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This thesis investigates the extent to which Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s and Ambassador Walters’ United Nations discourses on human rights reflects the rhetorical themes of “prophetic dualism” and “technocratic realism.” A metaphoric analysis of six speeches reveals that both Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ arguments were framed through an ideological division between Democracy and Communism.

The presence of “prophetic dualism” in Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ discourses is explained as an extension of President Reagan’s bipolar rhetoric on world affairs. The presence of “technocratic realism” in Walters’ discourse is described as resulting from a unique set of political and rhetorical factors. The exacting nature of “prophetic dualism” may make it ill suited as a method of argument in the realm of diplomacy.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This thesis seeks to investigate the rhetorical style in selected U.S. diplomatic discourse about human rights. Rhetorical scholars have long examined the role of metaphors in creating particular perceptions of reality (Richards; Black, "Second"; Ivie, "Images"). In this tradition, this study attempts to uncover some of the rhetorical strategies available to and employed by diplomats. By analyzing the metaphors used in diplomatic discourse, this author hopes to contribute to the understanding of how the speech of diplomacy proceeds and how the metaphors employed shape the United States' perceptions of various audiences.

Since the founding of this nation, a religious dimension has pervaded the political rhetoric of the United States. Political leaders have consistently drawn from a Protestant heritage when communicating their goals and justifying their actions. This religious dimension has been noted by many scholars, including Robert Bellah, who asserts that the founding fathers, especially the first few presidents, were responsible for establishing the tone and form of a national civil religion (7).

While the concept of civil religion owes its existence to the philosophy of the Enlightenment, its ideals are clearly manifest in the discourse that shaped this nation. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson's statement in the Declaration of Independence that "[all men] are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights" symbolizes the unification of spiritual and political rights into a national creed. This credo serves as the basis of a civil religion woven into the fabric of American society.

The importance of a reverent polity was not lost on Jefferson's successors. Political leaders throughout the nineteenth century invoked Providence for help in
guiding this nation along its rightful path. After two periods of religious revival (the Second Great Awakening of 1800 and the Third Great Awakening of 1857-1859), and domestic expansion in the sanctimonious name of manifest destiny, Abraham Lincoln rhetorically absolved his countrymen in an address at the Gettysburg National Cemetery by proclaiming that “this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom.” With the end of the Civil War, the United States experienced a growth of nationalism and subsequently industrialism. These developments would cast the United States as a world power; a role it seemed hesitant to accept.

With the dawning of the twentieth century, isolationists and internationalists engaged in great debates concerning America's proper role amongst nations. As Ralph Barton Perry summarized, “the evidence of this, abundant and eloquent, is to be found in the state papers of public officials, in congressional debates and political campaigns, and in the form of popular appeal employed whenever it was necessary to evoke the full force of American opinion and sentiment” (146). It was during this era of debate that the religious dimension in American political rhetoric was rarefied in foreign policy discourse.

The crisis of two world wars firmly entrenched the United States as a global economic and military power. Consequently, many political leaders translated this new position of dominance into justification for spreading the gospel of American democracy. The United States could justify involvement in the affairs of foreign nations in the name of making the world “safe for democracy.”

U.S. foreign policy during the post World War II era was portrayed as a Manichean confrontation of West and East, and was articulated in terms of reverent democracy versus Godless Communism (Bellah 16). Nowhere were these themes more prevalent than in the rhetoric of the Eisenhower administration. Eisenhower's foreign policy was frequently articulated in terms of the ideals of freedom, a militant
God, and the existence of evil in the world (Wander 344).

During the next two decades the United States found itself again in the midst of military and moral crisis. The Kennedy and Johnson administrations, however, did not employ the rhetorical strategies used by their predecessors in the previous exigencies. Rather, they stressed a “technocratic realism” in the execution of foreign policy (Wander 348). This mode of argument expressed U.S. involvement in Vietnam in terms of efficiency and expediency, rather than morality. The effects of the Vietnam war and the Watergate scandal on the United States’ national psyche contributed to the 1976 election of President Carter. For the American public, and indeed the world community, the election symbolized a return of humanity, if not morality, to the Oval Office. The Carter administration’s frequent predication of foreign policy goals on the observance of human rights stands as evidence of the rhetoric of morality.

However well-intentioned, this rhetorical strategy had serious practical shortcomings. The vital interests of the United States could not be held in precarious balance with human rights conditions in the Third World and Latin American countries. The foreign policy dilemmas that arose from this conflict of interests culminated in the humiliation of the United States at the hands of Iran. Thus, after four years of foreign policy founded on the hope of humanity but largely beset by failure, the American public may have been ready for the return of their “militant God” to restore national pride.

With Ronald Reagan’s ascension to the presidency in 1981, there occurred a “mighty comeback of the messianic approach to foreign policy” (Schlesinger 4). At the core of the Reagan administration’s foreign policy rhetoric lay the fundamental claim that the Soviet empire was the root of all evil in the world.1 Furthermore, it was the United States’ mission to lead the crusade for democracy. As Henry A.
Plotkin explained, "Reagan and the Republican right wing had historically invested the Soviet Union with demonic qualities. One had the impression of the United States locked in a never-ending struggle with the Soviet Anti-Christ" (58). This philosophy reflects a rhetorical turn in foreign policy similar to that of the cold war period of the 1950's.

**Statement of the Problem**

A review of U.S. political rhetoric reveals the frequent invocation of religious themes, especially during times of crisis. As the United States' prominence in world affairs grew, its foreign policy rhetoric took on a similar air of zealous nationalism. Most previous research efforts along these lines have focused solely on the rhetorical strategies used by the President in articulating his goals (Jewett; Ivie, "Presidential"; Wander, "Rhetoric"). Given the complexities in developing and articulating foreign policy, such research seems less than complete.

While the President bears ultimate responsibility for articulating foreign policy objectives, other channels of communication exist for this purpose. The Department of State is one such viable medium. With an array of diplomats around the world, and a delegation in the United Nations, the Department of State often serves as emissary of the foreign policy of the United States. To ignore the wealth of discourse created by these diplomats is to neglect discovering all the possible means of persuasion available to the presidency (Aristotle 7).

This study seeks to investigate the rhetorical strategies used in the field of diplomacy. Specifically, this study addresses the following question:

To what extent do the speeches of Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters reflect the themes of prophetic dualism and/or technocratic realism?

An analysis of the metaphors used in diplomatic discourse may reveal specific symbolic resources available in certain rhetorical situations. For the purpose of this
study, the rhetorical strategies used by United States Permanent Representatives to the United Nations Jeane J. Kirkpatrick (1981-1985) and Vernon A. Walters (1985-1989) will be investigated. Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters served successively as President Reagan's primary voice in the United Nations. The discourse to be analyzed concerns U.S. allegations of human rights violations by nations hostile to the United States, a key theme in Reagan's efforts to establish America's moral hegemony (Mazaar 406).

**Significance of the Study**

The speech of diplomacy is often rife with contradictions. Such discourses may be directed towards diverse audiences yet be depersonalized, may be caustic as well as conciliatory, and may be wrapped in rationalistic self-justification (Oliver 27). To better understand its inherent complexities, diplomatic discourse demands investigation from scholars in several disciplines. Rhetorical theorists and critics, legal communication scholars, historians, and political scientists may each make unique contributions to an understanding of the discourse of diplomacy. While the current study will focus solely on the rhetorical elements of diplomatic discourse, it may serve as impetus for interdisciplinary research.

Rhetorical theorists interested in the notion that rhetoric is epistemic may benefit from this study as it is essentially concerned with the social creation of reality (Richards; Black, *Models*; Turbayne; Berger and Luckmann; Burke, *Grammar*; Willard). As sources of rhetorical invention, metaphors allow rhetors to organize an audience's perception of reality according to the rhetor's particular needs (Black, "Second"; Ivie, "Speaking"; Perry, "Rhetorical"). In analyzing the metaphors used by Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters, this author hopes to provide insight into how their discourse functions to frame the United States' perceptions of various audiences.
Legal communication scholars may also find this study of particular importance as it relates to the precept of separation between church and state. When religious language is used to gain political leverage, the principles of the church often times become confused with the principles of the state (Cecil 20). Should this study find that religious themes are entwined with diplomatic themes so as to create the image that the political views of the U.S. are morally supreme, then legal communication scholars may use these findings to investigate how this discourse reflects the religious clauses of the First Amendment.

Historical scholarship traditionally has discussed diplomacy within the broader context of U.S. foreign relations (Dougherty and Pfaltzgraff). This current study may benefit historians by presenting another perspective from which to view diplomatic relations. By emphasizing the language of diplomacy, historians may discover significant patterns in the way the United States addresses certain issues or countries. Further, as the connotative meaning of language often change over time, such research will also better enable historians to understand diplomatic appeals in their historical context.

This current study also may aid political scientists in their examination of international conflict. Robert Newman correctly notes that the objective in studying the decision-making process in international affairs is not the simple understanding of why one decision was made over another, but rather to improve the decision-making process (320). In this light, the proposed analysis of diplomatic arguments can be seen as an important first step to understanding crisis resolution. By investigating the development of argument through the rhetorical topic of metaphor, political scientists may become more aware of how arguments are created. From this foundation, improvement to the decision-making process can be considered.
Scope of the Study

Having presented the heuristic value of this study, attention is now turned to defining its parameters. Analysis in this study will focus on the discourse of U.S. Permanent Representatives to the United Nations, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick, and her successor, Vernon A. Walters. Only those speeches delivered before the United Nations concerning alleged human rights violations will be investigated.

The reasons for selecting these specific arguments are two-fold. First, while the Secretary of State generally serves as the President’s primary diplomatic voice, the pronouncements of Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters may be assumed to be accurate representations of the predominant ideology of the Reagan administration. As such, the discourse provides at least a partial account of the United States’ diplomatic position on human rights during Reagan’s presidency. The use of human rights as a topic of attack was a key strategy in the Reagan administration’s attempt to gain moral superiority over its adversaries (Mazaar 406).

Second, while Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters frequently spoke before Congressional committees, private organizations, and public institutions, those audiences were generally homogeneous. As Aristotle long since noted, it is not difficult to praise the Athenians to an Athenian audience (51). In focusing specifically on speeches made before the United Nations, this author presents the argument that speakers before an international audience may not have the same rhetorical strategies available as speakers before a domestic audience. Further, given the history of opposition encountered by the U.S. in the United Nations, the speech of Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters may be instructive in understanding the ground of this conflict and the argument strategies used to adapt to various audiences.

A comparative study of Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ discourse with that of other
diplomats within the Reagan administration is beyond the scope of this study. As this study is intended to discover the primary symbolic resources employed in U.S. diplomatic discourse, the analysis of two prominent sources should be sufficient to meet this goal. Similarly, while the comparison of rhetorical strategies employed by diplomats during Reagan’s administration with those used by diplomats of other presidents may prove valuable, such an undertaking is not possible within the parameters of this thesis.

Review of Literature

This review will provide critical analysis of the literature directly and peripherally relevant to Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ speeches. Specifically, this section will examine influential works in the following areas: (1) The historical influence of religion on the United States’ democratic philosophy, (2) The role of human rights as a variable in the United States’ foreign policy goals, (3) The role of rhetoric in sustaining (political) ideology, and (4) The development of scholarship concerning the use of metaphors.

The literature review will present an extensive, albeit not exhaustive, collection that will enhance the reader’s understanding of Ambassador Kirkpatrick and Walters’ speeches. Further, while analyzing existing literature, this author will point to connections with ideas from the rich tradition of historical and critical research to add support to this paper’s thesis.

The wealth of scholarship pertaining to the historical influence of religion on U.S. democratic philosophy stands as testimony to this topic’s importance. Given the parameters of this review, however, only several of the many highly regarded works may be analyzed. Because of their uniquely influential nature, the following works will be highlighted: Ralph Barton Perry’s *Puritanism and Democracy*, William G. McLoughlin and Robert N. Bellah’s *Religion in America*, David L. Larson’s *The
Puritan Ethic in United States Foreign Policy, and Philip Wander's "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy."

In examining this nation's puritan and democratic heritage, Perry discussed topics ranging from God's sovereignty and the importance of salvation, to civil liberties and the ideals of humanity and equality. The real significance of Perry's work, however, lies in his appraisal of puritanism and democracy based on what he calls a "moral standard" (48). This standard is significant in that it permits the contemporary reader to evaluate the ideals of the founding father through a value consonant with that era: the value of individual rights as a central theme of political philosophy.

McLoughlin's and Bellah's anthology offers insights from respected scholars in various disciplines. This collection of essays includes Bellah's own classic "Civil Religion in America," Martin E. Marty's "The Spirit's Holy Errand: The Search for a Spiritual Style in Secular America," and Michael Novak's "Christianity: Renewed or Slowly Abandoned?" Along with the other collected essays, this anthology provides historical evaluations of religion in the U.S., discusses contemporary issues facing American religion, and predicts future orientations for religion in U.S. society.

Larson's work is unique in that it presents a series of addresses that reflect the puritan element in U.S. foreign policy discourse. It is the only work of its kind found by this researcher. The speeches represent academic, congressional, and presidential perspectives on the theoretical aspects of morality in foreign policy, the moral and ideological aspects of United States national policy, and the power and responsibility of the United States in protecting and projecting its national interests (Larson x).

In his 1984 article "The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy," Wander analyzes the modes of argument employed by U.S. presidents during the cold war. This analysis led Wander to uncover two contrasting rhetorical tactics which he labels "prophetic dualism" and "technocratic realism." More significantly, however, Wan-
der's investigation firmly entrenches foreign policy discourse as a viable topic for rhetorical investigation. Based on Aristotle's topic of comparison and contrast, Wander's article also serves as impetus for this thesis.

Several other compilations are particularly useful in providing an interdisciplinary view of religion's function in American politics: American Political Theology, edited by Charles Dunn; Religion and Politics, edited by Fred E. Baumann and Kenneth M. Jensen; and Religion and Politics edited by W. Lawson Taitte. These works are significant in that they each incorporate theological scholarship with philosophical, legal, and historical writing to provide the reader with several perspectives from which to view the role of religion in politics and politics in religion.

While the quantity of literature related to human rights as a philosophical or legal issue is certainly impressive, the more pertinent topic of human rights as a variable in the United States' foreign policy goals does not yield as rich a find. The edited works of Kenneth A. Thompson, Moral and Political Discourse: Theory and Practice in International Relations and Moral Dimensions of American Foreign Policy, and Donald P. Kommers and Gilburt D. Loescher, Human Rights and American Foreign Policy, are among the few that merit specific mention.

In Moral and Political Discourse, Thompson examines the relationship between rhetoric, defined as moral discourse, and political discourse and suggests that they are inextricably linked. Thompson first reviews the United States' political philosophy, then examines the problems of a moral approach to international relations. These problems are exemplified in a review of the disparate approaches to moral issues by several U.S. presidents.

The anthology Moral Dimensions of American Foreign Policy presents the viewpoints of such noted scholars and practitioners of human rights and foreign policy as John Courtney Murray and Hans Morgenthau. This compendium presents
recurrent dilemmas in U.S. foreign policy regarding moral issues including foreign aid, human rights, and warfare. These topics are of particular significance to his study in that they were moral issues frequently addressed by the Reagan administration.

Kommers and Loescher's book provides in-depth analysis of the role human rights has traditionally played in U.S. foreign policy, the problems in dealing with conflicting ideologies on issues of human rights, and the difficulties of monitoring human rights violations around the world. The value of this compilation lies not only in its theoretical contributions, but also in its proposals for implementing new strategies for fine-tuning existing policies.

Of additional interest are the works of Lars Schoultz, Human Rights and United States Policy Toward Latin America, and Marnia Lazreg, "Human Rights, State and Ideology: An Historical Perspective." Schoultz's work documents in great detail the relationship between economic and military assistance to Latin America and the human rights conditions in those countries. Lazreg's article takes the subject a step further and explores the reasons why the United States makes human rights part of its foreign policy. Lazreg asks, "In other words, what are the functions this [human rights] campaign fulfills for the governments that undertake it" (32)?

Apart from these books, the U.S. Department of State Bulletin presents many accounts of the current state of human rights in many countries and how these conditions affect U.S. relations with them. As an official organ of the United States government, this source may have an element of bias. However, the U.S. Department of State Bulletin does merit mention for it presents a vast amount of official government claims. The Human Rights Journal and Amnesty International also publish similar nation by nation accounts of the state of human rights. However, a caveat is extended again by this author that these publications may have an element of bias.
The next variable to be considered is that of ideology. Specifically, this section examines the role of rhetoric in sustaining ideology. Here, the works of Philip Wander are again invaluable. In “The Ideological Turn in Modern Criticism” and “The Third Persona: An Ideological Turn in Rhetorical Theory,” Wander examines the importance of investigating consistent or reoccurring themes in political and social rhetoric (c.f. Megill et al.). He is a major proponent of the idea that criticism has a social responsibility, and has received mixed support in articles by Michael Calvin McGee, “Another Phillipic: Notes on the Ideological Turn in Criticism,” and Farrel Corcoran, “The Widening Gyre: Another Look at Ideology in Wander and his Critics.”

In The Concept of Ideology, George Lichtheim presents the classic interpretation of ideology by defining it as false consciousness. Further, he attempts to determine the role of ideology as a political phenomenon. In the same vein, McGee feels that ideology has a political dimension in that political rhetoric is issue bound. He presents this view in “The ‘Ideograph’: A Link Between Rhetoric and Ideology.”


While Warner Levi, like other scholars, believes a relationship exists between ideology and government, in “Ideology, Interests, and Foreign Policy,” he claims that ideology had no real effect on decision-making in foreign policy. This claim is significant in that it represents an opposing viewpoint to much of the existing literature concerning ideology and politics.

The final area reviewed in this section is the development of scholarship concerning the use of metaphors. Metaphor as a topic of investigation originated in
ancient Greece. As such, Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* provide among the earliest accounts of the role of metaphors in rhetoric. In *De Oratore*, Cicero follows Aristotle’s tradition proclaiming that a metaphor is nothing more than a “brief similitude” in which one word is put in the place of another; “a great ornament to language” (237, 240). This view that metaphor is merely decorative language prevailed in rhetorical scholarship through the nineteenth century. Thomas Hobbes’ *Leviathan*, and Richard Whately’s *Elements of Rhetoric* are testimony to this.

Contemporary scholarship expands the view of metaphors and contends that metaphors are not just embellishment, but rather a way of knowing. Among the most influential works in this tradition are I.A. Richards’ *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Max Black’s *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*, and Colin Turbayne’s *The Myth of Metaphor*. In the classic 1936 work, Richards proclaims that “Thought is metaphoric, and proceeds by comparison, and the metaphors of language derive therefrom” (94). This observation, based on the belief that reality is created through the symbols used to describe, marked an epistemological turn in rhetorical scholarship. Richards also provided scholars with the terminology to describe the two parts of a metaphor: “tenor” and “vehicle” (96).

Black’s *Models and Metaphors* represents both an extension of Richards’ work and a departure from it. He follows Richards’ lead and develops additional terminology to aid in the understanding of how metaphors function to create reality. In Black’s analysis, a “subsidiary subject” fosters insight into a “principle subject” through a “system of associated processes” that allow the listener or reader to perceive the principle subject from a unique perspective (40, 46). Black, however, departs from existing “comparison” and “substitution” views of metaphors and develops a seven point “interaction view” that describes how metaphors alter perceptions of reality.
Turbayne’s interest in metaphors lies in understanding their role in creating myths. He believes that only by “exploding” certain myths, or “undressing” certain metaphors can their true meaning be understood (Turbayne 4). To this end, Turbayne examines the mechanism metaphors traditionally applied to metaphysics and suggests that a language metaphor would allow scholars to view events in nature in a different light. Accordingly, the repeated use of a metaphor to describe an event or object limits the perspectives from which the event or object may be understood. The implications of this for political rhetoric are significant.

Several other works merit attention for their summaries of the historical treatment of metaphors. The edited works of Andrew Ortony, *Metaphor and Thought*, and Mark Johnson, *Philosophical Perspectives on Metaphor*, each provide critical analyses by many respected scholars on metaphoric theory. In addition, Michael Osborn’s “The Evolution of the Theory of Metaphor in Rhetoric” serves a similar function by tracing the gradual development of thought on the subject from Aristotle to Kenneth Burke.

In the realm of political discourse, Robert Ivie has contributed significantly to the understanding of how metaphors or “vocabulary of motives” promote or conceal certain agendas. Ivie’s essays “Presidential Motives for War,” “Images of Savagery in American Justifications for War,” and “Speaking ‘Common Sense’ About the Soviet Threat,” present the rhetorical strategies used by various U.S. presidents in times of crisis. Of special interest to this thesis is Ivie’s “Metaphor and the Rhetorical Invention of Cold War ‘Idealists’.” This article establishes a method for examining the metaphors used in rhetorical discourse. Ivie’s taxonomy serves as a model for this study, and is explained in full in the following section.

**Methodology**

When deciding upon methodology, two questions must be considered: (1)
What method of analysis best fits the purpose of the study? and (2) How will this method be applied? As this study is essentially an examination of diplomatic discourse, a critical method that features the message is appropriate. Metaphoric criticism is one such method. Its theoretical foundation in the social creation of reality makes metaphoric criticism especially suited for this study. For political rhetoric, at its heart, is intended to paint a particular picture of reality.

Having briefly addressed the first question, the more detailed issue of application must be considered. Ivie’s five step process of examining the artifacts, then isolating, sorting, analyzing, and assessing the metaphors will be employed to examine Ambassadors’ Kirkpatrick and Walters speeches (Foss 191). While somewhat rigid by design, this process does allow for interpretation by the researcher, a quality that enhances the taxonomy’s heuristic value.

As suggested by Ivie, the procedure for identifying key metaphors begins with an extensive review of the speaker’s text and context (167). This author will examine the speeches of Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters that pertain to human rights and were delivered before the United Nations, as well as other addresses and essays related to the speaking events. In this manner, this author will gain a better understanding of the historical conditions during which the focal speeches were delivered.

After examining a substantial amount of material for historical and critical support, this author will select three speeches delivered by each ambassador. These speeches will then be examined carefully in effort to identify the metaphors employed by the speaker. After several readings, these vehicles will be marked and filed with their immediate context, reducing the text to an abridged version of its original form (Ivie 167).

Next, the marked vehicles will be categorized based on similarities in themes or “metaphorical concepts” (Ivie 167). During this step, the researcher begins to de-
velop an understanding of the rhetorical strategies employed by the speaker. After completing this initial categorization, this researcher will create a new file of vehicles and their immediate contexts from each of the similar themes previously identified. This organizational technique presents the rhetor's use of vehicles in a given category with uses in other categories.

Lastly, this researcher will examine the files created in the preceding step, focusing attention on predominant patterns of usage within and between categories (Ivie 168). This process uncovers the speaker's consistent rhetorical strategies. After completing this five step process, this researcher will be able to speculate about "both the limits and untapped potential" of Ambassador Kirkpatrick's and Walters' discourse (Ivie 168).

In keeping with I.A. Richards' definition, the word "metaphor" refers to a whole double unit—both the tenor or principle subject, and the vehicle which gives the tenor meaning (96,97). The emphasis is not on the two individual parts or a metaphor, but rather on the unique consequences of their interaction; not in establishing a direct resemblance between two objects, but rather in creating certain attitudes toward an object. As Richards explains, this interaction between tenor and vehicle creates "a meaning of more varied powers that can be ascribed to either" (100).

As such, the following metaphoric analysis focused not on the limited relationship between one tenor and one vehicle, nor on a highlighted word in a speech being identified as a metaphor, but rather on the cumulative effect of all metaphors in the discourse. Independently, each highlighted word may lack metaphoric value. However, grouped into clusters, these words create metaphoric themes. The methodological question then is not simply "What is the relationship between one metaphor and another?" but more significantly, "What prevailing themes emerge from these
relationships?” It is in answering that latter question that a deeper understanding of the complexities of diplomatic discourse may be gained.

Having presented the rationale for choosing this method of criticism, and describing how this proposed analysis will be conducted, attention is now given to the following chapters.

**Plan of the Study**

The proposed study will proceed in the following manner. Chapter two will present an analysis of Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s speeches based on the format described in the preceding section. Chapter three will present an analysis of Ambassador Walters’ speeches based on the same methodology. Chapter four will present this author’s evaluations of Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ speeches based on the analysis in chapters two and three, respectively, and will conclude this study with brief statements concerning limitations of the analysis and recommended areas for future research.
NOTES


2 In Lloyd F. Bitzer’s essay, “The Rhetorical Situation,” he explains “When I ask, What is a rhetorical situation?, I want to know the nature of those contexts in which speakers or writers create rhetorical discourse: How should they be described? What are their characteristics? Why and how do they result in the creation of rhetoric?”
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CHAPTER II
A METAPHORIC ANALYSIS OF AMBASSADOR JEANE J. KIRKPATRICK'S DISCOURSE

If it is true that "transformations in the field of American foreign relations history have occurred at times of great international change," then the time is ripe for a broader perspective in examining this field of research (Paterson 93). Traditionally the domain of diplomatic and political history, the intricate nature of foreign relations may be better understood if examined through an interdisciplinary approach. Accordingly, rhetorical criticism may aid in understanding the language used to articulate foreign policy goals and objectives.

Rhetorical critics have long been interested in U.S. foreign policy discourse as a field of research (Hill; Ivie; Wander). From a rhetorical critic's perspective, foreign policy discourse essentially creates a social reality. This concept prescribes that rhetoric is epistemic; that reality is known or understood through the language used to describe it (Berger and Luckmann).

One way in which language fulfills this function is through metaphor. As Sonja Foss explains, "metaphors contain implicit assumptions, points of view, and evaluations. They organize attitudes toward whatever they describe and provide motives for acting in certain ways" (189; Black; Richards). These implications are particularly significant in the realm of foreign relations. The language chosen by diplomats to explain a policy or justify an action can effectively influence the domestic audience, and, perhaps, shape the reactions of other nations.

That language is paramount in diplomacy is attested by Ambassador Jeane J. Kirkpatrick. During her confirmation hearings before the United States Senate
Committee on Foreign Relations, Kirkpatrick underscored the importance of effective communication:

I am profoundly convinced that speech is action - and important action. Speech both reflects and conditions our understanding of the world and of each other. We understand the world through words. One of my goals, Mr. Chairman, as this country's Ambassador to the United Nations, will be to speak clearly and to insure that others presenting the U.S. position speak clearly. Clarity is an essential component of effective communication. Communication is what I am most interested in (7).

Ambassador Kirkpatrick's premium on clarity in diplomatic communication is evident. As such, an examination of her own discourse seems worthwhile for several reasons. First, in response to Michael H. Hunt's call for "a greater sensitivity to language" a metaphoric analysis of Kirkpatrick's discourse may reveal specific symbolic resources which frame the United States' perceptions of the world (109). Second, by examining the ideological foundations of diplomatic discourse--"those deeper structures of language and rhetoric that both impart and circumscribe meaning"--a better understanding of how diplomatic discourse proceeds may be obtained (Hunt 110).

To this end, the following speeches by Ambassador Kirkpatrick will be examined: "Afghan Situation and Implications for Peace," November 18, 1981; "Double Standards in Human Rights," November 24, 1981; and "Human Rights in El Salvador," December 1, 1981. The basis for selecting these speeches is that they all addressed the issue of human rights and they were all presented before the United Nations. This criterion provides practical parameters for the study. These speeches will be analyzed according to a methodology which requires (1) an examination of discourse related to the speeches, (2) isolation of the metaphors in the speeches, (3) sorting the metaphors by their consistent themes, (4) analyzing the employed metaphors, and (5) assessing the employed metaphors.
A brief review of Ambassador Kirkpatrick's academic and political background may be useful in shedding light on her ideological foundations. Jeane Kirkpatrick earned a Ph.D. in Political Science from Columbia University (1968). In the ensuing years, Kirkpatrick studied at the University of Paris before going on to lecture at the Institute for American Universities at the University of Aix-Marseilles, Aix-en-Provence, France. Upon returning to the United States, Kirkpatrick taught at Georgetown University in Washington, D.C., where she was named a Leavey University Professor. She also became a Resident Scholar at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy.

Kirkpatrick has authored various books, monographs, and articles on American foreign policy and domestic policy issues. While her complete works are too numerous to mention, two articles merit particular attention. In “U.S. Security and Latin America,” and “Dictatorships and Double Standards,” Kirkpatrick vehemently criticized the Carter Administration’s handling of foreign policy issues in Central America, South America, and the Caribbean. This opposition eventually brought her to a political crossroad.

A politically conservative Democrat, Kirkpatrick served as co-Vice Chairman of the Coalition for a Democratic Majority, and was a member of the Democratic Commission of Party Structure and Presidential Nomination from 1975 through 1978. During the 1980 presidential campaign, however, she became a member of Ronald Reagan’s foreign policy advisory group; a position she earned primarily because of her ideological criticisms of the Carter administration’s foreign policies.

**Review of Related Discourse**

Jeane Kirkpatrick’s impressions of the Carter administration’s foreign policy were summarized in a November, 1979 article entitled “Dictatorships and Double Standards.” In this article, Kirkpatrick claimed the administration’s use of human
rights as standard by which to determine U.S. foreign policy not only contributed to a deterioration of U.S. relations with Third World countries, but also opened the door for Soviet expansion into the Middle East and Latin America. Further, she sharply criticized the Carter administration for its active collaboration "in the replacement of moderate autocrats friendly to American interests with less friendly autocrats of extremist persuasion" (34). These arguments brought Kirkpatrick to the attention of then President-elect Reagan and set the stage for her appointment as Ambassador to the United Nations.

Upon taking office, President Reagan continued the emphasis on human rights as a foreign policy concern. Indeed, the Reagan administration explicitly stated that international terrorism was considered the most serious human-rights violation (qtd. in de Onis A10). This claim was manifest in the administration's foreign policy rhetoric concerning Communist activity in Third World countries.

Taking a strong anti-Communist position, the Reagan administration frequently protested Soviet activity in Latin America. In February, 1981, the State Department depicted El Salvador's problems as being caused by "terrorist insurgency supported from the outside," and that U.S. assistance to El Salvador was designed to "improve their capability to interdict infiltration and to respond to terrorist attacks" (Department of State Bulletin 43). Further reports accused the Soviet Union specifically of being the source of the terrorist insurgency.

The State Department also made public a special report entitled "Communist Interference in El Salvador," a reputedly declassified version of official documents the Reagan administration shared with its allies (de Onis A1). The study concluded that Cuba, the Soviet Union, and other Communist states were carrying out a "well-coordinated, covert effort to bring about the overthrow of El Salvador's established government and to impose in its place a Communist regime with no popular sup-


port” (Department of State Bulletin 1). President Reagan asserted that the United States would stand committed to preventing the importation of terrorism into El Salvador and the Western Hemisphere (qtd. in New York Times A23).

The Reagan administration’s hard line rhetoric against the Soviet Union was not confined to that country’s involvement in the Western Hemisphere. Indeed, the administration was generally critical of the Soviet Union’s ideological foundations, an ideology the president described as “without God, without our idea of, of morality in the religious sense...which means they can resort to lying or stating - or stealing, or cheating or even murder’ (qtd. in New York Times A23). To Reagan, this lack of morality placed the Soviet Union as the greatest violator of human rights (qtd. in Clines A22).

Further, the Reagan administration vehemently protested the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Reports published by the State Department in March and October of 1981 presented the plight of the Afghan “mujahidin” who were struggling to defend their sovereignty against Soviet aggression. As one study stated, the Afghans were “fighting a holy war” (Van Hollen 65). As such, Reagan often took exception to the characterization of the Afghans as “rebels,” preferring instead to call them “freedom fighters” (qtd. in Raines A3). This detail for semantics characterized the administration’s opposition to the Soviet invasion and lends support to the thesis that language may create a social reality.

The United States Congress also took issue with the situation in Afghanistan. In a June, 1981 hearing before the Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organizations, and the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, Commission chairman Dante Fascell testified to the Soviet Union’s violation of the Helsinki Final Act of 1975. Fascell claimed that “the Soviet invasion and attempted occupation of Afghanistan have struck at the very heart of these Final Act prin-
ciples”; principles relating to the inherent rights of individuals and nations to self-determination (1). This testimony, supported with witness accounts of the Afghan situation, was the first congressional effort to document the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

In Autumn of 1981, the Reagan administration reemphasized its condemnation of Communist insurgency in El Salvador. The State Department released a report summarizing the history of terrorism in El Salvador and its destabilizing effect on democracy in that war-torn country. The report criticized not only left-wing terrorist activity, but also right-wing insurrection. It blamed both factions for disrupting the democratic reforms initiated by Salvadoran President Jose Napoleon Duarte (Department of State Bulletin 77).

On November 10, 1981, the Reagan-supported Duarte government came under fire from the United Nations Human Rights Commission. The Commission reported “a consistent pattern of gross violations” of human rights in El Salvador since the ruling junta took over in 1979” (qtd. in New York Times A4). In defense, the Duarte government claimed most of the alleged human rights violations to be “isolated ‘abuses of authority’” by security forces, and not the work of the regular army (qtd. in Bonner A3).

The Human Rights Commission’s report also elicited comments from the United States. On November 24, 1981, Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick formally protested the Commission’s practices in investigating human rights violations (“Double Standards in Human Rights”). One week later, Kirkpatrick presented the United States’ views on human rights in El Salvador (“Human Rights in El Salvador”). These speeches, along with Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s November 18, 1981 address (“Afghan Situation and Implications for Peace”) suggest a concerted effort by the United States to focus on human rights. These speeches, therefore, are the
focus of the following examination.

Isolation of Metaphors

For clarification purposes, Ambassador Kirkpatrick's speeches will be examined individually and in chronological order. Only sections rich in metaphor will be reproduced, and the metaphors will be marked in bold print.

Examination of “Afghan Situation and Implications for Peace”

1. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, launched on Christmas Eve nearly 2 years ago, was a momentous event that altered the climate and, indeed, the course of world politics. The invasion was a grave violation of the U.N. Charter, which enjoins all members to “...refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state...” As such, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan shook the very foundation of world order.

2. The far-reaching consequences of this event should by now be apparent to all of us. It had shattering effects upon the prospects for the continued stability of South Asia and the Persian Gulf, deepening anxieties throughout this vital region and raising the specter of a wider conflict. It also severely aggravated tensions between East and West. More than any single event in recent years, the Soviet invasion impelled a widespread reassessment of the world situation based upon a new and more sober appreciation of the danger that the policies of the Soviet Union now pose to global stability and world peace. The invasion thus marked a watershed in the postwar era, bring to a definitive conclusion a period of optimism concerning the evolution of Soviet policy and intentions.

3. No sector of the Afghan society has been spared the consequences of Soviet occupation and the ruthless efforts to impose upon the Afghan people a Communist totalitarian system - an effort that began in 1978 with the initial Communist coup
overthrowing the Daoud government. Almost 3 million people - about one-fifth of the entire Afghan population - have been forced to flee their country and now constitute the largest single refugee group in the world. Tens of thousands of people have been killed. Afghanistan’s educated class has been decimated. Whole villages have been destroyed, their inhabitants killed or forced to flee. Mosques have been desecrated and religious leaders jailed or murdered. Schools have been turned into centers of political indoctrination. The country’s economic and social infrastructures of roads, power and communication networks, hospitals, and educational institutions have been badly damaged and in many instances completely destroyed.

There have been many attempts in the past to conquer Afghanistan. But nothing in the country’s long history - with the possible exception of the devastating attacks more than 750 years ago by Genghis Khan - resembles the destruction wreaked in Afghanistan since 1978.

The Soviet Union and the Kabul regime have tried to conceal this destruction by sealing the country off from journalists and other foreign observers and from humanitarian organizations, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross. Nevertheless, the truth about the situation there and about the terrible human suffering is becoming known to the world.

How far the Soviets are willing to go in their war against Afghanistan is indicated by the kind of weapons they have used there, including little booby-trap mines which the Soviets scatter by the thousands along the paths used by the refugees and other civilians. These mines are frequently disguised as ordinary household items or toys. Children, naturally the least wary, are the ones most likely to pick them up. If they do, they risk being killed or having their limbs blown off.

In this connection, it is hard to imaging how Afghanistan might conceivably have posed a threat to the Soviet Union. For decades the Soviet Union had pro-
claimed to the whole world, repeatedly, that its relations with Afghanistan were a
model of peaceful coexistence, a prime example of neighborly relations between a
small country and a big country, each with different systems of government and social
structures but living together in peace without interference.
12 But aside from student riots fomented by Babrak Karmal and his followers in
1965 and a brief period of unrest following the bloodless Daoud coup in 1973, there
was no turmoil at all in Afghanistan before April 27, 1978 - before, that is to say, the
Communists violently seized power in Kabul and, with the help of growing numbers
of Soviet "advisers," began forcibly to impose upon the people of Afghanistan a
foreign ideology and a totalitarian system.
13 It is also suggested by apologists for the invasion that the Soviet Union feared
that a tide of Islamic fundamentalism might sweep from Afghanistan into its central
Asian provinces. But even if this were true, it would hardly justify the Soviet inva-
sion. In fact, the Afghans are a devout people. This attitude of tolerance is charac-
teristic of the Afghans except when their faith itself is attacked, as it now is by com-
munism. They are not tolerant, nor should they be, of an attack upon their freedom,
independence, and identity, of which their religion is an important part.
14 But so far, neither the Soviet Union nor the Kabul regime has produced a
shred of evidence to prove that such an invitation was ever issued. It is hard to
imagine what kind of evidence they could produce since, as we know, the invasion
preceded the installation of Babrak Karmal, who wasn't even in Afghanistan at the
time his predecessor was overthrown and killed by invading Soviet troops.
15 It exists only by virtue of Soviet actions and is, merely an appendage of
Moscow. Since 1979 Soviet personnel have also commanded the Afghan army down
to a brigade level and sometimes down to the company level. The Soviets even
control Afghanistan's natural resources, in particular natural gas, which are extracted
in a one-sided barter arrangement in exchange for good used to sustain the Kabul regime.

16 A de facto annexation has already taken place since the area - from which the indigenous Kirghiz tribes have been forced to flee - is now under the control of the Soviet Army.

17 Given the Kabul regime's utter subservience to Moscow, it is hardly surprising that it should have no base of support among the Afghan people. It is propped up by 85,000 Soviet troops. Yet the freedom fighters - poorly armed and trained and virtually defenseless against some of the most sophisticated weapons in the Soviet arsenal - have been able to deny the Soviets control of perhaps 90% of the countryside and have made them contest many of the important cities. Yet still they do not turn up, while draft-age men continue to slip out of the cities to join the resistance, and whole units of the army desert en masse. The regime has repeatedly offered amnesty to refugees who would return to Afghanistan from exile. Yet every week the refugee centers in Pakistan and Iran swell by the thousands.

18 Then, as now, the Kabul regime was not threatened by an outside power, justifying defense under Article 51 but was, in fact, threatened by a popular uprising, a spontaneous popular uprising of the nation - of the people in whom nationhood inheres, and solely inheres, in the absence of a legitimate government. It was an uprising against a regime that had slaughtered its own people, destroyed their homes, sent almost a half a million people fleeing into exile, and delivered the country to an alien force - an uprising that continues to this very day against the present regime and its Soviet masters.

19 It is this uprising and this uprising alone that is justified to invoke the right of self-defense, for it is defending the independence and very existence of the Afghan nation against a foreign and brutal domination.
21 There are only two realities in Afghanistan today; the Soviet occupation and the Afghan nation, and neither is compatible with the other. The Soviet Union can conquer Afghanistan only by eliminating the Afghan nation. This, the world must not permit to happen, for if Afghanistan is vanquished, no independent nation will be safe.

22 The draft resolution now before us, like its predecessors, seeks an end to the occupation of Afghanistan.

23 The struggle of the Afghan nation for survival is consistent with the basic and most cherished purposes of the United Nations, which are to protect national independence and to maintain world peace.

24 It is only fitting, therefore, that the United Nations should affirm the basic and cherished purpose of the Afghan Nations, which is to regain its ancient homeland so that it may once again be independent and live in peace.

Examination of “Double Standards in Human Rights”

1 The Government of the United States was founded squarely and explicitly on the belief that the most basic function of government is to protect the rights of its citizens. Our Declaration of Independence states, “We hold these truths self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. It adds, “To secure these rights, government are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

2 These notions - that the individual has rights which are prior to government, that protection of these rights is the very purpose of the existence of government, that the just powers of government depend on the consent of the governed - are the essential core of the American creed.
We believe that the rights of individuals are most effectively promoted and expanded by and through democratic political institutions - where governments are elected through periodic competitive elections, elections that feature freedom to criticize government, to publish criticisms, to organize opposition, and to compete for power.

Governments, moreover, are not the only source of oppression and tyranny. Serious political philosophers such as Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Baron Montesquieu, Rousseau, and their medieval predecessors, among others, understood that human rights exist independently of government and that human rights violations exist independently of government as well; that human rights can be and are violated by private violence as well as by public coercion. A government of laws protects and expands rights because it protects individuals against private violence.

Tyranny and anarchy alike are incompatible with freedom, security, and the enjoyment of opportunity.

It is, of course, not enough for the partisans of freedom to define the character and identify the sources of human rights violations. A serious commitment to human rights by this or any group also requires that one’s judgment be fair and reasonable. Thus, it is not fair to judge one nation or group by the Sermon on the Mount and all other nations on the curve;

Although these principles would appear to be almost self-evident, some curious practices have grown up in recent years around the standard of human rights, as some persons have attempted to use human rights less as a standard and a goal than as a political weapon; less to expand the domains of freedom and law than to expand the scope of their hegemony.

No aspect of U.N. affairs has been more perverted by politicalization of the last decade than have its human rights activities. In Geneva and in New York, hu-
man rights has become a **bludgeon to be wielded** by the strong against the weak, by the majority against the isolated, by the blocs against the unorganized. South Africa, Israel, and the non-communist nations of South America have been the principle **targets** of U.N. human rights condemnation - South Africa on grounds of apartheid, Israel on ground of alleged practices in the West Bank and in the territories occupied in the 1967 war, and assorted non-communist Latin American countries because, in addition to being **nondemocratic**, they have been **unorganized** and **unprotected** in this body in which from time to time moral outrage is distributed much like **violence in a protection racket**.

11 My government believes that apartheid is a **morally repugnant system** which **violates the rights** of black peoples and colored who live under it. It is one system through which the inhabitants of one country are **denied** equal access to **freedom**, **economic opportunity**, and **equal protection of the law**. It is one system by which one **ruling minority** refuses to share power and profits from its possessions of monopoly power. As such, it is **reprehensible**.

12 But let us be clear, apartheid is not the only system for **denying** people the enjoyment of **freedom**, **the right to choose and criticize their rulers**, **the rule of law**, **the opportunity for a good job**, **a good education**, **a good life**. There are other grounds on which other regimes in the last decade have denied their citizens **dignity**, **freedom**, **equal protection of the law**, **material well-being and even life**; other regimes that have more **cruelly** and more **brutally repressed** and **slaughtered** their citizens.

13 In my government's view, it is entirely appropriate that the agencies of the United Nations should condemn the spirit and the practice of apartheid and deplore its human consequences, providing, of course, that the same bodies of the United Nations demonstrate a serious moral concern for **freedom, equality, and law**.

14 The human rights agencies of the United Nations were silent while 3 million
Kampucheans died in Pol Pot’s murderous utopia. The human rights organizations of the United Nations have been silent about the thousands of Soviet citizens denied equal rights, equal protection of the law, denied the right to think, write, publish, work freely, or to emigrate to some place of their own choosing.

15 The activities of the United Nations with respect to Latin America offer a particularly egregious example of moral hypocrisy. Doubtless, some of these countries, some of the governments are guilty as charged.

16 The government has driven over one million of its citizens into exile. It has incarcerated more political prisoners than any other Latin American nation. It has repressed freedom, denied equality, and, incidentally, deprived its citizens of what is termed here the right to development - a talent for which Cuban's had demonstrated a large capacity, prior to Fidel Castro’s “liberating” revolution.

18 Less fortunate even that the poets who have been driven from their native land are those who rot in jail. Two of these cases are known and discussed all over the world by those who value freedom and respect human creativity. “There was no legal basis for this new reprisal against me. Only that I am a poet; that the world speaks my name; that I do not renounce my song. I do not put it on bended knees, nor do I use it for other political or partisan ends, but only literary, universal, timeless ones.”

19 One of the most pathetic cases of all is that of the poet Armando Valladares, whose case, by the way, was described in length in Le Monde November 13.

20 As a reprisal for the publication of these works, in 1979 Mr. Valladares was moved to the remote prison of Boniato, and deprived of his possessions, including all his books and his Bible. In a letter sent to PEN in 1980, Valladares wrote that such a letter would be the equivalent to “committing moral and spiritual suicide,” and he refused to write it.
21 In August 1974, the prison director ordered that no food be given to Mr. Valladares and, after 49 days of such imprisonment and punishment, he was left a total invalid. This is a direct violation of Article 5 of the Universal Declaration, regarding cruel punishment.

22 Armando Valladares has been officially adopted by Amnesty International as a prisoner of conscience and Amnesty International has submitted numerous appeals on his behalf.

24 What are we to think of defenders of human rights who ignore the victims of major tyrants and focus all their ferocity on the victims of minor tyrants? For if we do not have a single standard, then our resolutions and recommendations are merely tendentious political statements without moral content.

25 In a word, nothing less than the moral integrity of the United Nations is at issue in out deliberations here. Nothing less than the commitment of this organization to its own reason for being is at stake.

Examination of “Human Rights in El Salvador”

1 Mr. Chairman, the United States shares with the sponsors of this resolution a deep concern with the freedom and well being of the people of El Salvador. We share with them also an intense desire to see peace restored to that suffering land and a new democracy constructed out of the ruins of oligarchy and dictatorship.

2 It is said that the resolution before this committee is born of concern with human rights in El Salvador, and there are present among its articles expressions of concern for the suffering, intimidation, and oppression of the people of El Salvador. But, Mr. Chairman, two articles in this resolution give the whole a tendentious, partisan political aspect. Present here, under the guise of purely humanitarian concerns for human rights in El Salvador, is a bold effort to intervene in El Salvador’s
bitter internal strife on the side of the insurgents, and to help those insurgents gain, through international pressure, status and power which they are incapable of winning on the battlefield or through competitive elections.

3 It does not express an evenhanded concern for violence in El Salvador or for grave violations of human rights, nor an evenhanded concern with the life, security, and tranquility of the civilian population, as would a resolution concerned with the suffering and oppression of the El Salvadoran people.

6 It should hardly be necessary to point out that power hungry dictators do not submit themselves to such tests of popular consent. Democrats, who believe government should rest on the consent of the governed, do. The government of El Salvador is made up of democrats who respect the right of the El Salvadoran people to choose their rulers and the capacity to do so. President Jose Napoleon Duarte and his cabinet do not believe they have the right to rule by force, or that their citizens have been too intimidated or brainwashed to make judgments concerning their own good.

7 A second indicator of the character of this government and of its vision for its people is its land-reform program - the most radical in the Western Hemisphere. That program replaces large landholders with cooperatives, tenant farming with land-to-the-tillers program, and testifies to all the world that this government is no continuation of the “oligarchy” of absentee landlords and landless peasants. It is a government committed to reform and social justice.

8 A third indicator of the character of the government is its solid support by virtually all the democracies of Latin America. Most of the leaders of these democracies know personally and respect Jose Napoleon Duarte and his cabinet, knew his predecessors, and understand the problem of trying to break with the history of traditional military rule and simultaneously stave off a determined externally supported insurgency.
If the government of El Salvador is filled with good men - with democrats and reformers - why is there continuing violence from the government side? The answer is, first, that the insurgency has penetrated the population and attempts to hide itself within it - so that fighting violent insurgents spills over into the society; A government with imperfect control of its security forces confronts a violent enemy bent on provocation and destruction.

The present government of El Salvador, which came into being when a group of reform-minded officers overthrew the regime of General Romero, is no exception. The fact that it is confronted with a violent, well-armed adversary has enormously complicated the full consolidation of power by the government. The result is that, in El Salvador, murderous traditionalists confront murderous revolutionaries - with only the government working to end this mutual murder and attempting to pacify adversaries.

Political leaders exist there who are worthy of the support of democrats everywhere.

Do they have an equal claim to the support of persons and governments concerned about freedom, law, democracy, and development?

Mr. Chairman, the United States believes that the methods utilized by the FMLN provide all the evidence needed by reasonable men concerning the moral quality of the movement and the kind of regime it seeks to establish in El Salvador.

It is a band of armed men who rely on violence to achieve power.

The men of the FMLN have assassinated ordinary citizens, imposed bloody reprisals against villagers unwilling to assist them and decimated peasant cooperatives in their determined efforts to sabotage the land-reform program. They have bombed restaurants, buses, theatres, factories, food-storage facilities, marketplaces, public utilities, bridges, and public buildings. The have occupied eight foreign embassies,
kidnapped and killed diplomats, executed hundreds of presumed “informers” and until quite recently - when their “peace offensive” dictated a change in tactics - have taken no prisoners. In short, they have behaved not as Robin Hoods emerging from a Central American Sherwood Forest to comfort the oppressed, but as well-armed political freebooters inspired by the antidemocratic ideology, a consuming will to power and no inhibitions about the use of violence.

16 The international propaganda machine, from which the FMLN profits, keeps attention continually focused on the government’s depredations.

17 I, therefore, desire to call this committee’s attention to only a small sample of the kinds of atrocities committed on a regular basis by the radical armed insurgents against the civilian population of El Salvador.

18 Mr. Chairman, violent men engage in random and indiscriminate killing as a matter of deliberate policy. The essence of their strategy is provocation: through persistent attacks which disrupt society and make ordinary life impossible, such revolutionaries challenge authority and force repressive counter-measures in the expectation that such repression will alienate parts of the population, polarize the society, undermine the legitimacy of the regime, and create the “objective” conditions needed to bring themselves to power.

19 Had the FMLN succeeded in winning acceptance as a lesser evil, it would easily have come to power during the so-called final offensive of the 1980 Christmas season, a point at which the guerrillas enjoyed a large advantage in weapons and ammunition.

21 During this period of the offensive, when vast quantities of arms from Soviet-bloc countries had made the FMLN the best-armed insurgent movement ever in Central America, FMLN leaders anticipated imminent military victory.

22 Partisans of nondemocratic politics have no trouble finding reasons why the
people of El Salvador - or any other country - should not be permitted to choose their rulers and hold them accountable through competitive elections. The people have been brainwashed, say the brainwashers, and do not know their own minds. The people are intimidated, say the intimidators, and will dare not express their true views.

23 We hear it now out of El Salvador - whose brave, stolid people are said to be too frightened and confused to understand their own best interest.

25 Can any democrat seriously argue that the decision is better made by a small minority operating under unstable conditions than by a larger majority operating under those same conditions?

27 When the context of the struggle in El Salvador is taken into account, it is, I believe, clear that the government of that beleaguered people is doing an honest job under extraordinarily difficult circumstances.

30 Actions that weaken the government of El Salvador today strengthen those who all over the world undermine peace, democracy, national independence, and the self-determination of peoples.

31 Surely this body should not make the task of El Salvador’s democrats more difficult. Surely it does not desire to strengthen the fascism of the left. Surely it does not wish to intervene lopsidedly on the side of repression - ignoring the call of El Salvador’s people as articulated by their bishop in that same statement of September 4: “We the bishops of El Salvador defend the right of self-determination of our nation and condemn at the same time any kind of intervention in the internal affairs of our country.”

32 The bishops of El Salvador were right to defend the self-determination of their nation;
Sorting of Metaphors

A preliminary examination of Ambassador Kirkpatrick's speeches (hereafter referred to as "Afghan Situation," "Double Standards," and "El Salvador") reveals two primary clusters of metaphor vehicles, reinforced through seven secondary groups. The first primary cluster, IDEOLOGY, served as the basis from which Kirkpatrick formed her arguments. It featured positive and negative metaphors of political philosophy. Positive vehicles were those which referred to democratic values, especially those that are the "essential core of the American creed" (Double Standards 2). These vehicles included "liberty," "pursuit of happiness," "institution among men," "deriving their just powers," "consent of the governed," "periodic competitive elections," "criticize the government," "organize opposition," partisans of freedom," "publish criticisms," "self-evident," "self-determination," and "national independence." Ambassador Kirkpatrick spoke of "democrats" and "democracies" that were "committed to reform and social justice" (El Salvador 6,7,8); of "good men - democrats and reformers" whom want to build a "new democracy" (El Salvador 9,1). She also emphasized that "the most basic function of government is to protect the rights of its citizens" (Double Standards 1).

These positive vehicles were contrasted with negative images of Communism, particularly images of the Soviet Union. Kirkpatrick charged that this "international propaganda machine" was working to install an "antidemocratic ideology" in Central America (El Salvador 16,15). Further, these same "partisans of nondemocratic politics," were imposing a "foreign ideology and totalitarian system" on the people of Afghanistan and turning that country's schools into "centers of political indoctrination" (El Salvador 22; Afghan Situation 12,3). Other vehicles used by Kirkpatrick to characterize ideologies contrary to that of the United States were "nondemocratic," "violates the rights," "fascism," and "morally repugnant system."
The second primary cluster, AGGRESSION, further emphasized the nature of Communism. Through these vehicles, Ambassador Kirkpatrick argued that Communists “violently seized power in Afghanistan” (Afghan Situation 12), and supported “persistent attacks” (El Salvador 18) against the people of El Salvador. In regards to Afghanistan, Kirkpatrick further claimed that the Soviet “invasion,” “launched on Christmas Eve,” “altered the climate of world peace” and “shook the very foundation of world order” (Afghan Situation 1).

Other vehicles pertaining to Communist activity included “sealing off the country,” “devastating attacks,” “severely aggravated,” “attack,” “shattering effect,” “destruction wreaked,” “private violence,” “student riots,” “conquer,” “overthrown,” “bombed,” “sabotage,” “driven,” “posed a threat,” “alienate,” “polarize,” “undermine,” “final offensive,” “bold effort,” “compete for power,” “turmoil,” “provocation,” “insurgency,” and “invading.”

Ambassador Kirkpatrick also employed some less sensational vehicles in the AGGRESSION cluster. These vehicles, however, were used sparingly and depicted the actions of those fighting against the Soviet Union. Such terms included “brief period of unrest,” “invitation,” “public coercion,” “tide,” “sweep,” “struggle,” and “bloodless coup.”

Having examined the two primary clusters of metaphors, it becomes evident that the IDEOLOGY cluster is divided into “democratic” and “nondemocratic” camps. From this division, Kirkpatrick has invested the “nondemocratic” camp with powerful images of AGGRESSION. The milder images of AGGRESSION are generally assigned to the “democratic” camp.

To gain a deeper understanding of this fundamentally critical division, it is necessary to analyze how the interaction of IDEOLOGY vehicles and AGGRESSION vehicles functions to create the seven supporting clusters of metaphors. These
clusters, broadly labeled as DOMINATION, SAVAGERY, PSYCHOLOGY, RETREAT, SANCTUARY, LAW, and HUMAN RIGHTS, serve to reinforce the image that the “democratic” camp is non-threatening and adheres to moral standards, while the “nondemocratic” camp is bent on aggression, violence, and lack of respect for human rights.

**Analysis of Metaphors**

One way in which Kirkpatrick underscored the ideological differences between Democracy and Communism was through the use of DOMINATION metaphors. Vehicles in this cluster were divided into positive and negative images of authority. Authority was positively represented by terms such as “larger majority,” “reform-minded officers,” “security forces,” “partisan of freedom,” and “authority.” These vehicles were used to describe the nature of governments supported by the United States.

A greater emphasis, however, was placed on negative images of authority. Vehicles such as “power hungry dictators,” “ruling minority,” “rule by force,” “ruins of oligarchy and dictatorship,” “violent insurgents,” “externally supported insurgents,” “utter subservience,” “vanquished,” “propped up,” “appendage,” “repression,” “traditional military rule,” “commanded,” “hegemony,” “side of repression,” “radical,” “absentee landlords,” and “violent men” created images of Communist subjugation.

Kirkpatrick further referred to the “violent insurgents,” “violent, well-armed adversary,” and “band of armed men who rely on violence to achieve power” (El Salvador 9,10,14). She argued that these “murderous revolutionaries” “radical armed insurgents,” and “best armed insurgent movement” in El Salvador were supported with “vast quantities of arms from Soviet-bloc countries” (El Salvador 10,17,21). These “Soviet masters” were also intent on “foreign and brutal domina-
tion” in Afghanistan (Afghan Situation 18,19). In Kirkpatrick’s estimation, the problem of Afghanistan and El Salvador was caused by an “outside power,” or “alien force” (Afghan Situation 18); one which tried “forcibly to impose” (Afghan Situation 12) its “tyranny and anarchy alike” (Double Standard 6) on the will of the people.

The negative images of DOMINATION were reinforced with metaphors depicting Communists as savages, or as committing acts of savagery. In this SAVAGERY cluster, Kirkpatrick argued that Soviet involvement in the affairs of foreign nations was a “ruthless effort” that led to “terrible human suffering” (Afghan Situation 3,6) “random and indiscriminate killings,” “murder,” and other “atrocities” (El Salvador 18,10,17). The people of these nations were “cruelly and brutally repressed and slaughtered,” (Double Standards 12) “killed,” “decimated,” had limbs “blown off,” (Afghan Situation 3,3,7) “assassinated,” “kidnapped and killed” (El Salvador 15). Further, their countryside was “badly damaged,” “desecrated,” and “completely destroyed” (Afghan Situation 3).

Ambassador Kirkpatrick also framed her arguments as a psychological struggle between Democracy and Communism. These vehicles were divided into positive and negative psychological conditions. The positive vehicles portrayed the United Nations as a place of “fair” (Double Standard 7) and “reasonable men” (El Salvador 13) with “moral integrity” (Double Standards 25). In regards to human right issues in Latin America, however, Ambassador Kirkpatrick believed that the United Nations offered a “particularly egregious example of moral hypocrisy” (Double Standards 15); a position consistent with her ideology prior to becoming U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations. Nevertheless, Kirkpatrick stated that the United States and the U.N. shared a “deep concern,” and “intense desire” to aid the people of El Salvador (El Salvador 1). Other positive vehicles in the PSYCHOLOGY cluster characterized the Afghans as “tolerant” people and as having an “attitude of tolerance,” (Afghan
Ambassador Kirkpatrick employed negative PSYCHOLOGY vehicles when describing the consequences of Communism. She bemoaned the “suffering, intimidation, and oppression” that the Salvadoran people faced at the hand of Communist “brainwashers and intimidators” (El Salvador 2,22). These “beleaguered people” were said to be “too frightened and confused to understand their own best interest” (El Salvador 27,23). Kirkpatrick also noted that one of the most “pathetic cases of [human rights violations] is that of poet Armando Valladares” who was left a “total invalid” by the Cuban government (Double Standards 19,21). However, it was the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan that most severely caused “deepening anxieties” and led to a “new and more sober appreciation” by the United States of the Soviet Union’s international threat to peace (Afghan Situation 2).

As a result of Soviet aggression, savagery, and mental torture, the people of El Salvador and Afghanistan were forced to take defensive action. These images were manifest in the RETREAT cluster. Ambassador Kirkpatrick described the “resistance” movement that grew out of a “popular uprising, a spontaneous and popular uprising” (Afghan Situation 17,18). Indeed, Kirkpatrick claimed that “draft-age men continue to slip out of these cities to join the resistance, and whole units of the army desert en masse” (Afghan Situation 17). By and large, however, most civilians were “virtually defenseless” and “unprotected” people whom were “forced to flee” their homeland (Afghan Situation 17; Double Standards 10; Afghan Situation 16).

The need for defensive action was reinforced by creating images of land, religion, and life and death. These images comprised the SANCTUARY cluster. Kirkpatrick spoke of the “ancient homeland,” “native land,” and “suffering land,” (Afghan Situation 24; Double Standards 18; El Salvador 1) that “landless peasants” and “villagers” (El Salvador 7,15) were forced to “exile” (Double Standards 16).
Other images of land included “murderous utopia,” “Sherwood Forest,” “watershed,” “world peace,” “independent nation,” and “largest single refugee camp in the world.”

Religious vehicles included “Sermon on the Mount,” “raising the specter,” “bended knees,” “endowed by their creator,” “religion,” “devout people,” “lesser evil,” “timeless ones,” and “world speaks my name.” Images of life were expressed in terms of “born,” “momentous event,” “evolution,” “created equal,” “live in peace,” “very existence,” “reason for being,” and “life.” “Moral and spiritual suicide,” and “grave violation” created images of death.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick reinforced the metaphors of Soviet aggression and savagery by invoking images of Communism that pertained to punishment. For example, Ambassador Kirkpatrick spoke of the “political prisoners,” and “prisoner of conscience” that had been “incarcerated” and left to “rot in jail” (Double Standards 16,22,16,18). Those that resisted Communist aggression, undoubtedly were either “jailed,” (Afghan Situation 3) or “executed” (El Salvador 8).

Kirkpatrick also used more legalistic metaphors including terms such as “legal basis,” “rule of law,” “right of self-defense,” “guilty as charged,” “shred of evidence,” “equal protection of the law,” “government of laws,” “domains of freedom and law,” and “law.” Combined, these metaphors constituted the LAW cluster.

Ultimately, the conflict between Democracy and Communism led to the violation of HUMAN RIGHTS. Ambassador Kirkpatrick used positive images to define human rights in terms consistent with Democratic values. Such terms included “right of self-determination,” “equal rights,” “freedom,” and “equality,” along with more universal images as “goal,” “standard,” “tranquility,” “security,” and “dignity.” Human rights were also couched in terms related to intellect: “right to think, write, publish, work freely,” “good education,” and “value freedom and respect for human
creativity.” Kirkpatrick further perceived human rights to include “economic opportunity,” and the “material well-being” that comes with the “opportunity for a good job” (Double Standards 11,12,12). The “enjoyment of opportunity” ultimately coincided with the “rights to development” (Double Standards 6, 16).

Kirkpatrick used negative vehicles to underscore her claim that human rights issues in the United Nations had a “tendentious, partisan political aspect” (El Salvador 2). She protested that human rights had been “perverted by politicalization,” and that it had become a “bludgeon to be wielded” against non-Communist nations (Double Standards 10). In Kirkpatrick’s estimation, the use of human rights as a “political weapon” against these “principle targets” reduced U.N. recommendations to “tendentious political statements without moral content” (Double Standards 8, 10, 24).

Assessment of Metaphors

When speaking before the United Nations, Ambassador Kirkpatrick clearly explained the United States’ perception of human rights issues. An examination of the metaphors she employed reveals a consistent pattern of argumentation. The premise of her arguments was founded in the philosophical difference between Democracy and Communism: Democracies are based on a higher natural law that acknowledges the primacy of human rights, while Communist nations are based on an historical view of the struggle between the classes. This division was reinforced with images of Communist aggression, aggression that ultimately led to the violation of human rights. The metaphoric clusters of IDEOLOGY and AGGRESSION thereby served as the basis of her arguments concerning human rights violations.

The images created through these primary metaphors, or arguments, were enhanced through seven secondary metaphoric clusters: DOMINATION, SAVAGERY, PSYCHOLOGY, RETREAT, SANCTUARY, LAW, and HUMAN
RIGHTS. In turn, some of these supporting metaphors were divided into positive images -- those that depicted democracy favorably, and negative images -- those that depicted communism unfavorably. By associating democracy with positive images and communism with negative images, Ambassador Kirkpatrick was able to further support her argument that Democratic nations upheld human rights, and Communist nations violated them.

That Kirkpatrick presented Communism vis-a-vis Democracy has been demonstrated. However, the manner in which she accomplished this comparison merits further explanation. When discussing Communist activity, particularly that of the Soviet Union, Ambassador Kirkpatrick spoke frequently in terms of brutality, subjugation, psychological cruelty, and imprisonment. That is to say, she invested Communism with metaphors of SAVAGERY, as well as negative images of DOMINATION, PSYCHOLOGY, and LAW. Conversely, Kirkpatrick used metaphors of RETREAT and SANCTUARY, as well as positive images of DOMINATION, PSYCHOLOGY, HUMAN RIGHTS, and LAW when referring to Democratic nations or ideals. Through these metaphors, she depicted the people of Afghanistan, Cuba, and El Salvador as struggling against Communist aggression for their fundamental rights.

According to Ambassador Kirkpatrick, the United Nations was caught in this conflict between Communism and Democracy. She identified the U.N. with positive and negative images of PSYCHOLOGY. While this world organization was adamant about addressing human rights violations, Kirkpatrick protested that it was doing so discriminatingly. She reinforced this perception by further identifying the United Nations with negative images of HUMAN RIGHTS.

The metaphors used by Ambassador Kirkpatrick serve as specific symbolic resources that frame the United States' perception of the Soviet Union and of the United Nations through the lens of human rights. By dividing human rights along
ideological lines, Kirkpatrick was able to argue against Communism, and against its traditional bloc voting practices in the United Nations. These arguments represented a shift in the way human rights were spoken about in U.S. foreign policy.

During the Carter administration, human rights was a fundamental tenet of foreign policy. In the Report on Human Rights Practices in Countries Receiving U.S. Aid, the administration stated that it would act in accordance with Section 502B of the Foreign Assistance Act: “a principle goal of the foreign policy of the United States is to promote the increased observance of internationally recognized human rights by all countries” (6). This Congressional view of foreign policy was rejected by both Kirkpatrick and the Reagan administration.

President Reagan’s foreign policy rhetoric was based on a bipolar perspective of world events which pitted Democracy against Communism. As such, it was vital for the United States to protect its spheres of influence from Soviet aggression. This perspective dictated that human rights could not be a driving factor in U.S. foreign policy. Other considerations, including a country’s perceived military and strategic importance, often took precedence in determining the distribution of foreign aid.

In this light, Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s use of IDEOLOGY and AGGRESSION as primary metaphors clearly reflected President Reagan’s position on the role of human rights in foreign policy. Her rhetoric in the United Nations may be seen as an extension of Reagan’s transformation of human rights as a foreign policy concern. Human rights would be used not as a standard for determining foreign policy, but as an ideological issue that would allow the United States to gain the high moral ground.

Thus, the metaphoric clusters employed by Ambassador Kirkpatrick helped create a particular reality in foreign policy discourse. The reality of Communism’s violation of human rights through aggression, savagery, subjugation, and imprisonment was countered with the equally powerful reality of Democracy’s defense of
human rights through its concerns for law, order, and the sanctity of self-determina-
tion. Kirkpatrick also tried to establish that, in reality, the United Nations' practices
of investigating human rights violations discriminated against rightist regimes.

Ambassador Kirkpatrick's diplomatic discourse proceed along ideological lines.
The extent to which this fundamental division was either a theme employed in all
diplomatic rhetoric or, more specifically, a theme inherent in the Reagan administra-
tion's foreign policy rhetoric warrants further investigation. The following chapter
addresses the latter.
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CHAPTER III

A METAPHORIC ANALYSIS OF AMBASSADOR
VERNON A. WALTERS' DISCOURSE

In the wake of Ronald Reagan's second presidential inauguration, Jeane J. Kirkpatrick relinquished her position as United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations. Citing ideological differences with members of the administration as cause for her resignation, Kirkpatrick returned to her professorship at Georgetown University (Weinraub A9). As a private citizen, she remained vociferous in her support, and occasional criticism of Reagan's foreign policy. Ironically, it was Kirkpatrick's ideological perspectives and her outspoken nature that captured the President's attention five years earlier.

The vacancy created by Ambassador Kirkpatrick's abdication was filled with Reagan's nomination of Vernon A. Walters as chief United States delegate to the U.N. A skilled linguist and retired Army general, Walters served as interpreter and liaison officer for five presidents between 1941 and 1976. During this time, he established close ties with many foreign dignitaries and heads of state. Walters' experience in international relations led to his assignment as President Reagan's Ambassador at Large from 1981 to 1985. In this capacity, he served as Reagan's "chief diplomatic troubleshooter," negotiating with over 100 countries for the administration.

In addition to his diplomatic expertise, President Reagan held Walters' worldview in high regard. Ideologically, Walters bore great resemblance to Kirkpatrick, especially when it came to distinguishing right-wing military regimes from left-wing totalitarian governments (Washington Post C12). Further, as a practicing Roman
Catholic and staunch anti-Communist, Walters held a "certain idea about the United States - that it is the last best hope for mankind" (qtd. in Sciolino A5). These perspectives were consonant with Reagan's bipolar rhetoric about world affairs; a rhetoric that characterized the Soviet "anti-Christ" as the root of all evil in the world (Plotkin 58).

Within several weeks of Jeane Kirkpatrick's resignation, the United States Senate Foreign Relations Committee confirmed Vernon Walters as chief delegate to the United Nations. That Walters was confirmed by unanimous voice vote, and without a Senate hearing, was perhaps due to his extensive diplomatic experience. His nomination may have appeased members of Congress, and the Foreign Service, who had admonished many of Reagan's previous ambassadorial appointments for being politically based (Oberdorfer A21). For the Reagan administration, however, Walters' ideological persuasion suggested the continuation of conservative diplomacy in the United Nations.

**Review of Related Discourse**

Ambassador Walters' political conservatism drew immediate censure from human rights advocates. The Council on Hemispheric Affairs criticized his "long history of warm relations with extreme right-wing military governments," and "his lack of concern for human rights" (Sciolino A5). To his credit, however, Ambassador Walters did speak against human rights violations on various occasions. As Reagan's chief delegate in the U.N., Walters articulated the administration's human rights concerns as they pertained to foreign policy.

Nowhere was this task more difficult, perhaps, than regarding South Africa. In June, 1985, President Reagan pledged to continue his controversial policy of "constructive engagement" with the Pretoria government (Ottaway A15). This policy, first articulated by Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs Chester A.
Crocker, stated that the “United States must make clear that it does not intend to enter the slippery terrain of economic sanction,” but rather rely on quiet diplomatic pressure as a means of easing apartheid (346). Confident that diplomatic pressure alone could effect change in the policy of apartheid, Reagan’s unyielding position stirred debate in the United States Congress and in the United Nations.

In August, 1985, the U.S. House of Representatives voted in favor of economic sanctions against South Africa. While the sanctions were not expected to significantly influence the South African economy, the legislation expressed the “moral outrage” felt by some members of Congress (Edwards qtd. in Engeberg A4). The Reagan administration, however, remained in firm opposition to sanctions, stating that “constructive engagement” had “wrought changes leading to a more equitable life for black South Africans” (Mohr A3). Reagan further threatened to veto the legislation should it pass a Senate vote.

After a month recess, the U.S. Senate also approved the legislation ordering economic sanctions against South Africa. With support for “constructive engagement” waning in congress, in September, 1985, the Reagan administration abandoned its South Africa policy. Through Executive Order, President Reagan imposed limited economic sanctions against the Pretoria government and promised an active pursuit of reform in South Africa.

This change in policy “effectively reversed the fundamental premise not only of his [Reagan’s] policy of ‘constructive engagement’ but of a decade of U.S. diplomacy throughout southern Africa” (Ottaway A21). Further, by changing the nature of the debate from “whether to impose sanctions, to one over which sanctions to impose,” the Reagan administration restricted its rhetorical ability to “argue against any new attempt at the United Nations to impose sanctions on South Africa (Solarz qtd. in Ottaway A21). Several weeks after the policy change, Ambassador Walters clarified
the new U.S. position regarding South Africa to the United Nations General Assembly.

The 1987 session of the United Nations Human Rights Commission marked another milestone in the United States’ diplomatic strategy concerning South Africa. Adopting a more aggressive posture, the U.S. delegation submitted for the first time a resolution condemning South Africa’s apartheid policies as “fundamental violations of human rights” (Parry A21). More significantly, this shift characterized the United States’ “new high profile” concerning human rights violations (Wallich qtd. in Parry A21). During the session, the U.S. delegation assailed the Soviet Union for its religious oppression and involvement in Afghanistan. The delegation also took a stand against alleged human rights abuses in Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, Ethiopia, and Iran.

However, the United States brought a formal resolution before the Commission only against Cuba. In March, 1987, Ambassador Walters led the debate regarding human rights violations in that nation. The groundwork for this debate had been established earlier. In a February, 1987 article entitled “Human Rights in Castro’s Cuba,” the State Department criticized Cuba for denying freedom of expression, assembly, press, and religions, and for its detention of political prisoners. Together, these statements suggest a concerted U.S. effort to single out Cuba for alleged human rights abuses.

The Reagan administration’s renewed emphasis on human rights as a foreign policy concern has rhetorical implications that merit further attention. In the case of South Africa: How did the administration justify a complete reversal on a major foreign policy issue? In the case of Cuba: How did the administration rationalize its focus on human rights violations in Cuba? While these questions are significant, they may accurately be seen as part of a larger rhetorical issue: How did the Reagan
administration articulate its concerns over human rights?

To answer this question, the remainder of the chapter examines the following speeches by Ambassador Vernon Walters: “Promoting Peaceful Change in South Africa,” October 30, 1985; “U.N. Calls for Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan,” November 12, 1985; and “Human Rights in Cuba,” March 5, 1987. Keeping with the methodology presented in the previous chapters, the speeches will be analyzed by (1) isolating the metaphors, (2) sorting the metaphors, (3) analyzing the metaphors, and (4) assessing the metaphors in the selected speeches.

Isolation of Metaphors

Examination of “Promoting Peaceful Change in South Africa”

1 We all know the meaning of apartheid: deliberate, systematic, institutionalized racial discrimination denying South Africa’s black people their God-given rights. And because we live by Lincoln’s words - “No person is good enough to govern another without the other’s consent” - all Americans are united in hoping for the day when apartheid will exist no more.

2 The history of the United States is one of struggle against all forms of racial, cultural, and political intolerance. Our constitution resolutely forbids intolerance. And our commitment to equality and freedom does not end at our borders. Such elitist orders produce misery and refugees, many of whom bring their talent and energy to open societies, including my own.

3 And we are working toward the elimination of this unjust and unjustifiable system. The policy of the United States, outlined in dozens of addresses before this and other bodies and most recently by President Reagan on September 9, is to promote positive, peaceful change that will lead to a system in South Africa based on the consent of all those governed by it. We want to encourage change that assures rather than destroys South Africa’s future.
I should also point out that the United States believes that apartheid will not be undone by demagogic posturing and sloganeering. Exhortations to bloody revolution, calls for mandatory sanctions and hypocritical talk about liberation from the leaders and representatives of nations that deny liberty to their own people will not bring peace and justice to millions of South Africans.

That is the spirit of President Reagan's Executive Order of September 9. The measures he announced then, which will go into force by the end of this year, are aimed at specific areas: the apparatus and symbols of apartheid. They are designed to deprive the Government of South Africa of any direct or indirect U.S. support in maintaining its police, military, and apartheid-enforcing structure. The U.S. Government is taking concrete steps to encourage U.S. businesses and entrepreneurs to seek an end to the discriminatory labor and employment practices of apartheid. And we shall greatly increase our economic assistance for the education and training of disadvantaged South Africans and our support to peaceful opponents of apartheid through our human rights program.

One of these lessons is surely that economic and political freedoms are inextricably linked. It is exactly this hope for real improvement in their lives that has brought so many people to South Africa - black and white - and that now impels an unstoppable push for political change in that country.

Others call for destructive, punitive sanctions, arms, and more violence. We want jobs, better housing, and health programs. We take this approach because we Americans are builders, not destroyers. Our government is actively pressing for democratic, peaceful change in South Africa. So too are out foundations, our labor unions, our universities, our corporations - we want every link with South Africa to be dedicated to the purpose of bringing constructive influence to bear on that country. In other words, we are striving to utilize every instrument of peaceful change in
South Africa to the benefit of our common cause: the end of apartheid and the creation of a political process in which all South Africans can participate freely.

We Americans have accepted the hard reality that our passionate commitment to moral principles can be no substitute for a sound foreign policy. The choice for us, however, is not between moral principles and the national interest, but between moral principles divorced from political reality and moral principles anchored in political reality. Part of that reality is progress towards democracy and greater freedom around the world may be slower than we would like. If we use our power to push nondemocratic states too far and too fast, we may destroy the hope for greater freedom.

The changes in official policy so far are plainly inadequate - but ironically they have been enough to raise the expectations and impel demands for fundamental reforms such as we all desire. This fundamental change will occur - there can be no doubt about it. All Americans are disturbed by the trend of events in South Africa - the violence and official repression will not lead to serious negotiations over a new political future for the country.

A cause of hope is that South Africa is not a totalitarian society. This degree of openness in South African society and our willingness to engage with that society for constructive purposes are the sources of our influence. The United States will continue to take advantage of this opportunity to do what we can as a responsible nation to end apartheid. Our policy is aimed at seeking engagement with all sides in South Africa for the purpose of encouraging negotiations that will produce fundamental reforms, and we regard such a course as in the best traditions of the United Nations.

I urge that the United Nations use its prestige to work constructively to help the South African people achieve a democratic state under which they would enjoy
all the rights enumerated in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I also urge that the United Nations increase its efforts to work effectively for the elimination of all forms of racism and racial discrimination.

Examination of “U.N. Calls for Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan”
1 For almost 6 years now, Soviet troops in Afghanistan have waged a relentless war against everything Afghan.
2 An ancient land caught in a modern war, Afghanistan is being subjected daily to the full force of Soviet modern-day weaponry and technology. Never in its long tumultuous history or (sic) resisting marauding armies and foreign invaders has Afghanistan faced as remorseless and heartless an enemy.
3 Using a combination of military terror on the one hand and psychological manipulation in the form of reeducation and indoctrination efforts on the other, the Soviet forces have tried for 6 years - longer than the duration of the Second World War - to break the Afghan spirit.
4 Despite all efforts to impose a virtual blackout on news of the war, eyewitness reports of inconceivable, heinous crimes testify to Soviet callousness in achieving their ultimate goal - creation of a docile, client state. Unable to pacify or control the countryside, the Soviets - with clinical precision - have, in some areas, resorted to tactics aimed at depopulating the land. Migratory genocide is how one historian has described it. These are not tall tales or propaganda but rather a genuine human tragedy.
5 In addition to strong-arm tactics aimed at physically crushing the Afghan spirit of resistance, the Soviets have embarked on a long-term effort to reshape this spirit into a docile, pliable mold. These efforts to incorporate and absorb the Afghan people augur ill for an early solution to the war in Afghanistan.
The Soviets continue to escalate their military effort. They continue to upgrade their firepower. Their strategy is a long-term one, aimed at wearing down the resistance of and eroding international support for the mujajidin.

Despite their military offensives, their brutal scorched earth tactics, and their various subversive strategies, the Soviets are no closer today to achieving their objectives than they were on December 27, 1979, when their invading troops murdered President Hafizullah Amin and installed in his place Babrak Karmal. The Soviets cannot operate anywhere in the countryside without danger of attack. Unable to find qualified Afghan technocrats who are willing to participate in this puppet government, the Soviets have been forced to abandon the pretense that they are merely advising the Babrak Karmal regime and now either directly make, or are deeply involved in every major political, military, or social policy decision of the regime. The Kabul regime’s army - rent by disloyalty, desertions, defections, disillusionment, and undiscipline - has shrunk to less than half its preinvasion strength of 90,000.

What the Soviet Union has failed to realize - and, of course, refuses to acknowledge - is that the will of a people united in a national liberation struggle cannot be broken by force of arms. On the battlefield, the Afghan resistance is better organized, better trained, and more effective militarily than ever before. In Konar, in Paktia and Paktika, in Herat - in short, throughout the country - Afghan partisans have given a brilliant account of themselves against Soviet legions equipped with a terrifying array of the most modern instruments of war. In this conflict, the Afghan mujahidin are proving once more that their defense of their faith and country and their desire for freedom are indomitable.

Like a number of my colleagues in this body, I was honored to be able to hear firsthand of the struggle in Afghanistan - from the spokesman of the Afghan resistance alliance who visited here last month. The leader of this delegation and his
alliance colleagues not only lead a military struggle against a foreign oppressor but also translate into political terms the will of the Afghan people for freedom. The resistance is alive and well. The morale and determination of its members to continue to fight are unshaken.

11 The toll in human lives - not to mention the destruction of homes, crops, and the fragile agricultural infrastructure - is staggering. If both sides remain true to their objectives, the only possible outcome is continued death and destruction. This body, conceived from the ashes of one war of liberation and dedicated to the preservation of peace, has a moral duty to end this war and the agony of the Afghan people.

13 Yet the war and devastation continue. It is not enough for us to heap praise on the Afghans for their brave exploits against daunting odds. It is not enough to support the Afghan struggle passively. It can provide the basis for a just and viable settlement. It provides the means to stop the Afghan suffering.

14 We support and applaud the efforts of the Secretary General and his special representatives to find a just and viable settlement that protects the legitimate security interests of all parties.

15 We hope that adoption of this resolution will serve as renewed evidence of the international community's steadfast commitment to a negotiated settlement and will stimulate prompt resolution of this vital issue.

Examination of “Human Rights in Cuba”

1 On November 26, 1986 I came before the Third Committee of the U.N. General Assembly on behalf of my government to accuse the Government of Cuba of massive, systematic, and flagrant abuses of human rights so offensive as to demand the condemnation of the community of nations.
On that occasion, as time for debate grew rapidly to a close, I deferred to the judgment of friend and foe alike, conceding that we had allowed representatives to the committee insufficient time to consider the question carefully and objectively. Indeed, I was persuaded in particular by the personal appeal of delegates whom I hold in great esteem - delegates who argued convincingly that the time and place most appropriate for the initial introduction of such accusations would be this session of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

No other state in Latin America approaches Cuba in its total control of its citizens' lives and its disregard for their basic human rights. In no other country have tens of thousands of citizens crowded into foreign embassies pleading for asylum. No other Latin American country has seen 15% of its population flee to surrounding nations in search of basic freedoms, including freedom from want. No other nation in Latin America so stringently controls the departure of its citizens to prevent an even larger portion of its population from leaving.

The vision of the Americas as a regions controlled by military juntas or corrupt caudillos has simply lost credibility. Problems remain, but the future of Latin America is a future of great promise.

The Castro regime, like the model from which it was taken, seized power by force and retains it through terror. Fidel Castro's regime has imposed upon Cuba an uncompromising dictatorship which is unresponsive to the aspirations of its own people, and, indeed, intolerant of any internal opposition or political heresy. For nearly three decades it has systematically abused its people, compiling a record of brutality and oppression which ranks proportionately among the greatest tragedies of the century.

The people of Cuba have suffered long enough, Castro has tormented them with impunity.
In 1961, when Castro’s engineers laid tons of explosives beneath the basement of the prison buildings on the Isle of Pines transforming thousands of inmates from simple political prisoners into hostages of the regime, word of this horrendous crime was smuggled out of Cuba to this very commission.

In 1974, Dr. Humberto Medrano appeared before the Sub-Commission for the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities, and in 1975, before this commission with incontrovertible evidence of torture, murder, mutilation, and humiliation of political prisoners, and asked for an objective investigation of what was accurately described as “ideological genocide” in Cuba.

Under its present regime, Cuba has become a country alternately described as “an island prison” or, more eloquently, as the Cuban diplomat, Andres Vargas Gomez, described it, “a place without a soul.”

Granted, it is a place where the use of firing squad as the preferred method of eliminating political opponents has become more selective in recent years, where the cries of “Viva Cristo Rey” from the condemned in the trenches at La Cabana - so movingly portrayed by Armando Valladares in his memoirs - now only intermittently haunt other prisoners with the uncertainty of their own fate.

In considering the question of human rights in Cuba - or in any society - the treatment of political prisoners is but one symptom of a more profound problem. Fundamentally, it is a question of the role of law in society, the power of government, and the liberty of the individual citizen.

Unfortunately, Cuba is first and foremost a place where political terror masquerades as law under the familiar slogan “socialist legality;” a place where carefully crafted classification of state “crimes” prohibit any exercise of legitimate civil or political rights” and thus create among its people an entire class of victims who have engaged in activities proscribed by the ruling elite. The bullet-scarred walls and
doors are mute testimony to the unknown man's fate.

22 In Cuba the "crime" of enemy propaganda, propaganda enigma, provides a convenient vehicle for suppressing even the private expressions of the most innocuous, unorthodox political opinion. It has been invoked, for instance, to disrupt the single organization in the country attempting to monitor and inform citizens of the human rights situation in their country - activities entirely consistent, I might add, with the spirit of resolutions repeatedly approved by this commission and the General Assembly.

23 So swift and effective was the suppression of the group that its founder and president, Ricardo Bofill Pages, was barely able to take refuge in the French Embassy in Havana in order to avoid arrest for the fourth time in less than 20 years.

27 In truth, the problem must be a grave one for Castro. What could possibly explain the disproportionate number of exiles fleeing his island paradise with such regularity? We recently witnessed the tragic arrival in Florida of a raft with one dead and another brain-dead young man aboard, and the sad, pretty spectacle of a government allowing the boy's father to travel to the United States to see him, but holding his stepmother hostage to ensure his father's return. Like all captive nations, Castro's Cuba depends upon the unmerciful enforcement of criminal statutes, not to keep refugees out but to keep its own people in!

28 Among other criminal charges invoked to smash the unrealized dream of an independent labor movement in Cuba was "industrial sabotage." In what was orchestrated to be an impressive show trial for the regime, a second court had to be convened to hand down the state-ordered convictions after the original judges and lawyers refused.

30 The cases of these lawyers demonstrate clearly the travesty of law in Cuba today, for it is in the administration of justice itself that Cuba scorns most the norms
of law recognized by international standards of human rights.

31 Having created a class of victims among its own citizens, despots like Castro invariably confront the need either to compel conformity by those who would resist or to eliminate them. The treatment of political offenders in the Cuban penal system reflects an approach to that dilemma marked at once by insidious deceit and undisguised brutality.

34 Those prisoners who refuse to be rehabilitated or to be associated in any way with common criminals are subjected to the most severe punishment in an effort to dehumanize them, to reduce them to mere beasts and thus either to break their resistance or to destroy them completely. The have proven, however, time and time again, that man's spirit is indestructible, and, in the process, they have transformed the human aspiration for freedom into an heroic struggle for sanctity.

35 These are the plantados, the steadfast ones, who have stood firm in the face of evil. Through extraordinary faith and strength of will, they have triumphed. Though many have died, and some remain in chains, others have come back from the inner circles of hell to tell of the horrors which would otherwise remain known only to the condemned and to their tormentors. They bear the scars which attest to the truth of their testimony - most have been disabled or disfigured by years of torture.

38 Ask Sergio Bravo to tell you why a minister of God would be shot for the mere possession of a Bible in prison and to explain why, instead of the surgery needed to remove the bullet from his leg, prison authorities ordered the removal of the leg itself.

39 Ask Eduardo Capote to tell you of the routine beatings given to political prisoners and to describe the savagery with which a prison guard's machete mutilated both his hands.

40 Ask Tony Cuesta, a man seen by many in this room over the past few days, who
is now completely blind because he was denied medical care in prison.

Meet with these persons and ask them about the patient suffering of their families who endured unspeakable pain and humiliation from the authorities and their own neighbors in order to keep faith with their husbands, fathers, and sons locked up in prisons, often a day's travel from their home.

Ask them about Roberto Perez who, arrested and jailed, in 1959, has suffered through the infamous "blackout cells," biological experimentation, and a near fatal bullet wound during a brutal prison "massacre" at Boniato in 1975 and who remains incarcerated there still today.

These men, only three of more than 100 plantados we suspect remain in prison at Boniato, Combinado del Este, and Kilo Siete, are believed to be among the longest held political prisoners anywhere in the world.

While in prison, they were so inspired by the spirit of the older plantados that more than 50 of them in Combinado del Este have since May 1983 determined to carry on their struggle despite brutal reprisals of the authorities.

I invite my distinguished colleagues here today to meet with these men and women and to listen to them with an open heart and to see whether it is possible to ask yet again: Why now?

Cuba is assuredly not a place without a soul. The plantados are the soul of Cuba; their families are its heart; and this organization is its hope.

I speak not only for the United States, but also for the silent prisoners who suffer and die in Cuba's jails while some leave their cries unanswered because of timidity or some procedural cowardice. I call upon the conscience of the world for action - now.

Sorting of Metaphors

A preliminary examination of Ambassador Walters' speeches (hereafter re-
ferred to as "South Africa," "Soviet Withdrawal," and "Cuba") reveals three primary
metaphoric clusters, reinforced through nine secondary clusters.

Through the first primary metaphoric cluster, IDEOLOGY, Walters presented
human rights as part of an omnipresent dichotomy between democratic and nonde-
mocratic states. This division was based on the diversity in political heritage between
the two forms of governance.

Walters argued that the history of the United States was "one of struggle
against all forms of racial, cultural and political intolerance" (South Africa 2). As
such, he emphasized the United States' "commitment to equality and freedom," and
its efforts to "promote positive, peaceful change" around the world (South Africa
10,2,3). Walters also invoked a sense of historical significance about the Afghan
people by referring to their "long tumultuous history" of defending their "ancient
land" (Soviet Withdrawal 2,2). Other metaphors in this cluster included "actively
pressing for democratic, peaceful change," "aimed at seeking engagement," "pas-
sonate commitment to moral principle," "open societies," and "responsible nation." These metaphors began to depict the U.S., and others whom are struggling for their
freedom, as engaged in an eternal battle to preserve the inherent rights of mankind.

In contrast, Walters presented nondemocratic nations as "unjust and unjustifi-
able systems" run by an "uncompromising dictatorship," "ruling elite," or "despots"
(South Africa 3; Cuba 10,2,31). Not only were these nations "intolerant of internal
opposition," they were also rife with "discriminatory labor and employment prac-
tices," and "violence and official repression" (Cuba 10; South Africa 5,9). In addi-
tion, Walters referred to "elitist orders," "total control," "puppet government rent by
disloyalty, desertion, defections, disillusionment, and undiscipline," and "military
juntas or corrupt caudillos" in establishing an image of nondemocratic nations as
lacking in honor or integrity. These ideological differences are expounded through
some of the secondary metaphoric clusters.

While the IDEOLOGY cluster sets the tenor, or fundamental division of Ambassador Walters' discourse, the other primary metaphoric clusters serve as vehicles through which Walters fully develops the dualism between democratic and nondemocratic states. Through the second primary cluster, OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY, Ambassador Walters described the nature of nondemocratic governments as being mechanical. Soviet and Cuban human rights violations were articulated in terms of their effectiveness and expeditiousness.

Walters charged the Soviets with fighting a "modern war" using "modern day weaponry and technology" (Soviet Withdrawal 2,2). Further, as the war progressed, the Soviets were forced to "escalate their military efforts" and "upgrade their firepower" (Soviet Withdrawal 6,6). On another front, Walters criticized the "massive, systematic, and flagrant abuses" of human rights "orchestrated" by the Cuban government (Cuba 1,28). Further, Walters noted that suppression against dissenters was "swift and effective," and that many prisoners were "systematically abused" (Cuba 23,10).

These metaphors begin to depict nondemocratic governments as methodical in their abuse of human rights. Walters does not associate any human qualities with these governments; rather, he creates an image of a systematic machine bent on violating those who oppose it. Again, this image is more fully developed through some of the secondary metaphoric clusters.

The third primary metaphoric cluster employed by Ambassador Walters is SPIRITUALITY. Through this cluster, Walters depicted the struggle against human rights abuses as a crusade founded on religious faith. Walters claimed that black South African were denied their "God-given rights," and that the "spirit" of the United States' policy toward South Africa was aimed at ending apartheid (South
Africa 1,5). Regarding Afghanistan, Walters invoked the “Afghan spirit of resistance” that fought in “defense of their faith and country” (Soviet Withdrawal 5,8).

Nowhere was this theme more prevalent, however, than in Walters’ description of the Cuban people’s “heroic struggle for sanctity” (Cuba 34). According to Walters, the ‘plantados’—the steadfast ones—were the “soul of Cuba” and through their “faith and strength of will” they endured the “inner circles of hell” to tell their story of torture and abuse (Cuba 49,35,35). Indeed, Walters claimed the “cries of Viva Cristo Rey” (Live Christ King), still “haunts” other dissenters in their struggle to “keep faith” (Cuba 19,19,42). Other metaphors in this cluster included “Afghan spirit,” “political heresy,” “a place without a soul,” “spirit of resolutions,” “man’s spirit is indestructible,” “minister of God,” “the spirit of the older ‘plantados,’” and “not a place without a soul.”

By presenting human rights foremost as an ideological issue, Walters creates a dualism between totalitarianism and democracy. This dualism is expressed through the OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY and SPIRITUALITY clusters. The South African, Soviet, and Cuban governments are described as mechanistic and inhuman in violating the inherent rights of individuals. Conversely, those resisting man’s oppression are exalted in their plight. Theirs is a struggle for the freedom and sanctity of the human spirit.

To better understand Walters’ fundamental line of argument, it is necessary to examine the secondary metaphoric clusters. These clusters, broadly labeled as INHUMANITY, OPPRESSION, LAW, UNITED NATIONS, INSTRUMENTS, DESTRUCTION/CONSTRUCTION, SYMPTOM, HOPE, and REALITY, reinforce the division between OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY and SPIRITUALITY by providing additional testimony as to the nature of nondemocratic governments and as to the nature of those people that are oppressed.
Analysis of Metaphors

Reinforcing the IDEOLOGY cluster, Walters emphasized the inhumane nature of nondemocratic states and the oppressed nature of individuals struggling for freedom. Through the supporting clusters, INHUMANITY, Walters argued that nondemocratic regimes commit "ideological genocide" in effort to "dehumanize" or "reduce to mere beasts" any political dissenters (Cuba 15,34,34). Further, the "savagery," "brutality and oppression" typical of nondemocratic rule ranks proportionately among "the greatest tragedies of this century" (Cuba 39,10,10).

Other metaphors that depicted nondemocratic governments as inhumane include "callousness," "disregard for their basic human rights," "seized power by force and retains it through terror," "invading troops murdered," "military terror," "tormented them with impunity," "torture, murder, mutilation, and humiliation of political prisoners," "face of evil," "terrorists," "routine beatings," "remorseless and heartless," "marauding armies," "foreign oppressors," "mutilated," "brutal reprisals," and "brutal prison 'massacre.'"

Conversely, Walters described those struggling for their freedom through OPPRESSION metaphors. He argued that this "class of victims," "united in a national liberation struggle," had been "subjected to the most severe punishment," and had "suffered long enough" (Cuba 21; Soviet Withdrawal 8; Cuba 34,11). In fact, those "condemned" individuals in Cuba were among the "longest held political prisoners anywhere in the world" (Cuba 35,45). While many of the "disadvantaged" were forced to "flee to surrounding nations" "pleading asylum," many more remained "unshaken" and determined to "carry on the struggle" against oppression (South Africa 5; Cuba 8,8; Soviet Withdrawal 9; Cuba 46).

Walters also invoked "misery and refugees," "peaceful opponents," "Afghan suffering," "brave exploits," "subjected," "military struggle," and "resistance is alive
and well.” These tenors and vehicles reinforced the image that the struggle against human rights abuse was a defensive struggle against the inhumanity of nondemocratic states.

Through the use of LAW metaphors, Walters argued that nondemocratic states abused the law, while those dedicated to freedom became “hostages of the regime” (Cuba 13). Regarding Cuba, Walters added that Castro’s “island prison” was “unmerciful” [in its] enforcement of criminal statutes,” and that it “scorns most the norms of law recognized by international standards” (Cuba 18,27,30). Indeed, he claimed that the U.S. had “witnessed” “incontrovertible evidence” of the Cuban government’s “travesty of law” and “horrendous crime” against political prisoners (Cuba 27,15,30,13). Walters charged that the Soviets were also guilty of committing “inconceivable, heinous crimes” in Afghanistan (Soviet Withdrawal 4).

Other metaphors in this cluster included “common criminals,” “simple political prisoners,” “attest to the truth of their testimony,” “arrested and jailed,” “hostage,” “captive nations,” “show trial,” “remain in chains,” “incarcerated,” “mute testimony,” and “silent prisoners.” Combined, these tenors and vehicles enhance the view of human rights as an ideological issue. As Walters stated: “Fundamentally it [human rights] is a question of the role of law in a society, the power of government, and the liberty of the individual citizen” (Cuba 20).

Through the cluster UNITED NATIONS, Ambassador Walters extends the view of human rights as an ideological issue based on law, power, and liberty, by rhetorically associating the U.N. with these tenets. In doing so, Walters equated the “best traditions” of the United Nations with democracy (South Africa 10). He argued that “leaders and representatives of nations that deny liberty to their own people” should neither resort to “demagogic posturing and sloganeering,” nor to “exhortations to bloody revolution, call for mandatory sanctions, and hypocritical talk
about liberation" (South Africa 4). Rather, Walters claimed that as members of a body “conceived from the ashes of one war of liberation” and “dedicated to the preservation of peace,” he and his “distinguished colleagues” had a “moral duty” to “demand the condemnation” of human rights violators (Soviet Withdrawal 11; Cuba 47; Soviet Withdrawal 11; Cuba 1).

Walters also rhetorically associated his U.N. “colleagues” and “delegates whom I hold in great esteem” with the “spokesmen of the Afghan resistance” and their “delegation and alliance colleagues” who recounted Soviet human rights abuses (Soviet Withdrawal 9; Cuba 2; Soviet Withdrawal 9). The identification of Afghan resistance members and United Nations members through the same vehicles may be seen as an attempt by Walters to enhance the credibility of the Afghan spokesmen. Moreover, these metaphors, along with “heap praise,” “support the Afghan struggle passively,” “steadfast commitment,” “community of nations,” “friend and foe alike,” “delegates whom argued convincingly,” “timidity or some procedural cowardice,” and “conscience of the world,” allow Walters to create the image of a United Nations with a heritage of debate that must not succumb to political intimidation.

In support of the second primary cluster, OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY, Ambassador Walters employed INSTRUMENT metaphors. Through this secondary cluster, Walters presented the methods through which nondemocratic governments abused human rights. Regarding Afghanistan, Walters charged the Soviets with using a “terrifying array of the most modern instruments of war” (Soviet Withdrawal 8). While the Cuban government may not have been as technologically sophisticated as the Soviets, Walters argued that they were equally effective in violating human rights. According to Walters, the Cuban government relied on the “firing squad as the preferred method of eliminating political prisoners” (Cuba 19). He further added that the charge of “enemy propaganda provides a convenient vehicle” for
detaining political prisoners (Cuba 22).

Walters also associated the United States with the INSTRUMENT cluster. He claimed that the U.S. would “utilize every instrument of peaceful change” to dismantle the “apparatus and symbols” of apartheid (South Africa 7,5). While Walters appears to deviate from his thematic use of the INSTRUMENT cluster, it is significant to note that he describes the U.S. as using instruments for “peaceful” purposes. Conversely, Walters’ reference to the “apparatus and symbols” of apartheid continues to promote the image of a faceless government machine.

The bifurcation of the INSTRUMENT cluster is significant in that it suggests that ‘tools’ can be used for either evil, destructive purposes, or for good, constructive purposes. Speaking in quasi-engineering terms, Walters promotes the notion that as an advanced society, the United States can ‘fix’ the problems in underdeveloped or nondemocratic countries. However, this ‘hands on’ approach to diplomacy has traditionally led to charges of U.S. imperialism or interventionism.

The second supporting metaphoric cluster presents human rights as an issue of DESTRUCTION versus CONSTRUCTION. Though negative destruction metaphors, Walters argued that nondemocratic governments abused the rights of dissenters by physically trying to “break their resistance” or psychologically “destroy them completely” (Cuba 34,34). Walters also charged the Soviets with “wearing down” and “physically crushing” the resistance and attempting the “creation of a docile, client state” (Soviet Withdrawal 6,5,4). Such attempts could only lead to “war and devastation,” “death and destruction” (Soviet Withdrawal 13,11). Other tenors and vehicles in this cluster included “carefully crafted classification,” “industrial sabotage,” “destruction of homes, crops, and the fragile agricultural infrastructure,” “eroding,” and “destructive, punitive sanctions.”

In contrast, Walters depicted the United States as “builders, not destroyers”
He emphasized the 'constructive' nature of the United States' foreign policy objectives. These objectives were based on "constructive purposes:" affecting "change that assures rather than destroys" and "bringing constructive influence to bear" in nondemocratic countries (South Africa 10,3,7). As such, he argued that the U.S. was "taking concrete steps" to influence "fundamental reforms" and "fundamental change" in South Africa (South Africa 5,9,9).

Other tenors and vehicles in the CONSTRUCTION cluster included "designed to deprive," "foundations," "structure," "link," "work constructively," "increase its efforts to work effectively," "working toward the elimination," "creation of a political process," and "lead to a system."

The final metaphor cluster employed by Ambassador Walters in support of OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY was SYMPTOM. Through this secondary cluster, Walters attempted to reinforce the image of nondemocratic governments as being inhumane and calculating. He spoke of Soviet efforts at "psychological manipulation" and the "clinical precision" with which the Soviets had conducted "migratory genocide" in Afghanistan (Soviet Withdrawal 3,4,4). Regarding Cuba, Walters claimed that many political prisoners were "denied medical care" and were left "disabled or disfigured" by years of torture (Cuba 40,35). While these violations would certainly "augur ill" for political dissenters, Walters stated that ultimately, "the treatment of political prisoners is but one symptom of a more profound problem" within nondemocratic nations (Soviet Withdrawal 5; Cuba 20).

Walters also employed "operate," "brain-dead," "refuse to be rehabilitated," "bear the scars," "surgery," "removal of the leg," "open heart," and "families are its heart" to describe the nature and consequences of human rights violations by nondemocratic governments. By describing these abuses through graphic 'medical' metaphors, Walters emphasizes not only the use of medical technology for immoral
purposes such as “biological experimentation” (Cuba 43), but also the human suffering endured by those opposing nondemocratic governments.

These metaphoric clusters, INSTRUMENTS, DESTRUCTION/CONSTRUCTION, and SYMPTOM serve as catalysts in Walters’ efforts to describe human rights violators in quasi-technical terms. In doing so, Ambassador Walters depicts the South African, Soviet, and Cuban governments as methodical and callous in their suppression of human rights. These images are set in stark contrast to the primary metaphoric cluster, SPIRITUALITY, that Walters uses in describing individuals whom are oppressed by nondemocratic governments. A review of Walters’ use of HOPE and REALITY metaphoric clusters should further illustrate this rhetorical division.

Supporting the primary metaphoric cluster of SPIRITUALITY, Ambassador Walters emphasized HOPE as a means of enduring oppression. He stated that Americans were “united in hoping” for the end of apartheid, and that many South Africans share this “hope for real improvement” in their lives (South Africa 1,6). Walters added that for South Africa’s black population, “a cause of hope is that South Africa is not a totalitarian society” (South Africa 10). As such, there existed the possibility of world opinion exerting influence on the South African government.

Regarding Cuba, Walters held that while the future of Latin America was a “future of great promise,” the Cuban people lived with the “uncertainty of their own fate” (Cuba 9,19). It was the “human aspiration for freedom” that strengthened their resolve to struggle against a government bent on smashing their “unrealized dream” (Cuba 34,28). As a moral body, the United Nations could not leave the Cuban people’s “cries unanswered;” as Walters claimed, “this organization is its hope” (Cuba 50,49).

These metaphors, along with “destroy the hope,” “raise the expectations and
impel demands,” “desires for freedom are indomitable,” “unresponsive to the aspirations of its own people,” and “unknown man’s fate,” advance Walters’ theme of a spiritual people enduring human rights abuses. Moreover, hope is a distinctively human quality. By associating metaphors in the HOPE cluster with people opposing human rights violations, Walters enhances their humanness.

The second metaphoric cluster supporting SPIRITUALITY is REALITY. While the struggle against oppression was founded on faith and hope, through the REALITY cluster, Walters emphasized that an end to human rights abuses could only be realized through pragmatic action. In protesting the use of sanctions against South Africa, he urged the U.N. to join the United States in facing the “hard reality” that “economic and political freedoms are inextricably linked” (South Africa 8, 8, 8).

Conversely, Walters depicted nondemocratic governments as trying to distort reality. He charged that Cuba was a place where “political terror masquerades as law” and that the treatment of political prisoners was marked by “insidious deceit and undisguised brutality” (Cuba 21, 31). Other metaphors in the REALITY cluster included “just and viable settlement,” “objective investigation,” and “not tall tales or propaganda, but rather a genuine human tragedy.” Combined, they advance Walters’ claim that (political) “reality is progress toward democracy and greater freedom around the world” (South Africa 8).

Assessment of Metaphors

For Walters, reality was clear and simple: democracies upheld human rights, nondemocratic states abused them. As such, human rights was an ideological struggle between technological forces, described through the OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY cluster, and human forces, described through the SPIRITUALITY cluster. This dichotomy was reinforced through the secondary metaphoric clusters. Walters employed INSTRUMENTS, DESTRUCTION/CONSTRUCTION, and
SYMPTOM metaphors to create the image that nondemocratic regimes were mechanistic. Specifically, the Soviet, Cuban, and South African governments were described as methodical, efficient machines that violated the rights of those whom opposed it.

As previously noted, Walters did associate positive images of technology—the use of instruments for constructive purposes—with democracy. This rhetorical move enhanced the division between the democratic and nondemocratic states by portraying nondemocratic governments as abusers not only of human rights, but also of technologies that may end human suffering. Further, through the HOPE and REALITY clusters, Walters described U.S. policies, and the actions of people fighting against nondemocratic governments, as founded on faith and as preserving the sanctity of the human spirit.

The metaphoric clusters employed by Walters appear consonant with his own religious and political philosophy. As a devout Roman Catholic and staunch anti-Communist, Walters held that the U.S. was the “last best hope for mankind” (qtd. in Sciolino A5). This belief was manifest in his appeals for support of the ‘mujahidin.’ Walters argued that without assistance from freedom-loving nations in the U.N., such as the United States, the Afghan resistance would fall victim to Communist oppression.

Walters’ articulation of human rights as an ideological issue was also consistent with President Reagan’s bipolar rhetoric on world events. In establishing human rights as an ideological issue, Walters effectively divided the world into two camps. The democratic camp upheld human rights and supported those who struggled for their freedom, while the nondemocratic camp abused human rights and oppressed those who resisted its rule.

However, at least in the case of Cuba, the division of human rights along ideo-
logical lines proved unfavorable for the United States. During the March, 1987 Geneva convention of the U.N. Human Rights Committee, Walters' resolution calling for the condemnation of Cuba was rejected by a majority of Soviet-block and Third World countries. Similarly, a Cuban resolution condemning the U.S. for human rights abuses also failed to carry enough votes from the committee. As expressed by a delegate from India, the basis for rejecting these motions was to avoid the "politicizing" of human rights (New York Times A12).

Indeed, given the history of bloc voting practices in the United Nations, the United States' "politicizing" of human rights may not have been the most efficacious means of presenting petitions. With the Soviet-bloc and Third World countries wielding heavy influence in the U.N., the United States often fell short in advancing resolutions against Communist or Third World countries.

While these failures may have been influenced by historical or political factors, from a rhetorical perspective, the metaphoric clusters employed by Ambassador Walters contributed to a particular perspective on human rights in South Africa, Cuba, and the Soviet Union. However, Walters portrayal of nondemocratic nations as mechanistic and democratic nations as spiritualistic was not perceived as credible by sufficient U.N. delegates to advance a U.S. petition.

What may be needed, therefore, are different metaphors through which human right violations can be described. Metaphors which do not depict human rights as an ideological struggle may provide better results for the United States when arguing in an ideologically divided United Nations. This possibility, along with further recommendations for future study will be presented in the following chapter.
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CHAPTER IV
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

It has been argued that “a great deal of foreign policy consists of establishing a rhetorical position, rather than effectuating action in world politics” (Forsythe 36). This dictum may also apply to the realm of diplomacy. Given the subordinate role of diplomats in the making of foreign policy, considerable differences may exist between their public statements and their private beliefs. Nevertheless, one can trace themes, or lack thereof, in diplomatic statements through rhetorical analysis (Forsythe 36). Such is the purpose of this study.

An examination of Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick’s and Ambassador Vernon Walters' discourse suggests a concerted U.S. effort to establish a consistent rhetorical position on human rights. Of interest, therefore, is the method, or mode of argument, employed by Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters in promoting the United States’ position on human rights. As such, attention is turned to the thesis:

To what extent do the speeches of Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters reflect the themes of prophetic dualism and/or technocratic realism?

In the seminal article, “The Rhetoric of American Foreign Policy,” Philip Wander presents prophetic dualism and technocratic realism as contrasting forms of argument used in articulating U.S. foreign policy. Regarding prophetic dualism, Wander explains, “In the early 1950s during the Eisenhower-Dulles administration, a prominent and recurring argument supporting American policy in Vietnam concerned America’s moral or spiritual superiority” (342). Wander argues that through prophetic dualism, the Eisenhower administration was able to divide the world into two camps. On one side, the United States acted “in accord with all that is good,
decent, and at one with God's will;” On the other side, Communism acted in direct opposition (342).

During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, however, U.S. foreign policy was articulated in terms of technocratic realism. This rhetorical turn in foreign policy “emerged out of the university intellectuals, government bureaucrats, and skilled professionals who formed part of the coalition which brought the Kennedy administration into power” (Wander 349). As Wander further explains, “Technocratic realism finds the modern world much too complex for old time religion. Not the prophet, but rather a skilled, tough expert is what is needed, one whose mind is unclouded by violent and dangerous emotions; one who is wise, analytical, precise” (349).

Prophetic dualism and technocratic realism have long been a part of the United States' lexicon of foreign policy. However, Wander's examination of this phenomenon focuses solely on the rhetoric of U.S. presidents and their secretaries of state. The extent to which these modes of argument exist in one realm of modern diplomatic discourse is now examined.

**Findings**

On the issue of human rights, Ambassador Kirkpatrick's rhetoric is resonant of prophetic dualism. By dividing human rights along ideological lines, Kirkpatrick sets the stage for a Manichean conflict between democracy and communism, good and evil. Evidence of this is found in the primary metaphors she employs. In distinguishing democratic governments from Communist regimes through IDEOLOGY metaphors, Kirkpatrick is able to depict the United States as abiding by a higher natural law which respects the rights of individuals. Conversely, Communism is portrayed as an ideology which fosters aggression in its quest to end class struggles.

While many of the secondary metaphoric clusters employed by Kirkpatrick
support her ideological division of human rights, only the SANCTUARY cluster specifically resembles prophetic dualism. Through the SANCTUARY cluster, Kirkpatrick invoked images of religion, life, and death, thereby creating a sense of spirituality about those who struggled against Communist aggression. These images of martyrdom are consistent with the religiosity associated with prophetic dualism.

Of the remaining metaphoric clusters employed by Kirkpatrick--DOMINATION, SAVAGERY, PSYCHOLOGY, RETREAT, LAW, and HUMAN RIGHTS--none can be accurately classified as either prophetic dualism or technocratic realism. The DOMINATION, SAVAGERY, PSYCHOLOGY, and RETREAT metaphors serve as support for the primary IDEOLOGY and AGGRESSION clusters. Through these secondary clusters, Kirkpatrick emphasizes that Communist regimes were bent on physical and psychological terror. Conversely, those struggling for freedom are characterized as defensive in nature. The LAW and HUMAN RIGHTS clusters can be interpreted as Kirkpatrick's attempt to use the language which depicts the U.S. as adhering to international standards of law. In doing so, she fosters the impression that the U.S. may avoid charges that it is imposing its own moral code on the international community (Forsythe 45).

The absence of technocratic realism as a mode of argument in Kirkpatrick's rhetoric may be attributed to a variety of factors. Methodological consideration as well as author biases must be taken into account. As such, the small number of speeches analyzed, the topic of the speeches, and the aim of the speeches can all affect the tone of the discourse. Ambassador Kirkpatrick's background as a political theorist also may have influenced the style, if not the substance, of her arguments in the United Nations.

However, based on the analysis of those speeches given by Ambassador Kirkpatrick, some observations can be made. It is argued that Ambassador Kirkpatrick's
discourse reflects Wander's themes of prophetic dualism and technocratic realism inasmuch as President Reagan's rhetoric reflects these themes. That is to say, the presence of prophetic dualism and absence of technocratic realism in Kirkpatrick's discourse is in part a reflection of Reagan's method of argument. This consistent use of prophetic dualism by Kirkpatrick and Reagan also suggests the possibility that they share a similar ideological perspective.

Scholars have noted President Reagan's characterization that world conflict results from ideological differences between democracy and Godless communism (Ivie, "Speaking"; Goodnight; Lewis). Indeed, Reagan's rhetoric is classic prophetic dualism. The present study reveals a similar line of argumentation employed by Ambassador Kirkpatrick when addressing the U.N. on issues of human rights. However, the depiction of the United States as "God's chosen people"--a hallmark of prophetic dualism--is not presented as blatantly in Kirkpatrick's diplomatic rhetoric as it is in Reagan's presidential rhetoric.

The reason for this may lie in the nature of the audiences Kirkpatrick and Reagan addressed. That Kirkpatrick's U.N. speeches were before an international audience, while Reagan's "evil empire" rhetoric was presented directly to the American people, suggests that the nature of the audience influences the nature of the discourse. Indeed, Wander argues that "The domestic audience for foreign policy address is in a position to determine whether or not an administrative advocate and his or her party will remain in power" (340). By its nature, diplomatic rhetoric in the United Nations addresses a more varied and critical audience. It stands to reason, therefore, that while Ambassador Kirkpatrick could employ prophetic dualism as a mode or arguing the human rights issue in the U.N., she could not create the impression that the United States was morally or spiritually superior.

Ambassador Vernon Walters' human rights appeals in the United Nations
reflect both technocratic realism and prophetic dualism. Like Kirkpatrick, Walters divides human rights along ideological lines. His primary metaphoric cluster, IDEOLOGY, is supported by images of totalitarian INHUMANITY and OPPRESSION. Through these supporting clusters, Walters portrays nondemocratic governments as brutal oppressors of those whom struggle for democratic reform. Walters also employs LAW and UNITED NATIONS metaphoric clusters to create the impression that the United States fully supports the standard of law set by the international community. It is through the use of OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY and SPIRITUALITY as primary metaphors, however, that Walters creates the dichotomy between technocratic realism and prophetic dualism.

As Wander notes, the rhetoric of technocratic realism is marked by a "commitment to dispassionate, informed, and pragmatic expertise" (350). Such is the case in Walters’ OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY metaphoric cluster. Through these metaphors, Walters argues that nondemocratic regimes are systematic in their abuse of human rights. These images are enhanced through the secondary INSTRUMENTS, DESTRUCTION, and SYMPTOM clusters which present, in quasi-technical terms, the devastating physical and psychological effects of totalitarian rule. Reinforcing OPERATIVE TECHNOLOGY, Walters employs CONSTRUCTION metaphors to articulate the United States’ position on human rights. In doing so, he emphasizes that the U.S. has worked constructively toward supporting human rights.

It is significant to note that many, if not most, of the CONSTRUCTION metaphors are found in Ambassador Walters’ discourse concerning South Africa. The reasons for this are varied. Perhaps it is that by employing CONSTRUCTION metaphors, Walters was attempting to echo the Reagan administration’s policy of ‘constructive engagement.’ The thematic use of ‘construction’ would suggest a concerted effort to present a consistent U.S. rhetorical position regarding apartheid.
It may also be argued that Walters' human rights appeals regarding apartheid were articulated through technocratic realism due to the nature of relations between the United States and South Africa, and due to the right-wing disposition of the Pretoria government. On this point, Wander notes that, "One of the advantages of technocratic realism was that it could be adapted to explain hostile actions in international affairs and justify a more moderate course of action than would otherwise be the case when confronting Evil" (350). As such, Ambassador Walters was able to make a public moral argument against apartheid without reducing U.S.-South African relations to an inevitable conflict between good and evil (Fisher).

Through the use of SPIRITUALITY metaphors, Walters was able to argue in terms of prophetic dualism. He depicts the struggle against human rights abuses as a crusade forged in religious faith. Reinforcing this theme, Walters employs HOPE and REALITY metaphoric clusters. While these supporting clusters are not strongly resonant of prophetic dualism, they allow Walters to argue that religious faith and hope are not enough to sustain those struggling against oppression. Rather, only a realistic assessment of nondemocratic rule could lead to actions against those human rights violators.

While the presence of prophetic dualism and technocratic realism in Ambassador Walters' discourse may seem paradoxical, Wander notes that "Despite their logical and seemingly political incompatibility, prophetic dualism and technocratic realism not only can co-exist, elements of each may appear in the same speech" (352). Such occurrences are best explained not as a "blurring of categories" or "mixing of metaphors," but rather as rhetorical attempts to "relate to the worldviews of various groups" (Wander 352). In this light, the presence of both prophetic dualism and technocratic realism in Ambassador Walters' discourse seems plausible.

As with Ambassador Kirkpatrick, it appears that the extent to which
Ambassador Walters’ discourse reflects the themes of prophetic dualism and technocratic realism is influenced by the extent to which President Reagan’s rhetoric does so. Given the ideological similarities between Kirkpatrick and Walters, and between the two ambassadors and their president, this finding would ordinarily not be surprising. Indeed, it should be expected that diplomats articulate foreign policy consistent with the president.

However, that Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ human rights arguments in the United Nations were based, at least in part, on prophetic dualism carries significant implications. To be sure, “the very idea of human ‘rights’ is firmly rooted in biblical injunction, which asserts a metaphysical equality (‘Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself’)” (Buckley, Jr. 775). As such, prophetic dualism would seem to be a valid method of arguing for human rights.

The use of prophetic dualism becomes problematic, however, when it is employed in the realm of diplomacy. Again, Wander is instructive:

As a form of argument, prophetic dualism calls for overwhelming support—a response appropriate to the world’s greatest spiritual power... While it restricts debate and encourages dependence on existing authority, prophetic dualism has serious drawbacks for those in power. Prophetic dualism leaves little room for adaptation or compromise (345).

The exacting nature of prophetic dualism is ill suited for the give and take of diplomatic exchange. Further, given the history of opposition encountered by the U.S. in the United Nations, “overwhelming support” was not only unrealistic, but also unattainable.

The extent to which prophetic dualism and technocratic realism exist in Ambassador Kirkpatrick’s and Ambassador Walters’ rhetoric has been examined. It is posited that the existence of these themes in Kirkpatrick’s and Walters’ discourse reflects their presence in President Reagan’s rhetoric. As the United States’ primary
diplomatic voice in the United Nations, Kirkpatrick and Walters should be expected to articulate foreign policy consistent with President Reagan. That is, the substance of their argument should be the same.

However, that these ambassadors also echo the style of Reagan's rhetoric is significant. The similarity may be explained as a concerted effort by the Reagan administration to present a consistent rhetorical position on human rights. Moreover, given the similarities between Kirkpatrick's and Walters' ideological persuasions and that of President Reagan, it is argued that in the case of the speeches analyzed, the public statements of Ambassadors Kirkpatrick and Walters accurately reflect their private belief.

The presence of prophetic dualism and technocratic realism in diplomatic discourse adds credibility to Wander's claim that these themes are a part of the United States' lexicon of foreign policy. Indeed, prophetic dualism may be seen as part of a larger religious dimension that has pervaded U.S. political rhetoric since this nation's founding. Technocratic realism may be explained as a rhetorical consequence of the revolution in high technology of the last several decades. Further evidence of this may be found by investigating the metaphors, or mode of argument, employed by the Bush administration in describing U.S. successes in Operation Desert Storm.

Limitations

While the critical analysis of diplomatic rhetoric is a relatively virgin area of research, Robert Ivie's methodology for metaphoric analysis serves as a useful vehicle for maneuvering through the terrain. Although somewhat rigid by design, Ivie's five step process of examining the discourse, then isolating, sorting, analyzing, and assessing the metaphors does leave room for critical interpretation, a quality that enhances the taxonomy's heuristic value.
Ivie's methodology, however, is not without shortcomings. By failing to specifically define what constitutes metaphor, Ivie reduces the chances of conducting consistent analysis via his methodology. Language that one scholar may consider metaphoric may not be considered so by another. It is only through the use of the terms "tenor" and "vehicle" that Ivie guides the reader toward employing I.A. Richards' classic treatise. However, Ivie's failure to provide a critical interpretation of Richards' theory on metaphor insures inconsistent isolation, sorting, and analyzing of metaphors in subsequent studies.

Given the wealth of scholarship on metaphors and metaphoric theory, defining what is and what is not metaphoric becomes problematic. Richards' assertion that virtually all language is metaphoric further complicates matters. It should be noted, however, that the importance of defining what constitutes metaphor is not in establishing the primacy of one theory over another, nor in establishing a single definition of metaphor. Rather, the significance of attaching a specific definition of metaphor to a specific methodology lies in increasing the consistency of rhetorical criticism.

Another problem with Ivie's methodology stems from the identification and naming of clusters. The inherent subjectivity of Ivie's methodology breeds the possibility that metaphoric clusters are little more than the arbitrary classifications of a scholar. As such, they may present no real insights into the actual meaning of texts. Further, by grouping metaphors into clusters, Ivie's methodology may bias future studies. The question then arises: Would a second critic be influenced to fit metaphors into categories established by a prior critic?

Ivie does offer a safeguard to these dangers. By allowing for a review of discourse related to the focal speeches and an examination of the rhetor's background, Ivie guides other scholars toward gaining a clearer understanding of a rhetor's ideological persuasion. Accordingly, scholars may be better qualified to classify modes of
arguments accurately—that is, in accordance with the rhetor's true beliefs—than otherwise possible.

Beyond these methodological weaknesses, Ivie's method was helpful in the examination and analysis of Ambassador Kirkpatrick's and Ambassador Walters' discourse. However, there are a number of fruitful avenues of research that were beyond the scope of this study.

Future Studies

The analysis of Kirkpatrick's and Walters' discourse shed light on several areas that merit further attention. First, the analysis of a variety of speeches was necessary in gaining a broader perspective of the United States' rhetorical position on human rights in general. Of interest, however, would be a metaphorical analysis of the United States' diplomatic discourse vis-a-vis a single country. Through this sort of analysis, a better understanding of how the United States construes a particular nation may be reached.

Second, the findings of this thesis suggest that more attention should be paid to the nature of the audience. As Edwin Black notes,

> It seems a particularly useful methodological assumption to hold that rhetorical discourses, either singly or cumulatively in a persuasive movement, will imply an auditor, and that in most cases the implication will be sufficiently suggestive as to enable the critic to link this implied auditor to an ideology (112).

The surest signs of the implied auditor are metaphors, or "stylistic tokens" employed by the rhetor (Black 112). By examining such metaphors, rhetorical critics may better distinguish primary audiences from secondary and even tertiary audiences. Messages can then be placed in proper context once the intended audience has been identified. This has practical implications in the era of instantaneous worldwide broadcasts.
Third, what may be needed in foreign policy rhetoric are metaphors that depict the United States less as the world’s moral or spiritual leader, and more as a member of the world community willing to share its abundance with those nations less fortunate. Diplomats from the United States may also do well by de-emphasizing ideological differences, and promoting similarities between its heritage and that of other nations. In short, a different mode of argument comprised of COOPERATION metaphors may prove effective in the United Nations.

Finally, more scholarship must be devoted to the examination of diplomatic discourse. While foreign policy rhetoric has long received interdisciplinary attention, diplomatic rhetoric, and in particular speech within the United Nations, has received inadequate attention. It is only through the examination of such discourse that a better understanding may be gained of how the speech of diplomacy proceeds. From this starting point, the more significant issue of the implications of such discourse may be examined.
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