University of Rhode Island

DigitalCommons@URI

Open Access Master's Theses

2003

The Rhetoric of Colin Powell

Scott Dauenhauer

University of Rhode Island

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Dauenhauer, Scott, "The Rhetoric of Colin Powell" (2003). *Open Access Master's Theses*. Paper 1819.
<https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/theses/1819>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Open Access Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons-group@uri.edu.

THE RHETORIC OF COLIN POWELL

BY

SCOTT DAUENHAUER

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE

REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

COMMUNICATION STUDIES

UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND

2003

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes the rhetoric of Colin Powell, while further examining his background and the forces impacting his rhetoric. The situation in the Middle East between Israel and Palestine is examined along with Powell's role in attempting to resolve the conflict. This study employs the Neo-Aristotelian method of rhetorical criticism to analyze his address, "Remarks at the 24th Annual National Leadership Conference of the Anti-Defamation League," given on May 6, 2002, along with portions of Powell's other rhetorical works. An interview was conducted Larry Wilkerson, Chief of Staff U. S. Department of State.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the process of writing this thesis, I have not only become more enlightened about the rhetoric of Colin Powell, but also have been reminded of what a wonderful country in which we live and the efforts and sacrifices our soldiers, leaders, and citizens put forth throughout history. Studying Colin Powell has been a pleasure; I sincerely hope we continue to learn from our leaders as we work to improve our way of life, how we interact, and our social construction of race.

I wish to thank retired Army Colonel and current Chief of Staff U.S. State Department, Larry Wilkerson for allowing me to interview him, especially during the war with Iraq. His insight was invaluable and furthermore, his willingness to take time to speak with me under the circumstances is a testament to the freedom we enjoy--when a graduate student can be granted an interview with a senior government official during the most turbulent of times.

I wish to thank my wife, Brooke, for her constant support, as she truly helped me to focus and was always encouraging throughout the entire process. I also want to thank my brother Jason for his scholarly advice, along with family and friends. Thank you Dr. Geoff Leatham for agreeing to work with me from afar and always providing a perspective, which helped me to grow along with a shared passion for the study of rhetoric and leadership. Thank you to my thesis committee, Dr. Wood, Dr. Quainoo, and LTC Krajewski for their balanced perspectives and to Dr. Ketrow and Linda Palmer for their support over the past few years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 1 Rationale.....	2
Synopsis of Colin Powell’s Biography.....	5
CHAPTER 2 History of the Middle East Conflict	11
CHAPTER 3 African American, military leader, statesman.....	18
CHAPTER 4 Afrocentric Rhetoric.....	26
CHAPTER 5 Leadership Philosophies and Exchange Relations.....	31
CHAPTER 6 Methodology and Literature Review.....	37
CHAPTER 7 Rhetoric of Colin Powell.....	49
CHAPTER 8 Mid East Interview.....	70
CHAPTER 9 Significance of United Nations Address.....	76
CONCLUSION.....	79
APPENDICES Transcript of Telephone Interview with Larry Wilkerson, Department of State Chief of Staff, March 21, 2003.....	85
Manuscript of Speech, “Remarks at the 24 th Annual National Leadership Conference to the Anti-Defamation League,” May 6, 2002.....	101
Manuscript of Speech, “President Bush Calls for New Palestinian Leadership,” June 24, 2002.....	107
Manuscript of Interview, “Interview by Bob Edwards on NPR’s ‘Morning Edition,’” June 25, 2002.....	111
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	114

Introduction

As one of the most volatile conflicts of our time continues to unfold in the Middle East, the U.S. Secretary of State, Colin Powell has been frequently involved in articulating the United States' position on the conflict and attempting to facilitate peace talks between the leaders of Israel and Palestine. This thesis examines the rhetoric of Colin Powell along with perspectives from Larry Wilkerson, Colin Powell's Chief of Staff.

In order to understand the substance of the conflict and role of Colin Powell, I have divided this thesis into three parts. Part I entails a biographical synopsis of Colin Powell's life and a brief history of the Middle East conflict. Part II examines the uniqueness of Powell, leadership philosophies, and how elements of his uniqueness and leadership philosophies affect his rhetoric. Part III provides a rhetorical analysis comprising of a review of methodology of the artifacts using Neo-Aristotelian criticism, which encompasses Invention (development of persuasive arguments), Disposition (organization of the message), Style, Delivery, and Memory derived from Foss (1996) and Frey, Botan, & Kreps, (2000). I will also include the historical relevance of Powell's recent United Nations address and aspects of his career not only as a proven military leader and an integral Secretary of State, but also as an African American. An interview with Larry Wilkerson, Chief of Staff, U.S. State Department, will be analyzed to evaluate Powell's style, delivery, and adaptations to specific topics.

CHAPTER ONE

Rationale

Colin Powell continues to influence our nation and the world as he confronts situations and interacts with world leaders. Research to analyze the rhetorical significance of how and why Powell delivers his messages may provide insight to other U.S. diplomats or world leaders as how to effectively interact with Middle East leaders. Powell's command of his material along with his style and delivery of his messages serve as examples that set him apart from other speakers and may form a base for future rhetorical studies applying the Neo-Aristotelian method of criticism to other's works. Interpersonal relationships between leaders in politics, the workplace, or even in the military could be improved in reaching consensus or presenting viewpoints in the decision making process through continued study of leaders' rhetoric.

The struggle between Israel and the Palestinian people has grown more violent and the United States has become involved as a broker of peace to try to end the violence and facilitate the negotiation of a lasting settlement. This conflict has persisted over decades, at times appearing closer to an end and then repeatedly, the feuding resumes. The complex forces surrounding the situation include international politics, vital natural resources, heavy religious interests, terrorist groups, military occupation, land rights, years of violence, and leaders who find themselves at odds with one another (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001; Sahliyah 1988).

The leader of Israel, Ariel Sharon, and Yasser Arafat, the leader of the Palestinian Authority have not only been reluctant to reach agreement on many issues, they

have often refused to communicate with each other. The United States Secretary of State Colin Powell and President George Bush have become involved in trying to influence these leaders to cease the violence and progress toward resolution of the conflict.

During Spring 2002, the media portrayed the U.S. position encouraging Middle East peace talks and debate over Yasser Arafat being allowed to remain as President of a proposed interim Palestinian state. I believe Powell's stance on the issue and presentation of the United States' position in his interviews created anticipation for future talks and carefully maintained his relationship supporting President Bush amidst a barrage of media scrutiny following the President's speech on June 24, 2002. The President's speech included a peace plan, which omitted Yasser Arafat from his current leadership role and caused speculation among the press of the President's disapproval of Arafat:

Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership, so that a Palestinian state can be born...I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror...Today, the elected Palestinian legislature has no authority, and power is concentrated in the hands of an unaccountable few...Today, Palestinian authorities are encouraging, not opposing, terrorism. This is unacceptable (Bush, 2002, June 24).

Powell had previously expressed a willingness to work with Arafat as the recognized Palestinian leader, and had to respond to concerns over the President's remarks

(Borger, 2002, May 9; Calabrese & Robinson, 2002, July 8; Interview, 2002, June 25).

The rhetoric of Colin Powell surrounding President Bush's speech plays a vital role in the resumption and the success of future discussions leading toward a resolution. While many scholars have analyzed Powell's interviews and addresses, there exists very little research on the Neo-Aristotelian method of rhetorical criticism, which I believe can add significant value to enhancing communication regarding the Mid-East conflict as well as understanding the rhetoric of one of our nation's greatest leaders.

In addition to exploring rhetoric surrounding the conflict and the philosophies of Colin Powell, I will also examine rhetorical exigencies binding Powell as an African American. The significance of Powell's ascent to one of the top positions in our nation's military and government and the racial boundaries he has operated within, and challenged, are discussed.

As an Army lieutenant, manager, and student I have been intrigued with the study of leadership and the importance of rhetoric in influencing those around us to work toward achieving our objectives. I firmly believe through examining the rhetorical significance of how and why Colin Powell delivers his messages, we may be able to gain a better understanding of communication surrounding the situation. This study may also form a base for future rhetorical studies that may aid in the development of resolutions for similar conflicts as well as further our progress in changing the American social construction of "race."

Synopsis of Colin Powell's Biography

In order to understand the uniqueness of Colin Powell and examine his rhetoric, it is necessary to look at his professional career as well as his personal life. As a son of Jamaican immigrants, Colin L. Powell was born on April 5, 1937, in Harlem and later moved to the South Bronx in New York City (Powell, 1995). His parents were proud, hard working people who worked in the garment district and emphasized the importance of education to their children. He grew up in a neighborhood around many different ethnic groups including West Indians, Jews, Puerto Ricans, Italians, and Greeks to name a few. Powell was an average student during high school and chose to attend City College, where he joined Army ROTC (Powell, 1995). He found the structure and discipline of Army ROTC particularly the Pershing Rifles drill team, to be very appealing and excelled in his military science courses (Powell, 1995). Powell entered the Army as an Infantry Officer in 1958 and began his career at Fort Benning, Georgia, where he also encountered his first real brush with racism. Having grown up in a diverse neighborhood in New York City, he was not accustomed to the prejudices he observed off-post in Georgia and spent most of his time on-post focusing on his military responsibilities (Powell, 1995).

While serving at Fort Devens, Massachusetts, Powell met Alma Johnson who later became his wife. In December 1962, Powell left his family to serve in Vietnam, while his wife returned to live with her parents in Birmingham, Alabama awaiting the birth of their first child, son Michael. Powell returned from Vietnam in late 1963, where he and Alma relocated to Fort Benning, Georgia (Powell, 1995). The Powells continued to experience the realities of being black in a segregated South. They had

difficulty finding suitable housing and Powell was even refused service from a local restaurant. Nonetheless, Powell focused on his military career and raising his family. In 1965, daughter Linda became a new addition to the family and three years later Major Powell was assigned to serve a second tour in Vietnam (Powell, 1995).

During his second tour in Vietnam, Powell's career began to accelerate as he filled a high level G-3 Staff Officer position normally held by a Lieutenant Colonel (Powell, 1995). While in the G-3 position, Powell was involved in a helicopter crash and saved several survivors despite being injured. Following his Vietnam assignment, he completed his Master of Business Administration in 1971 along with welcoming a new daughter to their family, Annemarie. Powell went on to receive a coveted White House fellowship position in 1972 (Powell, 1995).

Over the next decade, Powell progressively developed his leadership skills as he commanded larger units of soldiers (Harari, 2002). He also served in many advisory roles to include being a senior military assistant in the Carter and Reagan administrations. In 1979, Powell was promoted to Brigadier General and moved between Washington D.C. and Army command positions in the field until 1986 when he was appointed Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs (Powell, 1995). Powell had previously worked for Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and was now working for Frank Carlucci, the National Security Advisor. Here he gained a wealth of experience in dealing with U.S./Soviet relations, the Iran/Contra Affair, and a variety of other national security and foreign relations matters (Powell, 1995).

In 1987, Frank Carlucci succeeded Caspar Weinberger as Secretary of Defense and Colin Powell was appointed as the National Security Advisor (Powell, 1995). This was another defining moment in his career, as Powell also became the first African American to hold this position.

As National Security Advisor, Powell experienced his first significant encounter with the media when he had to conduct regular briefings with the White House press corps. Although he received training in the military on public speaking, he was wary of dealing with the media. “ Communication is communication, whether to a class of OCS (Officer Candidate School) students or to Sam Donaldson. I nevertheless felt as if I were approaching a minefield as I went to the mike, explained the treaty and other issues, and opened the floor to questions” (Powell, 1995, p.344).

However, Powell gained confidence during this meeting and began to use humor in his discourse to relax the scene:

The questioning turned to two sites agreed to by us and the Soviets for verifying disarmament, Magna, Utah and Votkinsk, Siberia. Which one was preferable? A reporter asked teasingly. ‘Given my druthers, I’d take Magna,’ I said. Votkinsk was quite a desolate place. But I promised, ‘ We will make sure CNN gets there.’ They began laughing. I started not only to act relaxed, but to feel relaxed (Powell, 1995, p.344).

Powell went on to explain some early lessons he had learned from this initial press encounter,

I realized that the interviewee is the only one at risk in this duel. The media report only stupid or careless answers, not stupid or unfair questions. Also, when reporters ask a follow-up question, you're headed for trouble-so break off, apply power, gain altitude, or eject (Powell, 1995, p.345).

While Powell became experienced in working with the media, he also spent valuable time behind the scenes preparing speaking points for President Reagan during high-profile meetings, including treaty talks with Soviet President Gorbachev. Throughout the Reagan years, Powell continued to learn how to interact with the media.

During an interview with Chris Wallace of NBC News, Wallace asked Powell for some background information, which resulted in extending the interview. Wallace extracted a seven-second comment of a thirty-minute interview that portrayed Powell contradicting the President (Powell, 1995). To Powell's dismay, this "cheap shot" from the press certainly caused a stir, but also may have helped to condition Powell in his dealings with the media.

This trend of "firsts" continued as Powell was promoted to General (four stars) in 1989 and President George H. W. Bush appointed him chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff making Powell the first African American, first ROTC graduate, and youngest officer to ever hold the position (Powell, 1995). As he matured in his role, Powell became more aware of his presence and how his demeanor affected

situations. In dealing with the conflict in Panama, where the U.S. pondered intervention and ultimately ousted dictator Manuel Noriega, Powell described his stature, “My intention was to convey a sense of calm and confidence that we knew what we were doing” (Powell, 1995, p. 417).

Powell’s philosophies began to resonate in his rhetoric as he described lessons learned from the ousting of Noriega in Operation Just Cause and previous experiences in his doctrine for the future use of military power. “Have a clear political objective and stick to it. Use all the force necessary, and do not apologize for going in big if that’s what it takes. Decisive force ends wars quickly and in the long run saves lives” (Powell, 1995, p. 421).

In 1991, General Powell became engulfed in the strategizing and direction of Operation Desert Storm. Working behind the scenes with the Joint Chiefs, Secretary of Defense Cheney, General Schwarzkopf, and President Bush, Powell found himself in a position where he had to influence our nation. As the war broke out, different reports from the media were painting a picture of the military operations without the perspective of a senior military leader (Powell, 1995). Powell conducted a press conference and sent a deliberate message to the world to evoke an intended reaction.

General Powell described his methodology:

My presentation was deliberately understated and unemotional. And then I delivered the punch line. ‘Our strategy in going after this army is very simple,’ I said. ‘First we are going to cut it off, and then we are going to

kill it.' Those words led the press coverage on television that evening, and in the papers the next day. They achieved what I wanted. They let the world- and particularly Iraq- know our war aim unmistakably (Powell, 1995, p. 495).

Following the Gulf War and the election of President Clinton in 1992, Powell remained as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to complete his term and eventually retired from the Army in September 1993 (Powell, 1995). Between 1993 and 2000, Powell served on the board of directors for several companies, went on a public speaking tour, and became involved in several non-profit charitable organizations until his nomination and selection as Secretary of State in 2000 (Harari, 2002).

Since becoming the current Secretary of State, he has used his influence in a variety of highly sensitive foreign and domestic matters successfully. In 2001, he helped to arrange the safe return of a United States pilot who crashed in China. Following the tragedies of September 11, 2001, Powell focused on waging the war against terrorism in Afghanistan. In March 2002, following the Palestinian suicide bombing that killed 29 Israelis Powell traveled to the Middle East and worked to diffuse tensions and foster peace talks between Ariel Sharon and Yasser Arafat.

Most recently, Colin Powell may have given one of the most important addresses of his career when he presented the United States' evidence and justification to take action against Iraq before the United Nations and the world on February 5, 2003.

CHAPTER TWO

History of the Middle East Conflict

In order to understand the significance of Colin Powell's role in the Middle East Conflict and relationships between the world leaders involved, a brief synopsis of events will help illustrate origins of how the struggle originated and how it culminated into the current Arab-Israeli conflict.

The area in question where the Palestinian and Jewish people have settled is rich in history. The modern state of Israel encompasses an area known as the Holy Land, including towns and villages of great religious significance to Christians, Muslims, and Jews (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001; Sahliyah, 1988). Under the control of the Ottoman Empire dating from the early 1500s to the late 1800s, different groups passed through the region and settled in many areas. The areas range from the Gaza strip on the Mediterranean coast, historical cities such as Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Jericho, and Nazareth, as well as areas surrounding the Sea of Galilee up to the Golan Heights (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988).

As many different groups passed through the region and settled over the centuries, the Arabs who had been in place since the 600s remained. Today, this area, known as Palestine, has been predominately Muslim while co-existing among Christians and Jews. Toward the late 1800s, a sense of Jewish nationalism or Zionism gained momentum under the premise of Jews wanting to return the Holy Land from which the Romans expelled them centuries ago. The migration also occurred amidst the Russian persecution of Jews, which sparked the political movement and immigration to other countries (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988).

Many Jews felt anti-Jewish sentiment was growing throughout Russia and Europe, which began the discussion of a Jewish state leading to the formation of the First Zionist Congress based in Switzerland in 1897 (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988). Many international political leaders also recognized the religious significance of Jerusalem to the Jewish people as the Jews began to slowly immigrate to Palestine.

During the early 1900s, a British census showed approximately 78 percent of the population in Palestine was Arab with about 11 percent Christian and 10 percent Jewish. However, these figures dramatically changed during the 1920s and 1930s as Hitler's rise to power caused many Jews to flee to Palestine increasing their population to 39 percent in 1939 (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988).

During the First Zionist Congress, a fund was established to help the new Jewish immigrants settle in Palestine and purchase land. The use of these funds was contingent upon maintaining ownership only among Jews. Thus, Jewish people gained permanent control over the land while diminishing Arab power.

As the influx of Jews increased in the 1930s, financial support from Jews in other countries such as the United States assisted the immigrants in gaining land, establishing settlements, and opening businesses. The area was controlled by the British following the break-up of the Ottoman Empire and these settlements were encouraged by the British, especially considering the influx of funds from other sources, relieving British responsibility (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988).

The Arabs in Palestine did not merely approve of this immigration activity. While the Ottoman Empire had dissolved, the Arabs in Palestine were hoping to become part of Syria and when that did not occur, a growing sense of nationalism had

begun. The Arabs shared the same language, religion, community, and land for centuries. Palestinians went through a series of political transitions during the 1920s and 1930s as they saw the influx of Jewish people into their land; they attempted to organize a government to free themselves from British rule to protect their land and culture. Failed promises from the British government to support the organization of a Palestinian government demonstrated a favoring toward the Jewish settlement, which also increased tensions.

Violent clashes between Jews and Palestinians began as early as the 1920s and continued to escalate into the Palestinian Revolt of 1936–1939 (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988). Economic difficulties forced many Palestinians to sell their land. As Jews acquired Palestinian land, strong labor views among the Jewish people resulted in only Jews being allowed to work the land. The Palestinian hostility toward the Zionist movement and Jewish immigration resulted in a series of riots, strikes, and protests between 1936–1939. By the end of the revolt, Britain had committed close to 20,000 soldiers to restore order, much of the Palestinian leadership was in jail or exiled, and several thousand people were killed, the majority being Palestinians (Gerner, 1991; Sahliyah, 1988).

Following World War II, a better-funded and politically connected Zionist movement with British support made their case for statehood amongst the international community. The formation of the United Nations and the overwhelming international support for the Jews following the Holocaust resulted in the creation of a partitioned Palestine allowing for a Jewish state and an Arab state,

while Britain relinquished their control in 1948 (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001; Sahliyah, 1988).

At this point, of the two million people living in Palestine, about two-thirds were Arabs, and one-third were Jewish. Following the passage of UN Resolution 181, which allowed the formation of the two states, Israeli paramilitary forces systematically regained control of mandated Palestinian areas. Israeli control increased from 57 percent of the territory to 77 percent, forcing hundreds of thousands of people from their homes until armistice agreements were signed; fighting ceased in 1949 (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001).

From 1949 until 1967, the Palestinian nationalist movement lay mostly dormant with the leaders in exile and the people trying to rebuild their lives following the establishment of statehood. The surrounding Arab states voiced their discontent toward Israel. By the mid-1960s, the Palestinians began to realize the international community achieved little in terms of helping them regain their ancestral homes taken by Israel; they started to organize military groups and form a resistance movement.

In 1964, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) along with the Palestinian Liberation Army (PLA) was formed with Yasser Arafat elected chairman of the PLO (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001). Over the years, the PLO has gained support of the people as the representative body campaigning for the re-occupation of territory taken by Israel in the West Bank and Gaza strip in 1967.

While the PLO and PLA were busy organizing themselves in the late 1960s, Israel found itself amidst a potential “powder keg” in the placement of troops in the de-

militarized zone separating the border between Israel and Syria. Israel decided to take action to claim the de-militarized zone, which included land owned by Syrian Arabs. Neighboring Egypt received conflicting reports about Israeli military intentions to attack Syria and amassed troops in the Sinai.

In June 1967, Israel went to war with Egypt in the Sinai, Syria in the north, and clashes ensued between the Israeli Army and Jordanian forces around Jerusalem. The war was brief, only lasting six days. However, the Israeli Army crushed opposition forces in all three areas and gained control of the occupied territories in the Golan Heights, West Bank, and the Gaza strip (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001).

Another war broke out in 1973 as Egypt, Syria, and Jordan tried unsuccessfully to regain control of the lost territories. Although Israel suppressed the attempt, their military, with support from the United States, was not as swift in achieving victory as in the 1967 conflict.

From 1973 up to the present day, Israel has used military force to impose laws upon the Palestinian people and further repress them. The 1973 war also began a rise in resistance, which strengthened the favorable sentiment of the PLO. In the early 1980s, the Israeli government enacted a series of harsh policies to disrupt and repress PLO activities and Palestinian nationalism to include the jailing of activists, journalists, and community leaders (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001).

In 1987, the Palestinian uprising known as the “intifada” had begun. Although the death of four Palestinians sparked the uprising, tensions from forty years of repression had fueled its maintenance. Huge demonstrations, both non-violent and

violent, ensued. After two and a half years, over 2,000 Palestinians had died (Gerner, 1991; Ghanem, 2001).

Following the Gulf War in the early 1990s, and under pressure from Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Egypt, and the United States, the Palestinians negotiated with Israel to form the Oslo Peace Accords (Ghanem, 2001; Olson, 2002). The Accords, developed between 1993 and 1995, set about provisions to divide the West Bank into three areas except for Jerusalem. The agreements turned into more of a process rather than reaching a final agreement. In the meantime, the Accords did not prevent further Jewish settlements from being established. This allowed Israeli road construction, water pipelines, and infrastructure to bypass Palestinian towns, which further worsened the Palestinian's socioeconomic position.

In September 2000, the PLO was very close to accepting an agreement, which included Palestinian control over 75 percent of the West Bank. However, with this area being essentially cut off from industry, Palestinians were forced into a subservient position causing continued depression and ethnic cleansing leading the Palestinian people to wage war against Israel (Ghanem, 2001; Olson, 2002). Although leaders of the "intifada" have condemned the Oslo Peace Accords, the Palestinian Authority led by Yasser Arafat was created out of the Accords; Arafat continued to support the Accords--the basis for his power (Olson, 2002).

The recent status of the crisis in the Middle East hinges upon a peace plan proposed by the U.S. and the influence of neighboring Mid-East countries to help facilitate discussions. Following the Palestinian suicide bombing that killed 29 Israelis in March 2002, U.S. Secretary of State Powell became heavily involved in

attempting to reduce the violence and encourage peace negotiations between Ariel Sharon and Yasser Arafat. The U.S. has outlined a plan to support the creation of a Palestinian state with Israeli concessions to occur only after Palestinians enact a number of economic and political reforms (Kessler, 2002, June 30). However, Arafat claimed no reforms can take place while the Israeli Army continues to occupy Palestinian cities and the Israeli government refuses to pay a portion of the \$500 million in tax duties owed to Palestine (Anonymous, 2002, July 15).

The United Nations, European Union, and Russia supported Arafat's position on the matter (Anonymous, 2002, July 15). Arab nations also supported a proposal of the formation of a new Palestinian Parliament with elections to be held in 2003 and allowing Yasser Arafat to remain in power until the elections are completed (DeYoung, 2002, July 18). The premise of forming a new government might help facilitate the withdrawal of Israeli troops to allow Palestinians the opportunity to rebuild their infrastructure in preparation for the future elections and end the violence (DeYoung, 2002, July 18).

CHAPTER THREE

African American, military leader, statesman

Finally, let me say how honored I am that so many of you thought me worthy of your support. It says more about America than it says about me. In one generation, we have moved from denying a black man service at a lunch counter to elevating one to the highest military office in the nation and to being a serious contender for the presidency. This is a magnificent country, and I am proud to be one of its sons (Powell, 1995, p. 602).

As our nation journeys through history, our struggle to deal with the issues of equal opportunity, civil rights, and racism continue. While these issues persist along with the questionable integrity of many of our predominately Caucasian CEOs and political leaders, Powell is in a unique position. As an African American, he has reached one of the highest-ranking positions in the history of our government and gained the respect and support of our nation. The public opinion polls recently reflected, "56% thought Bush was doing a good job handling Iraq, but 83% approved of Powell's performance as Secretary of State" (Elliot & Frank, 2003, February 17).

The role of Colin Powell in trying to facilitate negotiations between Arafat and Sharon is not only significant because of the need for a mediator, but also because of the attributes that Powell himself possesses and interjects into the exchange relations. According to Garko (1990), the motives, needs, resources, and pre-

dispositions an individual brings to the influence or interaction relationship will affect how the exchange progresses, once the relationship has begun.

In order to understand aspects of Powell's rhetoric and how he chooses to interact with the media and world leaders, I will explore the significance of race and charismatic leadership in relation to his rhetoric. Furthermore, Powell's ability to present his perspectives in a manner that inspires others while using adversity as motivation will be discussed as well as how he has become a role model in this respect.

Race

While Powell recognizes the importance of his ascent through the military and the racial boundaries that may have been extended during his career, racism still constrains the social identity of our nation. In order for Powell to have become successful in his military and political endeavors, he had to operate within the confines of socially constructed boundaries of race. Black (1992) posits the comparison between heredity and conviction contributing to the social identity of America. Where a hereditary social identity may not be denied only minimized, a social identity based on conviction depends upon the persuasion of its members (Black, 1992).

Black (1992) further explained America's social identity is based on convictions, which change over time. Considering conviction is based on persuasion, our rhetorical activities are of the utmost importance in changing our views toward race. Black stated, "...such a social identity can be carried through time solely by the conditioning influences of family, peers, and role models" (Black, 1992, p.47).

Although Colin Powell's hereditary identity remains constant, he has been able to influence the beliefs of those around him, challenging racial stereotypes through his actions and altering their views toward race. In his rise through the military to the present day, Powell continues to redefine racial boundaries as he deals with existing prejudices and perseveres rather than protests:

I remembered the well-intentioned remarks of some of my white superiors: 'Powell, you're best black lieutenant I've ever known.' Thank you, suh. But inside me, I was thinking, if you intend to measure me against only black lieutenants you are making a mistake. I'm going to show you the best lieutenant in the Army, period (Powell, 1995, p.540).

Even as he encountered prejudices, Powell had to tread carefully choosing which battles he was going to fight, weighing the potential risks to his career. While serving as an Assistant Division Commander in 1982, Powell may have made some decisions that his Division Commander, General Hudacheck, disagreed with and Powell received a review rating that could have ended his career (Powell, 1995). Hudacheck may have disliked Powell because of his race or for his unfavorable decisions. However, another General two levels above Hudacheck recognized Powell for speaking his mind and doing what he thought was right. Ultimately, Hudacheck's disdain for Powell was overlooked as Powell was subsequently promoted to another assignment of increased responsibility (Powell, 1995).

During his tenure as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Powell also took it upon himself to alter President Bush's speech regarding the Rodney King incident. Powell noticed the language in the rough draft could have been extremely inflammatory and advised the President's speechwriter to alter the speech in such a way that fostered a more reconciliatory message surrounding the racially charged situation (Powell, 1995).

According to Lane (1995), Powell transcends race as arguably the most powerful African American public official in our history, yet he criticizes Powell for failing to take a stronger position on racial and homosexual issues in the military. An alternative point would be that Powell realized his situation as a minority soldier who would rather prove himself through his actions than to be an outspoken critic--challenging stereotypes through performance rather than protest. He also humbly credits those black soldiers who came before him for enduring a far more segregated past in the military, thus contributing to a more equal playing field in today's military.

Powell (1995) stated the military had provided more opportunity for African Americans than any other institution as a reason why the percentage of blacks in the military was disproportionately higher than in other career fields. Powell (1995) also recounted a story of how a young, black Congressman thanked him for helping him get elected, not through political influence, but serving as a role model. In speaking to students at his old high school, Powell's rhetoric supports the idea of conviction through hard work and role modeling:

Reject the easy path of victimhood. Dare to take the harder path of work and commitment, a path that leads somewhere...I want black youngsters to learn about black writers, poets, musicians, scientists, and artists, and about the culture and history of Africa. At the same time, we have to accept that black children in America are not going to have to make their way in an African world. They are going to have make their way in an American world (Powell, 1995, p.519).

Powell may have recognized long ago his particular preferred method of influencing people was through performance as conveyed in his rhetorical exigencies where he chooses to use race as a catalyst to exhibit superior performance. According to Melendez (1996), effective leaders are passionate about their cause, and yet, women and minority leaders have to be careful about how they convey their convictions so as not to have their views stereotyped as emotionalism or confrontation.

Other successful black performers have begun to emerge in top positions in the political and corporate sector. Dingle and Hughes (2002) cite the performance of leaders such as Powell and Kenneth Chenualt of American Express having contributed to a perception shift toward the abilities of black managers. In February 2002, when Richard Dean Parsons was named CEO of AOL Time Warner, a \$36 billion media conglomerate, he also became one of three African American CEOs of Fortune 500 Companies (Dingle & Hughes, 2002). Part of Parsons' success can be attributed to his hands-on leadership style, ability to communicate his vision to

others, and manage with a positive “can-do” attitude (Dingle & Hughes, 2002).

Although AOL Time Warner has had its share of recent problems, the company was received a rating of “Best Ten-Year Performer” in March 2003 under the leadership of Parsons (Shareholder, 2003, March 10).

Charismatic Leadership

The leadership traits Parsons possesses are not new or uncommon. The significance of his appointment serves as another example of a leader possessing qualities shared by other successful leaders alike regardless of their race or gender. According to Takala (1998), charismatic leaders are often able to gain the support of their followers in such a way that erodes class and status perceptions. Takala also stated, “Charismatic leadership usually arises in times of crisis when basic values, the institutions, and the legitimacy of the organization are brought into question” (Takala, 1998, p. 797). Leaders such as Powell and Parsons serve as role models to the increasing number of black leaders overcoming adversity by demonstrating their abilities as their accomplishments diminish and transcend racial stereotypes.

Charismatic leadership does not necessarily arise mainly in times of crisis. According to Conger (1991), effective leaders are also rhetoricians who use rhetorical techniques to inspire others. Conger (1991) explored how leaders use stories, emotions, and values to influence their people to support their objectives or their company’s mission. Leaders such as Powell, regularly use personal stories with deep cultural roots to elicit an emotional connection with audiences as explained later in the thesis.

A model known as the Conger-Kanungo model has also been developed to measure followers' perceptions of leadership behavior to identify the presence of charismatic leadership (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). As the group may recognize through the leader's behavior an expression of charisma, the leader also reflects the qualities of the group (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997). When Powell speaks to audiences, his stories contain common values shared among the audience causing a "connection." As the audience identifies with Powell, they may become aligned toward his message and view Powell as being charismatic. Further research could be conducted in this area using Conger and Kanungo's model of charismatic leadership, which encompasses behavioral aspects of charismatic leadership and the perceptions of followers during three stages of a leadership process (Conger, Kanungo, Menon, & Mathur, 1997).

In a time when America was on the brink of waging war against Iraq and the President faced opposition from the United Nations and many Americans, the choice to have Secretary of State Powell deliver the U.S. case to the UN becomes clearer. According to Elliot and Frank (2003, February, 17), while Powell's resume is impressive, other factors including his presence, integrity, and personality epitomizes what America represents and why he was the clear choice to deliver this message. Following Powell's delivery of his UN address and the subsequent war with Iraq, as his performance ratings remain high, he would also be the clear choice to assist the President in delivering America's commitment to support a peace plan between the Israelis and the Palestinians.

Another exigency facing Powell may be a series of parallels, which he has seen before. As the U.S. attempted to remove Saddam Hussein from power, Powell faced a similar scenario when Bush called for new Palestinian leadership in June 2002, implying the need to remove Yasser Arafat from his position. Prior to these recent events, Powell was also involved as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff during the ousting of dictator, Manuel Noriega. The significance of his experience dealing with these situations further solidifies the rationale behind his future involvement in the Middle East.

The unique attributes of Powell help to shape his rhetoric. Powell's choice to use the social construction of race as motivator, influencing people through role-modeling, along with his charismatic leadership ability all contribute to his effectiveness as a speaker and leader. These attributes also relate to Powell's interaction in the Middle East. The aforementioned significance of race and charismatic leadership can also be studied further as they pertain to African American leaders and leaders alike as important factors towards achieving success in leadership roles.

CHAPTER FOUR

Afrocentric Rhetoric

As the public embraces Powell, an opportunity exists to examine Afrocentric rhetoric and to what extent Powell uses aspects of this rhetoric to engage his audiences. The basis for Afrocentric rhetoric is both an ideology and a way of speaking. According to Collins (2001), in Western rhetoric there exists an agonistic separation between the rhetor and the audience, where the speaker is presenting their ideas in an almost superior/subordinate fashion. This allows the audience to agree or disagree, but not necessarily allow a convergence of ideas. The rhetor may attempt to persuade the audience and listen to alternative viewpoints, but in most cases, the dialogue does support an exchange of new ideas. The premise of Afrocentric rhetoric is quite different.

Originating from Afrocentricity, Afrocentric rhetoric employs a worldview based upon African and African American history, values, and culture to include an integration of ideas connecting other groups, creating harmony, and balance (Collins, 2001). From a rhetorical perspective, Afrocentric rhetoric focuses on equal participation from the audience and rhetor which generates dialogue to ultimately benefit the collective group rather than opposing sides (Collins, 2001).

While Powell may often need to conform to the Western rhetorical approach already in place in certain forums, such as debates and sometimes interviews, he is in a unique position to employ aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric and has done so on several occasions. Although the nature of the majority of his public addresses involved larger audiences where he is imparting his viewpoints rather than

facilitating open discussions for problem resolutions, Powell connects to his audience using his heritage, telling personal stories, and embracing shared cultural values.

Excerpt from August 12, 1996 address at the Republican National Convention:

I come before you this evening as a retired soldier, a fellow citizen who has lived the American Dream to the fullest. As someone who believes in that dream and wants that dream to become a reality for every American. My parents came to this country as immigrants over seventy years ago. They came here, as had millions of others, with nothing but hope, a willingness to work hard and desire to use the opportunities given them by their new land. A land which they came to love with all their hearts. They found work that enabled them to raise a family. Work that allowed them to come home every Friday night with the fruits of their labor, a decent wage that brought sustenance and, more importantly, brought dignity into our home. They raised two children to whom they gave a precious gift, a set of core beliefs. A value system founded on a clear understanding of the difference between right and wrong and a belief in the Almighty. Integrity, kindness, and Godliness, they taught us, were right. Lying, violence, intolerance, crime and drugs were wrong, even worse than wrong, in my family, they were shameful. We were taught that hard work and education were the keys to success in this country. We were taught to believe in ourselves. We might be considered poor, but we were rich in spirit. We

might be black and treated as second-class citizens. But, stick with it, because in America, justice will eventually triumph and the powerful, searing words of promise of the founding fathers will come true (Powell, 1996, p. 683).

Powell's dialogue stretches out across political, ethnic and societal boundaries as the aforementioned excerpt displays an integration of ideas, benefits for the collective group, and energizes them towards a common goal. Powell's rhetoric reaches out to everyone in the audience allowing them to self-identify in one or more ways with his sentiments and focus on a shared idea. This aspect of presenting shared values serves as an example of Afrocentric rhetoric.

In attempting to connect the audience to the discussion, Powell and those who use aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric work to create ownership and involvement from the audience to reach a collective decision or idea. Collins (2001) believes the Afrocentric rhetoric perspective encourages participatory democracy and views alternative rhetorics equally, thus, reducing the struggle for rhetorical power often seen in Western rhetoric. For example, imagine attending a political debate where rather than arguing about whose ideas are better and why, the rhetors discuss a topic, engage the audience, and work to develop a creative solution based on the collective dialogue where different ideas are presented equally. This is how Afrocentric rhetoric would be displayed.

Realistically, Colin Powell may not be able to drastically change his speaking style to incorporate Afrocentric rhetoric to the point where it becomes his dominant form of

speech. He may also not be able to conduct open forums establishing a convergence of exchanges. However, through using forms of Afrocentric rhetoric periodically to engage the audience and other rhetors, Powell may consciously or unconsciously lead others to develop better solutions and recognize how each other's perspectives benefit the whole.

“Both the rhetor and audience offer valuable insights and perceptions worthy of consideration; neither is empty or passive” (Collins, 2001, p.191). Through “connecting” with the shared values of the audience, Powell is able to create balance and harmony in delivering his message while influencing them toward embracing a participatory worldview, an aspect of Afrocentric rhetoric.

This concept can also be applied to the situation in the Middle East, where Powell may need to facilitate discussion between the leaders of Israel and Palestine. His ability as the rhetor to influence Arafat and Sharon using shared values and an equal exchange of perspectives may help both leaders to realize the impact of their actions and potential benefits to both sides, serving as a platform from which to reach peaceful settlements.

Another application of Afrocentric rhetoric might include its adoption as a communicative mode of Yasser Arafat. As Arafat struggles to maintain control over his people and influence them, using a “shared view” or “participatory democracy” to unite his people toward a common goal is an avenue that may produce better results. Many world leaders have questioned Arafat's leadership as terror attacks continue with the appearance of Arafat having little impact to control them. An

ideology that perhaps involves the group in decision-making using shared values as a basis may reduce the dissention among his people.

Evidence of a participatory worldview seen in Afrocentric rhetoric exists in many of Powell's rhetorical works. He often connects with the audience through shared values and while using mainly a Western approach, Powell is able to weave aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric into his speeches that effectively deliver his messages. These aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric may be used to facilitate improved communication with the leaders in the Middle East and interject the rhetorical mode into Western dialogue.

CHAPTER FIVE

Leadership Philosophies and Exchange Relations

Many of Powell's leadership traits and interpersonal principles are important in understanding his actions and are evident in the delivery of his messages. One of the concepts Powell displays involves an expression of fearlessness when making necessary decisions that may upset people. Also, once an unpopular decision is made, he is able to handle the adversity. Powell stated, "... leaders who are afraid to make people angry are likely to waver and procrastinate when it comes time to make tough choices" (Harari, 2002, p18).

Powell further explained his principle:

...The more stressful the conditions faced by the enterprise, the bolder the leadership decisions needed. The bolder the decision, the more it upsets the status quo. The more it upsets the status quo, the further likelihood that some (or many) people will be angry. And yet, when the enterprise faces turbulent and stressful times, a non-decision from the leader might very well generate the most universal anger (Harari, 2002, p. 27).

These points relate to the unwillingness of the actors in the Middle East to negotiate with each other and actually make difficult decisions. Both Sharon and Arafat continue to maintain an equal retaliation posture in their reactions to

violence, and even revisiting the proximity of reaching a compromise in July 2000, Arafat walked away from the proposal to define territories.

In either scenario, each party had a tough decision to make regarding the cessation of violence, or the adoption of a proposal that was likely to anger many people. However, the alternative of not making a decision continues to produce a stalemate and increase the loss of life on both sides.

Powell believes there exists a greater risk in playing it safe and not taking action to resolve an issue even if means not always asking for permission (Harari, 2002). In Spring 2002, Powell made statements with the intention of rekindling talks in the Middle East. However, President Bush and other members of the staff did not wholeheartedly support Powell's actions (Marshall, 2002). Although his actions may have involved some personal risk on his behalf, Powell's comments may have accelerated the process resulting in Bush unveiling a peace plan in late June. Had Powell played it safe, the plan may not have evolved as quickly. This reinforces the following sentiment: "You are likely to accomplish more by taking calculated, intelligent risks than if you play it safe. It is easier to get forgiveness than permission, particularly in these complex times" (Harari, 2002, p.76).

In addition to his position on taking the aforementioned actions, Powell compliments his approach of challenging those around him to reach better solutions. He also challenges others in a way to demonstrate respect for his superiors, allowing the superiors as well as himself, to maintain their own dignity and preserve their relationship (Harari, 2002). If Powell is not careful in how he challenges people around him, especially his superiors, he may lose their confidence and ultimately

detract from his goals and his influence. In June 2002, the media presented of view of Powell as a dissident in the administration among Secretary Rumsfeld, Vice President Cheney, and President Bush (Marshall, 2002).

However, as Powell challenges people in a professional manner, his opinion becomes valued, ultimately leading to further expedition of the peace process. The White House criticized Powell for supporting ideas from foreign governments entailing the creation of a temporary Palestinian state (MacAskill & Tisdall, 2002, June 13). Ironically, two weeks later President Bush conveyed U.S. support for a temporary Palestinian state, provided, the Palestinians enact reforms and elect new leadership (Kessler, 2002, June 30).

Another principle Powell upholds that impacts his leadership style and interpersonal interaction entails supporting people over plans or structures. This concept compliments the cohesion and trust-building necessary to maintain successful exchange relations increasing his credibility when delivering messages. “View people as partners, regardless of their place in the hierarchy. Like most effective leaders, Powell sees every person as a partner who brings experience and expertise to help him achieve exceptional goals” (Harari, 2002, p. 140). This perspective may also relate back to aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric, welcoming the perspectives of other people to help develop resolutions.

President Bush and Powell may not always agree about their positions on the peace process. Bush supports Israel and the removal of Arafat, however, Powell believes the U.S. should continue to work with Arafat or whomever the Palestinian people deem as their leader rather than exert pressure for his removal (MacAskill &

Tisdall, 2002, June 13). Powell stated the U.S. would work with Arafat although Sharon refuses negotiate with the Palestinian Authority as long as Arafat remains their leader (Anonymous, 2002, July 15; Shadid, 2002, June 13).

While the Bush plan calls for the election of new Palestinian leadership to support a peace plan, Powell realizes Yasser Arafat's position as the current leader and a key partner in potentially reaching an agreement (Shadid, 2002, June 13). Regardless of the quality of any proposed peace plan, the strength of a partnership and building of trust will be necessary to carry out the plan. Successful exchanges will not occur unless the foundation of the relationship is solid. As Powell recognizes the importance of partnering with both parties, he may be one step closer to improving exchange relations between them.

Another consideration in the examination of rhetoric to improve exchange relations between Arafat and Sharon involves reviewing the differences in the equality of power between the actors. Acknowledging the U.S. support for Israel and the history of the conflict between Israel and Palestine, Yasser Arafat may never feel an equality of power. However, Colin Powell's experience as a leader may help facilitate an equitable feeling during exchange relations.

As Powell meets with leaders and addresses issues, the emotions generated from his rhetorical acts may have a significant impact upon future relations. Conversely, emotions evoked as result of a physical act may also impact rhetoric, especially considering the frequent violent acts and numerous disastrous outcomes in the Arab-Israeli conflict. According to Goleman (2002), much of the success of exchange relations is dependent upon the emotions generated before, during, and after the

interaction. Goleman (2002) believes emotions have played a primal role in leadership where the leader has the most power to sway the emotions of their people.

While this study focuses on Powell's rhetoric, it is important to note that the two major actors in the Mid-East Conflict, Arafat and Sharon arguably are heavily influenced by emotion. Their rhetoric towards each other and refusal to meet with one another increase the complexity of the situation, especially when their people are willing to risk their lives to support their beliefs. For many of us, we may find difficulty understanding why the Palestinian people would sacrifice themselves repeatedly in suicide bombings to retaliate or draw attention to their cause. Such a powerful decision to take one's own life must be strongly guided by emotion and reinforced by their leaders. As Powell attempts to develop rapport and encourage the initiation of dialogue between Sharon and Arafat, he is dealing with powerful emotional obstacles that exist among the leaders and their people.

A recent recommendation to remove Arafat from power may result in major unrest in the Middle East if an ousting occurs as many people are emotionally connected to him as their leader. Goleman (2002) also explores the significance of a leader's mood to any given situation. Consider how Arafat felt after Israeli troops forced him to be confined to his compound for several weeks, or how Ariel Sharon reacts to the news of a Palestinian suicide bomber killing several innocent people on a crowded public bus. Their outward display of emotion impacts their decision-making process and fuels those around them.

The decision to retaliate with extreme force immediately may not be the most objective and appropriate course of action. People are physiologically affected as stress-related hormones are released into the body when people are upset and take hours to decrease as they become reabsorbed into the body (Goleman, 2002). Many people may lose sleep at night due to work-related stress they felt earlier in the day and carry their bad mood with them following an incident. On a large scale, leaders of nations can certainly have a greater impact on people than they may realize based on their emotional reactions.

According to Bardwick (1996), leaders are successful because they are able to influence their people to become passionate about following the leader's strategy. In order to gain commitment, the leader needs to create a vision, communicate persuasively, respect others, and act with integrity (Bardwick, 1996). Leadership becomes an art of appealing to one's emotions, which relates to the leader's ability to deliver persuasive messages reinforced by example. Powell's messages would not be nearly as effective without the evidence of his accomplishments, his continued action, and evoking emotional appeal through telling stories with which his audiences are able to relate. He may need to appeal to the emotions of Arafat and Sharon in order to gain their support and maintain their focus on the peace process.

CHAPTER SIX

Methodology

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of Colin Powell's rhetoric, I have selected the form of Neo-Aristotelian criticism as a preferred method for several reasons. The five canons comprising Neo-Aristotelian criticism provide a strong base from which to examine Powell's rhetoric, as they are evident in his addresses and character. This particular method has also been widely used and refined, which will be demonstrated through examples in the literature review to follow.

According to Foss, Foss, & Trapp (2002), Aristotle developed four out of the five canons of rhetoric, which later evolved into Neo-Aristotelian criticism. The first of the five canons, Invention, consists of the discovery of ideas and arguments. The canon of Organization involves the arrangement of the ideas discovered by means of invention. Another canon known as Style involves the linguistic choices of the speaker, while the fourth canon, Delivery, pertains to the presentation of the speech. Memory, the fifth canon, which Aristotle did not mention in his rhetorical theory, involves developing a strategy to recall information/memorization of the speech for presentation (Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000).

Invention

Invention involves the speaker's ability to develop their main ideas/argumentative points using external or internal proofs. External or inartistic proofs may consist of outside data such as statistical evidence, witness testimony, or other data not created by the speaker (Donahue & Prosser, 1997; Foss, 1996). Internal or artistic proofs

are derived from the speaker's creative ability using three types of proofs known as logos, pathos, and ethos (Foss, 1996).

Logos, or the logical proof, is based upon the evidence and rationale provided to substantiate a point. An emphasis is placed on the syllogisms and enthymemes, where propositions are stated to draw conclusions. A syllogism may include a major and minor premise to reach a conclusion, where an enthymeme provides a single premise and conclusion (Foss, 1996). Inductive and deductive reasoning are also used to support arguments. Inductive reasoning allows the audience to draw their own conclusions resulting from the rhetor presenting several specific examples leading to a general conclusion (Foss, 1996). Deductive reasoning is somewhat opposite, where the audience accepts an idea or generalization, as the speaker proceeds to provide supporting examples (Donahue & Prosser, 1997; Foss, 1996).

Pathos, derived from pathetic as "arousing compassion," is the proof which elicits support by appealing to the audience's emotions (Foss, 1996). According to Foss (1996), the emotions generated through particular statements in the speech may cause the audience to support the rhetor's point of view.

Ethos, or the ethical proof refers to the credibility of the speaker (Foss, 1996). The audience's perception of the speaker's credibility is critical to the speaker being able to persuade the audience towards a shared viewpoint. If the speaker is not entirely believable, varying degrees of credibility will weaken the rhetor's ability to influence the audience. According to Foss (1996), three important factors that impact the rhetor's ethos include integrity, intelligence, and goodwill. The audience perception of the speaker as possessing moral qualities, knowledge of the subject,

and maintaining good intentions toward the audience in the delivery of the message all contribute to the speaker's ethos and believability.

Organization

The organization or disposition of a speech entails the arrangement of main points or ideas used to influence the audience (Foss, 1996; Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000). The rhetor may choose to lay out their arguments in a particular order of importance using a chronological order or a problem-solution order (Foss, 1996). The organization canon examines the effectiveness of the particular arrangement upon the audience.

The arrangement of key points is significant to the retention of material from the audience. A poorly organized speech may have less of an intended impact upon the audience. Rhetors may elect to use a combination of problem-solution and chronological order formats to help effectively illustrate their points.

Style

Style or elocution pertains to the language the rhetor chooses to use in expressing their ideas of the message (Foss, 1996; Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000).

Examples of style include vocabulary choice, word emphasis, and sentence length (Foss, 1996). The rhetor may need to consider the education level of the audience, diversity, and environment in selecting language for an address. For example, a speech delivered to soldiers before going into battle may include different terms than a speech surmising the intended battle plan to the news media. Where the soldiers already possess an understanding of specific terms and objectives, the news media may lack such an understanding and they will need a different explanation. Intended

messages to soldiers might include terms surrounding specific, violent action versus messages to the press presented with less severe terms to be interpreted as controlled and objective.

Delivery

The manner in which the rhetor articulates the message is analyzed as delivery. Elements of delivery include voice, voice inflection, rate, and pitch along with nonverbal elements such as gestures, posture, and eye contact (Foss, 1996; Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000). According to Foss (1996), delivery also involves the address being presented from a manuscript/notes, memory, impromptu or extemporaneously.

Memory

Although not mentioned by Aristotle as an original canon, memory refers to the strategy the rhetor uses to recall information for an address (Foss, 1996; Frey, Botan, & Kreps, 2000). While few speeches today are entirely memorized, an important factor involving memory is that many of our leaders to include Colin Powell are questioned by the media. Their ability to recall information is crucial when responding publicly without necessarily having the luxury of being able to prepare remarks in the written form.

Literature Review

While there have been no previous analyses of Colin Powell's rhetoric using the five canons of Neo-Aristotelian criticism, the method has been used to examine the addresses and literature of many leaders. This review encompasses a variety of

analyses, which contribute to a further understanding of Neo-Aristotelian criticism and how it can be applied to the study of Colin Powell's rhetoric.

Almost forty years ago, Black (1965) examined Aristotle's methods and Neo-Aristotelian criticism in his book entitled, "Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method." Black (1965) provides evidence of early use of the canons and explains Neo-Aristotelian criticism has been the dominant mode of rhetorical criticism during the first half of Twentieth century. He states that authors who have written essays about Booker T. Washington, Henry Clay, Woodrow Wilson, Alexander Hamilton, Theodore Roosevelt, and Franklin Roosevelt use Aristotle's rhetorical techniques. While these may only employ one or two of the canons, the roots of this approach are prevalent throughout public address.

According to Black (1965), one of the views behind Neo-Aristotelian criticism is one of designing rhetoric with a tactical purpose to influence an audience on a specific occasion. Black (1965) cites Orville Hitchcock's essay on Jonathan Edwards as a strong example of criticism where he discusses the organization of Edwards' sermons, their division into four sections, each with their own main points establishing a common theme. Black (1965) continued to evaluate Hitchcock's essay addressing his use of the three proofs, style, and delivery.

Donahue & Prosser (1997) provide another example of evaluating discourse using the Neo-Aristotelian method applied to addresses at the United Nations. In this example, the authors claim on June 1962, Ambassador Adlai Stevenson used inductive examples to prove that the Soviet Union misused their veto power to willfully obstruct the normal operations of the council:

Before the first year was out the Soviet Union had cast nine vetoes. The Soviet member of the Council has today cast its 100th veto...The Soviet Union has used the veto lavishly to prevent states from assuming their rightful place in the United Nations. In fact fifty-one of these vetoes were cast on applications for membership in the United Nations....The Soviet Delegate used the veto thirteen times to assist Soviet bloc activities against the territorial integrity and the political independency of other states (Stevenson, cited in Prosser, 1969, p.471; Donahue & Prosser, 1997).

Donahue & Prosser (1997) pose these statements serve as an inductive example intended to prove Stevenson's claim that the Soviet Union was using their power to contradict a policy, which they had previously agreed to. Syllogisms and enthymemes can develop one's argument as well as refute an argument. Donahue & Prosser (1997) provide another example as the Soviet Ambassador Morozov responds to Stevenson's charge:

We are obviously hearing a very interesting lecture, no doubt; it is a survey of all the occasions when veto was used, the veto of the Soviet Union. I would be quite ready to listen to this lecture and to this summing-up if it were on the agenda. But the item on the agenda is not entitled 'Summary of the utilization of the veto by the Soviet Union in the Security Council since the inception of the United Nations' (Morozov,

interrupting Stevenson, cited in Prosser, 1969, p.472; Donahue & Prosser, 1997).

These authors further examine Stevenson's statements and find a logical pattern in the development of his arguments where he uses metaphors that have more of an emotional than logical appeal as he attempts to capture the audience's attention. Stevenson apparently used a variety of hypothetical syllogisms to draw conclusions. Donahue & Prosser (1997) provide the following assessment of a Stevenson quote:

'If it is to survive, if the United Nations is not going to die as ignoble a death as the League of Nations, we cannot condone the use of force in this instance (occupation of Goa, Damao, and Diu by the Indian military) and thus pave the way for forceful solutions of other disputes.' A syllogism might emerge: Major premise: 'The United Nations, like the League of Nations, will die if it does not renounce the use of force.' Minor premise: 'The United Nations has not renounced the use of force on the Goa question.' Conclusion: 'The United Nations will die' (Donahue & Prosser, 1997, p.213).

Other examples of the Invention canon are discussed to include ethos and pathos. According to Donahue & Prosser (1997), Stevenson attempted to create goodwill on behalf of the U.S. government, as he repeatedly attempted to link the U.S. to the

U.N. Charter. Stevenson's use of language or style on several occasions attempted to appeal to the audience's emotions as described in the following example:

He spoke of 'this fateful hour in the life of the United Nations,' of the American government's 'anxiety for the future of this Organization as a result of this incident,' of the urgent duty for the Security Council to act in the interest of international peace... (Donahue & Prosser, 1997, p.215).

In "Leadership, Rhetoric, and the American Presidency," Halford (1998) compares the rhetoric of Harry Truman and Franklin Roosevelt using Neo-Aristotelian criticism. Halford (1998) discusses the Invention canon, stating Roosevelt composed and edited much of his own material by working closely with his speechwriting staff, while Truman deferred compositional responsibility to his speechwriters, only devising general themes himself. Regarding the organization of his speeches, Truman was the stronger of the two presidents. According to Halford (1998), Truman routinely organized his speeches in a problem-solution format by laying out his major points and then addressing them. Although Roosevelt's speeches contained introductions and conclusions, the body of his speeches were convoluted, lacking clearly stated main points throughout the body (Halford, 1998).

Halford (1998) continued his analysis claiming extreme differences in style existed between the two presidents. Roosevelt used several metaphors and created memorable quotes to include labeling the bombing at Pearl Harbor as, "Yesterday, December 7, 1941, a date which will live in infamy." In contrast, Truman's diction

was not memorable as he and his speechwriters frowned upon “polished diction” (Halford, 1998). Halford (1998) made a poignant observation stating most Americans alive during both Presidencies remembered several quotable lines from Roosevelt’s speeches such as, “The only thing we have to fear is...fear itself.” Conversely, the author charges most people cannot remember any significant language from Truman’s speeches.

Comparisons of both Presidents’ delivery emphasize several differences. Truman’s lack of gestures, high-pitched and inadequately phrased voice weakened his ability to persuade the audience (Halford 1998). In contrast, Roosevelt’s deep, controlled, and rhythmic voice supplemented with a variety of gestures made him a more animated and powerful speaker allowing him to effectively deliver his messages (Halford, 1998).

Regarding the canon of memory, Halford (1998) claims the only similarity shared between the two Presidents is the reading of their speeches. Because Truman disliked giving speeches, he rarely rehearsed them, which resulted in poor delivery and an obvious ineffectiveness as a speaker (Halford, 1998). Roosevelt, however, became heavily involved in the production of his speeches and practiced delivering them to himself and his staff. His familiarity with the content of the speech was evident in his delivery and ultimately contributed to the overall effectiveness of his speeches (Halford, 1998).

Other works that touch upon the relationship between Aristotle’s rhetoric and Presidents’ communication involve overall comparisons between several Presidents. Ball (1996) reviews the works of Bostdorff (1994), Kiewe and Houck (1991),

Liebovich (1994), and Allen (1993) in relation to communication styles and strategies of Presidents Carter, Reagan, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower. Ball (1996) points out the electoral successes of Roosevelt over Hoover, and Reagan over Carter can be attributed to their use of simple language and charm. Roosevelt and Reagan exhibited a more appealing style in their speeches, noted by Liebovich (1994), Bostdorff (1994), and Kiewe and Houck (1991).

Eisenhower's communication sense contributed significantly to his military success, which served as the driving force behind his intent to research public opinion and take advantage of television as a medium to enhance his image (Allen, 1993; Ball, 1996). Similarly, Reagan also realized the influential power of language as a key factor in gaining public approval, which was apparent in his speeches (Ball, 1996; Kiewe & Houck 1991). Alternately, both Hoover and Carter failed to acknowledge the importance of their rhetoric as a tool to influence the public (Ball, 1996; Bostdorff 1994; Liebovich, 1994). Ultimately, their poor linguistic choices during critical moments of their careers fostered unfavorable and passive stereotypes among the media (Ball, 1996; Bostdorff, 1994).

In examining aspects of rhetorical criticism among political leaders, Colin Powell's (1995) autobiography does not directly address Neo-Aristotelian criticism, though several parts of the book discuss aspects relevant to this literature. Many of Powell's personal views and experiences define his moral character as one possessing integrity and maintaining credibility. As Powell recounts several stories, he discusses reasoning behind his choices and leadership principles, which builds his ethos with the audience and in many cases allows the audience to self-identify with

him as he appeals to their emotions. The autobiography also serves as an excellent example of Powell's style. Because he is telling his own story, the reader can become familiar with Powell's linguistic choices and may see similarities in his other works or addresses.

Harari's (2002) book entitled, "The Leadership Secrets of Colin Powell," also offers more insight into how Powell thinks, structures his messages, and provides leadership. This book adds to the credibility and character of Powell as his leadership philosophies are examined. Examples consisting of personal stories as well as comparisons relevant to different industries allow the reader to self-identify with Powell. Harari (2002) indirectly provides examples of the Invention, Organization, and Style canons as he explains the reasoning behind Powell's philosophies and argument structure; he provides the reader with a sense of Powell's style as he quotes Powell numerous times.

Another examination of Powell's rhetoric was found on a web site comparing the philosopher Plato and rhetorician Richard Weaver's perspectives on ethics. The web site for Bradley College presents a brief comparison of how Powell's 1996 address to the Republican National Convention serves as an example of maintaining high ethical standards in rhetoric (McDonald, Web site). The site uses excerpts from Powell's address to demonstrate his belief in diversity or inclusion among all Americans. Powell's comments correlate Weaver's concept of emphasizing certain aspects of an argument along with Plato's version of the "noble lover" by risking his status with the Republican political party to emphasize his point (McDonald, Web site). The site describes Powell as upholding high moral standards and ethics, even

though he may be at risk. This source also describes the importance of ethics in rhetoric remaining constant throughout history (McDonald, Web site).

Another example of research about Powell that indirectly touches upon attributes of Neo-Aristotelian criticism can be seen in Edwards' (1998) article viewing Powell as a major media candidate. Although Powell was not running for a political office, the media heavily speculated about a potential run for the Presidency. Edwards (1998) cited Powell's speaking engagements as part of his book tour and his non-expression of a desire to run for office as the catalyst for the media to fuel speculation. The media began to conduct polls, which accelerated the speculation as they hypothetically presented Powell as a candidate. The results showed Powell earning 51% of American voters as a Republican candidate over Democrat Bill Clinton who earned a 41% rating (Edwards, 1998). While the attention eventually dissipated as Powell chose not to run for office, the public opinion of Powell (attributed to his military career) helped to form a public image. This article indirectly provides further evidence of the scope of Powell's ethos.

According to Zielinski (1998), Powell's body language, diction, stage presence, and seasoned storytelling ability also enhance his effectiveness as a speaker. However, one of his principle speechwriters cites Powell's credibility as being the key to his success. Powell tells most of his stories from personal experience and rarely uses quotes from other people (Zielinski, 1998). In order to engage the audience, Powell's style is straightforward. He believes in establishing immediate credibility with the audience through being honest. Powell builds his sentiments through telling personal stories and evoking genuine emotion.

CHAPTER SEVEN

Rhetoric of Colin Powell

In examining the rhetoric of Colin Powell, I will use the five canons Neo-Aristotelian criticism to analyze one of his speeches, “Remarks at the 24th Annual National Leadership Conference of the Anti-Defamation League,” presented on May 6, 2002 at the Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, DC. I will supplement several assertions with excerpts from my telephone interview with Larry Wilkerson, U.S. Department of State Chief of Staff, who has worked with Secretary Powell for the last fifteen years, serving as his principle speechwriter for twelve of those years. The analysis will also encompass aspects of an interview Powell gave on June 25, 2002, following President Bush’s June 24, 2002 speech calling for new Palestinian leadership, in order to provide additional rhetorical perspectives as they pertain to Powell and his involvement in the Middle East situation.

I will provide examples that demonstrate Powell’s speaking ability as not only effective, but quite exceptional. His inherent use of invention adds immediately to his believability and engages the audience. Powell uses a combination of chronological and problem-solution techniques in organizing his speeches while his style is personal and sense of humor enhances his effectiveness and relationship with his audience. The delivery of his speeches is controlled and his thorough preparation and command of the material contributes to the authenticity of his message.

During spring 2002, Secretary Powell conducted several interviews surrounding the crisis in the Middle East and discussed the situation in some of his speeches. Although the primary focus of this particular speech to the Anti-Defamation League

is concerned with celebrating the ADL's mission of tolerance, Powell addresses the subject of the Middle East as it pertains to their cause. His remarks at the ADL Conference provide a balanced work that captures Powell's speaking abilities, the subject of the Middle East, and includes several aspects of the five canons. This speech serves as a good subject for analysis under the Neo-Aristotelian method of criticism and further exploration into communication surrounding the conflict.

Invention

Powell's ability to creatively develop and reinforce his main points not only adds to the persuasiveness of this address, but also energizes the audience. The internal proof, logos, is evident as Powell presents his viewpoint and then reinforces it repeatedly throughout the speech with a variety of examples:

The Anti-Defamation League and its work is desperately needed in a 21st-century world that is still torn by centuries-old conflicts, a world where all too often differences of color, culture and creed are treated as threats rather than as assets. The attacks of September 11th were a chilling demonstration of the extremes to which hatred can take human beings. People of every conceivable belief and background were killed, some 3,000 souls from 80 different countries (Powell, 2002, May 6).

Powell emphasized the importance of the ADL's mission and applied it to one of the largest tragedies in U.S. history. In the aforementioned quotation, Powell also uses

an external proof in the form of statistics surrounding the September 11th disaster.

He continued to reinforce his viewpoint in the following statements:

And it tells me that ADL's decades of educating the public about tolerance has had a real impact on the way people think and on the way people behave in our country. It tells me that ADL's inspiring work for nearly a century has helped our society develop habits of tolerance that overwhelmingly held up, even in the most traumatic of national circumstances...So much of the misery, danger and instability around the world today is caused or exacerbated by intolerance, whether it's the Middle East, Southeastern Europe, or Central Africa; whether it's in Cypress or Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland or Indonesia. And whenever ethnic and religious hatred help to fuel a conflict, it becomes all the more virulent and intractable with respect to finding a solution (Powell, 2002, May 6).

His reinforcement of the ADL's purpose to educate people about tolerance is compounded as Powell presents examples relating to the September 11th tragedy. He then supports the sentiment through sharing examples of other tragedies and how the U.S. Government is working on the same mission, both domestically and globally. Citing these examples also demonstrates evidence of a syllogism. In this case, a major premise would be, Developing habits of tolerance will lead to sustaining peace even in difficult times. Minor premise: Other countries, including

those in the Middle East, have not developed habits of tolerance. Conclusion:

Unless Middle East countries develop tolerance there will never be peace.

In this particular situation, there exists the opportunity for both deductive and inductive reasoning to occur among the audience. Since Powell is speaking to an audience who already shares his sentiments regarding the importance of tolerance and the need to educate people about its benefits, the audience already accepts his main ideas. As he recognizes their efforts and reinforces the shared message, deductive reasoning is evident. Inductive reasoning may occur when Powell discusses examples of domestic tolerance through the efforts of the ADL and relates them to the efforts of the U.S. Government who is applying similar principles to the international community. The audience may decide to support the international efforts of the U.S. Government based on Powell's correlation and examples.

Another internal proof, pathos, has become a key ingredient in Powell's speeches. Appealing to the emotions of the audience is not just a strategy to gain their acceptance of an idea. Colin Powell feels strongly about the importance of being emotionally engaged in his speeches. According to Wilkerson (2003, March 21), Powell prefers to be emotionally moved himself by the speech in order to move other people. Powell uses the following statements, which may certainly appeal to the emotions of this audience:

As a nation, we can be proud that in the darkest hours of rage, in the darkest hours of grief, President Bush and the American people chose the path of responsible action. We did not lash out indiscriminately...I am not

going to stand here in front of you today and claim that September 11th made all the Klansmen and the skinheads and the anti-Semites and other hate mongers in our country see the light (Powell, 2002, May 6).

Powell once again touches upon the September 11th tragedy, which affected most Americans profoundly. He uses strong language such as, “darkest hours of rage,” and “darkest hours of grief” to capture the emotional effects of the event. Powell also refers to extremist hate groups known throughout our history who are despised by many Americans, especially by the audience to which he is speaking. Aside from the use of emotional language, what makes Powell “special” as a speaker delivering this message is being a member of a minority group who has also dealt with adversity in his life. Powell conveys this similarity with other people who have shared similar experiences and appears not only comfortable discussing the topic, but also uses his background as a tool to reinforce his message.

Further evidence of Powell connecting to his audience is demonstrated when he discusses his personal experiences. His common practice to share something personal with the audience not only helps them feel closer to Powell and his message, but he shares a variety of experiences that allow many people in the audience to self-identify with him.

Considering the majority of the audience is probably middle aged or older, along with a significant percentage of them being Jewish, Powell provides identifiers the audience can relate to such as war and religion. This example may be considered quite unique as Powell an African American, is able to use his background to

personalize his message comparing himself to a group of older white Jewish Americans, where antagonistic societal stereotypes may exist. Powell also uses a member of the group as part of his speech, further personalizing his message to the group and gaining a few laughs:

I see it through the eyes of the son of those hard-working Jamaican immigrants who was given the opportunity to rise and to serve his country in a number of capacities. I see the world that we live in through the eyes of a black kid from Kelly Street in the Bronx whose boyhood pals came from every ethnic background imaginable, except white Anglo-Saxon Protestant in those days. In fact, in the neighborhood I grew up in, and Abe knows so well, we thought they were the minority. (Laughter.) I will always see the world in those terms, and I remember those growing-up years in New York City as a time of war, a time of hatred. I was about ten years old when Israel was created. It was between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean War. Most of my young teenage and youthful years were times of war (Powell, 2002, May 6).

As Powell concludes his speech, he once again appeals to the emotions of the audience, praising their work and making a personal, religious connection:

It is that same tolerant, embracing, hopeful spirit that animates the wonderful work of the ADL and which our world needs now more than

ever. By promoting tolerance, the Anti-Defamation League does invaluable service to the American people and to all mankind. For what they say about the Torah is also true about tolerance; its ways are ways of pleasantness, and all its paths are peace (Powell, 2002, May 6).

The internal proof, ethos, is arguably Powell's strongest trait. The credibility of Colin Powell makes him such a powerful speaker as he relates personal experience to his audience and cites examples of high moral character in his speeches. His regular use of examples from his personal life and philosophies create an ethos that is so solid and unique that the use of others' stories or quotes could actually dilute the strength of his intended message. Powell's insistence on living his life through a "leadership by example" philosophy along with his life experiences, radiate through his speeches, making him entirely believable and persuasive. Larry Wilkerson's perspective reinforces the significance of Powell's ethos:

I'd be hard pressed to find a life, African American or otherwise that could match the experience he's had and the various places he's been. Whether we talk about Deputy National Security Advisor, National Security Advisor, commander of over a million troops in Forces Command, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff just when Goldwater-Nichols' changes were coming into real effect in giving him the finest military staff arguably on the face of the earth, to being Secretary of State, I mean where can you find that experience? (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21,

21-27).

Referring to Powell's integrity:

...in fact, believes that setting the example, living what you believe in, living both what you believe in ethically and morally is probably the best and most effective way to teach others... You know you can listen to a very effective speaker but if he's trying to sell you snake oil and you know that, his effectiveness is diminished somewhat I think... You listen to Colin Powell and I think most Americans would agree that they are listening to someone whom they can trust, whom they respect and who's not going to tell them, not going to willingly tell them anyway, a falsehood (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 35-38, 215-217, 219-222).

As Powell discussed the importance of tolerance and cited examples, he moved to speaking about his current efforts to strive for peace in the Middle East. He outlined a three-point strategy previously presented to the world by President Bush and then shared his efforts to work with the leaders of other nations in striving for peace. Powell's examples of September 11th, praises of tolerance and the ADL, along with his actions, all work to enhance his credibility as a speaker. He is able to establish goodwill with the audience and demonstrate his intelligence through his knowledge of a variety of contributing factors.

While Powell uses some external proofs in this speech, this particular environment may not warrant an excessive use of external data to support his points. He uses a syllogism and an external proof to build upon his argument that democratic countries better serve their citizens and therefore are more accepting of tolerance.

Indeed, the promotion of tolerance is part and parcel of our diplomatic activity worldwide. Our annual reports to Congress on human rights and religious freedom describe how well or poorly governments respect the fundamental freedoms of their people, including their treatment of citizens belonging to minorities...I see societies struggling to create representative institutions that truly serve all of their people. When I spoke to the Council of the Americas this morning, I was talking about a Western Hemisphere where 34 of 35 nations are now fully democratic, with democratically elected leaders (Powell, 2002, May 6).

The use of external data may not be as necessary to persuade the audience of the importance surrounding the promotion tolerance and democratic institutions as they are already sold on the subjects. However, if this were a different audience, Powell may employ a significant amount of external data into his strategy. During my interview with Larry Wilkerson (2003, March 21), he referred to the key role of external data in trying to gain support from the international community during Powell's February 5, 2003 United Nations address:

And also I'd say the research, rehearsal, the credible, credible nature of the evidence made all the more credible by the fact that he refused to take anything that didn't have the ring of credibility, multiple sources, human intelligence, as well as signal intercepts, as well as national technical satellites, and so forth. He was not going to present anything that he didn't have at least a reasonable belief in it that it was accurate and right (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 343-347).

The importance of external data may be critical in obtaining support for a position. Wilkerson (2003, March 21) also explained that part of Powell's strategy in demonstrating the validity of the data in his February 5, 2003 UN address was the positioning of the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency behind Powell as he gave his presentation,

...one of the reasons he had the DCI, George Tenet, sitting behind him was that was to send the signal that this has all been vetted through everything that we have in terms of the most sophisticated intelligence apparatus in the world (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 183-185).

Organization

In organizing his main points, Powell follows a problem-solution method, but also incorporates chronological order in the latter half of Powell's May 6, 2002 speech.

An important organizational note involves Powell beginning his speech discussing his “busy day,” meeting with Prime Minister Sharon of Israel, Prince Saud of Saudi Arabia, and King Abdalla, briefly mentioning the peace process and then focusing on the ADL. Powell revisits the topic of Middle East later in the speech after speaking about the efforts of the ADL and then relating the mission of tolerance to the world affairs. He presented the September 11th tragedy and how the nation responded and then presented the Middle East crisis and how the U.S. and other countries are responding to resolve it.

As Powell lays out the three-point plan for Middle East peace, he presents each point, the reasoning behind them, and a brief summary:

Our strategy will consist of three elements. First, a restoration of security from terror and violence for Israelis; and for Palestinians as well, an end to the violence that is destroying their own dream. There can be no way forward unless the terror and the violence end once and for all.

(Applause.)

Second, we must address urgent humanitarian needs and we must help build strong, accountable, democratic, market-oriented institutions for Palestinians as the basis for a vibrant state.

Third, the promotion of serious and accelerated negotiations, and to that end we are working on a meeting to be held later in the summer where we can begin to bring together the different ideas, the different visions that exist with respect to security, with respect to economic development, and

with respect to a political way forward.

All three elements need to be integrated: security, a political way forward, and humanitarian and economic activity. It is crucial that the parties in the region end the violence; it is also crucial that they each have hope, both economic hope and political hope (Powell, 2002, May 6).

The chronological element in the speech is evident toward the end of the address as Powell talks about his childhood and how intolerance has changed over the years. He concludes his message describing the current state of affairs and the progress we have made as a nation along with the continuing mission for the future.

In discussing Powell's organization with Larry Wilkerson, Powell often formulates his remarks based on a regular regiment of reading, keeping himself knowledgeable on world affairs and organizing his thoughts:

There is a general pattern and for the more important ones he will even rehearse what he's going to do. But often, that's as extemporaneous as some of the other things. It doesn't draw on, just what I would call off, off the cuff, or off-hand remarks though, it draws on the vast amount of reading he has to do here (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 129-132).

In terms of maintaining consistency with other remarks made within the administration, some coordination with other agencies may be necessary. Powell's leadership philosophy of challenging those around him in order to develop the best

solutions is substantiated and shared by the President. At times, this philosophy may play a role in the organization of his speeches:

But a lot of that is because the President wants competing ideas, out of competing ideas he thinks he can grab the best idea. In terms of coordinating things, we do interagency coordination from fairly consistently, what he's going to say, what the President's going to say, what the Secretary of Defense is going to say, what the National Security Advisor is going to say, normally is vetted with all the others. Sometimes the changes are accepted when they're recommended, sometimes they aren't (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 153-158).

As Powell applies the problem-solution method to the Middle East situation, he draws parallels to the ADL's mission and discusses racism and the chronology of intolerance issues facing our own country. These are compelling issues, which have affected his audience and himself. Powell shifts back and forth between the changes within the peace process along with the history of intolerance and racism in the United States. His comparisons also display aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric touching upon the shared values of the audience as they pertain to the shared struggle and progress. Although the speech is not interactive in terms of two-way dialogue, the organization of the message incorporates important common themes reaching the audience and correlating his points, resulting in a very unique and powerful speech.

Style

Powell's use of language in delivering his messages has become more effective over the years and is quite impressive considering the lack of formal training he has received. According to Wilkerson (2003, March 21), Powell's only formal training was early in his military career consisting of basic presentation skills training taught at the Officer Basic Course. He has continued to hone his speaking skills throughout his career, learning mostly by experience and also picking up valuable techniques through observing other speakers, most notably while on his speaking tour following his retirement from the Army (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 1-10, 44-52).

Powell's vocabulary choices in the May 6, 2002 speech were balanced as he used both positive and negative terms periodically for emphasis. He comes across as warm and conversational, making the audience feel as though he is part of their group. His sincerity makes his message believable and his directness reinforces his conviction. Powell tailored his message to the audience as he speaks about the Holocaust, and other examples of anti-Semitic acts. He briefly speaks of his own experiences relating to the audience and their common goal:

Much of what I see is troubling, from rising tensions in volatile regions, to the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and the tide of hate propaganda on the Internet. But I see much more that is encouraging in this world. I see leaders trying to get beyond hostilities of the past, and cooperation to build a different, better future...It was a time when intolerance in my own country said that I was never going to get very far in life because of the color of my skin or my background. I see all that

changed. Those enemies are gone. Our nation has changed because there are people such as you, there are people all over this country, and increasingly people all over the world, who recognize that intolerance must be destroyed...(Powell, 2002, May 6).

Powell's personal experience and feelings toward issues such as the challenges people have faced because of hate or discrimination add to the power of his message. Whether he is speaking to a group of African Americans or members of the ADL who share similar experiences, he incorporates this view into his message. Wilkerson (2003, March 21) explained:

Because there, there is an innate recognition in him all the time, of the struggle that African Americans have had to go through, and the fact that he's speaking to a minority of which he's a member. And he feels a distinct obligation to always recognize that, to recognize the responsibility he has to as he puts it, to reach back and help other people achieve success, and that's always a part of his message (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 352-357).

Humor is also a consistent component of Powell's style as a speaker and a natural characteristic of his personality. While he may not be able to interject it as often as he prefers, in the ADL speech he finds a few ways to use humor effectively.

Wilkerson (2003, March 21) also points out that Powell has a remarkable ability to improvise and use humor:

Humor, humor with him is a fascinating experience because you can write things in the front of a speech that are supposed to be funny, supposed to be humorous and so forth, and invariably what he'll do is go to the diet (podium) after having sat at the head table or having mingled with people at pre-reception or reception cocktail party or something and he will pick up in that moment or two what's really going to be being relevant and humorous to that crowd and deliver it without it being written down before him (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 190-196).

The following two excerpts are examples of Powell's ability to not only use humor effectively, but also to place it strategically in the speech. The first quote is obviously at the beginning, which helps him to develop an immediate rapport with the audience. The second quote is near the end as he captures the audience's attention on a lighter note, allowing him to gracefully make his final point.

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen for that warm welcome. It's a great pleasure to be here, and I want to express my thanks to my fellow mensch, Abe, for that great introduction –(laughter) – a fellow New Yorker, a fellow CCNYer and ROTC cadet (Powell, 2002, May 6).

I see the world that we live in through the eyes of a black kid from Kelly Street in the Bronx whose boyhood pals came from every ethnic background imaginable, except white Anglo-Saxon Protestant in those days. In fact, in the neighborhood I grew up in, and Abe knows so well, we thought they were the minority (Laughter.) (Powell, 2002, May 6).

Powell's ability to speak genuinely about aspects of his personal life and relate them to the audience in some fashion along with displaying impromptu humor is uncanny and forms a unique style that sets him apart from other speakers. While many effective speeches include elements of humor and personal stories, Powell's trademark is evident in his style. Rather than relying on canned jokes or relevant stories of other leaders' life experiences, Powell often develops and shares his own. Amidst difficult time constraints as Secretary of State, the preference to continue to personalize his messages is part of a unique style that tells us he prefers to do more than just show up and give a prepared speech.

Delivery

As Powell delivers his speeches or messages, he is very aware of his composure and how he articulates his messages to the audience. Powell's non-verbal gestures are appropriately placed and he maintains eye contact with the interviewer and the audience. His deep voice is evenly paced and the timing of his voice inflections effectively enhance the key points of his speeches. Powell is also a patient speaker. Specifically, his use of pauses demonstrates Powell's control over the material,

increases the effect, and creates a consistent flow as he maintains the audience's attention.

Over the years, Wilkerson (2003, March 21) has also observed Powell's progression in the delivery of his speeches:

I saw him in the middle of this process, I saw him speak to the Brigade of Midshipman at Annapolis for example. And that was one of the most powerful speeches I've seen in my life, and he never said enough, he never paused unless it was for effect, everything flowed perfectly – his hand movements and gestures, his facial expressions the movement towards and away from and to the side of the podium, the use of the microphone.

Everything was so polished I wish I'd have taped it (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 74-80).

Powell's preparation enables him to wield exceptional control of the material and he exudes an air of confidence when he is speaking. He knows enough about his subject matter to speak articulately, yet never condescendingly, to a variety of audiences thereby increasing his credibility and presence. While his control over the material certainly enhances the delivery of the message, memory itself is only one part of Powell's successful delivery. Through his intonations, pauses, eye contact, and sense of directness, Powell is able to speak with conviction and believability. Powell's consistent use of humor and personal stories are successful because of his

sense of timing, knowing how to deliver the joke or story as well as when to place it appropriately within the framework of his speeches.

Memory

Powell's ability to retain information not only contributes to the effectiveness of his speech delivery, but also impacts his interaction with media. During my interview with Larry Wilkerson, I posed the question about how well Powell is able to deal with the shifting of topics during an interview and his ability to give consistent answers amidst tactics of media interviewers possibly intended to uncover discrepancies in his remarks. While Wilkerson (2003, March 21), believes Powell will be more accepting of aggressive questioning from talented interviewers, Wilkerson attributes Powell's ability to handle the situation to his preparation beforehand:

You ask about preparation for an interview, that's the main thing for him is thorough study of the issues. And another quality that I would put at the very top of the list for him, or anyone asking me to describe three or four things that really make him strong, is that he rarely enters the room for a discussion, for an interview, for that matter for a speech, that he isn't the most thoroughly prepared person in the room (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 274-279).

Interestingly, interviewers rarely, if ever, provide a list of questions prior to an interview, which further substantiates Powell's ability to recall and use information (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21).

Powell's memory certainly contributes to an effective delivery, which also involves the extent to which he reads from a manuscript or speaks extemporaneously. According to Wilkerson (2003, March 21), Powell limits his use of prepared notes to increase the power of his messages; the audience gains a stronger sense of Powell's knowledge and sincerity:

And the most effective ones of those are those where again he just has a few notes and he rarely refers to them and he just goes in and makes contact and begins to extemporize in appearance anyway, to talk to people in ways that there's eye to eye contact, there's a warmth built up, and the audience understands and connects, and therefore the remarks he's delivering are tenfold or more effective than they would have been if he'd just stood up there and read them (Wilkerson, 2003, March 21, 116-122).

According to Wilkerson (2003, March 21), depending upon the circumstances and his knowledge of the subject, Powell may elect not to use prepared remarks.

However, the magnitude of Powell's February 5th United Nations address required a massive amount of research and equally important rehearsal to ensure the material was accurately presented. In this example, Wilkerson (2003, March 21) refers to part of Powell's preparation for the U.N. address:

The rehearsal, he rehearsed that in front of the entire administration virtually, in terms of the pachyderms, National Security Advisor, Secretary of Defense, the Director of Central Intelligence, the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. Hadley, a whole number of people. He rehearsed that presentation a number of times. Had to take a lot of criticism, of course, washed off his back like it normally does (Wilkerson, March 21, 336-342).

CHAPTER EIGHT

Mid East Interview

After evaluating the rhetorical significance of Powell's address, events that followed the address on May 6, 2002 play an important role in Powell's involvement in the conflict and offer further material for analysis of both Powell's rhetoric surrounding the Mid-East crisis and his encounters with media.

While Powell's address on May 6, 2002 to the Anti-Defamation League celebrated the efforts of the group, aspects of the speech served as a pre-cursor to the June 24, 2002 speech by the President, which generated media attention on the United States' position. During the May 6, 2002 speech, Powell focused on a three-point strategy outlined earlier by President Bush that would serve as a template for peace talks between Israel and Palestine. Powell reiterated the strategy and the cooperation of other international leaders to help resolve the conflict:

Last week I met with United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, Foreign Minister Pique of Spain, and High Representative Solana of the European Union and Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov. Our "Quartet" as we call ourselves, this organization of four, committed itself to working for the realization of the vision of Middle East, the vision of the Middle East offered by President Bush on April 4th, a Middle East where two states, Israel and Palestine, live side by side in peace and security with an internationally recognized border (Powell, 2002, May 6).

While no direct reference toward Arafat was made during the speech, on the following day May 7, 2002, Israeli Prime Minister, Ariel Sharon visited the White House and referred to the Palestinian leadership as being “a corrupt and terrorist entity,” (Marshall, 2002, p.10). Media speculation fueled a rumor that Israel had obtained U.S. support for the removal of Arafat, but the White House denied the rumor (Borger, 2002, May 9). On June 13, 2002, Powell discussed the idea of an interim Palestinian state and the media cited that “the White House appeared to distance itself from Mr. Powell’s words,” and that President Bush seemed to be discontented with Arafat following a meeting with Sharon (Robbins, 2002, June 13).

On June 24, 2002, President Bush delivered a speech where he called for new Palestinian leadership, yet not mentioning Arafat by name:

In the situation the Palestinian people will grow more and more miserable. My vision is two states, living side by side in peace and security. There is simply no way to achieve that peace until all parties fight terror. Yet, at this critical moment, if all parties will break with the past and set out on a new path, we can overcome the darkness with the light of hope. Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership, so that a Palestinian state can be born. I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror (Bush, 2002, June 24).

As President Bush repeatedly implies the removal of Arafat is necessary for the peace process to move forward, he continues to lay out his plan and also reiterates the involvement of Secretary Powell in the peace process:

I've asked Secretary Powell to work intensively with Middle Eastern and international leaders to realize the vision of a Palestinian state, focusing them on a comprehensive plan to support Palestinian reform and institution-building (Bush, 2002, June 24).

After the President concluded his speech, a barrage of media scrutiny ensued surrounding perceived differences of opinion between the President and Secretary Powell. Although the President mentions his support for Secretary Powell's role in facilitating talks to create a Palestinian state in his speech, the media feeds upon the remarks and Powell grants a number of interviews the following day.

Whether or not an actual difference of opinion between the President and Secretary Powell existed on the subject of Arafat's leadership, Powell demonstrates his support of the plan in excerpts from this interview with Bob Edwards:

...we decided it was the right thing to do for the United States to make the clear statement that the Palestinian people should elect new leadership, find new leadership...The President believes in this. I believe in it. I spoke to Mr. Arafat in April right after that statement that you just quoted that I made, and said to him that he had been moving in the wrong direction and

it was time to make a strategic choice for his people (Interview, 2002, June 25).

Powell's firm support of the President and his reiteration that he believes in the plan, along with the inside perspective of a conversation he had with Arafat helps to argue his point. However, Edwards presses on and Powell supports his sentiments with further examples, including some external data:

It took Chairman Arafat six years to sign the basic law called for by the constitution. We see corruption in the Authority. We regrettably see that they have not taken strong action against terrorist organizations, even when it's within their capacity to do so (Interview, 2002, June 25).

The ethos in Powell's comments becomes evident again as he demonstrates his knowledge of the situation, his integrity, while organizing his message in a problem-solution format extemporaneously:

And so as hard as we have tried to work with the leaders of the Palestinian Authority -- and I think I am second to no one in my efforts and the energy I've put into it -- it was not producing the kind of results needed, not just simply for peace, but for the Palestinian people. And so we have called on them to have elections. They are in the process of rewriting their constitution, and I sense that there is movement within the

Palestinian community for new leadership and taking a look at the situation they are currently in (Interview, 2002, June 25).

Powell also reaffirms the position of the President and presents a vision that attempts to dispell speculation of the press pertaining to the United States' favoritism towards Israel, emphasizing a dual role of responsibility:

An important sentence that the President had toward the tail end of his speech when he talked about the vision of a Palestinian state with final arrangements within three years, he said, "I and my government will work toward that goal." And that is President George Bush stepping up and making a personal commitment to the Palestinian people and to the people of the region, both peoples. The Israelis and the Palestinians need peace. They need to find a way to create a Palestinian state. It is as much in Israel's interest to have such a state as it is in the interest of the Palestinian people (Interview, 2002, June 25).

While Powell supported the President's message, the majority of European and Arab diplomats critcized Bush for not treating Arafat fairly (Curtiss, 2002). In the months following the President's speech, the media scrutiny over the call to remove Arafat had dissipated and Arafat remained in power.

Since the unveiling of the peace plan in June 2002, another conflict has become the priority for the United States. Following Secretary Powell's United Nation's

address on February 5, 2003, the United States went to war with Iraq. Prior to the new war, President Bush rekindled the discussion about the peace process in the Middle East. President Bush urged Israel to support the formation of a Palestinian state once the war with Iraq has ended (King Jr.& Cummings, 2003, February 27). Bush rationalized his argument citing there will be a lack of outside support for terrorism, which will foster better conditions for leadership changes in the Palestinian Authority (King Jr.& Cummings, 2003, February 27).

On March 14, 2003 President Bush reiterated his intent to encourage the peace process after recent elections in Israel resulted in changes in the government and the creation of the Prime Minister position in the Palestinian Authority (Bush, 2003, March 14). However, with both Arafat and Sharon remaining in power, and the war with Iraq turning into a rebuilding process, Israel and Palestine continue to wait for the progression of serious peace negotiations.

CHAPTER NINE

Significance of United Nations Address

On February 5, 2003, Secretary Powell delivered arguably the most important address of his career to date. As the United States stood on the brink of war with Iraq, the selection of Powell to give the UN address was not only a testament to his ability to articulate the material and influence world leaders, but also a statement about the perception of his credibility. Considering the risks of losing favor among the world community, potentially resulting in permanent damage to long-standing alliances, the decision to have Powell give the address over any other administration official, including the President is monumental for several reasons.

The respect that Powell commands is not just nationwide, but worldwide. In a recent trip to Mexico City, the editor of Business Mexico commented on Powell's remarks saying,

Throughout his address, though, Powell's straight talk and tough words were tempered by a fundamental optimism and faith that has characterized his political trajectory and transformation from an architect of Operation Desert Storm into an internationally respected diplomat of the highest caliber (Brayman, 2003, p.37).

In this scenario, the majority of American public opinion was one of apprehension toward a war with Iraq (Elliot & Frank, 2003, February 17). A heightened concern of potential increasing acts of terrorism resulting from war and a skeptical

international opinion of U.S. intervention further emphasized the need to have someone of unquestionable reproach present the U.S. case before the world.

According to Elliot and Frank (2003, February, 17), the Administration chose Powell as someone whom the American people clearly trusted; they described their rationale:

Powell, we sometimes forget, is a phenomenon, a chapter from tomorrow's history books walking right in front of us. It isn't just the unique resume that demands respect; it's also the presence and the personality- the unforced authenticity and effortless sense of command while he refers to himself as just 'an old Army trooper' – that still fills the room. Ordinary Americans know that (Elliot & Frank, 2003, February 17).

This example reinforces the magnitude of how the American people view Colin Powell. This very sentiment is not only evident in his use of invention, but also serves as the foundation of what makes Powell such a great leader and speaker.

Along with Powell's experience and reputation, the choice to have him deliver a historic address that launched the United States into war also signifies an important step in changing America's social construction of race. Powell's ability to deliver such a message was clearly demonstrated throughout the presentation and the reactions of the world community. It is questionable that had President Bush, Vice President Cheney, or Defense Secretary Rumsfeld delivered the address, they would

have been certainly less effective, especially when the majority of American people hold Colin Powell in a higher regard than the other top leaders.

Following the February 5, 2003 address, polls clearly showed a rise in public support for a potential war with Iraq and Powell's performance rating was significantly higher than President Bush's rating in the eyes of the American people (Elliot & Frank, 2003, February 17). While the international community had mixed reactions following the presentation, several nations including China, would likely not veto another resolution based upon the information Powell presented (Leaders, 2003, February 8; Elliot & Frank, 2003, February 17; McGeary & Frank, 2003, February 10).

This address was a landmark in history for the American people, African Americans, the Presidency of George Bush, and Colin Powell. As Powell made the argument for war with Iraq, many factors hinged upon the outcome of the address to include support for the war, international consequences, economic impact, the future of the Bush administration, racial perceptions, Powell's career, and most importantly--risking human lives. The speech serves as a great example for future research in many areas to include the aforementioned factors as well as rhetoric under the Neo-Aristotelian criticism or other methods. Examples of the five canons are evident throughout the address along with a balance of external data that enhances Powell's assertions providing countless rich opportunities to examine as he delivered a compelling address.

Conclusion

This thesis analyzed the rhetoric of Colin Powell, while further examined his background and the forces impacting his rhetoric. The situation in the Middle East between Israel and the Palestine has become a volatile conflict in which Powell has become engaged in attempting to resolve. I have touched upon various aspects of his personal and professional life to provide a picture of how Powell ascended throughout his career and events that shaped his life. A brief summary of historical events leading up the current Mid East conflict was also necessary to accurately depict the complexity of issues surrounding the current situation.

In order to examine how Powell delivers his messages, I studied not only the leadership philosophies that he follows in his decision-making process, but also the uniqueness of his character and life. I explored racial exigencies impacting Powell and how he has worked to overcome them along with the potential application of Afrocentric rhetoric. Comparisons of leadership traits and philosophies additionally examine the exchange relations between the Middle East leaders and Powell.

My analysis of Powell's rhetoric included portions of his previous addresses with a primary focus on his "Remarks at the 24th Annual National Leadership Conference of the Anti-Defamation League" given on May 6, 2002. The remarks provided a base from which to analyze his rhetoric employing the Neo-Aristotelian method of criticism. I supplemented my assertions with a review of literature encompassing relevant works consisting mainly of presidential rhetorical studies. In order to support my rhetorical claims and the impact on the Middle East situation, I included aspects of the "Interview by Bob Edwards on NPR's 'Morning Edition,'"

Powell gave on June 25, 2002 pertaining to President Bush's June 24, 2002 speech, "President Bush Calls for New Palestinian Leadership."

In an attempt to learn more about Powell's rhetoric, I was able to interview Larry Wilkerson, Chief of Staff, United States Department of State. Wilkerson, a retired Army Colonel, has worked with Secretary Powell for over 15 years, serving as his principle speechwriter for twelve of those years and now as his Chief of Staff.

Wilkerson's insight helped to provide support of my rhetorical analyses pertaining to the Neo-Aristotelian method as well as a wonderful perspective on the life of Colin Powell. Additionally, I included periodic references to Powell's "Remarks to the United Nations Security Council" on February 5, 2003 and its significance to his career leading the United States into war with Iraq shortly after his address.

Neo-Aristotelian Criticism

My analysis of Powell's rhetoric provided several examples of characteristics pertaining to the five canons of Neo-Aristotelian criticism. Powell employed several aspects of the Invention canon, which has shown to be one of his strongest areas in this speech. He used external data when necessary to reinforce his points. Under the internal proof logos, he created the opportunity for the audience to use inductive and deductive reasoning to interpret his message. Syllogisms were also present in his speech to reinforce his arguments. The internal proofs, pathos and ethos were used regularly as Powell emotionally connected with his audience. Examples of his integrity, goodwill, and intelligence amplified the power of his remarks.

The organization of Powell's remarks incorporated both a problem-solution format as well as chronological order. Powell's style is direct and conversational as

he carefully uses his vocabulary to emphasize his points, again relating personal experiences to reach the audience when appropriate and displaying a great sense of humor, which is often improvised.

The delivery of his remarks encompasses periodic non-verbal gestures, consistent eye-to-eye contact, controlled voice inflection, and rarely the use of notes. Powell's insistence on thorough preparation affords him the ability to rarely use notes and adds to his effectiveness as a speaker. In certain situations, his preparation regiment will involve rehearsals, such as the case with the UN address.

The application of these findings leads us to a larger purpose than simply analyzing Powell's rhetorical ability under Neo-Aristotelian criticism. Because Powell possesses such strong attributes in all of the five canons, especially invention, he is clearly one of our nation's best choices as a representative entrusted to facilitate the peace process in the Middle East. Powell brings unmatched integrity to any discussion along with the ability to develop rapport and a unique personal background that has also seen adversity that may be compared to the struggle of those in the Middle East.

The evidence provided in his speech and the interview with Larry Wilkerson reinforces my claims under Neo-Aristotelian criticism that Powell is not just an effective speaker, rather, a great speaker. He maintains fantastic control over his material through solid delivery techniques and exhausting preparation. Powell possesses a masterful ability to connect with his audience using emotion and humor and organizes his messages presenting both problem-solution and chronological reasoning. Most importantly, Powell commits part of himself into his speeches and

everything he does. His career is one of determination and hard work. He is the ideal candidate to represent the United States and continue to work to develop a dialogue leading to a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Future Research

In my thesis, I have attempted to gain further insight into the how we can learn from one of our nation's greatest leaders not only to better understand the effectiveness of his rhetoric, but to also apply it to future scenarios. Powell has risen to a unique position in American society, overcoming adversity to serve as an example of what hard work, pride, and most of all, living and leading with the value of integrity, can achieve. He serves as an inspiration to many Americans. Through studying his efforts and how he dealt with the adversity, we can continue to challenge racial stereotypes and work to change the social construction of race in America.

I believe further research can be conducted in applying Neo-Aristotelian criticism to Powell's address to the United Nations on February 5, 2003. While I began this thesis prior to the rising tensions of what became the War in Iraq, my work may serve as a template to expand the Neo-Aristotelian method to the February 5th address. Research into the rhetoric of the Mid East leaders, Ariel Sharon and Yasser Arafat may also prove useful in determining how world leaders, specifically Colin Powell may be able to better communicate with them and reach tentative agreements to move forward with the peace process.

The application of the Neo-Aristotelian method of criticism to Powell's rhetoric highlighted specific levels of the five canons that were critical to Powell's success as

a speaker. Research can be expanded to draw comparisons between leaders in various fields such as business, the military, and politics to point out areas of improvement in order for others to enhance their skills as effective leaders and speakers.

An opportunity also exists to study Afrocentric rhetoric and comparisons versus the Western approach. Many aspects of Afrocentric rhetoric may prove more successful in different countries throughout the world and its value may be further realized if we can learn more about its benefits and role in our society. Along with the study of Afrocentric rhetoric, research of the evidence of charismatic leadership can also be studied. The Conger-Kanungo model of charismatic leadership can be used not only to evaluate Powell's leadership style as well as to teach others how they can improve upon their ability to inspire people.

Whether it is the charismatic leadership, Afrocentric rhetoric, or other forms of criticism and rhetorical study, I believe that through the continued study of rhetoric, we may be able to better understand how to improve the ways leaders and people in general interact. Future conflicts may be averted or existing ones resolved as we learn from those who have failed or succeeded in influencing those around them.

While I have only touched upon a few aspects of Colin Powell's rhetorical works, I also believe we have a great opportunity to learn from Powell himself. During my interview with Larry Wilkerson, he referred to one of the problems facing Colin Powell was never having enough time to reach all of the audiences to explain the reasoning behind our government's positions and actions regarding foreign policy. As Powell remains heavily immersed in his responsibilities, time quickly passes.

Too often, many scholars embark upon research long after their subjects are gone. I am extremely grateful and fortunate to have spoken with someone so close to Secretary Powell amidst a most turbulent time and gain a unique insight that might not have been possible several years from now. I believe the challenge is to continue to learn from our leaders, especially one who has come so far and humbly continues to break new ground on many fronts.

APPENDICES

Interview with Larry Wilkerson, Chief of Staff

On March 21, 2003, I had a telephone interview between 1:33 p.m. and 2:05 p.m. Eastern Standard Time, with U.S. State Department Chief of Staff, Larry Wilkerson. Wilkerson is also a retired Army Colonel who has worked closely with Secretary Powell for the last 15 years. For twelve of those years he served as Powell's principle speechwriter. Initially, I had written a letter directly to Secretary Powell requesting an interview. However, having been unable to grant many similar requests for interviews over the last 14 months, he graciously asked Larry Wilkerson to assist me.

I forwarded a list of questions in advance to COL Wilkerson, who took time from his hectic schedule, during the most turbulent of times and spoke with me. It is important to note we worked to arrange the interview over the course of several weeks. Rather than canceling my request amidst the war with Iraq, COL Wilkerson worked hard to accommodate this interview during the most extreme circumstances, for which I am truly thankful and hope will contribute to the future study of Secretary Powell's rhetoric.

COL Wilkerson and I developed an immediate rapport. We spoke briefly about our Army careers and discovered we had both served in the 25th Infantry Division (Light) in Hawaii as well as in Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti. COL Wilkerson was extremely friendly and very familiar with Neo-Aristotelian criticism. He graciously allowed me to record our conversation of which I have transcribed

below. I developed the format from Lofland (1971) and followed the five canons of Neo-Aristotelian criticism and my objectives to create the questions. He followed the list of questions, answering each one and taking time to entertain my probing questions and comments. The conversation was quite enjoyable; his perspective was not only unique but also, surprisingly “down to earth” and enlightening.

Invention – developing persuasive arguments through ethos (speaker’s credibility), pathos (engaging the emotions of the audience), and logos (presenting logical evidence).

- What kind of formal training has he had for interviewing and giving speeches?

1)(WILKERSON) LW: Your first question was about formal training. He always
2)talks about and he means it in many respects, people who don’t know the
3)military kind of think it’s semi-humorous, but the only formal training he ever
4)had and he thinks that was absolutely superb, was the Benning school for boys,
5)the Infantry school at Fort Benning.

6)SD: Do you mean the Officer Basic Course?

7)LW: Right. He also went through a course called Methods of Instruction, MOI
8)that is essentially, teaches you how to teach a class of 200 Captains, Lieutenants,
9)or whatever in the military style, and he refers to that more often than anything
10)else, in terms of, “That’s all I needed.”

11)SD: Well, it is reflected in his stature, how he is very direct, but you just have
12)to wonder and I have to ask, after all of the years of speaking to groups of
13)soldiers and the public, and other different varieties of media, you would think
14)that the government would have some other courses.

16)LW: (Laugh)

17)SD: So, it was pretty phenomenal, seeing that he had to learn quite a bit on his
18)own.

19)LW: (Laugh) Well, you threw the other element in there that I would throw in
20)and that is experience, you just can’t duplicate hardly in any American’s life.
21)I’d be hard pressed to find a life, African American or otherwise that could
22)match the experience he’s had and the various places he’s been. Whether we

23)talk about Deputy National Security Advisor, National Security Advisor,
24)commander of over a million troops in Forces Command, Chairman of the Joint
25)Chiefs of Staff just when Goldwater-Nichols' changes were coming into real
26)effect in giving him the finest military staff arguably on the face of the earth, to
27)being Secretary of State, I mean where can you find that experience?

28)SD: You just can't and it's evident, I remember reading in his book that he took
29)a few licks early in his career, where he mentions that part about uh, oh I can't
30)think of his name.

31)LW: Oh, Hudacheck, out in Denver.

32)SD: It was one of his first press conferences, where he took him off camera for
33)a little while and then nailed him and made him look a little inconsistent in
34)front of his big boss, then President Reagan.

35)LW: He has a remarkable knack for watching other people too, in fact, believes
36)that setting the example, living what you believe in, living both what you
37)believe in ethically and morally is probably the best and most effective way to
38)teach others.

39)SD: Absolutely. Well and that just answered my second question. I mean his
40)credibility really transcends out onto his audience and I think that's what makes
41)him so genuine, so believable in delivering his speech or an interview, what
42)have you.

43)LW: I think he would tell you that, experience for him, has been a remarkable
44)teacher because he has an incredible memory for things too and if he sees
45)something that's effective, it goes into his repertoire. I must say also, that
46)efforts between him as a deliverer of remarks, the difference between him at
47)the end of his Chairmanship and the end of his, I call it his private life as a
48)speaker under the auspices of the Washington Speaker's Bureau in making
49)money doing it, is the difference of night and day. I mean he absolutely had
50)become one of the polished speakers I've ever seen at the end of that
51)three, four-year period after his Chairmanship when he'd been giving a speech
52)about once every ten days. From Washington, DC to Beijing, China to Berlin,
53)Germany to you name it.

54)SD: Just going through all of the different experiences did he have anything
55)that was major that he had to change?

56)LW: A lot that was watching in these huge seminars and other events that he
57)would be a keynote, if not the keynote speaker in, watching a lot of the other
58)people who spoke either right before or right after him and picking up on all the
59)different techniques that some of the best speakers in America used to sell their

60)product or to push their positions, and he would tell me about coming back
61)from some of these things where you're probably familiar with it, you pay as a
62)citizen you would pay maybe \$250 into this huge pool and that \$250 gets you
63)to four or five events during the course of the year. At each event there are ten
64)or twelve really top drawing speakers

65)SD: Yes, sir.

66)LW: And it occurs all across the country and he would be often the number
67)one, the head of the list if you would or one of the prominent speakers. But
68)there are often really quality speakers on either side of him.

69)SD: So, it helps being the headliner, that way he doesn't have to go first and he
70)gets to

71)LW: Exactly.

72)SD: He gets to observe and then also see.

73)LW: How other people work and then pick up some of their techniques and so
74)forth. I saw him in the middle of this process, I saw him speak to the Brigade of
75)Midshipman at Annapolis for example. And that was one of the most powerful
76)speeches I've seen in my life, and he never said enough, he never paused unless
77)it was for effect, everything flowed perfectly – his hand movements and
78)gestures, his facial expressions the movement towards and away from and to
79)the side of the podium, the use of the microphone. Everything was so polished I
80)wish I'd have taped it.

81)SD: How much of that, I mean I'm sure he had to have had some type of a
82)general outline in terms of sticking from point to point. But, I guess how much
83)of it do you believe he stuck to a format? Or was it...

84)LW: It was inside him (Laugh) by that time. Let me...I'll cover some of that
85)when I get down to some of these other things. You ask in your second tick...if
86)there was a way he had to change when he became Secretary of State.

87)SD: Yes, sir.

88)LW: Yes, dramatically. And it has given him some, I think, my view, it's given
89)him some, some pain. (Chuckle)

- Knowing that the world may be watching Powell during many of his addresses, what areas of his public speaking did he have to develop since becoming Secretary of State? (Appealing to different audiences, working

with International media, formulating responses that will be thoroughly examined, etc.)

90)SD: Yeah, I mean he's got to be constrained.

91)LW: Very much.

92)SD: Knowing that everyone is watching him and he's got a wonderful sense of
93)humor and some of it, he, I've noticed he will jest back and forth with some of
94)the media interviewers, especially, if they give him a hard time, put it right
95)back on them, but you can tell he's got to be super controlled and composed, it
96)has to be tough.

97)LW: He prefers to make eye contact with the audience, to be into the speech, to
98)be emotionally moved himself by the speech. Otherwise, how can you move
99)other people?

100)SD: Right.

101)LW: And it's very difficult to that when you have to read.

102)SD: Well, and again, you mentioned it earlier sir, he knows what he's talking
103)about and it comes from the inside. And you don't really have to do a lot of
104)preparation or sticking to an outline if you know what you're talking about
105)and you feel that.

- One of the attributes that makes Powell such an effective speaker is his credibility based on leadership by example. Now that he is a position where he perceived as having to use rhetoric to influence people more than his actions, what types of things did you and he change in speechwriting? Did you have to make any changes?

106)LW: Mmmhn The pace of the speeches here of course, many of which the
107)public never sees because many of them are internal there to different groups
108)that come to visit the State Department or different groups that have a
109)lobbying interest in foreign affairs or maybe they, we have interest in
110)speaking to them because they provide some support for the State Department
111)of for our embassies overseas or whatever. So a lot of his speaking events, the
112)public really never sees in a big sense, just a little tiny element of it that comes
113)to the building to hear him speak or whatever.

114)SD: Right, and they do that on the – I looked through all the different
115)addresses that you have online, that's fantastic.

116)LW: Most of those are online. Yeah. And the most effective ones of those are
117)those where again he just has a few notes and he rarely refers to them and he
118)just goes in and makes contact and begins to extemporize in appearance
119)anyway, to talk to people in ways that there's eye to eye contact, there's a
120)warmth built up, and the audience understands and connects, and therefore the
121)remarks he's delivering are tenfold or more effective than they would have
122)been if he'd just stood up there and read them.

123)SD: Absolutely. Ok great, thank you. And again, you've added a lot to that
124)third question there, what makes him such an effective speaker and his whole
125)credibility, so thank you very much.

Disposition – organization of the message

- In preparing his messages during interviews, I have noticed that Secretary Powell seems to use a balance of historical information surrounding a situation and often presents his viewpoint and then ends the majority of his comments using "We" to include himself, the President, and the U.S. position. Is there a planned strategy for certain interviews or does he follow a general pattern in presenting his position? (Presenting a balanced perspective, directness with the interviewer, refrain from giving too much info)

126)LW: And you ask is there a balance perspective directness with the
127)interviewer, refrain from giving too much info, is there a planned strategy for
128)certain interviews or does he follow a pattern and so forth? There is a general
129)pattern and for the more important ones he will even rehearse what he's going
130)to do. But often, that's as extemporaneous as some of the other things. It
131)doesn't draw on, just what I would call off, off the cuff, or off-hand remarks
132)though, it draws on the vast amount of reading he has to do here. I know how
133)vast it is, because I have to read everything he reads.

134)SD: (Laugh)

135)LW: (Laugh) And, and the information that he picks up from all the multitude
136)of meetings that he does with his contemporaries around the world and with
137)heads of state and heads of government around the world.

138)SD: Yeah, that has to be an awful lot to process. I spoke with Jim Smith
139)briefly of Near Eastern Affairs just trying to get a feel, a little bit more about
140)the Mid East scenario and I can't imagine Secretary Powell being briefed by
141)so many different people and then having to read all of it, and digest it, and
142)get in front of the camera, and be able fire off direct answers to some
143)questions especially when they lead him on in some cases, so that's just a
144)testament to his ability.

- In examining interviews where the press had repeatedly questioned Secretary Powell about his position on Arafat remaining in power compared to the President's sentiments implying he needs to be replaced, do you coordinate with the President's speechwriters or aides to maintain consistency? It seems like the media may try to create inconsistencies and I am wondering how you prepare to handle them?

145)LW: You also ask about consistency and maintaining, what you might call the
 146)party line. This President is very tolerant of views that, shall we say, don't
 147)necessarily jive. In fact, the kind of views that he's looking for are views that
 148)do compete so that he can reach into those competing views and pluck out of
 149)that the best decision and while we do strive to present a consistent public
 150)view, so as not to give the impression that administration is fighting with
 151)itself. There is nonetheless that view. I know you read the papers- you know
 152)the papers talk about that all the time. But a lot of that is because the President
 153)wants competing ideas, out of competing ideas he thinks he can grab the best
 154)idea. In terms of coordinating things, we do interagency coordination from
 155)fairly consistently, what he's going to say, what the President's going to say,
 156)what the Secretary of Defense is going to say, what the National Security
 157)Advisor is going to say, normally is vetted with all the others. Sometimes the
 158)changes are accepted when they're recommended, sometimes they aren't.

159)SD: Well, no it makes a lot of sense. It's just a simple leadership philosophy I
 160)think that whether you're in the military or just a manager of people, I agree
 161)with you one hundred percent, and it just makes interesting I think from a
 162)speechwriting standpoint where you know you want to surround yourself with
 163)the best people who are going to challenge you. But yet, at the same time, the
 164)media watches every time someone in his position takes a step.

165)LW: In the twenty-four/seven news cycle has just made that, it's multiplied
 166)the problems with that a hundred fold.

167)SD: You probably spend more time trying to run interference for those types
 168)of things, and it just has to be overwhelming sometimes.

- Toughest challenge/speech to write and why?

169)LW: That's it. You said, you asked something about the toughest
 170)challenge/speech to write so far. I think, in my view anyway it was the five
 171)February presentation at the UN Security Council.

172)SD: Absolutely.

173)LW: And there were a number of reasons for that, one because we knew we
174)were walking into an audience, that for the most part, had already made up it's
175)mind and wasn't going to be persuaded by us. And secondly, as you pointed
176)out earlier- this man's credibility.

177)SD: Well, there was so much on the line I'm sure he had a lot of preparation
178)going into it and I read a few articles where they did talk about the rehearsing
179)of it. Again he comes across so genuine and so knowledgeable about the
180)believability part trying to keep all that on track and tie it all together, had to
181)take a little bit of preparation I'm sure.

182)LW: It did. And I think if you saw the film of it, one of the reasons, or the TV,
183)one of the reasons he had the DCI, George Tenet, sitting behind him was that
184)was to send the signal that this has all been vetted through everything that we
185)have in terms of the most sophisticated intelligence apparatus in the world.
186)And while it isn't infallible it certainly isn't.

187)SD: It just sends a subtle message especially.

188)LW: Yeah. Yes.

189)SD: Great. Thank you sir.

Elocution – style of the speaker, language used to deliver persuasive message

- In reviewing many of his interviews and speeches, Secretary Powell has periodically used an icebreaker and definitely has a sense of humor. Considering the serious nature of many of the topics you are involved with, do you feel he is often restrained by the subject matter, or is he able to weave in enough humor into his interactions with the media and be himself?

190)LW: And humor. Humor, humor with him is a fascinating experience because
191)you can write things in the front of a speech that are supposed to be funny,
192)supposed to be humorous and so forth, and invariably what he'll do is go to the
193)podium after having sat at the head table or having mingled with people
194)at pre-reception or reception cocktail party or something and he will pick up in
195)that moment or two what's really going to be being relevant and humorous to
196)that crowd and deliver it without it being written down before him. (Chuckle)

197)SD: That, that's fantastic, well, and it makes a heck of a lot of sense if you're
198)going to appeal to folks, having that ability to improvise fairly quickly versus
199)a canned joke or two, that's awesome. That makes it even more fun, more fun
200)for him I'm sure.

201)LW: Yeah, he's exceptional at that. Now when he was on the speaking circuit,
202)he actually would sometimes pay big money out to the Los Angeles crowd,

203)you know the New York crowd to get stuff that Bob Hope or whomever might
204)use. (Laugh)

205)SD: (Laugh) Well, there's nothing wrong with that.

206)LW: No, no but it came at a pretty high price, I'll tell you that. (Chuckle)

207)SD: (Chuckle) I'm sure, he probably gets some ribbing behind the scenes.

208)LW: But the most interesting and most effective humor I've seen him over the
209)decade or so that I've watched him and written for him is that what I just said,
210)the kind that he actually formulates right there on the spot so to speak.

211)SD: Which makes him much more genuine.

Delivery

- What tools has he developed during his military career that may have helped him to become a more effective speaker as Secretary of State? (Addressing large audiences, confidence, being direct, handling sensitive topics, etc.) What do you find to be his most impressive quality/strength in delivering his messages?

212)LW: Tools during the military career that may have helped him. Most,
213)foremost of all – confidence in himself, building over the years as he became
214)more and more proficient, and I think probably the integrity that goes behind
215)it. You know you can listen to a very effective speaker but if he's trying to sell
216)you snake oil and you know that, his effectiveness is diminished somewhat I
217)think.

218)SD: Absolutely.

219)LW: You listen to Colin Powell and I think most Americans would agree that
220)they are listening to someone whom they can trust, whom they respect and
221)who's not going to tell them, not going to willingly tell them anyway, a
222>falsehood.

223)SD: The great part about his career, one that I admire and hopefully more
224)people can appreciate, that, is the jockeying back and forth between the field
225)positions into the White House. He never lost touch with being a soldier and
226)enjoying leading, leading people and that's what makes again – what he
227)speaks about right on sir.

228)LW: I'll give you a little anecdote, the other day he was in the office and he
229)called me in and said, have you been watching this, I said what are you

230)referring to, and he said have you been watching the 101st, he said they're
231)loading out and he said it just moves me, profoundly. And I said what
232)particular aspect of it, and he said well I'm just sitting here watching this
233)platoon leader, and this platoon leader is standing out in front of his forty men
234)or so and he's saying, alright I want everybody touch their helmet, touch your
235)helmet, alright I want everybody to show their I.D. card, alright I want
236)everybody to touch their canteens (Laugh) and he said, he said, you know,
237)you just know they're going to get to Kuwait and there's going to be one of
238)them who just forgot something.

239)SD: And that's how it happens to, all the time.

240)LW: But, yeah he misses it.

241)SD: But just getting back to him as a person and being able to deliver any
242)message, you know he has been there and he has done that, and makes him
243)even that much more effective.

244)LW: Yeah, yep.

- What are the factors that are the most difficult to deal with in conveying his messages as Secretary of State? (International etiquette, time constraints, random questioning from interviewers, leading questions, etc.)

245)LW: Yes, yes. Let's see here, what are the factors that are the most difficult
246)to deal with here as Secretary of State, the biggest one is not enough time to
247)speak to all the audiences he wants to speak to and to do things that he needs
248)to do. That's a tremendous problem.

249)SD: That makes sense.

250)LW: Not being able to get out to all the states to at least the West, the North,
251)the South, the East, you know and to speak to people about foreign policy and
252)tell them why we're doing what we're doing in their name. It's been a real,
253)real problem, and we're still wrestling with it.

- I noticed Secretary Powell is more at ease with some interviewers than others (Juan Williams NPR vs. Tom Brokaw NBC). Does he change his style based on the interviewer? Are you allowing them to set the tone and responding accordingly? (Juan is more laid back where Brokaw may be more aggressive).

254)LW: About interviewing, has he changed his style based on the interviewer, to
255)a small degree, particularly, when he knows the interviewer personally and he
256)kind of has a sense of what's going to come across and sense of what he can

257)say to that particular interviewer that will elicit perhaps, the questions he's
258)really looking for.

259)SD: That was an eye opening experience for me when I started doing the
260)research that it's probably my ignorance in not having had the experience
261)within the media that some of them are (pause), especially, when you read the
262)transcripts that some of the interviews, they just fire directly at him and it's
263)almost, not to the point where it's rude, sir, but he's got to be on his toes to be
264)able to handle it, which he does very well.

265)LW: Yeah.

266)SD: And then there are some, which are genuinely a little bit nicer, but he is
267)consistent.

268)LW: Yeah, if you're good, if you're talented, I think he'll tolerate a lot more
269)aggressiveness than he would than if you were just, you know, asking dumb
270)questions.

271)SD: (Laugh)

272)LW: (Laugh)

273)SD: Right, right.

Memory

- What type of preparation does Powell do prior to an interview?

274)LW: You ask about preparation for an interview, that's the main thing for him
275)is thorough study of the issues. And another quality that I would put at the
276)very top of the list for him, or anyone asking me to describe three or four
277)things that really make him strong, is that he rarely enters the room for a
278)discussion, for an interview, for that matter for a speech, that he isn't the most
279)thoroughly prepared person in the room.

280)SD: Fantastic.

281)LW: It's just through study, small effort.

282)SD: Well, then he's not going to be sidetracked or get thrown a curveball that
283)he at least hasn't had the opportunity to think of some of these things through
284)and that...

285)LW: Yep.

286)SD: ...makes him that much more credible.

- At times Secretary Powell chooses to use an unedited speech, edit the speech prior to delivery, or choose not to use the prepared speech at all. What factors lead to his decision – audience, time, or subject matter?

287)LW: Your question about does ever discard a speech, uh, yep. (Laugh) Lots of
288)times.

289)SD: How many times, let me ask you sir, how much time and effort have you
290)spent on some of those and he just looks at you and says sorry?

291)LW: (Laugh) He's great, he's great, he comes back and says this was
292)marvelous, why don't you put it away and save this...

293)SD: (Laugh)

294)LW: ...for another time, I just felt like something else for that audience.
295)(Laugh). And maybe some time later you do pull it out again, you know. But
296)he's very kind in delivering the aftermath, if you will. And what factors lead
297)to his decision in that regard audience, time, subject matter? All three. Often
298)times, the prominent one there is the audience.

299)SD: That makes sense.

- I noticed during the television interviews, the TV interviewers are often quick to shift topics as part of their questioning. Do any of the interviewers provide you with a list of questions prior to the interview?

300)LW: And you said, I noticed during the television interviews, they're often
301)quick to shift topics as part of their questioning. Do any of the interviewers
302)provide a list, provide you with a list of questions prior, I don't know that
303)that's ever happened.

304)SD: Well, that just reinforces that he really has to know his subject matter and
305)be on his toes. When they do that, I mean I'm sure you've witnessed it
306)firsthand but it's just, again reading through some of these, they just – they're
307)talking about the Middle East, they're talking about NATO, they're back...

308)LW: Yep.

309)SD: ...on domestic issues, and they're back to the Middle East. It's almost
310)like they are looking for inconsistencies to see if either he'll slip up or give
311)them a reason to challenge the party line. And it's just pretty amazing, that he

312)is able to handle all those and it's just a testament to what you said about his
313)massive reading and knowledge of the subjects.

314)LW: You're right.

Miscellaneous

- What was your biggest fear about delivering the UN address on 2/5/03?

315)LW: Biggest fear at the UN on 2/5/03 (pause) didn't really have any fears but
316)as I said before we had some concerns, the biggest one was that certain
317)parties, most notably the French seemed to have already made up their mind.
318)It's no matter, no matter that you know you're speaking to a wider audience
319)internationally and domestically, you're also speaking to the people in the
320)room with you. It's, it's hard to deliver a speech when you know that the
321)people you're delivering the speech to immediately in front of you, don't give
322)a damn. (Chuckle)

323)SD: Right, right, and how do you try to obtain some of their buy-in, and you
324)may never be able to do that.

325)LW: Yep.

326)SD: There's always a certain percentage. With what I do in Human
327)Resources, union organizing comes to mind and you have a certain amount of
328)your associates that are on the fence,

329)LW: Yep.

330)SD: Some that have already made their mind up, and some that are completely
331)you know, anti-one way or the other. That audience had to be a pretty
332)interesting variety.

- Having worked with him for 12 years on giving speeches, what part of the
Feb 5 UN speech do you consider the best part of the speech and why?

333)LW: And the twelve years of speeches, what part of the 5 February UN
334)speech do you consider the best part of it? I would say three things, the
335)thoroughness of the research done, and I was head of the task force that put it
336)together, so I know how much time he spent doing it. The rehearsal, he
337)rehearsed that in front of the entire administration virtually, in terms of the
338)pachyderms, National Security Advisor, Secretary of Defense, the Director of
339)Central Intelligence, the Deputy Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. Hadley,
340)a whole number of people. He rehearsed that presentation a number of times.
341)Had to take a lot of criticism, of course, washed off his back like it normally

342)does. And also I'd say the research, rehearsal, the credible, credible nature of
343)the evidence made all the more credible by the fact that he refused to take
344)anything that didn't have the ring of credibility, multiple sources, human
345)intelligence, as well as signal intercepts, as well as national technical
346)satellites, and so forth. He was not going to present anything that he didn't
347)have at least a reasonable belief in it that it was accurate and right.

348)SD: Excellent, that's excellent.

- Do you employ different strategies when speaking to mostly black audiences, such as a Howard University commencement?

349)LW: And the last one is a very interesting one, about anything different for
350)African American audiences, absolutely. Not necessarily in terms of structure,
351)but in terms of the message that's delivered and the substance of that message.
352)Because there, there is an innate recognition in him all the time, of the
353)struggle that African Americans have had to go through, and the fact that he's
354)speaking to a minority of which he's a member. And he feels a distinct
355)obligation to always recognize that, to recognize the responsibility he has to as
356)he puts it, to reach back and help other people achieve success, and that's
357)always a part of his message. And where I saw that the most was when he was
358)Chairman, we used to speak lots of times to World War II and Korean War
359)black veterans. And the touch he had with them was incredible, whether it was
360)the Tuskegee Airmen, the Buffalo Soldiers, the 92nd Infantry Division, didn't
361)matter – he just had an incredible touch with them, and making them proud of
362)their service, making them proud of their continued work with the country,
363)making them proud of what they've done, and proud of who they were.

364)SD: His whole philosophy, at least, again from what I read and what I feel in
365)listening to him, it comes from hard work, and pride, and commitment in
366)getting where you want to be regardless of your scenario.

367)LW: Mmmnhn.

368)SD: And a lot that stuff like you said sir, was right. He touched on it in his
369)autobiography, was fantastic and really gives you an appreciation for not only
370)what he had to do, but for those folks that paved the way for those like him to
371)follow in their footsteps.

372)LW: Absolutely right.

373)SD: There's going to be a good portion of my paper, and I'll absolutely send
374)you a copy of it, again just for your benefit, and I appreciate your time, but to
375)be talking about the uniqueness of Secretary Powell as a human being, and the

376) strides that we're making, and we're not far enough, as a nation, in terms of
377) our issues with race.

378) LW: You're right. I still work with kids down in the inner city here in the
379) district and I can tell you, you're right. I'd love to have a copy of your paper.

380) SD: I'll absolutely send it you. I'll, I'll let my, similar to probably all the re-
381) writes I'm sure you have go through, my thesis committee is going to have
382) field day with it, but.

383) LW: (Laugh)

384) SD: But that's okay, I'm sure you can sympathize and look for it early May
385) and I'll get the final copy and I'll absolutely send it to you.

386) LW: Please do that and I'll give it to him too.

387) SD: Well, thank you again, very much for your time and is there anything else
388) you'd like to ask of me or...

389) LW: Well, I was going to tell you one more story (Laugh)

390) SD: (Laugh)

- Are there any stories we haven't heard? Perhaps humorous, maybe he wasn't briefed and had to ad-lib or impromptu a speech?

391) LW: You asked something about was there ever really a humorous thing, of
392) course there are hundreds of them, but I remember vividly being out in
393) Abilene, Kansas with him, and you can check with the Powell papers over at
394) the National Defense University, a lady by the name of Susan Lintke, I don't
395) remember the exact date, I think it was '92. We were out there celebrating
396) Dwight Eisenhower, and Winston Churchill III was there, and a whole, whole
397) slew of characters. I believe if I remember right Nancy Kassenbaum, Senator
398) Kassenbaum at the time, and he was about the penultimate, or the last speaker,
399) I think he was the penultimate speaker he was just next to last. And about six
400) or seven people went before him and he sat there on the stage, out there in the
401) wind and the sun in Abilene, (Chuckle) and he listened to each speaker steal
402) one his stories of his speech (Laugh). Until, by the time he went to the podium
403) he didn't have a story left (Laugh).

404) SD: (Laugh) That's great.

405) LW: And we thought we had some really rare ones too.

406)SD: So how did he get up there? Did he...

407)LW: Well, he got up and one of the first things he did was he told a story he
408)knew nobody else knew anything about, except him probably, and that no one
409)had previously given therefore. And it was about, he had walked out of the
410)Sec Dep's office one time when he was Military Advisor to Weinberger, and
411)he had noticed that all there was in the hall was a bust to Eisenhower, and that
412)was it. So, he turned, and you can go see it now in the Pentagon, he turned the
413)entire corridor outside of the Secretary of Defense's office into the
414)Eisenhower corridor. And now you can trace Ike's life all the way from a kid
415)on the far right if you're facing the wall where the Secretary's door is, to the
416)far left where he's the President of Columbia, and President of the United
417)States and all the different things that he did. It's really a beautiful corridor.
418)So, he told that story and how he learned about Ike as he moved through each
419)one of those little displays, the bust, the photographs, there's even in one of
420)'em, a little milk container. If you know what milk used to be delivered in, the
421)little metal container put on your back stoop. Eisenhower was a milk boy
422)when he was eleven. (Chuckle).

423)SD: That's excellent, that really is.

424)LW: Good story. So he can improvise under any circumstance. (Chuckle).

425)SD: That, that's part of the reason I asked the question, because his ability is
426)uncanny.

427)LW: Well good luck to you.

428)SD: Thank you very much, and thank you again for the time, and you'll be
429)hearing from me in the written format.

430)LW: I look forward to getting it.

431)SD: And good luck with everything else, we will talk to you soon.

432)LW: Thank you. Keep praying for us.

433)SD: I will. Thank you, sir.

434)LW: Goodbye.

Remarks at the 24th Annual National Leadership Conference of the Anti-Defamation League

Secretary Colin L. Powell
Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, DC
May 6, 2002

(As Delivered)

Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen for that warm welcome. It's a great pleasure to be here, and I want to express my thanks to my fellow mensch, Abe, for that great introduction –(laughter) – a fellow New Yorker, a fellow CCNYer and ROTC cadet. It is a very busy day for me, but I didn't want to miss this opportunity. I just finished a meeting with Prince Saud, the Foreign Minister of Saudi Arabia, and as soon as I am finished here I will meet with Prime Minister Sharon, and later today King Abdullah. I will be in my office for another meeting as we try to move the peace process forward, as we try to find a way out of the difficulties that affect us in the Middle East.

I also spoke to the Council of the Americas earlier this morning, which has to do with matters in the Western Hemisphere. And we also have President Museveni of Uganda here today. We're also spending a lot of time on US-Russia relations today because of the upcoming summit meeting between President Bush and President Putin.

Having said all of that, I had to come be here with the ADL today. (Laughter and applause.) I had to come be here because I wanted to express my appreciation, not only to Abe and all of those up here at the table, but to all of you for the essential work that you do every day in promoting tolerance here at home and tolerance across the globe.

The Anti-Defamation League and its work is desperately needed in a 21st-century world that is still torn by centuries-old conflicts, a world where all too often differences of color, culture and creed are treated as threats rather than as assets. The attacks of September 11th were a chilling demonstration of the extremes to which hatred can take human beings. People of every conceivable belief and background were killed, some 3,000 souls from 80 different countries.

We also saw how people of every conceivable belief and background reached out to one another, went to one another's rescue, prayed together, grieved together, went through this terrible experience together. And we saw how people of every belief and background answered President Bush's call for global coalition against terrorism.

As a nation, we can be proud that in the darkest hours of rage, in the darkest hours of grief, President Bush and the American people chose the path of responsible

action. We did not lash out indiscriminately. President Bush stood up before America and all the world and he made it clear that the perpetrators and abettors of the attacks were our enemies, not of people of any particular faith or ethnicity.

The President made it clear that worldwide terrorism is our adversary, not Islam. And to your everlasting credit, the Anti-Defamation League and other opinion leaders across America did exactly the same thing. And when isolated acts of hatred did occur against members of our Muslim community, our Muslim brothers and sisters, we swiftly and strongly condemned them. Our law enforcement went after those who committed those ugly crimes. And our communities rallied to the protection of their Muslim members.

America's principled response to September 11th speaks powerfully to the fundamental decency of the American people. It testifies to the human and civic values that all of us share as Americans. It's part of our legacy, it's part of our strength, it's part of what makes us so admired in the world. And it tells me that ADL's decades of educating the public about tolerance has had a real impact on the way people think and on the way people behave in our country. It tells me that ADL's inspiring work for nearly a century has helped our society develop habits of tolerance that overwhelmingly held up, even in the most traumatic of national circumstances.

I am not going to stand here in front of you today and claim that September 11th made all the Klansmen and the skinheads and the anti-Semites and other hate mongers in our country see the light. The opposite is probably true; they're still there. But, we as a nation, in the manner in which we responded, were remarkable. And I'm glad that our young people, who felt so deeply a part of the September 11th events as they unfolded, heard their President and their other role models send a strong message about tolerance.

That we right and deserve to feel proud of it is no cause for national complacency. Instead, our success should inspire us to keep doing the hard work of tolerance. It should recommit all of us to perfecting our still imperfect democracy, to playing our part in America's still incomplete experiment in equality. And it should deepen our collective response to stand up, speak out and act against hatred in all its forms, wherever that hatred manifests itself in the world.

And that is what you in the ADL and all of us in the United States Government are doing, not only because it is the right thing to do, but because promoting tolerance is fundamental to building a democratic, prosperous and peaceful world.

So much of the misery, danger and instability around the world today is caused or exacerbated by intolerance, whether it's the Middle East, Southeastern Europe, or Central Africa; whether it's in Cypress or Sri Lanka, Northern Ireland or Indonesia.

And whenever ethnic and religious hatred help to fuel a conflict, it becomes all the more virulent and intractable with respect to finding a solution.

Today, globalization and the spread of political and economic freedoms have opened unprecedented opportunities to lift millions of the world's people out of poverty and put them onto the road of development. But countries consumed with ethnic or sectarian violence cannot seize these opportunities, and the only way to break the cycle of violence is to convince the parties to conflict that investing in peace and cooperating with their neighbors pays greater rewards than unending strife, to present a compelling vision of the future and to help them build a path to that future.

Last week I met with United Nations Secretary General Kofi Annan, Foreign Minister Pique of Spain, and High Representative Solana of the European Union and Russian Foreign Minister Igor Ivanov. Our "Quartet" as we call ourselves, this organization of four, committed itself to working for the realization of the vision of Middle East, the vision of the Middle East offered by President Bush on April 4th, a Middle East where two states, Israel and Palestine, live side by side in peace and security with an internationally recognized border.

We, the Quartet, have pledged to work with the parties, with Arab governments and within the international community, to restore the hope of all the people in the region for a peaceful, secure and prosperous future. And Saudi Crown Prince Abdullah's initiative, recently endorsed by the Arab League, will also play an important role alongside President Bush's vision and the other ideas that are coming forward from a variety of quarters as we move forward.

Our strategy will consist of three elements. First, a restoration of security from terror and violence for Israelis; and for Palestinians as well, an end to the violence that is destroying their own dream. There can be no way forward unless the terror and the violence end once and for all.

(Applause.)

Second, we must address urgent humanitarian needs and we must help build strong, accountable, democratic, market-oriented institutions for Palestinians as the basis for a vibrant state.

Third, the promotion of serious and accelerated negotiations, and to that end we are working on a meeting to be held later in the summer where we can begin to bring together the different ideas, the different visions that exist with respect to security, with respect to economic development, and with respect to a political way forward.

All three elements need to be integrated: security, a political way forward, and humanitarian and economic activity. It is crucial that the parties in the region end the

violence; it is also crucial that they each have hope, both economic hope and political hope.

Of course, the Middle East, is not the only part of the world where we are working with contending parties and within the international community to support a just and lasting end to sectarian and ethnic conflict. I will cite only a few examples of the tolerance-promoting efforts in which we are engaged today. In Northern Ireland, we stand behind the Good Friday Agreement and the institutions it created to ensure that all communities have a say in their governance.

In Cyprus, we are supporting the United Nations efforts and have promoted people-to-people exchanges to bring together youth from both sides of that divided island. In the Balkans, our military presence and diplomatic engagement, and that of our allies and partners, helps create the confidence needed for minority returns, people to go back to their homes.

We have taken action against media that spew hate, and we are supporting enlightened journalists in the region who seek to dispel stereotypes that perpetuate intolerance.

Indeed, the promotion of tolerance is part and parcel of our diplomatic activity worldwide. Our annual reports to Congress on human rights and religious freedom describe how well or poorly governments respect the fundamental freedoms of their people, including their treatment of citizens belonging to minorities.

We do not just passively report once a year in our findings. Every day, all around the world, we work with foreign governments and their citizens to advance the development of tolerant civil societies, address inequalities and establishment of the rule of law. And we make it very clear that America always stands up, will always stand up, with the victims of hatred.

Like all of you, in recent weeks we have been deeply concerned by anti-Semitic acts that have been committed in the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, Germany and elsewhere. We have loudly and publicly condemned these crimes, as have national leaders and senior government officials throughout Europe. We applaud the governments' concern for taking enforcement action and security measures, and we welcome the fact that the European Union's justice ministers issued a categorical condemnation of their own.

All of these actions are important and necessary, but obviously more must be done by all of us to educate publics, especially young people. For them, the horrors of the Holocaust seem far away in time and distance, and that is why we have urged our partners in the International Task Force on Holocaust Education to work intensively not only with the 11 countries which already are members, but also with a widening circle of partners countries.

We seek to develop programs to increase understanding of the Holocaust and its timeliness. This will help new generations adopt the values and behaviors that it can avert fresh tragedies.

We are also working with the National Holocaust Commissions in the United States and 17 other nations to help countries confront their past and combat anti-Semitism and other forms of hatred in the future.

Ladies and gentlemen, as Secretary of State, I must look at the world with clear eyes. I must listen to all points of view. I must have an open mind to all ideas. Much of what I see is troubling, from rising tensions in volatile regions, to the spread of weapons of mass destruction, and the tide of hate propaganda on the Internet.

But I see much more that is encouraging in this world. I see leaders trying to get beyond hostilities of the past, and cooperation to build a different, better future, as we are now doing with Russia and China, two countries that were enemies for so many decades that we are now creating friendships and partnerships with these two nations.

I see societies struggling to create representative institutions that truly serve all of their people. When I spoke to the Council of the Americas this morning, I was talking about a Western Hemisphere where 34 of 35 nations are now fully democratic, with democratically elected leaders. Only Castro's Cuba remains outside that club. It's quite a difference from when I was National Security Advisor some 15 years ago, and I looked at this hemisphere and we saw dictators and generals running country after country.

I see science and technology helping once isolated populations broaden their horizons and embrace the promise of a diverse global marketplace.

And so despite all of the problems that I have to deal with every day, when I go home at night I reflect on a world that is still, thankfully, full of hope, full of promise. That isn't surprising for me because I look at the world through the eyes not of a Secretary of State, but through the eyes of the son of hard-working Jamaican immigrants, people who came to this country 70 years ago looking for a better life, looking for an opportunity, looking for a place to raise a family.

I see it through the eyes of the son of those hard-working Jamaican immigrants who was given the opportunity to rise and to serve his country in a number of capacities. I see the world that we live in through the eyes of a black kid from Kelly Street in the Bronx whose boyhood pals came from every ethnic background imaginable, except white Anglo-Saxon Protestant in those days. In fact, in the neighborhood I grew up in, and Abe knows so well, we thought they were the minority. (Laughter.)

I will always see the world in those terms, and I remember those growing-up years in New York City as a time of war, a time of hatred. I was about ten years old when Israel was created. It was between the end of World War II and the beginning of the Korean War. Most of my young teenage and youthful years were times of war.

It was a time when intolerance in my own country said that I was never going to get very far in life because of the color of my skin or my background. I see all that changed. Those enemies are gone. Our nation has changed because there are people such as you, there are people all over this country, and increasingly people all over the world, who recognize that intolerance must be destroyed, that everybody must be given the right to pursue their destiny as God has given them the vision to pursue that destiny.

The spirit of America, united in its diversity, and so full of possibility, lived with us kids in Kelly Street and the other cities of New York and cities all around our country. And I have carried that spirit in me, with me, all through my life.

It is that same tolerant, embracing, hopeful spirit that animates the wonderful work of the ADL and which our world needs now more than ever. By promoting tolerance, the Anti-Defamation League does invaluable service to the American people and to all mankind. For what they say about the Torah is also true about tolerance; its ways are ways of pleasantness, and all its paths are peace.

Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

President Calls for New Palestinian Leadership

President George W. Bush
The Rose Garden, Washington, DC
June 24, 2002
3:47 P.M. EDT

THE PRESIDENT: For too long, the citizens of the Middle East have lived in the midst of death and fear. The hatred of a few holds the hopes of many hostage. The forces of extremism and terror are attempting to kill progress and peace by killing the innocent. And this casts a dark shadow over an entire region. For the sake of all humanity, things must change in the Middle East.

It is untenable for Israeli citizens to live in terror. It is untenable for Palestinians to live in squalor and occupation. And the current situation offers no prospect that life will improve. Israeli citizens will continue to be victimized by terrorists, and so Israel will continue to defend herself.

In the situation the Palestinian people will grow more and more miserable. My vision is two states, living side by side in peace and security. There is simply no way to achieve that peace until all parties fight terror. Yet, at this critical moment, if all parties will break with the past and set out on a new path, we can overcome the darkness with the light of hope. Peace requires a new and different Palestinian leadership, so that a Palestinian state can be born.

I call on the Palestinian people to elect new leaders, leaders not compromised by terror. I call upon them to build a practicing democracy, based on tolerance and liberty. If the Palestinian people actively pursue these goals, America and the world will actively support their efforts. If the Palestinian people meet these goals, they will be able to reach agreement with Israel and Egypt and Jordan on security and other arrangements for independence.

And when the Palestinian people have new leaders, new institutions and new security arrangements with their neighbors, the United States of America will support the creation of a Palestinian state whose borders and certain aspects of its sovereignty will be provisional until resolved as part of a final settlement in the Middle East.

In the work ahead, we all have responsibilities. The Palestinian people are gifted and capable, and I am confident they can achieve a new birth for their nation. A Palestinian state will never be created by terror -- it will be built through reform. And reform must be more than cosmetic change, or veiled attempt to preserve the status quo. True reform will require entirely new political and economic institutions, based on democracy, market economics and action against terrorism.

Today, the elected Palestinian legislature has no authority, and power is concentrated in the hands of an unaccountable few. A Palestinian state can only serve its citizens with a new constitution which separates the powers of government. The Palestinian parliament should have the full authority of a legislative body. Local officials and government ministers need authority of their own and the independence to govern effectively.

The United States, along with the European Union and Arab states, will work with Palestinian leaders to create a new constitutional framework, and a working democracy for the Palestinian people. And the United States, along with others in the international community will help the Palestinians organize and monitor fair, multi-party local elections by the end of the year, with national elections to follow. Today, the Palestinian people live in economic stagnation, made worse by official corruption. A Palestinian state will require a vibrant economy, where honest enterprise is encouraged by honest government. The United States, the international donor community and the World Bank stand ready to work with Palestinians on a major project of economic reform and development. The United States, the EU, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund are willing to oversee reforms in Palestinian finances, encouraging transparency and independent auditing.

And the United States, along with our partners in the developed world, will increase our humanitarian assistance to relieve Palestinian suffering. Today, the Palestinian people lack effective courts of law and have no means to defend and vindicate their rights. A Palestinian state will require a system of reliable justice to punish those who prey on the innocent. The United States and members of the international community stand ready to work with Palestinian leaders to establish finance -- establish finance and monitor a truly independent judiciary.

Today, Palestinian authorities are encouraging, not opposing, terrorism. This is unacceptable. And the United States will not support the establishment of a Palestinian state until its leaders engage in a sustained fight against the terrorists and dismantle their infrastructure. This will require an externally supervised effort to rebuild and reform the Palestinian security services. The security system must have clear lines of authority and accountability and a unified chain of command.

America is pursuing this reform along with key regional states. The world is prepared to help, yet ultimately these steps toward statehood depend on the Palestinian people and their leaders. If they energetically take the path of reform, the rewards can come quickly. If Palestinians embrace democracy, confront corruption and firmly reject terror, they can count on American support for the creation of a provisional state of Palestine.

With a dedicated effort, this state could rise rapidly, as it comes to terms with Israel, Egypt and Jordan on practical issues, such as security. The final borders, the capital and other aspects of this state's sovereignty will be negotiated between the parties, as part of a final settlement. Arab states have offered their help in this process, and their help is needed.

I've said in the past that nations are either with us or against us in the war on terror. To be counted on the side of peace, nations must act. Every leader actually committed to peace will end incitement to violence in official media, and publicly denounce homicide bombings. Every nation actually committed to peace will stop the flow of money, equipment and recruits to terrorist groups seeking the destruction of Israel -- including Hamas, Islamic Jihad, and Hezbollah. Every nation actually committed to peace must block the shipment of Iranian supplies to these groups, and oppose regimes that promote terror, like Iraq. And Syria must choose

the right side in the war on terror by closing terrorist camps and expelling terrorist organizations.

Leaders who want to be included in the peace process must show by their deeds an undivided support for peace. And as we move toward a peaceful solution, Arab states will be expected to build closer ties of diplomacy and commerce with Israel, leading to full normalization of relations between Israel and the entire Arab world. Israel also has a large stake in the success of a democratic Palestine. Permanent occupation threatens Israel's identity and democracy. A stable, peaceful Palestinian state is necessary to achieve the security that Israel longs for. So I challenge Israel to take concrete steps to support the emergence of a viable, credible Palestinian state.

As we make progress towards security, Israel forces need to withdraw fully to positions they held prior to September 28, 2000. And consistent with the recommendations of the Mitchell Committee, Israeli settlement activity in the occupied territories must stop.

The Palestinian economy must be allowed to develop. As violence subsides, freedom of movement should be restored, permitting innocent Palestinians to resume work and normal life. Palestinian legislators and officials, humanitarian and international workers, must be allowed to go about the business of building a better future. And Israel should release frozen Palestinian revenues into honest, accountable hands.

I've asked Secretary Powell to work intensively with Middle Eastern and international leaders to realize the vision of a Palestinian state, focusing them on a comprehensive plan to support Palestinian reform and institution-building.

Ultimately, Israelis and Palestinians must address the core issues that divide them if there is to be a real peace, resolving all claims and ending the conflict between them. This means that the Israeli occupation that began in 1967 will be ended through a settlement negotiated between the parties, based on U.N. Resolutions 242 and 338, with Israeli withdrawal to secure and recognize borders.

We must also resolve questions concerning Jerusalem, the plight and future of Palestinian refugees, and a final peace between Israel and Lebanon, and Israel and a Syria that supports peace and fights terror.

All who are familiar with the history of the Middle East realize that there may be setbacks in this process. Trained and determined killers, as we have seen, want to stop it. Yet the Egyptian and Jordanian peace treaties with Israel remind us that with determined and responsible leadership progress can come quickly.

As new Palestinian institutions and new leaders emerge, demonstrating real performance on security and reform, I expect Israel to respond and work toward a final status agreement. With intensive effort by all, this agreement could be reached within three years from now. And I and my country will actively lead toward that goal.

I can understand the deep anger and anguish of the Israeli people. You've lived too long with fear and funerals, having to avoid markets and public transportation, and forced to put armed guards in kindergarten classrooms. The Palestinian Authority has rejected your offer at hand, and trafficked with terrorists. You have a right to a

normal life; you have a right to security; and I deeply believe that you need a reformed, responsible Palestinian partner to achieve that security.

I can understand the deep anger and despair of the Palestinian people. For decades you've been treated as pawns in the Middle East conflict. Your interests have been held hostage to a comprehensive peace agreement that never seems to come, as your lives get worse year by year. You deserve democracy and the rule of law. You deserve an open society and a thriving economy. You deserve a life of hope for your children. An end to occupation and a peaceful democratic Palestinian state may seem distant, but America and our partners throughout the world stand ready to help, help you make them possible as soon as possible.

If liberty can blossom in the rocky soil of the West Bank and Gaza, it will inspire millions of men and women around the globe who are equally weary of poverty and oppression, equally entitled to the benefits of democratic government.

I have a hope for the people of Muslim countries. Your commitments to morality, and learning, and tolerance led to great historical achievements. And those values are alive in the Islamic world today. You have a rich culture, and you share the aspirations of men and women in every culture. Prosperity and freedom and dignity are not just American hopes, or Western hopes. They are universal, human hopes. And even in the violence and turmoil of the Middle East, America believes those hopes have the power to transform lives and nations.

This moment is both an opportunity and a test for all parties in the Middle East: an opportunity to lay the foundations for future peace; a test to show who is serious about peace and who is not. The choice here is stark and simple. The Bible says, "I have set before you life and death; therefore, choose life." The time has arrived for everyone in this conflict to choose peace, and hope, and life.

Thank you very much.

END 4:04 P.M. EDT

Secretary Colin L. Powell
Washington, DC
June 25, 2002

MR. EDWARDS: Joining me now is the US Secretary of State, Colin Powell. Good morning.

SECRETARY POWELL: Good morning, Bob. How are you?

MR. EDWARDS: Good. On April 9th in Cairo, you said: "The United States recognizes that the Palestinian people view Chairman Arafat as their leader. I have said this repeatedly. It is up to the Palestinian people to decide who their leader will be." You have changed your mind?

SECRETARY POWELL: Well, what I said at that time was that Mr. Arafat had been anointed; but what we're saying this time, and what we have come to the conclusion on, is that he is not giving the Palestinian people, and his associates along with him are not giving the Palestinian people, the kind of leadership that they deserve, that they need really, to move forward and find peace. And it was reluctantly that we came to this conclusion, but it was the only conclusion we could come to.

And so the President and all of his advisors, considering the situation we were in where the violence is not getting any better and we did not see the right kind of action on the part of Palestinian leaders, and recognizing that Palestinians themselves in some areas were calling for reform and other nations were calling for reform in the region, we decided it was the right thing to do for the United States to make the clear statement that the Palestinian people should elect new leadership, find new leadership; and if they were to do so, then the United States stands ready to work with them and to work with Israel and with other parties in the region and the international community to move aggressively forward to create a state for the Palestinian people.

The President believes in this. I believe in it. I spoke to Mr. Arafat in April right after that statement that you just quoted that I made, and said to him that he had been moving in the wrong direction and it was time to make a strategic choice for his people. And unfortunately, that strategic choice has not been made. And we weren't going to keep -- we weren't going to move in positive direction unless changes are made, and the President called for those changes yesterday.

MR. EDWARDS: If the United States wants to support Palestinian democracy, how can it possibly say it won't recognize a state under Arafat's leadership, even if he is chosen in a free and fair election?

SECRETARY POWELL: What the President said, and what the United States says, is we do support democracy, but we don't believe that we are seeing the right kind of democracy, or democracy in action, now. It took Chairman Arafat six years to sign the basic law called for by the constitution. We see corruption in the Authority.

We regrettably see that they have not taken strong action against terrorist organizations, even when it's within their capacity to do so.

And so as hard as we have tried to work with the leaders of the Palestinian Authority -- and I think I am second to no one in my efforts and the energy I've put into it -- it was not producing the kind of results needed, not just simply for peace, but for the Palestinian people. And so we have called on them to have elections. They are in the process of rewriting their constitution, and I sense that there is movement within the Palestinian community for new leadership and taking a look at the situation they are currently in. And we will see what they decide they want through these elections, and the United States will respect whatever they say as a people when these elections are held.

MR. EDWARDS: The President says he wants a Palestinian leader uncompromised by terror. Who in the Palestinian leadership would the United States consider uncompromised by terror?

SECRETARY POWELL: Well, we'll wait and see what constitutes the Palestinian leadership after they have rewritten their constitution and have their elections. I am not in the leastwise, nor was the President, suggesting that every Palestinian leader is compromised by terror. I am confident that there are people within the Palestinian community who are responsible, who are committed to peace, who are against terrorism which is destroying their dream of a homeland. And we hope those leaders will emerge.

MR. EDWARDS: If Arafat is not replaced, then what?

SECRETARY POWELL: Well, we'll just have to see how that plays out. I mean, we will deal with the circumstances as we find them. But we hope that with the President's strong statement yesterday, and not just his strong statement with respect to the need for change in the Palestinian leadership, but what comes from that if we have responsible leadership that will crack down on terror, that will simply abandon these terrorist organizations in every way possible, and is willing to move forward with the United States and with Israel and with Arab nations and with the international community, there is a state waiting for them, which is what this is all about.

And the President went so far as to say that he would work to make it on a provisional basis as we moved forward toward a final settlement. And in that final settlement, the President said that the occupation would be ended, settlement activity would be stopped -- these are the requirements that we would place upon Israel -- and access would be opened up, and it would all be negotiated on the basis on the land-for-peace proposals in UN Resolutions 242 and 338.

An important sentence that the President had toward the tail end of his speech when he talked about the vision of a Palestinian state with final arrangements within three years, he said, "I and my government will work toward that goal." And that is President George Bush stepping up and making a personal commitment to the Palestinian people and to the people of the region, both peoples. The Israelis and the Palestinians need peace. They need to find a way to create a Palestinian state. It is as much in Israel's interest to have such a state as it is in the interest of the Palestinian people.

MR. EDWARDS: Is enough being asked of Israel here?

SECRETARY POWELL: I think quite a bit is being asked of Israel. But what is important here is that Israel has to have a responsible partner that is committed to cracking down on terrorism, ending terrorism, and negotiating in a responsible way without any suggestion that they are participating or supporting terrorist activity in any way.

Israel has made it clear -- and this is not the slightest bit unreasonable; we feel the same way -- that is it very difficult for them to move down a path to peace when bombs are going off every other day. It does not create the kinds of conditions.

And those who are setting these bombs off are not only trying to kill innocent Israelis, they're trying to kill the dream of a Palestinian state. And that is why we believe it is so much in the interest of Palestinian leaders, the Palestinian people, to reject this kind of strategy, reject these kinds of organizations, and bring in responsible leadership that will reject this categorically and crack down on it.

MR. EDWARDS: And when will you be returning to the region?

SECRETARY POWELL: I'll make a judgment on that in the days ahead. We've got a few things that we have to do first. The President, as you know, is going to Canada today to be with the leaders of the other industrialized nations, and they want to get a response from them. And I will be in contact with leaders in the region by telephone over the next several days and make an assessment of when I should return to the region, and for what purpose. And so there is some work that has to be done before I return, but I can assure you we're hard at work, beginning this morning, on moving forward on the President's vision.

MR. EDWARDS: Mr. Secretary, thank you.

SECRETARY POWELL: Thank you. Bye-bye.

[End]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, C. (1993). *Eisenhower and the mass media*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Anonymous, (2002, July 15). Looking to America. *Economist.Com/ Global Agenda*. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>
- Ball, M. (1996). The role of language, media, and spectacle in constituting a presidency. *Journal of Communication*, 46, 176-180. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>
- Bardwick, J. M. (1996). Peacetime management and wartime leadership. In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (Eds.), *The Leader of the Future*, (pp.131-139). New York: Peter F. Drucker Foundation.
- Black, E. (1965). *Rhetorical criticism: A study in method*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Black, E. (1992). *Rhetorical questions: Studies of public discourse*. University of Chicago Press.
- Borger, J. (2002, May 9). Middle East crisis: Policy changes and split inside administration add to confusion: Powell left to pick up the pieces after reversals. *The Guardian*, 1.5. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>
- Bostdorff, D. M. (1994). *The presidency and the rhetoric of foreign crisis*. Columbia: University of South Carolina.
- Brayman, M. (2003). Four-star power. *Business Mexico*, 13, 37. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>
- Bush, G. W. (2003, March 14). *Hopeful moment for progress toward Middle East peace*. The White House. Retrieved March 30, 2003 from the World Wide Web: <http://state.gov/>
- Bush, G.W. (2002, June 24). *President Bush calls for new Palestinian leadership*. Washington, DC: The Rose Garden. Retrieved November 27, 2002 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/20020624-3.html>
- Calabresi, M. & Robinson, S. (2002, July 8). Bush vs. Arafat. *Time*, 160, 16.

Retrieved March 30, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web:
<http://proquest.umi.com>

Collins, D.F. (2001). Audience in Afrocentric rhetoric: Promoting human agency and social change. In L. Gray-Rosendale, & S. Gruber, (Eds.), *Alternative Rhetorics*, (pp. 185-202). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Conger, J.A. (1991). Inspiring others: the language of leadership. *The Executive*, 5, 31-46. Retrieved March 30, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Conger, J.A., Kanungo, R.A., Menon, S.T., & Mathur, P. (1997). Measuring charisma: Dimensionality and validity of the Conger-Kanungo scale of charismatic leadership. *Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration*, 14, 290-302. Retrieved March 30, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Curtiss, R. H. (2002). Bush's speech an unhappy ending to hopes of U.S. role toward Mid East peace. *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 21, 17-18. Retrieved September 9, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

DeYoung, K. (2002, July 18). Arabs give Bush a Palestinian plan: Reconstituted government would be designed to lead to statehood. *The Washington Post*, A24. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Dingle, D.T., & Hughes, A. (2002). A time for bold leadership. *Black Enterprise*, 7, 76-82. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Donahue, R.T., & Prosser, M.H. (1997). *Diplomatic discourse: International conflict at the United Nations, addresses and analysis*. Greenwich: Ablex Publishing.

Edwards, J.L. (1998). The very model of a modern major (media) candidate: Colin Powell and the rhetoric of public opinion. *Communication Quarterly*, 46, 163-176. Retrieved September 9, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Elliot, M., & Frank, M. (2003, February 17). Countdown to war. *Time*, 161, 24-29. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Foss, S. (1996). *Rhetorical criticism: Exploration and practice*. Prospect Heights:

Waveland Press.

Foss, S., Foss, K., & Trapp R. (2002). *Contemporary perspectives on rhetoric*. Prospect Heights: Waveland Press.

Frey, L.R., Botan, C.H., & Kreps, G.L. (2000). *Investigating communication an introduction to research methods*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Garko, M.G. (1990). Perspectives on and conceptualizations of compliance and compliance-gaining. *Communication Quarterly*, 38, 138-157.

Gerner, D. J. (1991). *One land, two peoples*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Ghanem, A. (2001). *The Palestinian-Arab minority in Israel, 1948 – 2000*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Goleman, D. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston: Harvard Business School Publishing.

Halford, R. (1998). Leadership, rhetoric, and the American presidency. *Executive Speeches*, 12, 18-21. Retrieved February 4, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Harari, O. (2002). *The leadership secrets of Colin Powell*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Interview by Bob Edwards on NPR's "Morning Edition". (2002, June 25). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of State. Retrieved November 27, 2002 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2002/11406pf.html>

Kessler, G. (2002, June 30). Cutting Arafat loose, but not by name; In intense two weeks, White House shifted and refined U.S. stance on Middle East. *The Washington Post*, A19. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Kiewe A., & Houck, D.W. (1991). *A shining city on a hill: Ronald Reagan's economic rhetoric, 1951-1989*. New York: Praeger.

King Jr., N., & Cummings, J. (2003, February 27). Leading the news: Bush acts to prod Israel to energize peace process. *The Wall Street Journal*, A3. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Lane, C. (1995, April 17). The legend of Colin Powell. *The New Republic*, 212, 20-32. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide

Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Leaders: - Burden of proof; America and Iraq. (2003, February 8). *The Economist*, 13. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Liebovich, L.W. (1994). *Bylines in despair: Herbert Hoover, the great depression, and the U.S. news media*. Wesport, CT: Praeger.

Lofland, J. (1971). *Analyzing social settings*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.

MacAskill, E., & Tisdall, S. (2002, June 13). Bush and Powell in public split over Israel. *The Guardian*, 2. Retrieved June 23, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Marshall, R. (2002). Bush gives up posing as “peacemaker” to emerge as Sharon’s staunch ally. *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 21, 8-11. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

McDonald, M., Plato, Richard Weaver and Colin Powell ethics and rhetoric. *Matt’s Land O’ Rhetoric Web site*. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://bradley.bradley.edu>

McGeary, J. & Frank, M. (2003, February 10). Dissecting the case. *Time*, 6, 56-61. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Melendez, S. E. (1996). An “outsider’s” view of leadership. In Hesselbein, F., Goldsmith, M., & Beckhard, R. (Eds.), *The leader of the future*, (pp. 293-302). New York: Peter F. Drucker Foundation.

Olson, R. (2002). The Arab-Palestine, Israel conflict, 53 years on: Perceptions and an assessment. *Journal of Third World Studies*, 19, 37-48. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Powell, C. L. (1996). Integrity, kindness, and godliness. *Vital Speeches of the Day*, 62, 683-687. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Powell, C.L. (1995). *My american journey*. New York: Ballantine.

Powell, C.L. (2002, May 6). *Remarks at the 24th annual national leadership conference of the anti-defamation league*. Washington, DC: Omni Shoreham Hotel. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from the World Wide Web:

<http://state.gov/secretary>

Powell, C. L. (2003, February 5) *Remarks to the United Nations security council*. New York. Retrieved February 6, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://state.gov/secretary>

Prosser, M. H. (Ed.). (1969). *An ethic for survival: Adlai Stevenson speaks on international affairs 1936-1965*. New York: William Morrow.

Robbins, C.A. (2002, June 13). Interim Palestinian state draws U. S. consideration, Powell says: Secretary of state cautions idea is just one of several getting White House review. *Wall Street Journal*, A15. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Sahliye, E. (1988). *In search of leadership: West bank politics since 1967*. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Shadid, A. (2002, June 13). Administration mixes signals on Palestinians. *The Boston Globe*, A1. Retrieved July 21, 2002 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Shareholder scorecard (A special report): The best and worst performers of the WSJ 1000---Going to extremes: Companies at top and bottom of rankings. (2003, March 10). *The Wall Street Journal*, R1. Retrieved March 30, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Takala, T. (1998). Plato on leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 785-798. Retrieved March 5, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>

Zielinski, D. (1998). Secrets from the pros: 5 master presenters share their top techniques. *Presentations*, 12, 46-56. Retrieved March 4, 2003 from Proquest Database on the World Wide Web: <http://proquest.umi.com>