feeling, they buy into the continuation of the ideology that the deceased subscribed to.

Reagan uses bolstering when he sets America’s space program apart from that of the Soviet Union. According to Ware and Linkugel, bolstering is a rhetorical strategy in which the speaker “attempts to identify himself with something viewed

positively by the audience” (277). Reagan states, “We don’t hide our space program. We don’t keep secrets and cover things up. We do it all up front and in public. That’s the way freedom is, and we wouldn’t change it for a minute.” By bringing in the concept of freedom, it also conjures its opposite. In the 1980’s the Cold War was still a large political factor, and by calling up the image of communism, Reagan is able to portray America’s space program as patriotic. In other words, if it is the opposite of the communist way of doing things in Russia, our way of doing things is good, despite the fact that this horrible tragedy just occurred.

Transcendental strategies of apologia, those that guide the audience to see positive outcomes and not blame the speaker, are peppered throughout Reagan’s speech, as he is trying to get them to view this event not as a tragedy, but as step on a journey. Reagan states, “I know it’s hard to understand, but sometimes painful things like this happen. It’s all a part of the process of exploration and discovery...” He is trying to get his audience, most of whom witnessed the explosion, to view it as a means to an end, not simply the end of seven lives. Transcendence requires the speaker to “cognitively join some fact, sentiment, object, or relationship with some larger context within which the audience does not presently view that attribute” (Ware & Linkugel 280). Reagan is asking the audience to focus on the positive aspects of what can be learned through the space program rather than on the dangerous aspects that the audience is currently confronted with. He states, “The challenger crew was pulling us into the future, and we’ll continue to follow them.” With quotations like this, Reagan is hoping that the audience will see the continuation of the space program as essential to honoring the memory of the brave

astronauts and to continuing the American struggle to be superior in all ways.

Reagan had multiple motivations in his “Challenger Address.” One of these was to preserve his space program, into which he had invested a lot of time, effort, and money (Bondi). The space program was his pet project, and he needed to have his audience see it as a positive program in order to still believe in him. These motivational factors played into the speech he delivered, yet the constraints of the event limited his message. He had to address the tragic loss and explain why the space program was still worthwhile. In order to accomplish this, Reagan encourages the audience to feel guilt. He states, “We’ve grown used to wonders in this century. It’s hard to dazzle us...we’ve grown used to the idea of space, and perhaps we forget that we’ve only just begun...the members of the Challenger crew were pioneers.” He is highlighting how little the audience cared about the space program until the explosion. This causes them to feel guilty, as he has set up the space program as the top of the hierarchy. By reorienting the audience to what they should have been paying attention to—those pioneering astronauts—the audience feels remorseful for their apathy and possibly responsible for the deaths. This feeling of guilt and responsibility is intensified when Reagan tosses his support to NASA, the only other people who could really be thought to be responsible for the tragedy. He states, “I wish I could talk to every man and woman who works for NASA...and tell them: ‘your dedication and professionalism have impressed us for decades’.” He also says, “I’ve always had great faith in and respect for our space program. And what happened today does nothing to diminish it.” If the President trusts NASA, then apparently they must not be at fault for the accident. The audience is left with

their guilt, and the only route available to them, once Reagan establishes that he supports NASA and that they will not be the scapegoats in this situation, is self-mortification. They must turn their guilt upon themselves; they are guilty of not caring about their country's space program. In order to atone for this action, they must support it in the future.

C. Clinton's April 19, 1993 speech ("Statement on the Tragedy in Waco, Texas")

Clinton's speech begins with a seemingly simple statement: "on February the 28th, four federal agents were killed in the line of duty trying to enforce the law against the Branch Davidian compound which had...placed innocent children at risk." Although it doesn't sound like a typical eulogy, it functions to fulfill the need for the audience to know that their community will continue (Jamieson, 1978, in Foss, 1983). By stressing law and order, he established the parameters of right and wrong.

Clinton doesn't spend a lot of time eulogizing the Federal agents who were killed almost two months before this speech, but it is significant that he begins with their deaths and the nod to law and order rather than the more recent burning of the compound. Following Vatz's (1973) argument, speakers can select what they want to bring forward and therefore make relevant. By bringing up the federal agents who were killed, Clinton is helping to justify his cause and shift the audience toward support of his policies. It is important to the second persona he will invite his audience to become.

In general, the speech focuses on the fine line of responsibility. Clinton



claims responsibility for the decision only. He states that he “didn’t have a 4-or 5-hour detailed briefing form the FBI...didn’t go over every strategic part of it.” Janet Reno, it is implied, did. He claims that he, and the government in general, are “fully accountable to the American people.” This shifts blame away from him. He points out how impossible it would be for him to be solely responsible for the Waco fiasco because the media and therefore the American people were looking over his shoulder the entire time. If they blame Clinton, then they almost have to blame themselves since they had the opportunity to be vigilant and speak up at any time. He discusses how well-covered the event has been; the media was saturated with Waco coverage. This statement regarding the media serves to bolster his position that they have nothing to hide. Clinton makes a distinction of what he is personally responsible for when he says that he “signed off on the general decision and gave her (Reno) the authority to make the last call” (Emphasis mine). Additionally, he invokes his title, which may stir some hints of patriotism. He unnecessarily states, “I’m the President of the United States.” Essentially, he carefully avoids explicitly blaming Janet Reno, because as Attorney General, she was selected by him to do her job, any guilt on her part would reflect poorly on him as a leader. As much as he is denying that the government could have prevented the loss of the children’s lives, he selects his words in order to leave the listener with the impression that if the disaster at the Branch Davidian complex is found to be anyone’s fault, it is definitely more Janet Reno’s than his. This shift shows how his speech has become forensic in nature at this point.

Clinton assigns the responsibility for the actual deaths to David Koresh. He

states, “it is not possible in this life to control the behavior of others in every circumstance...He (Koresh) killed those he controlled, and he bears ultimate responsibility for the carnage that ensued.” Clinton further characterizes the cult leader by claiming, “David Koresh was dangerous, irrational, and probably insane...He was, moreover, responsible for the deaths and injuries.”

Clinton throws support to government officials and justifies their actions. First and foremost, he claims that Koresh had “placed innocent children at risk.” He repeatedly emphasizes that it was the children they were attempting to save, which will appeal to his audience. You can’t very well leave kids in the hands people who are menacing, as he portrayed the Branch Davidians and Koresh. He claims the cult members were “fanatics” who broke “Federal laws and common standards of decency” and that “the children...were...being abused significantly...forced to live in unsanitary conditions.” The government agents “made every reasonable effort” to prevent the loss of life. The standoff had been going on for seven weeks, and the planning was emphasized heavily. Clinton claims that the tear gas that was to be used was supposed to be safe for children and adults, and that “under no circumstances would our people fire any shots on them, even if fired upon.” He illustrated this point by stating, although the compound burned, that there was “no exchange of fire.” He explicitly states his support of the government agencies. He says, “The FBI has done a lot of things right for this country...” He provides examples such as finding the people responsible for the Trade Center bombing. Clinton further states, “I want to express...appreciation...Attorney General...Justice Department...Federal agents on the front lines who did the best they could under

deeply difficult circumstances.” He also strengthens the audience’s favorable opinion toward the agents by reminding them that “Four Federal agents were killed...trying to enforce the law.” It would seem heartless to be angry with people who had lost their colleagues as they were simply doing their job. The statement also serves to remind the audience that the cult was breaking the law. This show of support echoes Reagan’s support of NASA after a shuttle exploded on their watch.

One of the major ways that people seek forgiveness in an apology is by grounding the event in some historical time sequence. If an event has ties to the past and the future, so that it is seen as a contextual event rather than an isolated one, the audience is more likely to accept the explanation (Ware & Linkugel, 1973). Clinton evokes this characteristic of apologia when he states, “now we must review the past with an eye toward the future.” He orders “vigorous and thorough” investigations so that any events like this in the future may be “somewhat better handled and better understood.” The most telling tie he makes is a vague threat of future threats. He states, “fanaticism is on the rise...we may have to confront it again.” He also provides the audience with this lesson-learned statement: “I hope very much that others who will be tempted to join cults and to become involved with people like David Koresh will be deterred by the horrible scenes they have seen over the last seven weeks.”

The situation required more explanation than eulogy. It was a long, drawn-out situation, and Clinton needed to justify why the action was taken on that particular day, in that specific manner. He needed to explain the fact that he had made no official comment on the actual day of the disaster. Prolonged, in-depth

eulogizing of the innocents lost would most likely have back-fired, considering the intolerance Americans have for harming children. In addition, if he focused exclusively on eulogizing the fallen agents, he might have been seen as insensitive. His explanation serves as an apology without coming out and saying he was at fault. The plan was through, the intent was noble, the fanatics inside were harming the children; they had to act.

The second persona projected by Clinton consists foremost of people who will not tolerate behaviors such as child abuse, living in unsanitary conditions, or any other immoral or illegal activities. He offers this by continuously mentioning the children and how they were at risk by the way they were being treated. He does this to shift attention away from the children's' deaths, which would naturally anger the American population.

The second persona believes in law and order, even when their actions backfire. This is accomplished by emphasizing the World trade Center bombing and the death of Federal agents as they were doing their jobs. He also emphasizes that his audience has a say-that he and the government are fully responsible and will answer to the United States public. This "answering" is unnecessary, for those who have accepted the persona as it was presented, due to the extensive media coverage. Unless the public wants to accept that they personally failed by not being more attentive and outspoken as they watched the drama unfold in the media, they must accept the ideology offered to them: the government and the President are good, as they did everything by the law and order book. The "fanatics" are the ones to be feared and destroyed, which is what happened, albeit with some innocent

causalities-the children who they tried to protect and the agents who were just doing their job.

#### IV. Conclusions/future research

This idea of using eulogies in a combination of epideictic, deliberative and forensic functions works with many different scenarios: international military events, peace-time space disasters, domestic insurgencies. This could be broader than a genre-there are dissimilarities too numerous to mention, so a genre claim is unfounded, yet it is interesting that similar strategies can be employed across such different events to produce similar results.

Textual qualities that make it work (or not)-“I” when shifting blame through adoption of second persona-(Carter), “we” when the mourning/patriotism/they did it for the country so we have to keep it going-type feeling is needed (Reagan), and “he” or some one “other” when a combination is needed (Clinton).

It would be interesting to examine whether this is a relatively recent phenomenon-for example, after the Kent State incident, Nixon’s statement was very brief and almost blamed the victims-no use of eulogy. Other area to examine could include Jonestown or the CIA leaks that lead to assassinations.

## Bibliography

- Black, Edwin. "The Second Persona." *The Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 56 (April 1970) 109-119.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14.
- Bondi, Victor. "Science and Technology." *American Decades: 1980-1989*. Detroit: Gale Research Incorporated, 1999.
- Carpenter, Ronald H. and Robert V. Seltzer. "Situational Style and the Rotunda Eulogies." *Central States Speech Journal*, 22 (Spring 1971) 11-15.
- Carter, Jimmy. "Rescue Attempt for American hostages in Iran." 25 April 1980. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Jimmy Carter*, book 1, Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1981. 772-73.  
\*\*\*Also available in hard-copy from Kathryn Olson.\*\*\*
- Clinton, William J. "Statement on the tragedy in Waco, Texas." 20 April 1993. *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: William J. Clinton*, book 1, Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1994. 461-64.\*\*\*Also available on-line: <<http://frwebgate5.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/waisgate.cgi?WAISdocID=932038395626+2+0+0&WAISaction=retrieve>>  
\*\*\*
- Condit, Celeste Michelle. "The Functions of Epideictic: The Boston Massacre Orations as Exemplar." *Communication Quarterly*, 33 (Fall 1985) 284-99.
- Foss, Karen A. "John Lennon and the Advisory Function of Eulogies." *Central States Speech Journal*, 34 (Fall 1983) 187-94.

- Gold, Ellen Reid. "Political Apologia: the Ritual of Self-defense." *Communication Monographs*, 45 (November 1978) 306-316.
- Goldzwig, Steven R. and Patricia A Sullivan. "Post-Assassination Newspaper Editorial Eulogies: Analysis and Assessment." *Western Journal of Communication*, 59 (Spring 1995) 126-150.
- Jamieson, Kathryn H. *Critical Anthology of Public Speeches*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1978.
- Kramer, Michael R. and Kathryn M. Olson. "The Strategic Potential of Sequencing Apologia Stases: President Clinton's Self-Defense in the Monica Lewinski Scandal." *Western Journal of Communication*, 66 (Summer 2002) 347-68.
- Kruse, Noreen Wales. "The Scope of Apologetic Discourse: Establishing Generic Parameters." *Southern Speech Communication Journal*, 46 (Spring 1981) 278-291.
- Oravec, Christine. "'Observation' in Aristotle's theory of Epideictic." *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 9 (1976). 162-73.
- Perelman, C. and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: a Treatise in Argumentation*. (J. Wilkinson and P. Weaver, trans.) Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969 (original work published in 1958).
- Reagan, Ronald. "The Space Shuttle 'Challenger' Address." Online. Internet. <http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/rreaganchallenger.htm> 12/11/03.
- Ryan, Halford Ross. "Kategoria and Apologia: on their Rhetorical Criticism as a Speech Set." *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 68 (1982) 254-261.
- Ware, B. L. and Linkugel, Wil A. "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: on the

Generic Criticism of Apologia.” *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 59 (1973) 273-283.

Vatz, Richard E. “The Myth of Rhetorical Situation.” *Philosophy and Rhetoric*, 6(Summer 1973). 154-61.